

SEARCHING FOR THE TRANSLATOR IN THE ARCHIVE:
A MICROHISTORICAL APPROACH TO PINAR KÜR'S PRIVATE PAPERS

HAZAL YONCA BİRİNCİOĞLU

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2025

SEARCHING FOR THE TRANSLATOR IN THE ARCHIVE:
A MICROHISTORICAL APPROACH TO PINAR KÜR’S PRIVATE PAPERS

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Translation

by
Hazal Yonca Birincioğlu

Boğaziçi University

2025

Searching for the Translator in the Archive:

A Microhistorical Approach to Pınar Kür's Private Papers

The thesis of Hazal Yonca Birincioğlu

has been approved by:

Prof. Özlem Berk Albachten
(Thesis Advisor)

Assist. Prof. Ayşenaz Cengiz

Assoc. Prof. Müge Işıklar Koçak
(External Member)

March 2025

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Hazal Yonca Birincioglu, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date

ABSTRACT

Searching for the Translator in the Archive:

A Microhistorical Approach to Pınar Kür's Private Papers

This study presents an agent-oriented microhistorical approach to the established author-translator Pınar Kür's Private Papers in the Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation (WLICF) in Istanbul, Türkiye. Although curated primarily as an author's archive, Pınar Kür's Private Papers constitute a rich repository of various materials related to translation practice, performed by Kür as the author-translator and by other agents of translation. Among these materials, the correspondence between Kür and multiple translation agents was selected as the primary source of investigation within the scope of this thesis as it presents a less overtly mediated account of forgotten or overlooked details related to the author-translator's life as well as the lives of other translational agents who have, although periphrastically, found a place in Kür's archive. Complemented with extratextual materials, primarily interviews, found inside and outside the archive, an investigation of the correspondence reveals an insight into the living and working conditions, working practices, and self-perceptions of these agents. Moreover, as a result of the social situatedness of translators and translation, this thesis also offers a sociological perspective on the habitus and telos of the translational agents in its focus. Finally, by providing a portrayal of the interactions and parallels between the translational practices and habitus of translation agents situated in various literary fields between the 1960s and 1990s, this study aims to make a contribution to translator-oriented historiography within the scope of Translator Studies.

ÖZET

Arşivdeki Çevirmenin İzinde:

Pınar Kür'ün Özel Arşivi'ne Mikrotarihsel bir Yaklaşım

Bu çalışma yazar-çevirmen Pınar Kür'ün Kadın Eserleri Kütüphanesi ve Bilgi Merkezi Vakfı'nda (KEKBMV) yer alan Özel Arşivi'ne aktör odaklı mikrotarihsel bir yaklaşım sunmaktadır. Bu arşiv, esasen bir yazar arşivi olarak derlenmiş olmakla birlikte, Kür'ün ve başka çeviri aktörlerinin çeviri pratikleriyle ilişkili çeşitli malzemenin yer aldığı zengin bir kaynak sunmaktadır. Bu malzemeler arasında yer alan, Kür'ün çeşitli çeviri aktörleriyle yaptığı yazışmalar bu çalışma kapsamında gerçekleştirilen araştırmalarda birincil kaynak olarak ele alınmıştır. Bu yazışmalar, yazar-çevirmen Kür'ün ve onun arşivinde, dolaylı yoldan ve çevrede kalarak da olsa, kendisine bir yer edinebilmiş diğer çeviri aktörlerinin hayatlarına ilişkin unutulmuş veya göz ardı edilmiş detayları daha az aracılıkla aktaran anlatılar olmalarıdır. Bu yazışmalar, arşivde veya arşivin dışındaki kaynaklarda bulunan ve çoğunlukla röportajlardan oluşan metindışı malzemeler ile desteklenerek incelendiğinde söz konusu çeviri aktörlerinin yaşam ve çalışma koşulları, çalışma pratikleri ve özelemlerine yakından bir bakış sunmaktadır. Ayrıca bu çalışma, çevirmenlerin ve çevirinin toplumsal konumsallığının bir sonucu olarak, odağındaki çeviri aktörlerinin *habitus* ve *telos*'u üzerine sosyolojik bir bakış da sunmakta, 1960'lar ve 1990'lar arasındaki dönemde farklı edebiyat alanlarında konumlanmış çeviri aktörlerinin çeviri faaliyetleri ve habitusları arasındaki etkileşimler ve paralellikleri göz önüne sererek Çevirmen Çalışmaları kapsamında çevirmen odaklı tarih yazımı çalışmalarına katkıda bulunmayı amaçlamaktadır.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Prof. Özlem Berk Albachten, for guiding me with her invaluable insight, meticulous eye for detail, and endless patience; for sharing her profound knowledge with me and with all the future researchers of translation who have had the chance to learn from her; and for being an inspiration with her unwavering stance, dedication, and passion for her work, which I have looked up to throughout my academic journey and always will.

I would also like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to the members of my jury. Assist. Prof. Ayşenaz Cengiz has offered her kindest guidance and support since my very first day as an undergraduate student at this university. Thanks to this thesis, I got the chance to meet Assoc. Prof. Müge Işıklar Koçak and benefit from her outstanding expertise and illuminating suggestions. I genuinely hope to work with her in the future, especially on a feminist translation study. I would also like to thank the external members of my jury, Assist. Prof. Fazilet Akdoğan Özdemir and Assoc. Prof. Ahu Selin Erkul Yağcı, for kindly agreeing to serve as alternate jury members and for sharing their invaluable feedback.

Undoubtedly, there are many other people who have supported me throughout this journey. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all of the professors with whom I have had the chance to work and from whose profound knowledge and inspiring perspectives I have learned a great deal, including Prof. Şehnaz Tahir Gürçağlar, Assoc. Prof. Jan Buts, Dr. Ceyda Elgöl, Assoc. Prof. Şule Demirkol Ertürk, Assoc. Prof. Jonathan Ross, and other professors both within and beyond our department.

I would also like to express my heartfelt thanks to the Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation, especially to its former coordinator, Hülya İskender, for helping me access and investigate the materials in Pınar Kür's archive at the library and for informing Pınar Kür of my research, to whom I am deeply grateful for kindly allowing me to use the materials in this thesis. I also extend my sincere thanks to the librarians who assisted me at various stages of my investigation and the digitalization of the materials.

I am grateful to The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Türkiye (TÜBİTAK) and its Science Fellowships and Grant Programmes Directorate (BİDEB) for their financial support through the 2210 - MSc/MA Scholarship Programmes. I would also like to thank the Boğaziçi University Foundation (BUVAK) for their financial support.

Last but not least, my heartfelt thanks to my family and friends for the boundless love, patience, and support they have shown me throughout this journey and my entire life. Thank you for believing in me, helping me believe in myself, and guiding me to find the spark within me when everything around seemed so dark. I dedicate this study to you — and to all the women in the world who are writing, speaking, and standing up for the women who have lived, created, and done wonderful things in this world, whose stories we must not allow to fade away into silence. I hear you, I feel you, and until we achieve the lives we dream of — and even beyond that — we stand together in solidarity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Aim and scope.....	2
1.2 Literature review	4
CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	23
2.1 A microhistorical approach to the translator’s archive.....	25
2.2 Translation as a social practice and agency of translators: A Bourdieusian perspective.....	27
2.3 Translator studies: An agent-oriented approach to translators	33
2.4 Microhistorical research in translator studies: An archival methodology.....	35
CHAPTER 3: SEARCHING FOR THE TRANSLATOR IN THE ARCHIVE: PINAR KÜR AS THE AUTHOR-TRANSLATOR, HER PRIVATE PAPERS, AND METHODOLOGY.....	36
3.1 Pınar Kür: The (translated) author, translator, and author-translator	36
3.2 Women’s Library and Information Centre Foundation	62
3.3 Private Archive of Pınar Kür.....	67
CHAPTER 4: <i>FERHAD ET SHIRINE</i> : A COLLABORATIVE DRAMA TRANSLATION AND THE ROLE OF INSTITUTIONAL AGENTS	88
CHAPTER 5: KÜR AND HER “MARGINAL” TRANSLATORS: (SELF-)PERCEPTION, PRACTICE, AND POWER RELATIONS IN THE LITERARY FIELD	117
5.1 “Kısa Yol Yolcusu” in English: Translating women authors of the Turkish literary field for the Anglo-American literary field in the late 1980s	118

5.2 “Bir Deli Ağaç” in English: The working conditions and practices of Ruth Christie	129
5.3 <i>Asılacak Kadın</i> in French: Ferda Fidan’s symbolic capital and practice as a translator.....	152
5.4 <i>Bir Cinayet Romanı</i> in Czech: Tomáš Laně’s efforts in translating Turkish (crime) novels.....	176
CHAPTER 6: TRACING THE AGENT IN TRANSLATION CRITICISM: SAYDAM ÖZEL’S CRITICISM ON <i>GENİŞ</i> , <i>GENİŞ BİR DENİZ</i> AND THE AUTHOR-TRANSLATOR’S RESPONSE	
	184
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION	197
REFERENCES	205

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This thesis focuses on the private papers of Pınar Kür, a renowned author who has published several acclaimed novels and short stories, some of which have been translated into other languages, and the prolific translator of a diverse body of literary works into Turkish. These private papers, comprising her archive, were donated by Kür in 2015 to The Women’s Library and Information Centre Foundation (WLICF) located in Istanbul, Türkiye. The archive offers a variety of materials, which include translation-related materials such as drafts and manuscripts of translated works, correspondence between translation agents, and interviews. Adopting an agent-oriented approach, this study centers around the correspondence between Kür and other translation agents since they provide invaluable insight into the lives, working conditions, practices, self-perceptions, and identities of translators as well as the interactions between these agents. Moreover, since most of the translation-related materials are fragmented and limited, the study also follows the “clues” (Atefmehr & Farahzad, 2022) found in the archive and draws on interviews, prefaces and introductions of translations, and other related materials found in and outside Kür’s archive that are complementary to the discussions raised by each correspondence. In this way, the thesis searches for and highlights the “translator” and the “translatorial” to contribute to an agent-oriented history of translation and the discourse of Translator Studies (Chesterman, 2009).

The “ordinary” and overlooked details of the lives of translation agents in this archive have also revealed valuable insight into the social role of these agents and their interactions with their sociocultural contexts as well as the power dynamics and

asymmetries among them. To investigate the role of translation as a social practice and translators and other translation agents as socially-situated agents, this study integrates the Bourdieusian concepts of “habitus,” “capital,” and “field,” drawing on their usage in translational research. Such an approach allows for a better understanding of the driving forces behind the attitudes and dispositions of translators, the asymmetries in power, and the interactions between agents and fields, as well as amongst agents themselves. Moreover, by focusing on the interactions and connections between the habitus, working practices, and living and working conditions of translation agents contributing to the translation, publication, and circulation of translated literature in various literary fields, this study aims to contribute to an agent-oriented historiography within the lines of Translator Studies. Finally, by “bridging” (Chesterman, 2007) theoretical and methodological approaches from different disciplines, history and sociology in this case, this study not only underlines the position of Translation Studies as an “interdiscipline” but also highlights the importance of drawing on and integrating multiple approaches as a productive methodology for engaging with complex, fragmented, and versatile sources in translational research, particularly in dealing with translator archives.

1.1 Aim and scope

The first aim of this thesis is to focus on and learn more about Pınar Kür’s translatorship by making use of her private papers located at the WLICF. In this respect, my research is the first of its kind in studying Kür’s archive from a translational perspective. Although other studies (Aka, 2011; Kocabay, 2013; Öztürk Baydere, 2015; Ozbirinci, 2017; Canlı, 2023) have investigated Kür’s translatorship, they mostly trace her translatorial strategies through textual analysis and comparison.

In these studies, the element of “style” stands out as these scholars argue for the presence of a translatorial style and demonstrate its interactions with Kür’s authorial style. Some of these studies also present a sociological framework, but only to explain the driving factors behind Kür’s translatorial strategies, which are also identified through textual analysis, and only in relation to the text(s) that they investigate. Therefore, my research proposes a new look at Kür’s translatorship that shifts the focus from her translations (the product) to her position as a translator (the agent). Moreover, an agent-oriented approach to Kür through the archival materials also reveals another important position of Kür, that is, her position as the translated author, which has been largely overlooked although it provides invaluable information when investigated in relation to her position as a translator.

The other aim of my thesis is to contribute to the growing body of research focusing on translator archives. Recent studies have pointed out a shift from “primary text products” (Munday, 2014) to extratextual sources, including translator archives, which are rich, complex, and fragmented repositories (Guzmán, 2013; Guzmán, 2020) of translational knowledge waiting to be excavated, collected, and re-curated by translation researchers. Such composition of translator archives also posits methodological challenges and limitations, which I argue, continue to encourage more research in the area. Nevertheless, with each individual study of translators, which will allow for further research that will reveal patterns, connections, and gaps on a broader sociocultural scale, an international translator-oriented history can be shaped into existence. In the same vein, as archival research in Translation Studies is a relatively new method that goes hand in hand with microhistorical approaches to translation history, this study also aims to present a

case study that will contribute to the discourse of Translator Studies and encourage further translator-oriented research in the field.

1.2 Literature review

Within the scope of this research, I first looked for existing translational research centered on Kür's archive at WLICF, which yielded no result since there are no records of any published studies that use the archive as a (primary) source in their discussion. In fact, although it has been around ten years since Kür donated this collection of private papers to the Library, and thus presented a rich repository that encompasses a long period of her life throughout which she performed various roles, I have found no records of any kind of research that centers on the archive.¹

Therefore, I continued my search, widening my scope and looking for translational research on Kür that focuses on her agency and/or (author-)translatorial identity. I have found several studies that fall under this scope, but they were still limited in number, especially compared to numerous studies on her authorial identity, practice, and original works. The research on Kür's identity and practice as an author-translator has shown that her symbolic capital as an author has also elevated her position as a translator, making her one of the most esteemed (author-)translators in the Turkish literary field. Nevertheless, her translatorial identity, while it has also been recognized, has remained in the margins when compared to her identity as a well-known author.

It was also revealed that the research focusing on her (author-)translator identity and translations share certain characteristics and perspectives: Either as a

¹ I checked YÖK's (Council of Higher Education) Ulusal Tez Merkezi (National Thesis Center), the Thesis Collection and the General Catalog of the Women's Library, the Boğaziçi University Library, Milli Kütüphane (the National Library of Türkiye), and various databases via the EBSCO interface provided by the Boğaziçi University Library.

central or a complementary discussion, all of them deal with Kür's (pro-)feminist approach, which had a certain impact not only on her original works but also on her translations. Other common characteristics of these studies, except for Ozbirinci (2017) centering around the feminist translatorial strategies adopted by Kür through a case study, are that they draw parallels between Kür's authorial and translatorial identities, investigate their interaction and focus especially on Kür's style as an author and a translator in this investigation. Therefore, they all inevitably use the traditional methodology of comparative textual analysis, combined with a sociohistorical analysis, through paratextual and/or extratextual sources, of the context that has shaped her authorial and translatorial identities as well as her translatorial strategies. Finally, some of these studies also touch upon the concept of "visibility" (Venuti, 1995) with reference to Kür's translatorial strategies and position and argue that Kür makes herself, her voice as the translator, "visible" in her translations.

Among these, the study that I found the most relevant to my research is Aka's (2011) doctoral dissertation, which looks at some of Kür's original novels and translations of Jean Rhys' novels from a stylistic perspective. In her research, Aka has combined stylistic analysis with a sociological approach that investigates the impact of Kür's multiple identities, primarily focusing on her roles as an author and a translator, on her agency and the style of her original works and translations. Thus, the study searches for interactions between her authorial and translatorial identities and their corresponding impact on the interactions between her authorial and translatorial styles. For the sociological aspect of her research, Aka integrates Bourdieusian concepts and presents a discourse analysis of paratextual and extratextual materials such as interviews (including the one conducted by Aka for the

study), articles from translation-oriented magazines, reviews, and criticism of Kür's original and translated works. These materials provide significant insight into Kür's habitus and symbolic capital as an author-translator as well as into the field of Turkish literature where Kür conducts her translatorial practice. It is important to point out that Aka defines author-translator as a distinct identity in which the authorial and translatorial identities constantly interact with each other, often nourishing Kür's practice both as an author and a translator. For the stylistic analysis, on the other hand, Aka uses corpus methodology through which she conducts a comparative text-oriented stylistic analysis, first through a quantitative analysis using a corpus tool, which she later combines with a qualitative analysis of the texts. Although, as Aka argues and Kür also admits, there are certain interactions between Kür's authorial and translatorial styles, the study calls for further stylistic analysis through the integration of other corpora, which would help provide a clearer and more grounded identification of these interactions. At the same time, it also presents important sociological insights regarding Kür's role as an author-translator, which I further investigate in my study that goes beyond the text-oriented stylistic analysis and centralizes interactions between Kür and other agents operating in the field of translated literature.

There are other studies that focus on Kür's translatorial identity through analysis of her translations while also revealing important insights regarding their connection to her authorial identity. For instance, in Canlı's (2023) study, Kür's translation of the post-modern novel *Frankissstein: A Love Story* (2019) (*Frankissstein: Bir Aşk Hikâyesi* (2021)) by Jeanette Winterson is subjected to stylistic analysis. Having investigated the characteristics of postmodern literature and their implications for translation and having compared the stylistic features of the

original and the translated texts, the researcher concludes that Kür adopts certain translatorial strategies, such as omissions, additions, and other “creative” interferences through language use, that make her voice as a translator more “visible” in the translated text. According to Canlı (2023), these strategies can also be explained by the “plurality of meaning” in postmodern texts, which leads to individual interpretations and renderings by the translator whose primary role is defined as a reader of the text (p. 83). Moreover, Canlı also argues that the connection between Kür’s authorial and translatorial identities is also reflected in her style as a translator. However, the study does not provide an elaborate discussion of Kür’s authorial style, which is necessary for understanding its interactions with her translatorial style. Instead, it simply touches upon Kür’s defiance of clear-cut rules in terms of genre and form in her novels and emphasizes sexuality, a traditionally taboo concept, as a central theme in Kür’s works. Although this explains the connection between the authorial styles of Kür and Winterson, the interaction between Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles and how it manifests itself in this particular translation remains unclear, other than implying defiance as a common driving force. Therefore, in terms of this connection, the study does not go further than underlining “creativity” behind Kür’s translatorial decisions as a daring power and skill that are endowed by her authorial identity and its more privileged position. Nevertheless, it opens up discussions about the privileges that are endowed to Kür by her position as an author-translator, which I also take up on a sociological level in my study.

There are two other studies on Kür’s translations of Jeanette Winterson’s works and her position as a (pro-)feminist translator. One is Öztürk Baydere’s (2015) research on Turkish translations of Winterson’s novels *Written on the Body* (1992) and *Sexing the Cherry* (1989), translated by Süheyla Çağlayan Mathews (*Bedende*

Yazılı, 2013) and Pınar Kür (*Vişnenin Cinsiyeti*, 1995), respectively. In this study, Öztürk Baydere presents a comparative stylistic analysis of these two translations to see whether they convey the lexical choices of their respective originals to create the same “contextual effect” on the reader that the author aims for. She underlines word choices as an important component of the author’s style, which, in turn, reflects her ideology. Winterson openly deals with sexuality in her works and uses explicit language. However, the findings of the study demonstrate that Çağlayan Mathews imposes self-censorship in her translation of “obscene” words. This self-censorship is then explained in the broader context of censorship in Türkiye with its book bans and prosecutions of authors. Kür, on the other hand, does not shy away from reflecting the “obscene” aspect of the original in her translation. Öztürk Baydere argues that this results from Kür’s position as a censored author who even underwent prosecution for the “obscene” content of her novel *Bitmeyen Aşk* (1986), which points to a defiance of social norms that is continued in her translations and a reaction against censorship policies.

By pointing out Kür’s stance against social norms and showing its impact on her original works as well as in the works that she chooses to translate, this study presents one aspect of the many interactions between her authorial and translatorial identities. However, a review of the research on Kür’s translatorial identity reveals that Öztürk Baydere’s study is not the first to raise this discussion since Kür’s pro-feminist stance and the interplay between her authorial and translatorial identities and their impact on her style were first explored in Kocabay’s (2013) study. Although Öztürk Baydere (2015) does not cite Kocabay in her references, the latter’s gender-based approach to Kür’s translation of *Sexing the Cherry* by Jeanette Winterson is quite similar to the discussion provided by the former. Therefore, it is evident that,

despite the limitations of her study, Kocabay opens up the space for further discussions on the impact of ideology on translations through the case of Kür's translation and her rejection of the social norms of her time and self-censorship. Moreover, her study also touches upon the authorial identity of Kür, whose works openly address sexuality, like Winterson does, and points to a possible interaction between her authorial and translatorial identities, especially in terms of text selection and translatorial strategies.

A similar "defiant" stance is taken up by Ozbirinci (2017) in her study of Pınar Kür's role as a "bold female translator" in her translation of Sam Shepard's play *Curse of the Starving Class* (The original play was produced and first staged in 1977 while Kür's translation, *Aç Sınıfın Laneti*, was published in 1990). However, Ozbirinci's study does not attribute Kür's ability to "boldly" interfere with the translation to her position and privilege as an author. Instead, she argues that Kür, as a woman and a translator, adopts a "pro-female" perspective that "attacks, conquers, and recreates Shepard's text to assert her voice as a Turkish woman in the translation process" (Ozbirinci, 2017, p. 141). In this way, translation becomes "an ideological weapon to inject the feminine into Shepard's masculinist text" (Ozbirinci, 2017, p. 142). This is reflected in Kür's translatorial strategies that make omissions, additions, and alterations while interpreting the text in a way that interferes with the derogatory portrayal of the woman character, Ella, in the original play and also in different stage productions of it. Ella is often portrayed as a selfish and foolish woman because she does not perform the "socially acceptable" and "therapeutic" role as the mother of the family that society expects her to conform to in a time of familial crisis (Ozbirinci, 2017, p. 144). Ozbirinci (2017) further points out the patriarchal norms embedded in such portrayal and shows how Kür opposes them through feminist

translational strategies, shifting the text's "authorship, and by implication, some of its Western, male perspectives, into a liminal, intercultural space" (p. 148). Therefore, this study underlines the translator's central, active, and independent position without referencing any other role that might be supporting or empowering it. It presents significant findings that underline the pro-feminist approach that Kür adopts as part of her translational identity that gives voice to the marginal in a male and Western-oriented narrative.

Archive-based research for translator-oriented historiography, on the other hand, is a growing area in Translation Studies. To further situate my research, I have investigated studies that focus on translation and translator archives, especially those with a microhistorical approach to translators and other agents of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1993) involved in the translation and publication processes. For this reason, I examined studies on both individual translators' archives as well as those that present a translational perspective to publisher archives. In addition, I also looked at research that focuses on the function and value of the archive itself as a source of knowledge. For instance, in her groundbreaking study on translator archives, Guzmán (2013) responds to Simeoni's (1998) call for translator "sociographies" to present a "sociological eye" to translators' "historicity and position in the cultural sphere." In this study, Guzmán (2013) provides a retrospective look at her previous research investigating the archives of three translators, Gregory Rabassa, Suzanne Jill Levine, and Sergio Waisman, and that positions them as key agents in the translation of Latin American literature and the formation of its image in the U.S. While reframing her research with reference to the archival methodology that she proposes, Guzmán demonstrates what the archives have revealed about these translators' role, both individually and collectively, as

agents of cultural production and their reflections on translation and their own practice. Moreover, drawing on Mignolo's (2000, as cited in Guzmán, 2013) reading of Foucault's "subjugated knowledges", her study underlines a genealogical approach to archives which traces the fragmented and marginalized knowledge of translators and expands on how they can be investigated.

Such a conception of the archive also aligns with microhistorical approaches to translations and translators (Munday, 2014). In fact, Guzmán (2020) retackles these issues with regard to contemporary discussions in Translation Studies, including Chesterman's (2009) proposition of Translator Studies as an agent-oriented perspective, while providing different ways for approaching the translator's archive, both as a physical repository of materials and a symbolic composition of diverse discourses. While underlining the transformative experience of working in an archive for a researcher, she also points out its limitations, which are reflected in the researcher's subjective interpretation of it. This methodology and its agent-oriented perspective also inform my study as I investigate Kür as an agent whose practice and interactions with other agents, including her translators, reveal the power dynamics in the literary field. Moreover, I argue that her archive is a manifestation of the discourse on translators and author-translators in the Turkish literary field, in which the scattered voices of Kür's translators can survive through the archive of the author-translator.

Archives can also be used for a microhistorical investigation of the working practices and conditions of translators in relation to the role of other agents involved in translation and publication processes. Paloposki (2016), for instance, presents a study that focuses on the translator papers of Karl Gustaf Samuli Suomalainen, who translated significant literary works into Finnish, and the archive of Edlund, an

influential publishing house in Finland in the second half of the nineteenth century that published translated literature in Finnish. By presenting an overview of the language policies in Finland, Paloposki (2016) contextualizes her research to understand the sociohistorical factors that shape the translation event (Toury, 2012). By looking at the various materials found in these archives, such as correspondence, contracts, and receipts, Paloposki (2016) investigates not only the “working life and conditions” of an individual translator but also the practices of the publishing house “influencing translators’ work” (p. 2). Her examination of the materials in the publisher’s archive enables the researcher to look at the documents related to more than 70 translators and their work in search of any patterns that could be identified regarding the conditions and practices of translators in the Finnish literary field while comparing the information on their practice to that found in Suomalainen’s, thus the individual translator’s, archive. This comparison reveals that Suomalainen’s position as a translator and his relationship with the publishing house were different from those of other translators working for Edlund. Regarding this difference, Paloposki (2016) underlines that “well-known and respected figures”, like Suomalainen, “had earned their reputation through different literary and educational roles and tasks” which leads her to question who can be defined as a “translator” (p. 14). This opens up a discussion on the different roles played by the translator and to what extent the translatorial role is informed by the other roles of the translator as an agent, which I also further tackle in my study through the investigation of the identity of the author-translator.

Similarly, Atefmehr and Farahzad (2022) also adopt an archival methodology in their microhistorical research of a woman translator, only known by her titles Khanoom Hajib and Nayyirah ‘Uzma, in the late Qajar era in Iran. They also present

“an archival method for microhistorical research in translator studies”, which is a three-step process that is initiated by a “clue” (Ginzburg, 1980, as cited in Atefmehr & Farahzad, 2022). After finding a clue that is tied to a translator, a translation event, or other translation-related phenomena, the researcher searches for evidence in relevant archives, which can be found through an investigation of personal, institutional, and/or official primary sources. The last step is the establishment of a relationship between the individual (micro) and the general (macro). They underline that this relationship serves not to confirm but to challenge and reveal the gaps in dominant macro narratives by unearthing micro details about individual translators’ lives. By adopting such a methodology, Atefmehr and Farahzad (2022) reveal that, although only two of her translations were published, Khanoom Hajib was an influential figure in translation, having translated more than 20 works, which would have been enough to identify her as a prolific translator of the Qajar era if they had been published. Moreover, she was an educated woman in a society where the education of women was not encouraged and women were confined to the private sphere of their homes and to their role as wives and mothers of the nation. Therefore, translation was also a social and even political practice for Khanoom Hajib, through which, she aimed to “serve the national interest in translating books” and her “compatriots” (Atefmehr & Farahzad, 2022, pp. 258-259). This shows Khanoom Hajib’s emphasis on the idea that women’s role in society and the nation could go beyond traditional expectations and include translation practice. Lastly, although they present a study on a “neglected” and marginalized translator, Atefmehr and Farahzad (2022) also underline an alternative perspective that offers the possibility of revisiting the narratives on “prolific” and/or already-investigated translators with a “fresh look” which would also provide important insights that could “challenge the

dominant discourses” and “reveal the gaps in our historical knowledge” (p. 259). I found both of these perspectives truly beneficial in my research since I look at the archive of a prolific and well-known author-translator who benefits from the symbolic capital endowed by her authorial identity and whose archive reveals fragments of microhistories of other, more “marginalized” translators.

In addition to individual studies, special issues of translation magazines and journals have been devoted to discussing archives as repositories of socio-historical knowledge on translations, translators, and the translation practice, as well as the discourse surrounding them while offering a variety of approaches to archives of translators and other agents involved in the translation process. The issue of *Palimpsests* “Dans l’archive des traducteurs” (In the archive of translators), presents genetic, genealogical, and self-reflective approaches to the translator archive as a physical and symbolic space (Hersant, 2020a). While some articles deal with manuscripts and drafts (Hersant, 2020c; Lessinger, 2020; Hartmann, 2020), others trace the genetics of a translation through paratextual (Montini, 2020) and pretextual materials (Épié, 2020).² Guzmán’s (2020) revised article, which was discussed above, on the genealogical perspective to archive and her case study of the creation of the Latin American image through translation in the U.S. is also included in this issue. Lastly, this issue underlines what translators’ self-reflection on their translation practice can reveal as well as the importance of its documentation (Stratford, 2020; Bouton-Kelly, 2020; Cordingley, 2020 as cited in Hersant, 2020a).

Similarly, the issue “Archives de traduction” (Translation archives) of *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* (*Meta: Translators’ Journal*) presents, in three sections, different perspectives on translation archives, looking at individual translator

² All cited in Hersant’s (2020a) introduction (pp.7-13).

archives (Arber and Tophoven, 2021; Verhulst, Beloborodova and Van Hulle, 2021; Hidalgo Nácher, 2021) and publishers' archives (Pickford, 2021; Milan, 2021; Paloposki, 2021; Lobejón Santos, Gómez Castro and Gutiérrez Lanza, 2021). The experience of working in an archive is also tackled in this issue (Stowe, 2021; Méchoulán; 2021) alongside interviews with archivists working in significant translation and translator archives, such as Breon Mitchell the director of Lilly Library (Cordingley, 2021), Albert Dichy, the literary director of IMEC, and Marjorie Delabarre, archivist in the library (Agostini-Ouafi, 2021), and Anna Kinder, the head of research at Deutsches Literaturarchiv (German Literature Archive).³

In their introduction to the issue, Cordingley and Hersant (2021a) provide an overview of archival studies and microhistorical approaches to the working practices and conditions of translators. In this overview, they present various discussions on the objectivity of archives as sources for historical research, the fragmented knowledge that they contain, the position of archives as “lieux de mémoires,” and the subjective and limited perspectives of researchers (Cordingley & Hersant, 2021a). Regarding translational perspectives on archives, they also highlight the variety of materials, including drafts of translations, correspondence, and contracts, among many others, and of approaches, including but not limited to sociological, pedagogical, and genetics-oriented translational research. Finally, they comment on the impact of translation technologies on the creation and function of archives, with the self-organization of translators on online platforms and the usage of translation memories through which translated texts become fragmented and are used for future translations.

³ All cited in Cordingley and Hersant's (2021a) introduction to the issue.

As for the archival studies that focus on (author-)translators and translated authors, there are three studies that I found the most relevant to my research in terms of their engagement with agents who mirror Kür in terms of the multiple roles they play in the cultural and literary fields. A significant study that offers a translational perspective to influential agents in the Turkish literary field is Malaymar's (2021) study on Sabahattin Ali, a once-censored, well-known author in the Turkish literary field whose translatorial identity has been largely overlooked. In her study, Malaymar adopts an archival methodology to Ali's published correspondence and memoirs in order to discover the unknown details related to his translatorial practice. Therefore, in Malaymar's study, the archive appears as a "conceptual space" (Guzmán, 2013). According to Malaymar (2021), Ali was both a supporter of leftist ideologies and "a self-appointed political and cultural agent" (p. 63).

As a result of his growing interest in leftist ideologies during his education in Germany in the 1920s and his acquisition of German, Ali became highly interested in the translation of literary and non-literary works with leftist tendencies, both as a keen reader and a translator. However, he was frequently arrested due to his affiliation with newspapers that presented news and translated literature associated with Marxism and other leftist ideologies. As a result of this constant censorship and imprisonment, and during his tenure at governmental or government-supported institutions, including the famous Translation Bureau, he struggled to publish any works that conflicted with the agenda of these institutions. In such cases, he continued reading and recommending leftist literature and encouraged his friends to translate works that were ideologically laden with leftist tendencies. However, as these friends also feared censorship and imprisonment, they were afraid to undertake the task. While referring to these efforts, Malaymar underlines Ali's position as an

“agent of change” (Toury, 2002, p. 151 as cited in Malaymar, 2021, pp. 50-51) as he manages to create an alternative repertoire through translations of “leftist” books while “resisting” the “culture planning” (Even Zohar, 1997, 2002, as cited in Malaymar, 2021, pp. 50-51) efforts of the state. Lastly, Malaymar (2021) highlights the issue of “mediation” in archival materials and other testimonies and asserts that the published collections of Ali’s correspondence with various people and the memoirs on Ali necessarily involve an editorial selection process, which shows that they are not “raw materials” (p. 54). On the contrary, they present a re-introduction to the personal life and diverse roles of Sabahattin Ali, who was once presented to the public as a man with “dangerous” ideologies.

As another study on an influential figure playing multiple roles in the field of cultural production in Türkiye, Avcı Solmaz and Karadağ’s (2024) research underlines the diverse roles played by Seniha Sami Moralı, whose recognition as the first Turkish woman museologist and archaeologist overshadows her other identities, including her translatorial one. In their archival study, Avcı Solmaz and Karadağ unearthed documents related to Moralı’s “underrepresented” roles in their investigation of the Taha Toros Private Archive, the private archive of the Turkish cultural history researcher and author Taha Toros. This initial investigation led to the expansion of the research into other archives, where several additional documents related to Moralı, also complementary to their study, were found. These documents revealed ideological agendas with national romantic tendencies in Moralı’s translatorial practice, as well as in her other endeavors as a museologist, author, and women’s rights activist. Moralı’s national romantic agendas, shaped by the sociocultural and political milieu of the early Republican period, were reflected in her “pursuit of shaping and preserving what she saw as a unique Turkish identity,

which constructs its future by drawing upon its historical foundations” (Avcı Solmaz & Karadağ, 2024, p. 319).

While Avcı Solmaz and Karadağ’s research presents a microhistorical approach to archives to contribute to the agent-oriented discourse of Translator Studies, it also shows the lack of translator-oriented archives and designated categories for translation-related materials in archives. This leads researchers to excavate the papers of translators from public and private archives of institutional and individual agents who enjoy significant symbolic capital in the field of cultural production. Similarly, in my study, documents related to underrepresented translators were found in the private archive of Pınar Kür, whose position as a well-known author has been an important factor in her privilege of maintaining her own private archive at WLICF as an agent of cultural production. Moreover, like Avcı Solmaz and Karadağ, I also consulted other archives to fill the gaps caused by the absence of certain complementary documents in Kür’s private archive, although the majority of the documents and relevant information used in my discussions were found in Kür’s archive.

Presenting a study on a woman author-translator who engages in communication and even a collaborative translation practice with her translator, Nuri (2024) focuses on the archival documents related to Halide Edib Adivar and the Swedish translation of her novel *Ateşten Gömlek* (originally written in Ottoman Turkish and serialized in the *İkdam* newspaper in 1922), which appeared with the title *Eldskjortan* in 1928. Among the archival documents, there are private papers of the novel’s translator, Hjalmar Lindquist, found in the Kungliga biblioteket, the National Library of Sweden. These private papers include the correspondence between the author and her translator, which reveals important insights into the

translation process where one can trace the genesis of the translation, the collaboration between the author and the translator, and the challenges that the text presents.

This discussion is accompanied by an investigation of paratextual elements found in the translation, including a foreword and a separate section of explanatory notes at the end of the translation added by the translator. These paratextual elements shed more light on the translation process while also referring to the correspondence between the author and the translator. The preface, for instance, provides insight into the translatorial strategies followed by Lindquist. Since the discussion revolves around the position of Adivar and her novel in the Swedish literary and cultural systems, it investigates the novel's reception in its target context by integrating more documents from the digital archive of newspapers in the same library. Translation-related documents and the translator's role are investigated from a perspective that centralizes the reception of Turkish women writers in foreign literary and cultural systems, which can also be seen in its account of social, cultural, and economic relations between the source and target systems. Therefore, rather than providing a sociological perspective to the significant information found in the archives and centralizing the translator's role in its discussion, the study investigates translation mainly as a tool in the literary and cultural exchanges between Türkiye and Sweden, and specifically in Adivar's portrayal and the dissemination of her works. Nevertheless, its integration of translation-related materials and investigation of multiple archives and documents related to multiple agents present an important contribution to microhistorical approaches to translation while demonstrating the translator archive's role as a rich source for diverse discussions, especially if combined with materials from other archives.

As alternative perspectives to translation history, its sources, and the focus on its agents have gained momentum in the contemporary studies of translation and translators, there are many other studies that adopt a similar approach and methodology in addition to several important ones presented here. The diversity of individual studies, as well as the special issues devoted to archival methodology, have revealed the increasing interest in using archives as both physical repositories of translation-related materials and symbolic sites that portray interactions between agents and translational discourses. Moreover, it has been revealed that the archive can also be approached as a source of “subjugated knowledge,” which can be investigated with a genealogical approach that traces the connections between fragments of knowledge (Guzmán, 2013, 2020). Therefore, my study also responds to the call for microhistorical translator-oriented studies and underlines the importance of archives as rich repositories that preserve significant but unexplored information on translators' lives, multiple roles, working conditions and practice, and their self-perception as translators. In addition, while presenting a contribution to existing research on microhistorical and archival studies, my research also attempts to go beyond product-oriented studies to reveal a more comprehensive look at Kür's author-translator identity and agency in their relation to those of more marginalized translators who find a voice in Kür's archive.

In the second chapter of the thesis, I will provide an overview of the theoretical framework that will be applied to the study to make such a microhistorical investigation possible. Since translators are socially-situated agents, in constant interaction with other agents, I will explain how I aim to complement my analysis of archival materials with a sociological perspective and identify certain concepts that I

will be referring to throughout this study. Finally, I will discuss the contributions of this study to the agent-oriented discourse of Translator Studies (Chesterman, 2009).

Following this chapter on my theoretical framework, Chapter 3 will first provide an insight into the life, practice, and habitus of Pınar Kür in her multiple roles as the (translated) author, translator, and author-translator. The author-translator identity of Pınar Kür will be discussed in detail to provide a clarification of my usage of this term. After a brief introduction to Kür's position as a multifaceted agent, I will talk about the Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation and its position as the first and only women-oriented library in Türkiye and a rich repository that preserves the lives and practices of influential women. In this chapter, I will expand on this study's usage of archival methodology, its strengths and limitations, and how it can complement the microhistorical approach to uncover the hidden and overlooked details regarding the lives and practices of translators. While discussing my methodology, I will provide a detailed account of my research process at the Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation by expanding on the challenges and limitations that I have encountered during my investigation of the archive. I will offer an insight into Kür's archive at the WLICF, and the various materials that it offers for translational research.

Chapters 4, 5, and 6 will present a microhistorical investigation of selected translation-related materials found in Pınar Kür's archive, analyzed and discussed on a case-by-case basis according to each translation event (Toury, 2012) that they are related to. Chapters 4 and 6 will position Kür as the translator and focus more on the impact of her authorial habitus on her translatorial habitus in different periods in her translatorial practice and interactions with other agents of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1993), respectively in the 1960s and 1980s. Chapter 5, on the other hand,

will investigate Kür's position as the translated author whose translatorial habitus impacts her interactions and collaborative practices with her translators. These discussions will unearth forgotten or overlooked details of the living and working conditions, translational practices, and self-perceptions of the translators and translation agents presented in this study in relation to their habitus and telos. Moreover, Chapters 4, 5, and 6 will situate all of the agents discussed in this study and their collaborative practices in the literary fields of Türkiye, the U.S., France, and the Czech Republic, presenting a cross-national portrayal of translation events and key agents of cultural production in these events between the 1960s and 1990s.

While concluding my study, I will explain the parallels between these living and working conditions, practices and self-perceptions, not to present them as "universals" or prescriptions but to connect them to broader translational events and collaborative endeavors. As this study adopts an archival methodology, I will also expand on the strengths and limitations of adopting an archival methodology and combining it with multiple interdisciplinary approaches in translational research. Moreover, since the archive presents a rich source of diverse translation-related materials, some of which could not be covered in this study due to obvious limitations of space and scope, I will encourage further research that could flourish through the investigation of other materials in Kür's archive. Finally, I will explain how my research makes a contribution to the agent-oriented history of Translator Studies that awaits to be further explored and written about by interested researchers.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

For my investigation of Pınar Kür's archive at the Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation, I adopted a microhistorical approach to translator archives (Munday, 2014). This is due to two reasons: First, the archive presents important insights into the life, working conditions, and practices of Pınar Kür as a prolific and well-known translator, whose recognition as a translator has been, nevertheless, overshadowed by her recognition as an author. Second, since Kür is also a translated author, the archive presents valuable information on the life, working conditions and practices of the translators of her works as well. These translators appear to be less privileged than Kür in terms of preserving their history since they do not have their own archives. However, their papers have survived to this day through Kür's archive, which shows the importance of author-translator archives as a source of translator-oriented archival research. In addition, I argue that Kür's archive is curated primarily as an author's archive, as translation-related materials make up a relatively small part and appear in a disorganized and fragmented manner. Because of this fragmented and limited disposition, following the "clues" (Atefmehr & Farrahzad, 2022) that Kür's archive presented, some of the materials, including textual, paratextual (Genette, 1997; Tahir Gürçağlar, 2002), and extratextual (Munday, 2014) ones, that are complementary to the sociological discussions presented in this study, had to be found outside Kür's archive.

The materials I found in my investigation also presented significant information related to Kür's role as a socially-situated agent and the power relations she forms with other socially-situated agents, primarily her translators and

publishers. This inevitably invited a sociological approach to the dynamics of these relations, its agents, and its sociocultural context. Moreover, in these power relations, Kür shifts between two positions: the (translated) author and the translator. However, the line between these two positions often becomes blurred, especially when she gets involved in collaborative translation practices with her translators and when she presents her perception of the translation practice, in general, as well as her own translatorial practice. Therefore, to understand the interplay between her identities as an author and a translator, which I take as a dual identity (the “author-translator”) because of their interwoven nature, and the interactions between Kür and other translation agents, I adopt a sociological perspective that is based on Bourdieu’s theory of social action and that integrates the concepts of “field”, “habitus”, and “capital” into my discussion (Bourdieu, 1979/1996, 1986, 1990a, 1990b, 1993).

Before moving on to how I integrate Bourdieu’s theoretical framework into my research, I will elaborate on the microhistorical approach that I adopt in this study. Then, I will present definitions of sociological concepts introduced by Bourdieu (1979/1996, 1986, 1990a, 1990b, 1993), which are elaborated on under different lights in his works. These concepts are fundamental in understanding the agency of translators and the position of translation as a social practice. To illustrate this, I will trace how they have been integrated into translational research (Simeoni, 1998; Gouanvic, 2005; Chesterman, 2007) and further explain how they relate to my research. Finally, I will discuss how my research contributes to the agent-oriented discourse of Translator Studies (Chesterman, 2007, 2009) and the microhistorical and sociological approaches to it, which underline the importance of interdisciplinary approaches.

2.1 A microhistorical approach to the translator's archive

Munday (2014) introduces a microhistorical approach to translator archives and other materials, such as manuscripts, translator papers, interviews, and post-hoc accounts. In this way, he proposes a shift from what he terms “primary text product”, meaning source texts and target texts, since, “in the absence of pre-textual material (i.e. drafts) or extra-textual material (e.g., interviews or paratextual commentary)”, a Descriptive Translation Studies research “limits itself to the primary text product” and, in that case, it “remains rooted in an analysis of that product and dependent on the analyst’s more or less subjective deduction of the process which underpinned it” (Munday, 2014, p. 65). Archival materials, and other extratextual materials, have the potential of “creating a ‘microhistory’, reclaiming the details of the everyday lives and working processes of sometimes little-known or forgotten translators and contextualising them to construct a social and cultural history of translation and translators” (Munday, 2014, p. 64). The type of microhistory that Munday proposes draws on Burke’s (1991/2001, as cited in Munday, 2014) “new” “social” history that focuses on the lives of “ordinary people” or specific “marginalised groups” such as women and translators (Delisle and Woodsworth, 2012, as cited in Munday, 2014).

In my case, Kür does not appear as a marginalized translator in the contemporary literary field of Türkiye. However, the research on her translatorial identity remains highly limited compared to the vast body of research focusing on her authorial identity, which, I argue, implies a certain “marginalized” and overlooked aspect. Moreover, some of the materials in the archive dates back to the 1960s, a period when Kür was a doctoral student in Paris and engaged in translational practice as a result of her interest in theater and drama translation. Therefore, she was in the early stages of her career as a translator and did not enjoy

the same authorial and translatorial symbolic capital that she does today, underlining another aspect of marginality.

Among the various testimonies and materials that can be found in translator archives, Munday (2014) finds the translator papers, and also interviews and other testimonies, to be “most useful in studies adopting the method of microhistory” (p. 75). Although he does not explicitly define what translator papers might include, based on his discussion of personal papers of other agents, such as politicians and authors, one can suggest that translator papers include correspondence between translators and other individual or institutional agents involved in the translation and publication processes, drafts of published translations, notes and ephemera, and other types of materials related to translators, translations, and the translation process. Although Munday treats manuscripts (unpublished drafts, pre-textual materials) and interviews and testimonies (extratextual materials) as separate categories, I propose to use translator papers as an umbrella term to cover all of them. As will be expanded on later, all of these materials are present in Kür’s archive except for memoirs and autobiographies which Munday (2014) categorizes under “post-hoc testimonies” along with interviews.

Lastly, there are some terms that will be used in the categorization of materials according to the type of elements surrounding the primary text products (translations/target texts and originals/source texts). The archive includes paratextual (Genette, 1997), which includes epitexts (e.g., “comments, reviews, criticisms or interviews dealing with specific works” (Tahir Gürçağlar, 2002, p. 58)) and peritexts (preface, title page, etc. (p. 45)), pre-textual and extratextual materials. Except for pre-texts, I will use the definitions provided by Tahir Gürçağlar (2002), who recontextualizes these terms in translational research. According to Tahir Gürçağlar's

(2002) definition, “extratexts” refer to “the general meta-discourse on translation circulating independently of individual translated texts” while paratexts refer to “presentational materials accompanying translated texts and the text-specific meta-discourses formed directly around them” (pp. 44-45). Drawing on Munday (2014), I will use pre-texts to refer to unpublished and published drafts of a translated text.

2.2 Translation as a social practice and agency of translators: A Bourdieusian perspective

Although it took years for Translation Studies to finally shift its focus from texts to the actual “agents” of the translation process working in sociocultural contexts, the position of translation as a social practice is hardly a new topic for translational research. While the groundbreaking work of Descriptive Translation Studies with its systemic approach (Even Zohar, 1978, 1979, 1990) and norms of translation (Toury, 1995, 2012) has positioned translation in the sociocultural context, it has remained mainly text-oriented and offered little insight into the agency of translators and the driving factors behind it, especially “within a coherent theoretical framework” (Wolf, 2007, p. 10).

Wolf (2007) points out that, although subject to certain limitations, translator’s role as an agent in the sociocultural contexts has been subject to discussion through the concept of “rewriting” and the patronage system (Lefevere, 1998), the functionalist approaches (Nord, 1991), the “translational action model” (Holz-Mänttari, 1984), and the concept of “(in)visibility” (Venuti, 1995).⁴ This emphasis on agency and the relationship between translators and their sociocultural context also invited interdisciplinary sociological perspectives, among which Pierre

⁴ All cited in Wolf (2007)’s article.

Bourdieu stands out as an influential name whose works have guided translation researchers in their definition and exploration of the translator's agency (Wolf, 2007).

As “agents” of a sociocultural context “do not act in a vacuum, but rather in concrete social situations governed by a set of objective social relations”, Bourdieu introduced the concept of the “field”, which denotes “a structured space with its own laws of functioning and its own relations of force” (Johnson, 1993, p. 6). The concept of the “field” was first used by Bourdieu in 1966 (Thomson, 2012), and it is a fundamental concept around which his other concepts revolve (Gouanvic, 2005). Since my study focuses on translated literature, which has already been established as part of the literary polysystem (Even-Zohar, 1978, 1990)⁵, the most relevant definition of the field for this study can be found in Bourdieu's works focusing particularly on the literary, where the translator can also be positioned. Bourdieu (1993) defines the literary field as:

a *field of forces*, but it is also a *field of struggles* tending to transform or conserve this field of forces. The network of objective relations between positions subtends and orients the strategies which the occupants of the different positions implement in their struggles to defend or improve their positions (i.e. their position-takings), strategies which depend for their force and form on the position each agent occupies in the power relations [*rappports de force*].⁶ (p. 30)

At the core of these *rappports de force* is the capital, which is defined as “the set of actually usable resources and powers” (Bourdieu, 1979/1996, p. 114). Bourdieu (1986) categorizes capital into three fundamental types, economic, cultural, and

⁵ Although one might tend to see an “overlap” between polysystem theory and the concept of the field, the similarity was refuted by Hermans (1999, as cited in Gouanvic, 2005), and later by Gouanvic (2005), who mostly agrees with him and underlines that “Bourdieu rejects the notion of system in order to elucidate the rapport between symbolic productions and their mode of reception” (p. 149). By referring to the polysystem theory, I only want to point out that translated literature is, along with original productions, a part of the body of literary works in a language and the target sociocultural context.

⁶ Original emphasis.

social, “depending on the field in which it functions, and at the cost of the more or less expensive transformations which are the precondition for its efficacy in the field in question” (p. 16). He later expands on the “symbolic capital”, which is “founded on cognition [*connaissance*] and recognition [*reconnaissance*]” (1990a, p. 22). It refers to “the degree of accumulated prestige, celebrity, consecration or honour” (Johnson, 1993, p. 7).

In connection with these concepts, Bourdieu (1979/1996) defines habitus as a “structured and structuring structure” (p. 171). In its structuring role, habitus “organizes practices and the perception of practices” by agents while it is also a structured structure because “the principle of division into logical classes, which organizes the perception of the social world, is itself the product of internalization of the division into social classes” (Bourdieu, 1979/1996, p. 170). The relationship between field, habitus and capital, with reference to the literary field, is further explained in the following remarks by Bourdieu (1990a):

[T]he literary field is a force-field as well as a field of struggles which aim at transforming or maintaining the established relation of forces: each of the agents commits the force (the capital) that he has acquired through previous struggles to strategies that depend for their general direction on his position in the power struggle, that is, on his specific capital. (p. 143)

The literary field is regarded as a subfield of the cultural field, and the cultural field is “situated *within* the field of power because of its possession of a high degree of symbolic forms of capital (e.g., academic capital, cultural capital)” (Johnson, 1993, p. 15). Inevitably, writers are fundamental agents in Bourdieu’s literary field, and they possess considerable symbolic capital. Publishers and critics are also discussed within the cultural field, whereas there is no reference to translators as agents of the literary field or the cultural field in Bourdieu’s works.

Nevertheless, the evident potential of adapting Bourdieusian concepts with reference to their usage in the literary field has not escaped the attention of translation researchers. In his pioneering study, Simeoni (1998) has introduced the concept of *habitus* to translational research and brought an illuminating approach to translatorial agency. Simeoni's (1998) research underlines the importance of moving away from the text-oriented and norm-driven approach of Descriptive Translation Studies and, instead, proposes to focus on the actual "practices of translating and authoring" and "translatorial habitus" (p. 33). Translatorial habitus, refers to "the elaborate result of a personalized social and cultural history" which also becomes a driving force behind translatorial decisions in the translation practice, reflecting the "structuring" and "structured" aspects of habitus and its impact on the translator as a "social agent" (Simeoni, 1998, p. 32).

According to Simeoni (1998), the personalized social and cultural history is a history of subservience internalized by translators and directly impacting their agency. Moreover, it is difficult to argue for an independent field of translation since it occupies a secondary and subservient position, as a result of which "[t]he pseudo- or would-be field of translation" appears as "much less organized than the literary field, its structuring being far more heteronomous" (Simeoni, 1998, p. 19).

Therefore, in this case, translations are products of translatorial habitus that is "*governed by the rules pertaining to the field in which the translation takes place*" (Simeoni, 1998, pp. 19-20).⁷ These definitions of "habitus" and "field" will be drawn on in my discussions as well since the archival materials related to Kür and other translation agents reveal important insights into their *habitus* and the *literary field* in which they are positioned.

⁷ Original emphasis.

Simeoni's approach has been further expanded on and criticized by other researchers. Gouanvic (2005), for instance, refers to Simeoni's (1998) overlooking of another important Bourdieusian concept: the capital. Gouanvic (2005) underlines that "the central notions" in Bourdieu's research, namely field, habitus, capital and *illusio*, are "intrinsically woven together, such that none can be defined without recourse to the others. Bourdieu's theory of cultural action is thus not only a sociology of the institution but also of its agents" (p. 148). Gouanvic builds his case study on another important concept by Bourdieu, that is the "field of restricted production" which is a sub-field of the field of cultural production, and it stands in opposition to the "field of large-scale production" (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 185). The field of restricted production includes different forms of "high art", such as "serious literature" or "classical music", the agents of which are in a competition at the heart of which is symbolic capital, "involving prestige, consecration, and artistic celebrity" (Johnson, 1993, p. 15).

Similar to Bourdieu (1993), who tackles this opposition in his analysis of the structure of the literary field of France in the 1880s, Gouanvic (2005) focuses on "the restricted field" of American literature in Paris in the period between 1920-1939. This restricted field emerged from several American authors' "fierce desire to be freed from all censorship external to the field", especially that imposed by the legal field (Gouanvic, 2005, p. 152). Until the 1940s, these authors' books enjoyed "extraterritoriality" in the French literary field on two levels: First, they were published in English and, second, they could escape censorship as, with the revisions in the French law, books "could not be tried for offending good behaviour between 1882 and 1939" (Poulain, 1998, p. 5, 557, as cited in Gouanvic, 2005, p. 153). During the translational activities of the 1940s, on the other hand, some of these

works were translated into French and, with the changes in the law, were again subjected to censorship, this time by the French law.

Nevertheless, Gouanvic (2005) further argues that translation played another crucial role, which was its contribution to the formation of a literary field in France, with various specialized series of translated literature and the flourishing of various genres through translation. In his discussion, Gouanvic (2005) also emphasizes the role played by the translators of American literature into French and how their habitus shaped their selection of the texts to be translated. In relation to this role, he expands on the difference between the symbolic capital of authors and translators. For authors, symbolic capital refers to “recognition,” which needs to be “constantly regained through new works published in the literary field” unless their works achieve the “status of a classic” (Gouanvic, 2005, pp. 161-162). For translators, symbolic capital is defined as a derivative, secondary capital, explained only in relation to the capital of an original work and its author, both benefiting from and contributing to it.⁸

The importance of this case study and Gouanvic’s usage of symbolic capital and “the field of restricted production” in a translational context is that the materials in Kür’s archive reveal a similar case. First of all, there is an obvious difference between the symbolic capital of Kür (as the author-translator) and that of her translators, which is reflected in their power dynamics. Second, translations of Kür’s original works as well as Kür’s own translation of *Ferhat ile Şirin* found in this archive, although published in fragments or unpublished, can be regarded as part of a field of restricted production in the literary fields of Türkiye, the U.S., France, and the Czech Republic. Therefore, the symbolic capital of translators in relation to their

⁸ Although Gouanvic also integrates the concept of “illusio” to his discussion, it will not be used within the scope of this study.

respective restricted production fields also becomes relevant and will be discussed in detail thanks to the information provided by the correspondence between different translation agents found in the archive.

2.3 Translator studies: An agent-oriented approach to translators

In his search for the translator in Holmes' (1972/1988) famous "Map of Translation Studies", Chesterman (2009) points out that, although the translator is an implicit part of several branches and sub-branches, the Map remains highly text-oriented.

However, as the growing body of research with cultural and sociological approaches in the field has shown, the focus has shifted from translations (texts) to translators (agents). Being aware of and responding to this change, Chesterman (2009) underlines the need to reclassify various types of research on translators under the sub-branch titled "Translator Studies". He maps out the branches of Translator Studies as cultural, cognitive, and sociological based on the interdisciplinary theoretical approaches and methodologies adopted in the investigation of translators as agents. According to his categorization, the sociological branch investigates "translators'/interpreters' observable behaviour as individuals or groups or institutions, their social networks, status and working processes, their relations with other groups and with relevant technology" while the cultural branch focuses on "ethics, ideologies, traditions, history, examining the roles and influences of translators and interpreters through history, as agents of cultural evolution" (Chesterman, 2009, p. 19). The cognitive branch, on the other hand, deals with "mental processes, decision-making, the impact of emotions, attitudes to norms, personality, etc." (Chesterman, 2009, p. 19). Moreover, reflecting on the models of research in Translation Studies that he previously categorized as comparative,

process, and causal (Chesterman, 2000/2017), Chesterman (2009) proposes another model of research, the agent model, “focusing not on translations as texts, nor even on the translation process, but on the translators themselves and the other agents involved” (p. 20).

Another important issue tackled by Chesterman (2007, 2009) is the position of Translation Studies as an “interdiscipline”, a position resulting from years of interdisciplinary research integrating theoretical and methodological frameworks from various disciplines such as sociology, history, and psychology. In an attempt to connect these “fragmented” approaches, Chesterman (2007) also offers “bridge concepts”, including “translation practice” and “*habitus*”. According to his definitions, translation *practice* is “the set of translation events within a given temporal, institutional and cultural setting, influenced by and itself affecting cultural values and traditions” while *habitus* is “the totality of professional dispositions and attitudes of agents within a given field or practice” (Chesterman, 2007, pp. 176-177). Chesterman also underlines Simeoni’s (1998) definition of the concept of *habitus* as “the elaborate result of a personalized social and cultural history” (p. 32, as cited in Chesterman, 2009, p. 177). In relation to *habitus*, Chesterman proposes another concept, “*telos*”, “to denote the personal motivation of translator”, to explain “why they work in this field [the field of translation] in general, and “why they translate a given text” (2009, p. 17). His usage of this concept falls in line with his emphasis on the “agent” and implies a certain subjectivity on the part of the translator that should be taken into consideration along with the translatorial *habitus*.

2.4 Microhistorical research in translator studies: An archival methodology

Here, I borrow the title from Atefmehr and Farahzad (2022) to emphasize how microhistorical research in translator archives, which also defines my study, falls under Translator Studies (Chesterman, 2009). Although their article does not cite Chesterman (2009), Atefmehr and Farahzad use the concept of Translator Studies to refer to their translator-oriented research, which shows that they acknowledge the agent model and the autonomous position of the sub-branch. In my study, I also offer a sociological approach, which seems inevitable as the microhistorical research into Kür's archive has revealed a variety of materials providing valuable information on subjects that fall under the sociological branch of Translator Studies. Therefore, the combination of the microhistorical approach from the field of history with a sociological analysis in my study underlines the importance of the translator's archive as a fruitful source for interdisciplinary research. Complementing this interdisciplinary theoretical framework and drawing on Guzmán's (2013, 2020) proposal to approach translators' archives as a methodological resource, I have adopted an archival methodology shaped by the specific conditions and scope of my research. I will elaborate on this in the following chapter, offering an insight into Kür's archive at the WLICF and outlining my own research process within it.

CHAPTER 3

SEARCHING FOR THE TRANSLATOR IN THE ARCHIVE:

PINAR KÜR AS THE AUTHOR-TRANSLATOR, HER PRIVATE PAPERS, AND

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I will first introduce Pinar Kür with reference to her multiple roles as an agent in the cultural and literary fields of Türkiye and the countries in which the translations of her original works have been translated and published. I will present an overview of Kür's authorial and translatorial practice as well as details on her personal life to shed light upon the formation of her habitus as well as her "symbolic capital". Drawing on Aka's (2011) study on Kür's dual identity as an author-translator, I will then explain how and why I will use this term. In addition, I will also offer an insight into the Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation, its history, collection, and significance, with particular focus on Pinar Kür's Private Papers. I will then expand on the methodology that I adopted in my investigation of the rich and diverse materials that I have found in Kür's archive while delving into my research process, offering a (re-)categorization of the archive's contents, and discussing the limitations of this methodology through an account of the challenges I have encountered during this investigation.

3.1 Pinar Kür: The (translated) author, translator, and author-translator

Havva Pinar Kür was born in 1943 in Bursa, Türkiye, where she spent little time before she and her family moved to different cities in Türkiye and abroad. She spent her childhood years in various cities in different parts of the world, such as Zonguldak (TR), Ankara (TR), London (UK), and New York (USA). She graduated

from Robert College, now Boğaziçi University, in 1963. In 1964, Kür went to Paris to pursue her PhD studies in Comparative Literature at the University of Sorbonne. Her PhD thesis focused on the concepts of “illusion” and “reality” in the works of famous playwrights Luigi Pirandello and Eugene O’Neill. After successfully completing her doctoral studies, she returned to Türkiye and started working as a dramaturgist at Ankara State Theater until 1973, when she moved to Istanbul. She worked as a lecturer of English language and literature in various universities in Istanbul, where she still lives and works as an author and translator of diverse works.

3.1.1 Pinar Kür as a (translated) author

Since her childhood, Kür has been surrounded by a family interested in literature. Her mother, İsmet Kür, was a well-recognized author. Besides her mother, her aunt Halide Nusret Zorlutuna and Zorlutuna’s daughter Emine Işınsu were also authors, and her grandfather was a journalist (Kür, 1984b). Kür’s own interest in literature goes back to her childhood years when she first started to “tell” poems at an age when she did not even know how to read or write. These poems were written down by her mother, İsmet Kür, and sent to magazines and publishing houses, and some of them even got published in *Doğan Kardeş*, a children’s magazine, in 1949 (Şüyün & Işıltan, 1999). Moreover, one of these poems was translated into English by a friend of Kür’s father (whose name remains unknown) and even received a prize (Kartoğlu, 1985).

Later, she combined her interest in literature with her desire to become an actor and started writing plays when she was still a student at the university (Kür, 1984b). In fact, she wrote her acclaimed novel *Asılacak Kadın* initially as a play during her doctoral studies at the University of Sorbonne (Kür, 1984b). Another play

she wrote during those years is *Kuru Kuru Kurbanın Olam*, which appeared in French as *Amour d'Os* (Romance of Bones). Kür translated the play in collaboration with a “French [speaker]”, possibly referring to the French director Albert Vander, and it was staged at a youth festival in France (Karantay, 1989, pp. 16-17). However, the play was never published, and neither was her first original play, *İki Başlı Adamın Tek Eli* (The Single Hand of the Double-Headed Man), which was written during her years at Robert College and also staged in 1962 in Istanbul. Another drama translation from that period, a significant one within the scope of this thesis, is her translation of Nâzım Hikmet’s play *Ferhad ile Şirin* (Ferhad and Şirin) into French. For this translation project, Kür collaborated with her newlywed husband, Can Kolukısaoglu, who was working as an actor in Paris at the time (Karantay, 1989), as well as Albert Vander, whose name is not openly mentioned in her interviews, although the letters found in the archive reveal him as a significant collaborator (Kür, 1966a, 1966b, 1966c, 1967a; Vander, ca. 1967). Kür also contacted Münevver Andaç, who was the inheritor and holder of Hikmet’s copyrights at the time, to get permission to translate the play (Kür, 1966a, 1966c), a project that eventually failed. After her doctoral studies, Kür returned to Türkiye and started working as a dramaturgist at Ankara State Theater, where she worked between 1971 and 1973. She was also responsible for having the plays translated for staging and editing the translated texts (Karantay, 1989, p. 12).

During this period, Kür’s early short stories were published in *Dost* magazine and, except for “Herkes Bana Düşman” (Everyone Is Against Me), these early works were not included in her short story collections (Kür, 1984a). While working as a dramaturgist, she started working on her first novel, *Yarın... Yarın* (Tomorrow... Tomorrow), which was published by Bilgi Yayınevi in 1976 (Kür, 1984b, p. 84). Her

first novel was well-received in the literary sphere and was followed by two other novels, *Küçük Oyuncu* (Small-time Actor) (1977) and *Asılacak Kadın* (A Woman to Hang) (1979). In the 1970s and later in the 1980s and 1990s, Kür also wrote columns and articles, and even conducted interviews with important names from artistic spheres for newspapers and magazines, tackling a variety of subjects ranging from literature and the Turkish literary system to the publishing industry, translation, theater, and cinema. She wrote reviews on plays that were being staged at the time in the column titled “Theater” in the *Dünya* newspaper during the late 1970s. Some of these reviews even touch upon translation-related issues.

The 1980s was a prolific period in Kür’s both authorial and translatorial careers. Kür published her first short story collection, *Bir Deli Ağaç* (A Crazy Tree), in 1981, which was followed by *Akışı Olmayan Sular* (Still Waters) in 1983, which received the prestigious Sait Faik Short Story Award in 1984. Shortly after, her fourth novel, *Bitmeyen Aşk* (Endless Love) (1986), was published. However, alongside a successful start to the decade, the 1980s also marked a dreadful and challenging period in Kür’s life. Her original works *Yarın... Yarın* (1976), *Asılacak Kadın* (1979), and *Bitmeyen Aşk* (1986) encountered censorship. *Yarın... Yarın* was banned on the grounds of communist propaganda in 1982, while *Asılacak Kadın* and *Bitmeyen Aşk* were banned for their “obscene” content in 1986 (Antmen, 1992; Söğüt, 2004, p. 59; Şentürk, 2009).

This censorship was conducted in the turbulent and oppressive political atmosphere of the period. After the military coup of September 12, 1980, the Turkish media encountered serious censorship regulations. A list of books that were deemed “dangerous” or “inappropriate” were banned and pulled off the shelves. Book burnings and bans have become a part of daily life, resulting in a climate of fear

(Dündar, 2016; Külsoy, 2023). Two of these “dangerous” ideologies were socialism and communism, which the Turkish army “had been conditioned to see [...] as Türkiye’s most deadly foes” (Zürcher, 2004, p. 288). In addition, books were pulled off the shelves for “moral” reasons as well. Founded in 1927, the Board for the Protection of Minors from Obscene Publications was especially active during the 1980s. In a panel organized collaboratively by PEN International and PEN Türkiye, several speakers highlighted that the Board was used as a political and ideological tool in addition to its role of protecting children from books that involve “obscenity” (Vardar, 2011).

Therefore, although all charges against Kür and her works had been dropped and her books were back in circulation, Kür did not address sexuality as openly in her subsequent works. The author is unsure whether this is because she “talked about everything that [she] wanted to” or it was “self-censorship” (Şentürk, 2009, my translation from Turkish). Nevertheless, her writing did take a turn as her first murder mystery, *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (A Murder Novel), was published in 1989. This book was followed by two sequels: *Sonuncu Sonbahar* (The Last Autumn) published in 1992, and *Cinayet Fakültesi* (The Faculty of Murder) published in 2006. However, after the publication of *Sonuncu Sonbahar*, Kür took a twelve-year break from original literary production and eventually returned to the literary scene with her latest short story collection, *Hayalet Hikâyeleri* (Ghost Stories), in 2004. The same year, *Beşpeşe* (Five-in-a-row), a collaborative fiction to which she contributed along with four other contemporary authors – Murathan Mungan, Faruk Ulay, Elif Şafak, and Celil Oker – was published. This was followed by another long break, lasting ten years, which came to an end with her latest novel, *Sadık Bey* (Mr. Sadık), appearing on the shelves of bookstores in 2016.

As for the thematic content of Kür's original works, her novels, short stories, and plays revolve around the themes of love, complicated relationships, self-invention, alienation, betrayal, and murder, among many others. Most of her works unfold stories of women, appearing as the protagonists, while highlighting the marginalized position of women in society and the suppressing social norms surrounding them. For instance, her most influential novel, *Asılacak Kadın*, offers a portrayal of the sexualization and exploitation of a woman's body that is used as a commodity by her husband. *Küçük Oyuncu*, on the other hand, presents the story of a woman actor with a budding career in theater who faces challenges in her journey of self-invention while surrounded by people constantly trying to take advantage of her. Kür's other novels *Yarın... Yarın*, *Bitmeyen Aşk*, and short story collections *Bir Deli Ağaç* and *Akışı Olmayan Sular* also feature women characters while offering a portrayal of the complexities of different relationships, where not only love but also generational and sociopolitical conflicts are at the center.

Moreover, women are not the only marginalized characters that find a voice in Kür's works. The author emphasizes that her works mostly feature "misfits", which, as she explains, results from the fact that she is also a misfit, in the sense of rejecting to conform to the norms of a broken society where being a misfit can be considered a natural reaction to one's surroundings. Thus, Kür relates to her misfit characters on a personal level. This is also reflected in her tackling themes such as madness, self-alienation and isolation, and non-conformity with social norms in general (Kür, 1984a). For instance, in *Sadık Bey*, the author presents a psychological introspection to the thoughts and memories of an aging man who failed at self-realization and is haunted by his own paralysis. Her latest short story collection,

Hayalet Hikâyeleri, on the other hand, is another introspection into the minds of emotionally-haunted and alienated individuals.

Another important, yet understudied, aspect of Kür's authorial identity is her position as a translated author. Pınar Kür has been introduced to the literary fields abroad through translations of her original works by various translators. Only a few of these translations are book translations. Most of them are individual translations of her short stories, which were translated and published in anthologies and/or literary magazines. Although it is difficult, and also not possible within the scope of this thesis, to track each and every one of these translations, certain publications stand out. Moreover, these publications share the fundamental goal of introducing Turkish literature to other literary systems, highlighting its diversity, especially through translations of contemporary works.

Among these endeavors, there are two prominent book translations into German: *Bir Deli Ağaç* (*Ein verrückter Baum*) and *Cinayet Fakültesi* (*Mordsfakultät*), which were translated by Beatrix Caner and published by Literaturca Verlag in 2006 and 2008, respectively. Literaturca Verlag, or, in its full name, Literaturca Verlag für Türkische Literatur (En. Literaturca Publishing House for Turkish Literature), is a publishing house based in Frankfurt am Main, Germany, founded by Beatrix Caner and Mesut Caner in 2001 with the goal of translating “the best writers from Türkiye” into German (Zähringer, 2006). Accordingly, the publishing house has primarily published translated literature, translational activities occupying a central position in its agenda. In fact, most of these translations were done by the co-founder Beatrix Caner, who is recognized as a notable figure in the translation of Turkish literature into German.

In addition to these two translations, the catalog of Deutsche National Bibliothek (German National Library) shows another record of a translation: the short story “Gece Görüşmesi” (Nocturnal Visit) from Kür’s short story collection *Hayalet Hikâyeleri*. The translation appears with the title “Nächtlicher Besuch” in an anthology of Turkish short stories in German, titled *Alles Blaue, alles Grüne dieser Welt: Türkische Erzählungen* (Everything Blue, Everything Green in this World: Turkish Stories), also compiled by Beatrix Caner and published by Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag in 2008. Moreover, I found two earlier anthologies of Turkish literature in German, namely *Aufbruch aus dem Schweigen: Erzählerinnen aus der Türkei* (Emerging from silence: Women storytellers from Türkiye), published by Buntbuch Verlag in 1984, and *Jedem Wort gehört ein Himmel* (Every word brings a sky), published by BABEL Verlag in 1991. The former includes the translation of the short story “Taksim-Maçka” by Astrid Pietruschka, while the latter presents the translation of the short story “Kısa Yol Yolcusu” (“Der Kurzstreckenfahrer”) translated by Deniz Göktürk.

As multiple translations stand out in the German literary field, it is essential to discuss the reasons behind this interest in Kür’s works and whether these translation activities were encouraged and/or supported by any agents in the literary fields of Germany or Türkiye. As for the anthology *Jedem Wort gehört ein Himmel*, it is seen that the translation was funded by two institutions: the Senatsverwaltung für Kulturelle Angelegenheiten (Senate Department for Cultural Affairs) and the Stiftung Preußische Seehandlung (Prussian Maritime Trade Foundation), which once again shows the support of governmental and private institutions in translating and introducing Turkish literature into other literary fields. Moreover, the other books mentioned above, including *Ein verrückter Baum* and *Mordsfakultät* as well as the

anthology *Alles Blaue, alles Grüne dieser Welt: Türkische Erzählungen*, were published as part of the TEDA⁹ project, an ongoing project initiated by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Türkiye in 2005 with the aim to introduce Turkish literature to foreign readers and promote it in international book markets.

Published to pursue this goal, the anthology *Alles Blaue, alles Grüne dieser Welt: Türkische Erzählungen* features fourteen contemporary authors from the Turkish literary field, most of whom received “Türkiye's most coveted literary award, the ‘Sait Faik [Short Story] Award’” (Caner, 2008, p. 2). This makes it evident that, in Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag’s case, one of the selection criteria of the publishing house was the amount of recognition a book had gained in its own literary field, which made up its symbolic capital. Moreover, in the afterword of the anthology, it is emphasized that the works of the translated authors included in this book reflect a search for “new, independent models, aesthetic categories, forms of expression, and references that make young Turkish literature distinctive” while providing a portrayal of the “mosaic-like modernity” and rapid metropolisation in Türkiye (Caner, 2008, pp. 242-243). This also shows these translations’ representative role in not only introducing a literary text but also offering a portrayal of the changes in the social, cultural, and literary spheres in which it was created.

In addition, in Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag’s translational practices, translation is also assigned an ideological role, especially in Kür’s case. In the German literary field, Pınar Kür is seen as the “Grand Dame of Turkish literature” (Caner, 2008, p. 251) who deals with provocative themes and experiments with literature while portraying “the powerlessness of women in a patriarchal society”

⁹ TEDA stands for “Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Türk Kültür, Sanat ve Edebiyat Eserlerinin Dışa Açılımını Destekleme Projesi,” which roughly translates to “the Ministry of Culture and Tourism’s Project for Supporting the Translation and Publication of Turkish Cultural, Artistic, and Literary Works Abroad.”

(pp. 244-245). Caner (2008) underlines Kür's position as a censored author by adding that "[Kür] had to answer in court several times" because of the "critical" and provocative nature of her works (p. 245). Therefore, it is seen that the author's struggle against censorship became integral to her portrayal in the German literary field.

Similarly, on Literaturca's website, one can also find brief introductory information on Pınar Kür, among other authors whose works were translated into German, stating that "[Kür's] first works were banned in Türkiye" whereas, "[t]oday, she is one of the best writers in her country, being a category in and of herself" (Literaturca, n.d.-a). The emphasis on the once-banned book's success highlights how censorship can hinder literary works that have the potential to gain recognition or even achieve canonical status. Once the obstacle is removed, which was achieved through the medium of translation in this case, the potential of the book shines through and can be fully appreciated. Moreover, as will be discussed in detail later, from an ideological perspective that opposes the censorship policies imposed in the author's home country, being a censored author contributes to their symbolic capital, encouraging more translational activities to disseminate her works as translation also becomes a form of resistance taken up by intellectuals in literary fields abroad.

There is another book translation of Kür's works, this time into a different language, which was also supported by the TEDA project: the Bulgarian edition of *Asılacak Kadın* published by Lettera in 2008 under the title *Жена за обесване* (Jena za obesvane) (A Woman to Hang). The book was translated by Yordanka Bibina, an associate professor at the Institute of Balkan Studies and Centre of Thracology, and was among the 86 books translated into Bulgarian and published as part of the TEDA project between 2006 and 2010 (Bibina, 2013, p. 60). However, it appears to be the

only Bulgarian translation of Kür's books published to date, since the National Academic Library and Information System Foundation (NALIS)' Union Catalogue, which is the national catalog of libraries in Bulgaria, shows no record of any additional translations.

Moreover, in addition to German and Bulgarian, Kür's works were translated into Greek as well. Her short story "Yaz Gecelerinde Keman" was translated into Greek by Stella Christidou and published in 2002 by Kastaniotis Editions as part of an anthology titled *To Violi tis Kalokairines Nyhtes* (The Violin of Summer Nights). In this case, it was a feminist initiative, Winpeace (Women's Initiative for Peace), that supported the publication of the book. Founded by Margarita Papandreou and Zeynep Oral, the NGO promotes "personal and regular exchanges between Greek, Turkish, and Cypriot women (Cyprus being a major issue in the Greek-Turkish conflict) to build a new feminine solidarity and contest the excesses of nationalism" (Seraïdari, 2008, p. 57). "Literary exchanges" are listed as one of the projects of the initiative, while Seraïdari (2008) emphasizes the position of the co-founder Zeynep Oral as a well-known author in Türkiye (p. 57).

The goal of introducing and promoting Turkish literature has also been pursued in the French literary field. The translation of the short story "Kısa Yol Yolcusu" ("The Commuter") from Kür's award-winning short story collection *Akışı Olmayan Sular* was translated into French as "Les Petits Trajets" by Süleyman Durmaz and published as part of the anthology *Paroles Devoilées – Les Femmes Turques Écrivent* (Words Unveiled – Turkish Women Writing) in 1993. The anthology was published as part of the European series of the UNESCO Collection of Representative Works, a translation project that pursued the goal of making "the

masterpieces of world literature” “available in translation in two international languages, English and French” from 1948 to around 2005 (Maunick, 1986, p. 6).

Similarly, the translation of another short story by Kür, “Herkes Bana Düşman,” from her short story collection *Bir Deli Ağaç*, was published in the literary magazine *ANKA* in 1993. The French translation of the story by Aysel Özadanır appeared with the title “Haï de tous,” and it was included in the special issue dedicated to the 1993 edition of the annual literary festival “Les Belles Étrangères” organized by Centre National du Livre in France. Correspondence in the archive reveals that Pinar Kür also attended the event (Fidan, 1993b). As for the interest and agenda behind these endeavors, *ANKA* aimed to introduce Turkish authors to French readers, with a particular emphasis on showcasing the “modern faces” of Turkish literature in order to offer a more comprehensive portrayal that goes beyond the “exotic” and the “traditional” (Behramoğlu, 1986, pp. 6-7).

To highlight this agenda, in the first issue of the magazine, Behramoğlu (1986) explains that the Turkish intellectual is “between two fires”, one being the anti-democratic oppressive atmosphere of the 1980s that was introduced by the military coup and the other being “the hurtful prejudices against Türkiye and the Turks, largely stemming from the interpretation of a complex historical past” (pp. 6-7). Therefore, within this context as well, translation becomes an ideological tool to present an anti-censorship stance and provide a platform for censored authors from the Turkish literary field. In addition, through the translation of “modern” Turkish literature, a portrayal of “modern” democratic Turkish society is also presented to French readers.

Nevertheless, although individual translations have appeared in literary magazines, The Bibliothèque nationale de France (National Library of France) and

Demirkol's (2010, 2019) bibliographical studies show no record of any book-length French translation of Kür's works. However, as archival documents investigated in this study have revealed, this absence does not stem from a lack of interest in translating a book-length work by the author. As will be discussed in detail in the following chapters, an attempt to publish a French translation of *Asılacak Kadın* was made by the translator Ferda Fidan and the publishing house Publisud, but ultimately failed. Instead, an excerpt from the translation was published in 1992 in *ANKA*'s issue titled "Le roman turc" (The Turkish novel), which aimed to introduce diverse examples of the Turkish novel genre to the French literary field.

In addition to its German translation, "Kısa Yol Yolcusu" also appeared in English, with the title "The Commuter" in the anthology *Twenty Stories by Turkish Women Writers*, translated and compiled by Nilüfer Mizanoğlu Reddy. The anthology, which will be discussed in detail in the following chapters, was published as part of the Indiana University Turkish Studies Series in 1988 and originally included twenty stories by women authors from the Turkish literary field. In 1994, a second edition of the anthology appeared, featuring five additional short stories. Moreover, it is important to highlight that the Turkish Studies Series was a joint initiative with the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Türkiye, which emphasizes the role of national cultural policies in the dissemination and promotion of Turkish literature within other literary fields.

Another well-known translation that appeared in the English literary field is Ruth Christie's translation of Pınar Kür's short story "Bir Deli Ağaç" ("A Crazy Tree") from the eponymous short story collection. As will be discussed later, Christie attempted to publish her translation during the 1990s, but the effort failed due to issues related to the publishing house Dağyeli Verlag, which had initially planned to

publish the translation. Instead, years later, Christie published the translated short story as a standalone book by Epsilon in 2004.

As can be seen in the text selections of translators and publishing houses, three original works by Kür stand out in these translation efforts: *Akışı Olmayan Sular*, *Asılacak Kadın*, and *Bir Cinayet Romanı*. Each of these works is marked by a different prominent characteristic that makes them appealing options in terms of introducing the author to foreign literary fields. For instance, as it was highlighted above, *Akışı Olmayan Sular* won the Sait Faik Short Story Award in 1984, which significantly increased its symbolic capital. *Asılacak Kadın*, on the other hand, is the most controversial book Kür has written to date, attracting both praise and critique. In fact, Kür even argues that the ban on her book even increased its popularity (Söğüt, 2004, p. 59). She also repeatedly underlines that *Asılacak Kadın* is her most experimental work in terms of language and “the most influential” one in terms of her contribution to Turkish literature (Şüyün & Işıltan, 1999, p. 15; Ayral, 1983, p. 2). Finally, *Bir Cinayet Romanı* marks a turning point in Kür’s authorial career as she employed new narrative techniques and wrote in a genre she had never written before. As the book is a murder mystery, it has already intrigued Turkish-speaking readers since its publication and also presented the promise of attracting more readers in other languages as a genre with universal appeal.

Therefore, thanks to the popularity and success of her books with their innovative form and provoking content as well as to the efforts of individual and institutional agents in the national and international literary fields, Kür’s books have been translated into German, Bulgarian, Greek, French, and English. However, these translations have been mostly in the form of individual pieces published in periodicals or included in more comprehensive collections of texts, such as

anthologies, rather than as book-length publications. Moreover, they have also remained limited in number, which I argue is partly the result of the scarcity of book-length translations of her works, enhancing the visibility of and access to her works. Another reason can be the absence of an English book-length edition, where English would function as a relay language with universal symbolic capital, encouraging and enhancing translations into other languages. Nevertheless, while these two macro-level reasons will be discussed in detail in the following chapters, this study will also reveal that each translation endeavor entails its own micro conditions and challenges delaying or hindering the translation process, some of which will be illuminated thanks to the materials found in the archive.

3.1.2 Pınar Kür as a translator

Intervals between Kür's original works, ranging from shorter two-year periods to longer breaks, were often filled with translational activities. This is explained by Kür as a deliberate strategy since, by "keeping [her] hands busy" with translation projects, she continues to practice her writing skills, as well as her language skills (Aka, 2011, pp. 313-314; Söğüt, 2004, p. 62). Moreover, Kür suggests that, except for the translations she undertook to make a living at the beginning of her career, she has always preferred to translate the authors and works that she genuinely likes and enjoys reading (Şüyün & Işıltan, 1999, p. 15; Söğüt, 2004, p. 62) as well as those that "have not yet been translated" into Turkish (Aka, 2011, p. 315). Therefore, her selection of texts is driven by personal preference, and she pursues the agenda of pioneering the introduction of new authors and works to the Turkish literary field through her translations.

Accordingly, to this day, Kür has been a prolific and versatile translator of more than 30 authors from around the world. She has translated works from English and French, including both fiction and non-fiction titles across a variety of genres, dealing with topics ranging from psychology and politics to literature and literary criticism. This diversity in languages, genres, and subject matter reflects how her translatorial practice aligns with personal preferences and reading habits. Moreover, while most of her translations are direct translations from English or French original works, some are indirect translations, with English serving as the most common relay language.

The earliest translations undertaken by Kür were those of plays by various playwrights as a result of her interest in theater. While studying Pirandello's plays for her doctoral thesis in Paris, Kür translated several plays by Pirandello, which are indirect translations from the French editions of his works (Karantay, 1989, p. 15). She later translated more of his plays intended for radio broadcast, which were ultimately not aired as they were deemed "dangerous" (Karantay, 1989, p. 15). Her translations of Pirandello's plays have not yet been published, except for *Oyunun Kuralları (Il giuoco delle parti)* (The rules of the game), which was published by YKY in 1992. As it was previously mentioned, she also translated her original play *Kuru Kuru Kurbanın Olam* into French which appeared with the title *Amour d'Os* during her studies in Paris.

Her earliest book translations of various other genres, on the other hand, date back to the 1970s, featuring works by diverse authors written in different periods, languages, and genres. In this period, Kür translated *Before Adam (Âdemden Önce)* by Jack London in 1971, *The Life and World of Al Capone (Al Capone: Gangsterler Kralı)* by John Kobler in 1973, *Histoire du théâtre (Tiyatro Tarihi)* (History of

Theater) by Robert Pignarre and *Harlequin* (*Şaklaban*) by Morris West in 1975, *Lettera a un bambino mai nato* (*Doğmamış Çocuğa Mektup*, translated from the English edition *Letter to a Child Never Born*) by Oriana Fallaci in 1977, and *Semnadtsat' mgnoveniy vesny* (*Himmeler'in Oyunu*, translated from the English edition *Seventeen Moments of Spring*) by Julian Semenov in 1979. Four of these books were novels, while the other two were non-fiction, one being a biography and the other a theater history book. Except for *Histoire du théâtre*, which was translated from its French original, the other translations were from English, either directly from the original works or via English as a relay language.

Apart from book translations, during the 1970s, Kür also contributed to the editing and translation of contents for the encyclopedia, *Kadın ve Erkek: Ruhsal ve Cinsel İlişkiler Ansiklopedisi* (Women and Men: An Encyclopedia of Spiritual and Sexual Relationships), which was Türkiye's first "sex encyclopedia", openly tackling sexuality (Aka, 2011, p. 313). The encyclopedia was published in five successive volumes in 1975 by Gelişim Yayınları, with each volume featuring diverse content ranging from educational texts and illustrations on the biological composition of women's and men's bodies to psychosexual and sociological insights into relationships, sexuality, marriage, and other related subjects. Interestingly, none of the volumes provide any clues to distinguish original content from translations, and the texts have no identified authors or translators, although the names of translators, including Kür and others, as well as "advisors," are provided in the colophon of each edition.

Some of Kür's most famous translations appeared first in periodicals, especially during the early 1980s. In 1982 and 1983, Kür's translations of several short stories by Jean Rhys ("Böceklerin Dünyası" ("The Insect World")) in the May-

June 1982 issue, “Gece Gezmesi – 1925” (“Nigh Out 1925”) in the July-August 1982 issue, and “Uyursan Geçer Hanım Teyze” (“Sleep It Off Lady”) in the May-June 1983 issue) were published in *Yazko Çeviri*, a popular translation magazine at the time. In 1982, Kür translated another one of Rhys’ works, her acclaimed novel *Wide Sargasso Sea*, which appeared with the title *Geniş, Geniş Bir Deniz* in Turkish. Although the translation has been well-received and Kür has been well-recognized as the translator who “introduced Rhys into the Turkish literary system” (Özgüven, 1983), the correspondence in the archive reveals that she also received criticism (Özel, 1983). Nevertheless, this first translation was successful enough to pave the way for more translations of Rhys’ works, in fact, most of her oeuvre, into Turkish: Kür translated *Quartet (Dörtlü)* in 1985, *Voyage in the Dark (Karanlıkta Yolculuk)* in 1989, *Good Morning, Midnight (Günaydın Geceyarısı)* in 1990, and *Sleep It Off Lady (Dalda Duran Kuşlar)* in 1991.

Among these works, *Good Morning, Midnight* was the first book by Rhys that Kür had ever read (Aka, 2011, p. 316), while the early translations of the abovementioned three short stories that were initially published in periodicals were republished in her latest translation of Rhys’ final short story collection, *Sleep It Off Lady*. In the interview that Aka conducted with her, Kür claims that she also translated *After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie* by Rhys, and it to be published by Can Yayınları, where her translations of Rhys’ works debuted and, ever since, have been published (Aka, 2011, pp. 319-320). In response to Aka’s question, highlighting that it was the only novel that Kür did not translate, she suggests that Aka should contact the publishing house and “ask for the list” of all of her translations (Aka, 2011, p. 320).¹⁰

¹⁰ Aka (2011) refers to a “catalogue search” as her main source of information on this subject and does not mention any communication with the publishing house. Therefore, taking Kür’s advice, I reached

However, as Aka had already pointed out, the novel *After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie* was translated by another translator, Nili Bilkur, and published by Can Yayınları with the Turkish title *Ayrılıktan Sonra* in 1985 (Aka, 2011, p. 10). In addition, Aka also underlines that “Nuray Kermen seems to be the first translator to have introduced Jean Rhys to the Turkish readership” with her translation of *Good Morning, Midnight* (*Günaydın Geceyarısı*) appearing in Tel Yayınları in 1972. Nevertheless, “Nuray Kermen’s translation was not known and probably is still not known to many,” therefore, it was “after Kür’s Jean Rhys translations that Rhys became more well-known to the Turkish readership” (Aka, 2011, p. 11). In addition to Aka (2011) and others who emphasize this pioneering role of the translator, Kür also portrays herself as the translator who *can be* regarded as the first translator who “discovered” Rhys, introduced her to the Turkish literary system as Rhys was “practically unknown” before her translations (Kür, 1982, p. 5; Söğüt, 2004, p. 62).¹¹ Therefore, although Kür does not explicitly claim that her translation of Rhys was the first, she acknowledges her role as the translator who played the most important part in promoting Rhys’ oeuvre within the Turkish literary field, which is an effort regarded as a “proper introduction” in this context.

Another significant translation from the 1980s is Kür’s translation of selected letters from *Letters of Vincent Van Gogh*, which is a compilation of the letters that the famous painter wrote originally in Dutch and French. Kür translated the letters addressed to Vincent’s brother Theo, which were published in Turkish with the title *Kardeşi Theo’ya Mektuplar* (Letters to his brother Theo) in 1985 by Ada Yayınları, and republished with the title *Theo’ya Mektuplar* in 1996 by Yapı Kredi Yayınları

out to Didem Bayındır, the managing editor of the publishing house’s contemporary fiction and non-fiction series “Can Çağdaş”. I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to Bayındır for sending me the records and confirming that there is no record of a translation by Kür of *Good Morning, Midnight*.

¹¹ Emphasis added.

(YKY), another prestigious publishing house in the Turkish literary field. Van Gogh's letters, through Kür's translation, must have truly resonated with Turkish readers as the book has been reprinted more than twenty times to this day. In fact, the letters were so well-received that Kür co-translated another selection of Van Gogh's letters, *Ever Yours: The Essential Letters*, which was published in 2016 with the title *Dostlukla: Seçme Mektuplar*. The letters resonated with Kür as well, as they "deeply affected" her to the point that she "kept crying while translating them" (Söğüt, 2004, p. 62) and Van Gogh became "like a son" to her (Şüyün and Işıltan, 1999, p. 15), although the translation process was quite challenging for her, since she described it as the most challenging translation process she had experienced so far (Ayrıl, 1983, p. 2).

There are other authors and works that Kür translated out of personal interest. Among these are her translations from the 1990s, including two plays, Sam Shepard's *Curse of the Starving Class* (*Aç Sınıfın Laneti*, first published in 1990) and David Mamet's *Speed-the-Plow* (*Bağla Şu İşi*, first published and staged in 1999), as well as a novel, Nabokov's *Kamera Obskura* (translated from its English translation *Laughter in the Dark* and appeared with the Turkish title *Karanlıkta Kahkaha* in 1993) (Şüyün & Işıltan, 1999, p. 15). Other works that she translated in the same period include *The Comfort of Strangers* (*Yabancı Kucak*, 1991) by Ian McEwan, *The Murder of Roger Ackroyd* (*Roger Ackroyd Cinayeti*, 1992) by Agatha Christie, *The Neon Bible* (*Neon Işıklı İncil*, 1992) by John Kennedy Toole, "The Djinn in the Nightingale's Eye" (the short story was published as a standalone book in Turkish with the title *Çeşm-i Bülbülün İçindeki Cin* in 1994) by A.S. Byatt, *Sexing the Cherry* (*Vişnenin Cinsiyeti*, 1995) and *The Passion* (*Tutku*, 1997) by Jeanette Winterson, *Diana o la cazadora solitaria* (translated from its English translation *Diana the*

Goddess Who Hunts Alone) and appeared with the Turkish title *Diana: Yalnız Avlanan Tanrıça*, 1996) by Carlos Fuentes, *An Unquiet Mind: A Memoir of Moods and Madness* (*Durulmayan Bir Kafa: Bir Delilik ve Duygudurumları Güncesi*, 1996) by Kay Redfield Jamison, *Hannah Arendt – Martin Heidegger* (*Hannah Arendt – Martin Heidegger: Bir Aşkın Anatomisi*, 1996) by Elżbieta Ettinger, *Small g: a Summer Idyll* (*Küçük g: Bir Yaz Masalı*, 1998) by Patricia Highsmith, and *Sonnenfinsternis* (translated from the English translation *Darkness at Noon* and appeared with the Turkish title *Gün Ortasında Karanlık*, 1999) by Arthur Koestler.

During the 2000s, other translations by Kür were published, although smaller in number compared to the prolific period of the 1990s. Kür's co-translation of Nabokov's short stories was published in the collection *Bir Günbatımının Ayrıntıları: Toplu Hikâyeler I* (The Details of a Sunset: The Complete Short Stories 1) in 2000. This was followed by her translation of Louis Begley's *Wartime Lies* (*Savaş Yalanları*) published in 2001. In 2003, Kür also co-translated a collection of Henry James' short stories. The Spanish translations of these stories were originally compiled in *Los Amigos de Mis Amigos* (Friends of My Friends) by Jorge Luis Borges, which was published as part of his La Biblioteca de Babel (The Library of Babel) series. Pınar Kür's and Fatih Özgüven's translation of these short stories, on the other hand, was published with the Turkish title *Dostlarımızın Dostları*, and conveyed the title, content, and format of the Spanish edition and attempted to recreate the series in Turkish while using the English original texts of the short stories for translation, rather than their Spanish translations by Borges.

In the early 2000s, Kür also translated *Gold* (*Altın*) by Peter Greenaway in 2004 and *Property* (*Mal*) by Valerie Martin in 2007. In 2012, her Turkish translations of *The Dain Curse* (*Ailenin Laneti*) by Dashiell Hammett and *Dolphin People* (*Yunus*

İnsanlar) by Torsten Krol were published. Kür's translation of Byatt's short story "The Djinn in the Nightingale's Eye" was republished along with four additional stories in her translation of the eponymous book *The Djinn in the Nightingale's Eye: Five Fairy Stories (Bülbülün Gözündeki Cin: Beş Peri Hikâyesi)* in 2013. In the following years, Kür translated two memoirs: Her translations of John Manderino's *Crying at Movies: A Memoir (Sinemada Ağlarken)* and Michelle Obama's *Becoming (Benim Hikâyem)* were published respectively in 2018 and 2019. Her latest translation is Anne Brontë's *Agnes Grey*, which was published recently in 2024.

3.1.3 Pinar Kür as an author-translator

As can be seen in the chronological account of her original works and translations, translation has been a recurring practice in Kür's life, although she often took it up as a kind of writing exercise at the intervals between her original works, which shows its secondary position compared to her authorial practice. It is also important to underline once again that Kür took long breaks from writing original literary works, during which she engaged only in translation. This also partly accounts for the higher number of translations in her repertoire compared to her original works. However, although her translatorial identity has been overshadowed by her authorial one, Kür's position as a translator in the Turkish literary field cannot be identified as marginal in the traditional sense. As Aka (2011) has shown, this is mainly due to the symbolic capital endowed by Kür's authorial position in the field, which gives her a more privileged position than a translator since translators do not enjoy the same recognition as authors. Therefore, the difference in symbolic capital and status calls for the identification of the author-translator as a distinct identity and for a

sociological investigation of its impact on the agent operating within the literary field.

Tracing the position of author-translators in the Turkish literary field through an investigation of the discourse in popular translation-oriented periodicals published between the 1940s and 1960s, as well as the 1980s and 1990s, Aka identified three norms¹² governing the practice of literary translation, established by key figures in the Turkish literary and translation fields writing in these publications: The first and the most fundamental argument is that translation of literary works should be undertaken by authors. Aka (2011) points out that this fundamental argument was prevalent in the period between the 1940s and 1960s, whereas it was also present but not “as apparent” in the 1980s and 1990s (pp. 69-70). At the root of this discussion was the presumption that authors who write “well” also have the necessary skills to translate “well”. This stemmed from the similarities between writing and translating, which is often discussed with regard to “creativity,” even by Kür herself, who argues that both acts require “a certain degree of creativity” (Aka, 2011, p. 310).

The other two norms, which preserved their relevance from the 1940s to the 1990s, were related to text selection and the style of the selected text. The author-translators were expected to choose texts that they enjoyed reading and shared similarities with the source author in terms of writing, the most emphasized component of which was style. The author-translators had to convey the original’s style, with which the style of their original works was expected to share similarities. The author-translator was also expected not to impose their authorial style on the

¹² Although Aka does not explicitly use the term norm to describe the views and expectations regarding the author-translator’s role, I argue that they fall under what Toury (1995) names as translational norms.

work they are translating (Aka, 2011, p. 66). As can be seen, all of these norms highlight the unrealistic expectations imposed on translators.

Moreover, the articles in these periodicals also include references to the views of other important literary and translation figures at home and abroad, through presenting translations of their articles or their comments on translational issues, in order to enhance the periodicals' credibility. It is possible to suggest that, in this way, they also tried to underline that such translational norms were not specific to the Turkish literary field. The names appearing in these publications include key literary figures such as Ahmet Haşim and Memet Fuat, along with André Gide and Wladimir Weidlé, as well as well-known translation scholars and translators such as Talât Sait Halman, Akşit Göktürk, Alexander Fraser Tytler, and Edmond Cary (Aka, 2011, pp. 59-71).

As can be seen in Aka's interview with Kür (2011) and in other interviews and paratextual materials that were found in the archive, Kür's habitus as an author-translator has also been shaped by such norms governing literary translation in the Turkish literary field for extended periods of time. For instance, in an interview titled "Dilinin 'namusunu koruyabilmek'" (Protecting the purity of one's language)¹³, Kür openly states that "translations by a translator who is also an author achieve greater success" while underlining that translation requires a perfect knowledge of the source and target languages, the necessary skill and experience as well as a certain, secondary creativity. However, she also acknowledges that other people who "devote

¹³ Here, "namus" refers to the purity of language in a way that underlines the metaphorical "chastity" of the language. In addition, although I checked the issue of the newspaper cited as the source of the interview on the archival document, I could not find the interview in that issue. This suggests that there may have been an error in identifying the source of the document during the classification process conducted by the Women's Library.

themselves to the practice” can also succeed in translation, although not as much as author-translators (Kür et al., 1993).

To strengthen her argument, she further suggests that author-translators can better understand and sympathize with the source author as a result of their authorial identity, which results in a more selective approach in choosing the texts to be translated and special attention paid to remain “loyal” to the source author (Aka, 2011, p. 311). Accordingly, Kür often underlines her preference to translate the authors that she enjoys reading and with whom she feels closely connected (Aka, 2011, p. 311; Söğüt, 2004, p. 62). For instance, in another interview found outside the Women’s Library and also cited in Aka’s (2011) study, Kür identifies the relationship between herself and Rhys, whose works she prolifically translated into Turkish, as an “affinity” (Özgüven, 1983, p. 132). In the same interview, she also acknowledges the stylistic similarity between her authorial style and that of Rhys while refuting the argument that she imposed her own authorial style in her translations of Rhys’ works (Özgüven, 1983, p. 132). In fact, Kür also acknowledges that translating certain works helps her improve her linguistic skills in Turkish since finding equivalents for certain words and concepts can be challenging (Aka, 2011, p. 318; Söğüt, 2004, p. 62).

Aka’s (2011) research further argues that Kür’s authorial and translatorial identities are constantly in interaction, the impacts of which can be traced in the styles of both her original works and translations. Although Aka’s study offers valuable data regarding the differences in the usage of linguistic elements in Rhys’ original works and Kür’s translations, which are analyzed as indicators of “style”, it also presents certain limitations that prevent the researcher from reaching well-defined and more grounded conclusions. Aka (2011) also acknowledges these

limitations as she suggests that, although Kür seems to make “her own stylistic preferences while also paying attention to the choices of the source author” in her translations of Rhys, “without the use of subcorpora of Turkish novels written by other authors in a period close in time, it is not very possible to know the degree to which the structure of Turkish language affects the results” (p. 307). She further argues that the integration of the corpora consisting of other author-translators’ works would contribute to drawing broader conclusions from the case study of Kür that could be applied to a wider group of author-translators (p. 308).

As can be seen in her arguments, her study and its implications for further research remain rooted in text-oriented analysis that focuses primarily on the interactions between Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles. However, I argue that her study offers highly valuable insights as the first socio-translational approach to Kür’s role as an author-translator, which I find more impactful than its text-oriented conclusions. Moreover, although from a text-oriented perspective, Aka (2011) also underlines that “it is necessary to bear in mind that there are agents other than the author-translator who have a role in the production of ‘original’ and translated works of literature” (p. 307). Therefore, the interaction between Kür’s authorial and translatorial habitus goes beyond their impact on her style and opens up space for further sociological discussions focusing on its impact on Kür’s interactions with different agents involved in the translation process, which is presented as the objective of this study.

My investigation of archival materials in the private papers of Kür at the Women’s Library and Information Centre Foundation, complemented by related extratextual and paratextual materials found outside the archive, has shown that, in her interactions with various agents in literary field, Kür appears primarily in two

positions: The recognized author whose works have been translated into different languages by translators in different literary fields with whom she often interacts and the translator who has also interacted with other agents in her own translatorial practice.

These interactions, which can be traced through the materials found in the archive, reveal important insights into Kür's habitus and symbolic capital as well as her self-perception as an author-translator, complemented by her remarks on translation as a practice. Also evident in these interactions is how Kür's identity and agency as an author-translator shape the power relations and the process of collaborative translation practices that she is involved in with other agents. Moreover, as will be later expanded on, Kür's archive preserves and presents not only her "curated" history and self-perception as an author-translator but also those of other translation agents. It is an "indispensable resource" for the investigation of the conditions, working practices, and lived experiences of these agents, which "shed light on the bigger picture of the history of translation in specific socio-historical and cultural contexts" (Munday, 2014, pp. 64-65). Finally, her decision to include the materials related to other translators in her archive can also be tied back to her identity and agency as an author-translator, as will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

3.2 Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation

The Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation (WLICF) is a women-centered library and archive, the first and only of its kind, founded in 1990 by Füsün Akatlı, Jale Baysal, Aslı Davaz, Füsün Ertuğ, and Şirin Tekeli, prominent figures in women's studies, with the aim "to learn and truly know about women's history, to

present this knowledge to researchers in an organized manner, and to preserve today's documents for future generations" (Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation, n.d.-a). The Library's collection has 16 main sections, comprising unique documents related to women's struggle for equality and liberty in all aspects of life: Women's Private Papers, Women's Oral History, Women's Organizations, Women Writers, Women Artists, Visual Documents, Audio Materials, Posters, Art Collections, Newspaper Clippings, Books, Periodicals, Rare Materials, Thesis-Dissertations, Articles, and Ephemera. The library also organizes lectures, book launches, workshops, interviews, screenings, conferences, talks, and many other events as well as projects. One of these projects is a thesaurus project, which is also a translation/adaptation project through which 2687 terms from the *European Women's Thesaurus* (Drenthe and Van der Sommen, 1998), which is itself a translation/adaptation of the original Women's Thesaurus in Dutch (Drenthe and Van der Sommen, 1992), were translated/adapted into Turkish (Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation, n.d.-a).

The Private Archives in the library are the result of a relatively recent effort since it was with the library's foundation in 1990 that a systematic preservation model was adopted. According to the information provided on the library's website, archives are often created posthumously, and the donation of private papers by women with the aim of creating an archive is a relatively new practice in Türkiye (Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation, n.d.-a). Currently, there are 104 private archives that belong to women from diverse backgrounds, including authors, translators, artists, actors, journalists, librarians, archivists, doctors, professors, feminist activists, archaeologists, lawyers, politicians, and many more whose achievements and contributions to the women's cause cannot be reduced into

categories and professions (Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation., n.d.-b). Pınar Kür's Private Archive is among these invaluable materials preserved in the library. In addition to archives of individuals, the Library's Private Archives also include archives of certain institutions and organizations for women, especially those focusing on women's education, such as Amargi Kadın Akademisi Derneği (Amargi Women's Academy Foundation), Biçki Dikiş Yurdu (Tailoring School), Türk Hemşireler Derneği (Turkish Nurses Association), Türkiye Soroptimist Kulüpleri Federasyonu (Turkish Soroptimist Clubs Federation), and Türk Üniversiteli Kadınlar Derneği (Turkish Association of University Women).

One of the first things that caught my attention was that, although some of the women who have their own archives in the library produce and publish translations, only a few are translators by profession. Except for Rezzan Yalman and Pınar Kür, translation has limited space in the careers of other women in the archives and is overshadowed by their actual professions and other endeavors. In fact, as I argue in this study, even Kür's authorial identity overshadows her translatorial identity although she is a prolific and well-known translator. Therefore, it is safe to suggest that the only archive that can be identified primarily as a "translator's archive" is Rezzan Yalman's archive. Accordingly, in the archive's inventory document, she is identified as "Translator, Journalist, Author" in the original order provided in the document (Kadın Eserleri Kütüphanesi, n.d.-c). Pınar Kür, on the other hand, is identified as "Novelist, Short Story Author, Playwright, Translator, Academic, Dramaturgist" in the original order provided in the document. As can be seen, her translatorial identity comes after her authorial identity even in the inventory document (Kadın Eserleri Kütüphanesi, n.d.-d).

Guzmán (2013), in her pioneering study, underlines the importance of translator archives as both physical and symbolic repositories of socio-historical knowledge and discourses of translation. Nevertheless, there are also limitations that the archival methodology brings. The first and the most obvious one is the physical limitations. The materials in the archive may not always be presented in designated or detailed categories, and in the case of translation-related materials, the conditions of preservation and categorization seem to be worse. As Munday (2014) notes, “until recently,” “exclusion [of translation-related materials] seems to have been the norm” in the formation of archives (p. 71). As I will expand on in the following section, Kür’s archive was also not classified and did not present translation-related materials under a separate category, which was one of the main challenges that I encountered during my investigation.

Nevertheless, the lack of designated “translator archives” or classification of translation-related materials do not always point to an absence of materials. In fact, they can often be found in the collections of other agents of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1993) who have been involved in or shaped translation processes (Nuri, 2024; Avcı Solmaz & Karadağ, 2024). This is especially the case when the agent is “aware of the potential importance of [a translation-related] material” (Munday, 2014, p. 74), which was also true for Kür’s archive, mainly as a result of her position and dual role as a (translated) author and a translator, although the materials that she included are relatively limited in number and often fragmented. In addition, as some of the other influential women whose archives are housed at the WLICF were also involved in translational activities, their private papers also offer a repository waiting to be explored by researchers.

In my case, another significant physical limitation of this methodology was that most of the archival materials at the WLICF have not yet been digitalized. Thus, their investigation requires a visit to the library for interested researchers. Although Munday (2014) underlines that hybrid archives have been appearing with the “developments in modern communication” and the digitalization of archival materials (pp. 74-75), my research process has shown that these appear to be in slow progress at the WLICF, if there is any progress at all, due to various issues. In such cases, archival investigation requires more time and effort from researchers, which often proves challenging and highlights the need for more digitalization efforts in archives. Therefore, as both a necessity for the analysis process of my research and a humble contribution to this effort, I volunteered to digitalize the materials relevant to my thesis. The digitalization of materials had to be done within the library, which also required frequent visits. After the digitalization process was completed, I still needed to obtain Pınar Kür’s permission to use these “private” materials, which she kindly granted to me for the purposes of this thesis.

As for the reasons behind these limitations, in the case of the WLICF, the problem has proven to be a more fundamental one, related to budget constraints and a lack of personnel. I have been informed that the Women’s Library, the first and only women-centered library in Türkiye, does not receive the necessary financial support to hire archivists, librarians, or other experts to classify and digitalize the materials in the Private Archives. It is thanks to the efforts of volunteers and interns willing to help preserve women’s histories by taking on different responsibilities, such as the preservation, recording, classification, digitalization, and even translation of the materials at the library, that the library still stands today.

3.3 Private Archive of Pınar Kür

Pınar Kür's archive consists of 25 folders containing a wide variety of numerous materials, all of which were donated by Kür to the library in 2015. The folders do not follow any clear chronological, thematic, or material-based order, except in a few cases that remain exceptions. For instance, Folder 9 contains only drafts of several chapters from her novel *Küçük Oyuncu* while Folders 17 and 18 contain drafts of several chapters from her novel *Bitmeyen Aşk*. Folder 8 consists mostly of drafts of her novel *Bir Cinayet Romanı* and related notes. Folders 20 and 21 include drafts of several short stories and novels. However, there is no classification system or labeling on the folders that would provide any indication of their contents.

I conducted my investigation of the archive at the WLICF between October 2023 and February 2024. During this period, the library was open to visitors and researchers only on weekdays.¹⁴ Occasionally, special events were organized, during which the library could not be used for research purposes. My investigation process, which lasted for about four months, consisted of several steps. As the first step in my methodology, I had to go through Kür's entire archive (25 folders, 695 files, the content of each file ranging from a single-page document to voluminous documents spanning more than a hundred pages). Only a relatively small part (126 files) of the archive's content turned out to be translation-related materials. After this initial identification process, I made an inventory of the archive with detailed descriptions since the inventory presented on the library's webpage was incomplete and unclassified. I also had to create my own classification system based on the type and genre of the materials. In addition, since most of the documents in the archive are

¹⁴ To my knowledge, a large-scale classification work has recently been started at the library's depository, where the private archives are kept due to storage constraints. I was first informed of it in August 2024. Therefore, the current access status to Kür's archive, the condition of the materials, and research opportunities are unknown.

fragmented, incomplete, or untitled, I had to identify the documents and track down their complete versions outside the archive.

This process also had its challenges since some of the documents, such as unpublished drafts and manuscripts of original works and translations, do not exist outside the archive. The fragmented, untitled, or incomplete documents that also exist outside the archive, on the other hand, were not easy to track down either. For instance, Kür's Turkish translation draft of the short story "You Were Perfectly Fine" by Dorothy Parker was found in the archive, but it was untitled and could not be identified at first glance. I later found the original short story among a selection of short stories in English, titled *Short Fiction in English*, which Kür prepared as a coursebook for her students in the period when she was teaching at Bilgi University.

I also had to check whether some of Kür's Turkish translation drafts in the archive, which were found not to be part of any of the published book translations or collections featuring translations, had been published elsewhere—most likely in periodicals since original works and translations from the early stages of Kür's literary career were published in literary, arts, and translation magazines (Söğüt, 2004). To find out, I consulted several issues of periodicals housed at the archive of IMM Atatürk Library, in which some of Kür's early translated and original works were known to have been published during the 1970s and 1980s, such as the literary magazines *Dost*, *Yazko Edebiyat*, and *Hürriyet Gösteri*, as well as the translation magazines *Yazko Çeviri* and *Metis Çeviri*.

This search revealed a poem translation conducted in collaboration with Mehmet Can Köksal, whose name appears on several documents in Kür's archive, including what appears to be a poem translation draft as well.¹⁵ Kür and Köksal's co-

¹⁵ At first, I did not think that this document could be a translation, therefore I did not digitalize it. Later, when I found the translation of "Snake" in the archive of IMM Atatürk Library, I went back to

translation of D.H. Lawrence's poem "Snake" ("Yılan") was published in issue 9 of *Yazko Çeviri* in 1982. It was revealed that Kür's translations of several short stories by Jean Rhys were also published for the first time in *Yazko Çeviri* (issues 6, 7, and 12). Moreover, the interviews as well as the published original works and translations found in these magazines helped me further classify the documents in the archive. By investigating these magazines, I was able to check the publication status of the documents in the archive and re-identify what I had initially thought might be original works, translation-related materials, or unpublished texts.

Thus, after a meticulous process of examination, identification, and classification, I have classified Kür's archive into the following categories: translations and self-translations (published and unpublished); translations of Kür's original works by other translators; correspondence; interviews; drafts of original short stories (published and unpublished); drafts of her original novels (published and unpublished); original dramas; original poems (published and unpublished); original film scripts; film scripts adapted from Kür's original works; teleplays; essays and articles; film reviews; theater reviews; working notes and fragments of writing; notebooks; articles and reviews on Kür (original works and translations); promotional materials (original works and translations); official documents; PhD thesis drafts; documents related to literary/art events and conferences; postcards, brochures, and other documents from Kür's travels; books, magazines, and newsletters; photographs; documents related to other agents of cultural production; translations of other authors by other translators; other materials and ephemera.

the Women's Library to take another look at the document but was informed that Kür's archive could not be recalled from the depository due to a large-scale classification work in progress at the depository. Therefore, I could not check whether it is the same poem although it is highly possible.

As can be seen, the abundance and variety of materials required a detailed categorization based on several criteria. Therefore, I categorized the materials based on their medium (texts and photographs), textual origin (original works and translations), text types (literary texts, performance texts, informational texts, critical writing, academic writing, official documents, etc.), literary genre (short stories, novels, poems, etc.), agents (Kür, other translators and agents of cultural production), and status of completion (drafts, fragments, and complete works). In addition, I further divided Kür's translations based on their genre and the involvement of other translators (collaborative or individual translation).

As mentioned earlier, Pınar Kür's archive, like most of the private archives at the library, was not digitalized. After the identification and classification of the materials, I digitalized all of the translation-related materials. This was followed by a re-examination and analysis of the translation-related materials, which helped me see the connections that the materials revealed as well as the possible approaches that can be adopted in analyzing them. However, I also had to consider the scope of my study and the limitations, this time epistemological, that the archival methodology presented.

The first and most obvious one was that I investigated the materials with the initial aim of uncovering overlooked information about Kür's role as a translator. This agent-oriented microhistorical approach has informed my study from the beginning, starting with the initial step of selecting the materials to be analyzed in detail within the scope of this study. Therefore, it was my subjectivity, "presuppositions and constructions" as the researcher that shaped the "archive's interpretation and the narratives it generates" (Guzmán, 2020, p.13). It can be suggested that these limitations result mainly from the fact that, as Munday (2014)

points out, “the methodology for the study of personal papers” has been “underdeveloped” (p. 72) and calls for the development of methodologies through further research.

For this reason, I also position myself as the “researcher-agent whose gaze can be framed, questioned, opened to alternative perspectives, and whose epistemological choices may respond to unstated and unconscious motivations” (Guzmán, 2013, p. 177). In fact, as will be discussed in detail below, Kür’s archive offers other possible approaches that I encourage researchers in translation studies to adopt, since “reading and interpreting an archive is never completed. The materials, in their open and somewhat raw nature, continue to elicit and prompt new questions, thereby offering the promise of new paths for enquiry” (Guzmán, 2020, p. 32).

In addition to the researcher’s positionality, there was another layer of subjectivity related to the mediation of materials themselves. First, since the materials in the archive were donated by Kür herself, it is possible to say that the archival content was shaped by a degree of “curatorship” (Guzmán, 2020). Kür’s archive reflects her own selection and presentation of what she deemed relevant and valuable, her decision to preserve, to include, and also to exclude. It presents a (self-)portrayal of the trajectory of her literary career, not only as a translator but also as an author, as well as her image and practice as an agent of cultural production (Simeoni, 1998). The first thing that I noticed, and did not find striking at all, was the number of materials related to her authorial identity and practice compared to which those related to her translatorial identity and practice remained quite limited in number. In fact, there are fewer than 200 materials related to her translatorial identity and practice, even when loosely related materials are included, such as blurbs on translated works where the act of translation is acknowledged only superficially,

interviews that simply mention a new translation to be published, or literary event brochures that announcing readings of translations.

Nevertheless, this is not surprising since, as it has been discussed above, translation occupies a peripheral position in Kür's literary career, the center of which is dedicated to authorial practices. It is only a complementary practice that contributes to her writing skills as an author, an activity that she turns to during her breaks from original production, a space where she can rest and prepare for the next original production (Yılmaz, 2004; Söğüt, 2004). Therefore, it is both a refuge from the blocks and stagnation periods in her original literary production and a refined intellectual hobby that allows her to "translate the authors and the works that she likes" and helps her "practice her language skills" while "keeping [her] hands busy" (Söğüt, 2004).

In addition, although there is a growing interest in a translational approach to archives and an increasing awareness of the significance of translator archives, there are still very few archives in which translators appear as a distinct category, let alone ones that can be defined as dedicated translator archives. Exceptions in the world are "a collection of translators' manuscripts housed in the Lilly Library at the University of Indiana at Bloomington" and another collection of Gregory Rabassa's translation-related materials at Boston University (Guzmán, 2013, p. 179). This scarcity of dedicated translator archives partly results from the fact that "[u]ntil very recently, university archives have prioritized purchasing publishers' and authors' archives over those of the translator, because of asymmetries in cultural capital" (Woods, 2022, p. 328). In Türkiye, there are even fewer examples since, to my knowledge, "translator" often does not appear as a distinct category, even in the libraries with major collections. One of the few examples is the WLICF, housing the archives of

influential women translators, such as Rezzan Yalman and Pınar Kür, although Kür's translatorial identity is overshadowed by her other multiple roles. Avcı Solmaz & Karadağ's (2024) study also shows that translational materials can be found in the private archives of other important cultural agents of production, such as Taha Toros. Nevertheless, these remain as exceptions.

Cordingley and Hersant (2021), on the other hand, point out that it is in the archives of "famous writers who occasionally translated" that "[r]esearchers are most likely to encounter translation manuscripts" (p. 18), which is also the case for Pınar Kür's archive, except for the occasionality part and the variety of materials. As it has been discussed above, Pınar Kür is a prolific translator of a variety of literary works, and despite being a peripheral practice that only comes to the fore during periods of stagnation in her writing, translation as a practice still holds an important position in Kür's career. Although the number of translation-related materials it holds is relatively small, Kür's archive is also a testimony to the significance of her translatorial practice and her awareness of it.

By including translation-related materials in her archive, Kür shows what I would like to call "translatorial awareness", drawing on Wolfram Wilss' (1997) discussion of "translator awareness". In his attempt to provide a "feel" for the concept, Wilss takes Donmall's definition of "language awareness" as "a language user's sensitivity to the nature of language and its role in communication" (1985, p. 7, as cited in Wilss, 1997, p. 90). Building on this connection, I would like to suggest that Kür, as a translator, exhibits an awareness of the role of translation as a social practice that she performs as an agent, which provides her with certain symbolic capital while also contributing to her practice as an author. This awareness is reflected in her inclusion of the materials related to her own translations in the

archive, materials which she preserved in the first place because she was aware of their significance.

As for the inclusion of other translation-related materials that are not directly related to her own translatorial role, Kür's remarks on whether it is important for authors to have their books translated into other languages can shed light on their significance:

Of course, it is a good thing, even if it does not become a bestseller, even if you don't become very famous, a book's existence in another language extends its lifespan. I have never engaged in any effort to that end. I don't have the energy for it. Everybody says, 'You are competent in two foreign languages; why don't you translate your own works?' No, sir, I can't; that is just not possible. The best I can do is to check the translation. I can tell whether it is good or not. (Söğüt, 2006, p. 11, my translation from Turkish)¹⁶

This is an important statement as it is a quintessential manifestation of Kür's habitus, her position as an agent, her translation practice, and her perception of it, as well as her self-perception as an author-translator. Based on her words, it is safe to say that her understanding of the translation practice parallels what Benjamin defines (1921/2002) as the "afterlife" of originals "mark[ing] their stage of continued life" (p. 254).

Moreover, by preserving and including materials related to the translations of her original works, especially those that could not be published or were partly published, she still contributes to their afterlife in another way, as they continue their existence in her archive and become more visible and accessible. This, in turn, along with their translated status, adds to their symbolic capital, an intellectual value that goes beyond the ephemeral nature of popular attention and the financial benefit that comes with a "bestseller" status. It is what appears in Bourdieu as "a profit of disinterestedness, or the profit one has on seeing oneself (or being seen) as one who

¹⁶All translations throughout this thesis are mine unless stated otherwise.

is not searching for profit” (Johnson, 1993, p. 15). Through translation, Kür’s works can find a place in “a restricted field of production” among the “serious” literature and not be a part of the large-scale “popular” literature that is consumed by the masses (Johnson, 1993, pp. 15-16).

Another important aspect of this remark is her hint at the possibility of an author-translator collaboration in the translation process, where the author-translator not only appears as a helping hand but establishes herself as the “authority” who is able to assess the “quality” of a translation. In the discussion of this dual position, I would like to delve into other materials that Kür included in her archive. As has been discussed earlier, Kür appears in a dual position of agency and interacts with various other agents of cultural production. The most detailed portrayal of these interactions, which rely heavily on power dynamics, can be found in the correspondence in Kür’s archive. The archive includes 103 letters in which Kür appears both as the sender and, mostly, as the recipient, which implies that Kür often did not keep a copy of her letters or possibly preferred not to include them. There are exceptions where Kür preserved not only one but several copies of the same letter, which is the case in her correspondence with Ruth Christie, as will be discussed later. Although there are fewer than 30 letters, Kür kept and included copies of the letters that she wrote to her translators in the archive, except for Nilüfer Mizanoğlu Reddy, who appears only as the sender of a single letter in the archive. Among this trove of letters, I have decided to focus on Kür’s correspondence with Münevver Andaç, Saydam Özel, Ruth Christie, Ferda Fidan, Nilüfer Mizanoğlu Reddy, and Tomáš Laně.

Kür’s correspondence with her translators reveals details about the translation process of her original works into different languages, the contribution of these translations to Kür’s portrayal in foreign literary fields, specifically in the “restricted

field” (Bourdieu, 1993; Gouanvic, 2005) of Turkish literature in them. Other details that the correspondence sheds light upon include the working and living conditions (financial problems, additional professions pursued by translators, etc.), working practices (author-translator collaboration and other translatorial strategies), and self-perception of translators, all of which invite a sociological approach that integrates the Bourdieusian concepts habitus, capital, and field. Therefore, as a rich and diverse source of information, I have placed the correspondence at the heart of the discussions in this thesis.

Other materials in the archive that offer additional information on similar subjects are the translation drafts, sent either as attachments to the letters or as separate texts. The existence of drafts from several stages of the translation process immediately enables a “genetic” analysis, which is the tracking of “the transformations of the translated text during the process of its composition” by studying “translators’ manuscripts, drafts and other working documents” with a focus on “the textual evidence of the activity of translation rather than the translating subject” (Cordingley & Montini, 2015, p. 1). Moreover, the translation drafts are defined as “organic” materials as they “bear the traces of revision by the translators” (Qi & Gerber, 2021, p. 11).

Nevertheless, I do not engage in such an analysis for obvious reasons. The first reason is that my study proposes to go beyond textual analysis and tries to shift the focus from texts to agents. Another reason is that most of the translation drafts in Kür’s archive, whether they belong to Kür or others, appear in either final or near-final state with minor corrections, while some are incomplete with several missing pages or unknown translators.¹⁷ Only a few of these drafts may lead to fruitful

¹⁷ For instance, there is a four-page draft translation of Kür’s short story “Bir Ayrılık Şarkısı” in the archive, which appears with the title “A Song of Farewell” but without an indicator of the name of its

discussions, and that is in individual text-oriented cases where changes can be traced throughout the draft and in comparison with a published version. Therefore, as a result of the stated limitations, but mostly because of my interest in the agent rather than the text, I limit my use to the translation drafts that were sent as attachments to the letters, as they provide textual evidence which can be discussed in relation to the dynamics of author-translation collaboration. The fragments of translations that I use in my discussions belong to the translations of “Bir Deli Ağaç” and *Asılacak Kadın*, respectively by Ruth Christie and Ferda Fidan. Another translation draft that I will mention in my discussion is Pınar Kür and Albert Vander’s co-translation of Nâzım Hikmet’s *Ferhat ile Şirin* into French, only the second act of which appears in the archive. The draft shows minor corrections. Moreover, since the draft dates back to the period when Kür was still a student and a translator at the beginning of her career, it is highly possible that the rest of it was lost.

Other translation drafts in the archive include Kür’s edited translation drafts of Jean Rhys’ short stories “The Insect World” (“Böceklerin Dünyası”), and “Night Out 1925” (“Gece Gezmesi – 1925”) into Turkish; a complete edited draft of her translation of Van Gogh’s letters to his brother Theo¹⁸ into Turkish; self-translation¹⁹ of her short story “Son Çizgi” (“A Final Line”) into English which appears in two drafts, one edited and the other near-final; an edited draft of possibly a self-

translator. The usage of “v” in place of “w” in this draft suggests that it was written on a different typewriter than the other drafts. “A Final Line” has two drafts, one with corrections and the other a final draft, while only the final draft has Kür’s name on the cover as the translator. The paper used for “A Final Line” and for “A Song of Farewell” look identical.

¹⁸ Her Turkish translation of the letters was first published by Ada Yayınları in 1985 and later by YKY in 1996. Since there is no date on the draft, it is not possible to tell to which final edition these drafts belong without comparing the draft translation with the two published editions.

¹⁹ Although the existence of a self-translation in the archive seems to contradict Kür’s abovementioned remarks in the interview, they do not necessarily suggest a contradiction since she is talking specifically about book translations, which are denser in volume and require more time than translating individual short stories. Moreover, other correspondence in the archive shows that Kür participated in author reading events abroad which required short-length translations of her works to be read at events (Kleinmichel, 1991). This could also explain the existence of self-translations in her archive.

translation of her short story “Bir Ayrılık Şarkısı” (“A Song of Farewell”) into English; untitled final translation draft of Dorothy Parker’s short story “You Were Perfectly Fine”; self-translation of her play *Kuru Kuru Kurbanın Olam* (*Amour d’Os*) into French, an edited draft with multiple marginalia; draft translations of Luigi Pirandello’s plays into Turkish including three near-final drafts of *Doktorun Görevi* (*Il dovere del medico*) (*The Doctor’s Duty*) and two drafts, one final and the other edited, of *Resmi Belge* (*La Patente*) (*The License*); near-final translation draft of Susan Glaspell’s *Trifles* (*Önemsiz Şeyler*) filed together with another draft of an unidentified edited play in Turkish, possibly a translation of an English original, Allan Monkhouse’s *The King of Bavender* (*Bavender* [sic] *Kralı*), and Jill Glew’s *A Family Occasion* (*Buyrun Cenazeye*) into Turkish; a near-final translation draft of an act from Arthur Schnitzler’s *Anatol* (“Ayrılık Sofrası”) (“A Farewell Supper”) into Turkish; and near-final translation draft of Károly Szakonyi’s *Adáshiba* into Turkish.

In addition to the translation drafts that appear as independent, standalone texts, there are also fragments of translations found within Kür’s personal notebooks. My investigation has revealed Turkish translations of six poems by Emily Dickinson: “Pain-has an Element of Blank-”, “The Mountains-grow unnoticed-”, “A Cemetery”, “I took one Draught of Life”, “I heard a Fly buzz-when I died-”, and “I taste a liquor never brewed”. To my knowledge, Kür’s translations of these poems have never been published. Although Kür states that she has never engaged in writing poetry after her childhood poems, she also notes that she has translated poems (Kartoğlu, 1985, p. 55). However, as it was mentioned above, the only published poem translation that I encountered during my investigation was her co-translation of D.H. Lawrence’s “Snake”. This evidence, along with the translation of “Snake”, has demonstrated that Kür’s translation practice, in fact, encompasses all major genres of literature: drama,

fiction, non-fiction, and poetry. It also shows that although it has informed her habitus as a translator, poetry translation has remained an unearthed part of Kür's translatorial corpus as well as an unexplored part of her translatorial habitus and practice, highlighting a gap that could only be revealed through an investigation of her archive due to the unpublished status of these translations.

In addition to correspondence and translation drafts, the archive also includes interviews that feature comments by Kür on various sociological aspects such as her own translatorial practice, the role of the translation practice on a broader level, translatorial strategies followed in specific translations, her relationship with other agents in the literary field as an author-translator, and so on. While only two of these interviews center around her translatorial identity (Karantay, 1989) and perception of translation practice (Kür et al., 1993), the rest of them also tackle her translatorial identity and other translational matters, although more peripherally (Şüyün & Işıltan, 1999; Kartoğlu, 1985; Ayral, 1983; Yılmaz, 2004; Söğüt, 2004).

As this study aims to understand the power relations among translators as well as the translatorial habitus, interviews have proven to be a rich source of information for several reasons. First, they provide direct access to the translator's self-perception, which, in turn, makes it easier to understand the translatorial habitus. Second, they fill the gaps left by the absence of "written evidence" and "help interpret documents" (Seldon, 1996, pp. 353, 358-359, as cited in Munday, 2014, p. 70). Simeoni (1998) also underlines the importance of interviews, especially in forming "sociobiographies" of translators. Therefore, I decided to refer to multiple interviews in this study, interviews found not only within but also outside the archive.

To better explain the strategy of including materials found outside the archive in a study that centers around that archive, I would like to reflect on and refer back to the limitations of this study, focusing especially on the factor of subjectivity through mediation. As I have already discussed, mediation occurs primarily in the formation of this archive, in the form of a kind of curatorship, and thus points to a degree of subjectivity. In addition to this, there is another form of mediation that occurs at the level of different types of accounts found in the archive. Extratextual sources, such as interviews, are treated with “circumspection” as they are deemed “partial and biased,” “emanating (...) from interested parties” (Toury, 2012, p. 88). According to Munday (2014), on the other hand, each account is mediated, but to a different degree. For instance, interviews and post-hoc accounts are identified as “overtly mediated testimonies” because they offer a retrospective and subjective look to past translation events, while the archives, manuscripts, and personal papers are considered to be “less overtly mediated”, which still underlines a certain degree of subjectivity (Munday, 2014).

While I acknowledge their “overtly mediated” (Munday, 2014) status, I argue that interviews can prove to be useful materials when used as a complementary element in the discussion of more “organic” and “less overtly mediated” testimonies, such as correspondence. Moreover, while the archive presents a rich repository of materials including both kinds of testimonies, I have taken a further step towards data triangulation by combining interviews found within and outside the archive, specifically those offering different accounts on the same subject. Another important reason for the inclusion of interviews with outside sources was the gaps left by the absence of relevant accounts in the archive. The fact that published interviews are

public accounts that can be found in the periodical archives at libraries also made them more accessible.

As another important but overlooked material, the archive includes brochures of literary events through which Kür's works were translated into different languages and introduced to different literary fields, which are also accompanied by relevant correspondence (Kür, 1986a, 1986b, 1990d, 1990e; Başgöz, 1986, 1987; Scharf, ca. 1990; Kleinmichel, 1991). In addition to the letters that I used at the core of my discussions, I also referred to the information provided in these letters which were relevant to the translation events that I investigated. Nevertheless, I argue that correspondence surrounding literary events, as well as other materials related to these events, such as brochures, has not received sufficient attention and calls for more exploration in this area of research. As will be seen in Mizanoğlu Reddy's case, these events facilitate the publication of translations, especially with the support of engaged intellectual agents, such as İlhan Başgöz in this case, who take on different and multiple roles in the literary field as authors, researchers, publishers, and so on. Therefore, any material related to these literary events could reveal complementary insights into translation practices.

Last but not least, Kür's archive presents essays and articles, film reviews, theater reviews, working notes and fragments of writing, notebooks, articles and reviews on Kür, promotional materials, official documents, translations of other authors by other translators, other materials, and ephemera. Among these, the theater reviews, where Kür presents a critique on recent stage productions of her time, also present important insights into Kür's perception of drama translation since they comment on the translations of the plays, although often superficially. A similar discussion can be made based on her film reviews. Therefore, the theater and film

reviews can be regarded as pieces of translation criticism, and analyzed from different perspectives. The promotional materials, on the other hand, including even the superficial comments appraising Kür's translations, also provide an insight into a translation's reception as well as the translator's portrayal. Although these materials do not provide significant information relevant to my discussions, their inclusion in the archive contributes to the archive's position both as a conceptual and physical repository, where these documents "along with the translator's body of works (i.e., the translations themselves as well as other writings)" (Guzmán, 2013, p. 179) can be preserved and presented as a whole. I argue that this holistic presentation will make it easier for researchers to see possible connections and patterns waiting to be unearthed in the archives.

To give a few examples of these connections, I would like to dwell more on the materials and the different perspectives that the archive offers. As mentioned above, there are several translation drafts in the archive, some of which are complete drafts of direct translations with considerable corrections and marginalia. Although these are limited in number, they may still be useful for a genetics-oriented study. Moreover, some of the translation drafts are of relay translations, which open up a different perspective for genetic analysis. For instance, Kür confirms that she translated Van Gogh's letters, originally appearing in French and Dutch, from French but also checked the English translation since "the French are a bit arrogant; they make a lot of changes" (Karantay, 1989, p. 15). A genetic analysis of this translation, when complemented by the original letters in addition to the English translation, can reveal important insights into the genetics of relay translations. In addition, since Kür appears to often engage in relay translation, this can open up new discussions on the interactions between her translatorial habitus and relay translation practice.

Moreover, since Kür repeatedly states that translating these letters was one of the most “challenging” translation processes that she has ever gone through (Ayrál, 1983) and emphasizes their emotional impact on her (Şüyün & Işıltan, 1999, p. 15; Söğüt, 2004, p. 62), the draft of this translation can also be traced to identify this impact in Kür’s translatorial strategies when complemented with her statements on the process. This would also open up a psychological discussion on the impact of emotions on translatorial decision-making, and can be further expanded on through the inclusion of other translation drafts and correspondence found in the archive.²⁰ The only risk of working with this material would be its fragile condition since the pages of the draft show signs of wear, and they tend to crumble, causing the document to become fragmented with missing pieces of letters and words here and there. Therefore, the documents may not always be preserved in the best conditions, which is another limitation of working with physical, and yet to be digitalized, archival materials that researchers of archives must be aware of before their investigation.

In addition to Kür’s translation of Van Gogh’s letters, another interesting discussion of genetics can be built on Kür’s drama translations of Luigi Pirandello, Susan Glaspell, Jill Glew, Allan Monkhouse, Arthur Schnitzler, and Károly Szakonyi. Her Turkish translations of Pirandello’s plays include three near-final drafts of *Doktorun Görevi* (*Il dovere del medico*) (*The Doctor’s Duty*) and two drafts, one final and the other edited, of *Resmi Belge* (*La Patente*) (*The License*). It is important to underline that these are also relay translations as Kür confirms that she translated the plays from their French translations, while also consulting the English translations, since she does not speak Italian (Karantay, 1989, p. 15). A similar case is

²⁰ I would like to thank Professor Müge Işıklar Koçak for drawing my attention to this possible line of inquiry regarding the emotional dimension of translatorial decision-making.

seen in the translation of an act from Schnitzler's *Anatol* into Turkish, since it was originally written in German, and Kür does not speak German. Other examples include her Turkish translation of Szakonyi's *Adáshiba*, as she does not speak Hungarian, and it is highly possible that she used the English translation in this case since it was just published in 1971 in *The New Hungarian Quarterly*. Moreover, all of this immediately reveals a "clue" to a significant pattern in Kür's translatorial practice: If she does not speak the original work's language, she prefers to check her translation by referring to a third language.

Moreover, according to the archive of translated and staged plays on the website of Turkish State Theaters (T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Devlet Tiyatroları, n.d.), Kür's Turkish translation of Szakonyi's play, *Teknik Arıza* was staged at Ankara State Theatre in 1974 and also at İzmir State Theatre in 1975. Its translation was received on October 26, 1972 (T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Devlet Tiyatroları, n.d.).²¹ As the play was not published before or after its submission to Ankara State Theater, it can be regarded as a play text translated for the stage, and this position can unearth discussions of drama translation, especially on the "performance dimension" (Bassnett, 1991). In addition to this translation, Kür's self-translation of her play *Kuru Kuru Kurbanın Olam* (*Amour d'Os*) can also be approached from a similar perspective since it was staged in French in Paris (Karantay, 1989, p. 16), while it also adds the layer of self-translation to the discussion.

²¹As mentioned earlier, Kür worked as a dramaturgist at Ankara State Theater from 1971 to 1973. Although Kür explicitly states that translation of texts was not among her responsibilities as a dramaturgist at Ankara State Theater (Söğüt, 2006/2022, pp. 153-154), the text's submission coincides with the date of her post at Ankara State Theater. Nevertheless, the text could also be an earlier translation presented to be staged.

The other plays that Kür translated from their English originals, Glaspell's *Trifles* (*Önemsiz Şeyler*), Monkhouse's *The King of Barvender* (*Bavender* [sic] *Kralı*), and Glew's *A Family Occasion* (*Buyrun Cenazeye*), are signed not only as translations but also as “radio adaptations” which implies another kind of performativity to be taken into consideration by the translator. Although the edited or final drafts of these texts offer the opportunity to trace translatorial strategies through textual evidence, a fruitful discussion can only be achieved if the analysis is supported by extratextual materials (Munday, 2014) which can provide an insight into the competencies that Kür's habitus as an author, translator, and dramaturgist endows her with.

To broaden the perspective to other interdisciplinary approaches and to further discuss possible criteria that may have informed Kür's curation of the materials, it is important to look at the position of WLICF as the repository of her archive. The mission and vision stated by the WLICF must have been a determining factor in Kür's selection of materials. Although such a requirement is not openly stated on the library's webpage, it is possible that Kür was mindful of the self-assigned role of WLICF in preserving women's histories, and thus, wanted to contribute to the cause. Accordingly, among Kür's private papers, there is a significant amount of materials related to or commenting on her position as a “woman” in Turkish society, as well as a woman author-translator in the Turkish literary field. As it was mentioned above, Kür has even gone through censorship and prosecution for dealing with themes such as women's sexuality and exploitation of women's bodies in her works, which were found “obscene” at the time. Therefore, it is not a coincidence that there are several interviews in the archive documenting her defiant stance against censorship policies especially targeted at the representation of

women's bodies and sexuality in literature (Ayr  , 1983; Ayg  nd  z, 1999; S  g  t, 2004). Moreover, the archive presents materials related to other women agents in the literary field, such as M  nevver Anda  , Ruth Christie, and Nil  fer Mizano  lu Reddy, who have played a significant role in the translation and circulation of Turkish literature in the world, along with several materials related to her translations of Jean Rhys, who is also a feminist author.

Nevertheless, it was interesting to see that K  r did not include materials related to her most-studied translations, which are her translations of Jeanette Winterson's works.²² In fact, this served as a reminder of the role that archives play not just in inclusion but also in the exclusion of materials, which do not always have to be intentional. Although there are drafts of her other numerous translations, the archive does not include any materials related to some of her well-known translations or, in fact, any drafts by or correspondence with other translators who translated book-length works of K  r. Here, Beatrix Caner appears to be an exception, although this correspondence is made via Caner's literary agent and comprises only a single letter requesting K  r's permission to translate her short story "Gece Ziyaret  isi" (Nighttime Visitor) into German, which was to appear in an "anthology of Turkish short stories" (Schaefer, 2007). Apart from the letter from Caner's literary agent, no correspondence related to the translations of her book-length works could be found in the archive.

A possible reason for this could be that the translation and publication processes of these works were marked with "success". They managed to get published with no major problems that would hinder the translation or publication

²² Except for a promotional review that praises her translation of *The Passion* (published as *Tutku* by İletişim Yayınları) with a single sentence: "The exquisite translation by Pınar K  r". The author and the date of the review is unknown.

processes. However, Kür herself admits that she once did not “grant permission” for the publication of an English translation of her original work, *Asılacak Kadın*, because she “did not like it at all” (Söğüt, 2006, p. 11). Moreover, it can be seen that the language competency of Kür is a determining factor in this exclusion, since she does not seem to be interested in or able to engage in fruitful conversations with her translators in a language that is foreign to her. As she also cannot understand the translated text, she cannot interfere with the process. The extensive effects of this interference and author-translator collaboration will be discussed in the following chapters.

Therefore, although the archive offers a rich variety of materials that can be worked on from diverse perspectives, my focus in this thesis will be on a limited number of correspondence, which, I argue, will provide a more coherent and clear analysis of the materials. The correspondence between Kür and several agents of cultural production operating in different literary fields and/or different periods sheds light on their interactions, perceptions of translation practice, self-perceptions of their translatorial identity and practice, as well as living and working conditions, and practices. Having already provided an overview of the possible approaches and connections that the materials in the archive offer, I will delve into a more detailed case-by-case investigation and discussion of the materials and connections that I have selected to focus on in the following chapters.

CHAPTER 4

FERHAD ET SHIRINE: A COLLABORATIVE DRAMA TRANSLATION AND THE ROLE OF INSTITUTIONAL AGENTS

This chapter will provide an insight into the translation process of *Ferhad et Shirine*, an unpublished drama translation of Nâzım Hikmet Ran's original play *Ferhat ile Şirin* (1965)²³, co-translated by Pınar Kür and the theater director Albert "Vander" Vendeville. It will also shed light upon the power dynamics and translatorial strategies followed in translator-director collaboration, where the latter contributes to the translation process. While the translation event is primarily situated in the literary field of France during the early 1960s, it also crosses borders with Kür's request for the acquisition of translation rights of the play. The copyrights of Nâzım Hikmet's works were inherited by his son Mehmet Nâzım Ran, but, as he was underage, they were controlled by his mother and Hikmet's former wife Münevver Andaç, who was in Poland when Kür reached out to her. Therefore, this chapter will focus on Kür's correspondence with not only Vander but also Andaç and ZAiKS, the writers' association that represented Andaç at the time. The correspondence consists of eight letters in total: four from Kür to Andaç, one from Andaç to Kür, one from Kür to Vander, one from Vander to Kür, and one from Kür to ZAiKS.

It is important to underline that in this context, Kür appears as the translator and playwright with a budding career, a position that highly differs from her position as a well-known author who oversees the translations of her works and the prolific translator who enjoys the symbolic capital of her recognition as an author-translator which will be discussed in detail in the following chapters. Therefore, she is in a

²³ The play was written in 1948, and published posthumously in 1965 (Fuat, 2002, p. 151).

more marginal position with insignificant symbolic capital in the literary field, which, combined with the following discussion, will later allow for a discussion of this position by tracing its development in 20 years and comparing it to that of her marginal translators. Moreover, this chapter will situate this failed project among other translations of Hikmet's works during the 1960s and discuss its sociopolitical situatedness while shedding light upon the role of translation as an ideological tool that can help disseminate works of literature that were subjected to political censorship in their field of production.

During her doctoral studies on drama at the University of Sorbonne in Paris, Pınar Kür initiated a conversation with Münevver Andaç Borzècki to explain her enthusiasm to translate Nâzım Hikmet's *Ferhat İle Şirin* into French and to make a request for the acquisition of its translation rights. Before delving into the details of this process, it is important to look at the reasons behind Kür's interest in this work and the sociopolitical factors that had shaped her habitus and, thus, sparked this interest. As she repeatedly states in her letters to Andaç (Kür, 1966a, 1966b, 1966c) as well as in several interviews (Şüyün & Işıltan, 1999; Söğüt, 2004), Kür has been a "fervent admirer" of Hikmet's works since her childhood. In 1950, when Kür was just a child, Hikmet had just been released from prison, twelve years after his conviction on the grounds of inciting the army to mutiny and making communist propaganda. He was seen as a threat to the Turkish government with his communist ideas and criticism of the government; thus, he was declared a "traitor," denaturalized, and exiled from Türkiye in 1951, which was the same year that he applied for Polish citizenship. The reason behind his choosing of Poland for his country of refuge is explained by two factors: his lineage and the position of Poland as a communist satellite state of the Soviet Union (Emiroğlu, 2019). As for his

lineage, Hikmet's maternal great-grandfather Konstanty Borzęcki (Mustafa Celâleddin Pasha) was born and had lived in Poland before he got involved in the Poznań Uprising in 1848, and upon its failure, took refuge in the Ottoman Empire and later joined its army. With the help provided by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Hikmet took refuge in Poland. He was given the surname Borzęcki and became a Polish citizen in 1955 (Emiroğlu, 2019). Therefore, Poland, with its communist regime, offered a more welcoming environment for Hikmet, who was convicted for his communist stance in his home country, as it would later do for Münevver Andaç as well.

Starting from the 1930s, Hikmet's works were banned and taken off the shelves by the government; their publishers were tried in court on the grounds of communist propaganda. It was not until 1991, the year in which "the infamous Articles 141 and 142 of the Turkish Penal Code, which had criminalized communist organization and propaganda" were repealed, that Hikmet's works could be published without omissions and bans (Fişekçi, 2012). In addition, it was not just publishing Nâzım Hikmet's works that was considered a crime, since even reading them could also get one into trouble. During the 1980s, organizing commemorative events for Nâzım Hikmet was also considered a crime (Can, 1984, p. 3).

Accordingly, in several interviews, Kür highlights that Hikmet's poems were copied onto "onionskin papers," which were used with carbon paper for making copies in a typewriter, and "read in secrecy, and in a whisper" in households, including her own (Şüyün & Işıltan, 1999; Söğüt, 2004).

When Kür went to Paris in 1964 to pursue a PhD in drama at the University of Sorbonne, she witnessed an atmosphere that was quite different from that in Türkiye, that is the aftermath of the military coup of 1960 and its anticommunist and

antisocialist atmosphere (Zürcher, 2004). Therefore, Kür found it “exciting” to be able to easily find and read books by Trotsky, Marx, and Lenin, as they were sold in “every bookstore,” whereas in Türkiye, one “could not even utter the word communism” (Söğüt, 2006/2022, p. 102). It is also in Paris that Kür participated in anti-war protests against the Vietnam War (Söğüt, 2006/2022, p. 102), personally witnessed the leftist student revolt in Paris and other events of 1968, and, thus, had her “political awakening” in general, which led her to become a “Trotskyist” at that period (Söğüt, 2004; Söğüt, 2006/2022, Günay-Erkol et al., 2022). Therefore, her political stance shows leftist and anti-militarist tendencies, thus shaping her habitus as a translator in that period.

In addition, during those years, Kür also enrolled in Université du Théâtre des Nations (The University of the Theater of Nations), which was founded in 1961 as an educational initiative and an extension of Théâtre des Nations, “a non-profit international theater festival sponsored by the city of Paris and the French government” which had been presenting “productions of drama, ballet, opera and folklore” since 1957 (Goldes, 1962, p. 148). The UTN was founded to “provide young practitioners from all over the world with a glimpse into the training required to navigate the new emerging global theatre culture,” offering a series of lectures and workshops and even organizing symposiums (Iacob, 2020, p. 69). Thus, Kür immersed herself in the world of theater in Paris, although not as an actor, but as a playwright (Söğüt, 2006/2022). Becoming an actor was a calling that goes back to Kür’s childhood when her family house was frequented by actors who were friends of her parents, and she would go to the theater to see plays with her parents, even those that were not meant for children since she had a “special warrant” that allowed her to see those plays, issued by her father’s friends at Ankara State Theater (Söğüt,

2004, p. 54). She even had stage experience from the days when she took part in school plays, which was a passion that was cut short as her family did not want her to become an actor and, instead, steered her toward writing (Söğüt, 2006/2022).

Therefore, by becoming a playwright, she found a compromise which she further complemented through engaging in drama translation, as can be seen in this case as well as in the other drama translation drafts in her archive.

When she wrote to Andaç, however, she was at the early stages of her career, both as a playwright and a translator, with no published translations and only two original plays written and staged. Her original play *Kuru Kuru Kurbanın Olam*, which she had translated into French as *Amour d'Os*, had just been staged at Theater Montparnasse-Gaston Baty as part of a competition organized by UTN in 1965 (Kolukısaoglu, n.d.; Kür, ca. 1986; Université du Théâtre des Nations, 1965). Her other play, *İki Başlı Adamın Tek Eli*, which was written when she was still a student at Boğaziçi University (then Robert College), had been staged in Istanbul and Ankara (Kür, ca. 1986). Although these were significant early steps in her career, she had not yet gained considerable symbolic capital as either a translator or a playwright.

Therefore, the impact of her habitus as an admirer of Nâzım Hikmet and of theater, as well as her attempts to combine her interest in theater with her skills in writing, can be clearly observed in her decision to translate the play *Ferhat ile Şirin*. These are also what she dwells on in her first three letters to Andaç. Her very first letter includes a brief self-introduction, an explanation of her interest in Hikmet's works, and a statement of her intentions regarding the translation. She emphasizes that she is "a long-time admirer" of her "compatriot" Nâzım Hikmet, being "brought up on his poetry" and that her parents were friends with the author (Kür, 1966a). After kindly requesting Andaç's permission and the translation rights of the play, she

also adds that she had “already begun translating the play into French” (Kür, 1966a). Moreover, she states that the translation is being conducted in collaboration with a “French stage director, Monsieur Albert Vander, who has the possibility of producing the play next season,” which was to be “registered at the ‘Société des Auteurs’²⁴ which will automatically transfer ‘author’s rights’²⁵ to [Andaç] when the play is produced and/or published” (Kür, 1966a). The letter, brief and to the point, ends with Kür’s asking for Andaç’s “authorisation for translation rights” and “eventually, after [her] final approval of the completed French version, the performance and publication rights” (Kür, 1966a).

This letter makes it clear that it was Kür, the translator, who initiated the process and that her request results from a personal interest and not a commissioned project by a publishing house or another institution. In addition, she immediately lays out a plan for the translation, publication, and stage production of the work. Although the publication is simply touched upon as a possibility without any naming of a prospective publisher, it is seen that she had already started the translation process and even collaborated with a director who would provide help with both the translation and the staging. When considered together with her activities at the theater at the time, it can be argued that she translates the play with the main purpose of staging it, which offers a glimpse into both her *telos* and *habitus*. Publishing the play, on the other hand, is of secondary importance since whenever she mentions the possibility of publication, she always positions it after the translation and performance, respectively. This could also be resulting from the fact that, at the time,

²⁴ La Société des auteurs et compositeurs dramatiques (SACD) which is a long-established copyright collective that undertakes collective rights management for authors.

²⁵ Here, it is unclear whether she refers to legal or economic rights. In her second letter, she writes that a “fee” will be provided to Andaç, which shows that she refers to the economic rights here as well (Kür, 1966b). Nevertheless, it is not clear whether this will be a one-time licensing fee or part of a royalty payment.

Kür was more involved in the field of theater than in that of literature, identified herself as a “playwright,” and wrote plays only for the stage. Therefore, it can be argued that she did not have strong connections in the literary field of France, which could have helped her with the publication of these plays. It is also seen that she later relies heavily on such connections in the Turkish literary field once she establishes connections with publishing houses through her translatorial practice and then strengthens them through her authorial practice (Söğüt, 2006/2022).

Moreover, it can also be observed that Kür strives to show her genuine interest and dedication to the project as a translator, of which she makes sure to inform Andaç to increase her credibility, as she lacks the recognition that would readily provide it. This can be seen in her inability to give any reference to an existing published translation in her letter as well. Instead, to contribute to her credibility, demonstrate her competence, and further underline her connection to Nâzım Hikmet (a friend of her parents, her “compatriot”, and a fellow playwright), she mentions that she is also a *playwright* of *Turkish* nationality and that she is competent in English and French, able to “work easily in both languages” as a result of “[h]aving spent long years in New York and Paris” (Kür, 1966a). This also shows that, as a translator, she values competence in foreign languages, accompanied by active usage, which she establishes as a necessary criterion for translation and shows that she meets it with her years-long exposure to both English and French (Kür, 1966a).

After not receiving a response to her letter for about a month, Kür resolves to write another letter, this time in Polish. This might be due to three reasons: First, Kür does not know who Madame “Borzeçka”, as she addresses in her letters, is. Second, she comes to the conclusion that her letter was not responded to by Borzeçka because

she does not speak English. Thus, Kür decides to write to her in Polish since “Borzecka” resides in Poland according to the address on the letter. This also leads to a third inference, which is Kür’s determination to acquire the play’s translation rights and commitment to this translation project. The former inference is later confirmed by Kür’s third and fourth letters to Andaç, which are written in French and Turkish, respectively (Kür, 1966c, 1967a). In her fourth letter, she apologizes and explains that she did not know that Münevver Andaç, as Kür addresses her in this letter, was Turkish since she was given the name “M. Borsecka” for correspondence and the abbreviation, as well as the foreign surname, misled her (Kür, 1967a). Nevertheless, this still does not confirm that Kür knew who Münevver Andaç was. There is no indicator in her letters showing that she was informed about Andaç’s marriage to Nâzım Hikmet, their shared child, the reasons that led to her residency in Poland, and Andaç’s position as the translator of Hikmet’s works, which will be discussed in detail below. In fact, she writes, “I have been informed that you [Andaç] are the sole inheritor of my compatriot, Nazim Hikmet” (Kür, 1966a), which shows that she did not have up-to-date information on Hikmet’s personal life.

In her letter written in Polish²⁶, Kür (1966b) repeats her interest in translating the play, her intentions, and details regarding its translation, staging, and publication processes. In the introductory part of her letter, on the other hand, she decides to add more details that do not appear in her first letter. Although she already provides a curriculum vitae²⁷ and underlines her competence in her first letter, Kür (1966b) adds a list of professional references in her second letter to further underline the credibility

²⁶ Kür does not speak Polish which means that she was helped by someone else who must have translated the letter to Polish. In my references to the letter, I used a machine translation tool to translate them into English.

²⁷ This CV was not found among the materials in the archive, although there is another CV (Kür, ca. 1986) from a different date, which was preserved and included in the archive by Kür.

of her translatorial competence as well as Vander's credibility as a director. These references include the following names: Georges Belmont, a French writer and literary translator who was managing editor in the literary magazine *ARTS LOISIRS* and whose published translations included works by popular figures such as Henry Miller, John Hersey, and an autobiography by Gandhi at the time. Another name that is included in the references is André Perinetti, who was the director of Université Internationale du Théâtre (the International University of Theater), the rebranded name and the continuation of Université du Théâtre des Nations. The last name on the list is Professor Hilary-Summer Boyd from Robert College in Türkiye, which was clearly provided as a professional reference for Kür who had studied there.

As these names are not provided in separate lists for Kür and Vander, it is not known which one is provided by whom. Nevertheless, it can be argued that Perinetti could be a reference for both Kür and Vander, since Kür knew Perinetti from UTN (Söğüt, 2006/2022), and Vander was also an influential, although a lesser-known figure, from the theater field, as one of the last students of Charles Dullin (Vendeville, 2005; Kür, 1966c). Although it is highly possible that Belmont was also provided as a reference for Vander, I could not find anything that would give a clue as to their connection. Nevertheless, it is clear that these names were prominent figures with considerable symbolic capital in the fields in which they carried out their practices, including not only the fields of literature and theater but also the academic field, which can also be associated with an intellectual symbolic capital. Therefore, by drawing on the symbolic capitals of these figures, Kür aims to improve her professional image as a translator, as well as that of Vander as a director and her collaborator in translation, in the literary and theater fields of France. This shows that Kür also interprets Andaç's lack of response as a possible lack of confidence.

This also has implications related to the age-old discourse on the hierarchical relationship between originals and translations and, thus, authors and translators. In Kür's position as a translator with a budding career and its impact on her self-perception, one can trace what Simeoni (1998) points out as "the historically ingrained subservience of the translator" (p. 25) shaping her translatorial habitus and competence "characterized by conformity to a greater extent than is the competence of other agents active in the cultural field" (p. 7). This ingrained subservience is best reflected in Kür's (1966c) third letter to Andaç.²⁸ Although she receives a response from Andaç after her second letter, Kür continues to add more details that would improve her self-portrayal and symbolic capital in this third letter. This is partly due to another reason as it is revealed in the letter: Andaç apparently had not received the curriculum vitae that Kür sent her as an attachment to her first letter dated October 22, 1966. Kür assumes that Andaç had not received the letter itself, either (Kür, 1966c).

For this reason, Kür expands on her experience as a playwright, mentioning her plays *İki Başlı Adamın Tek Eli* and *Kuru Kuru Kurbanın Olam* (*Amour d'O's*), her "great knowledge" of French and English, and even mentions that she was "given the opportunity to translate literary and dramatic works as well" in the language combinations of French, English, and Turkish (Kür, 1966c). Although she does not give any examples as to these translations, this is the first time in their

²⁸ Kür wrote this letter in French and in response to Andaç's first letter to Kür. Andaç must have written this letter in response to Kür's second letter in Polish. This letter by Andaç is only mentioned in Kür's third letter in French, and it was not included in the archive. It can be argued that, just as Kür did not know that Andaç was Turkish and was misled her surname and residency in Poland, Andaç must have assumed that Kür could not speak Turkish since, from the beginning of their correspondence, Kür had not written a single letter in Turkish up to that point. As Kür wrote her third letter in French, it is highly possible that Andaç also wrote her first letter in French because she assumed that Kür could speak French as she resided in France according to the sender's address on the letter. As Kür's third letter was written originally in French, I translated the relevant parts cited in this chapter into English.

correspondence that Kür refers to her translatorial experience. She also expands on Vander's experience as "one of the last students of Charles Dullin, director for fifteen years, experienced in Elizabethan theater techniques, and adaptation of dramatic works for radio broadcasting"²⁹ such as Jean Bodel's *Le Jeu de saint Nicolas* (Kür, 1966c). Similarly, in all of her letters addressed to Andaç, Kür also underlines that once the translation is completed, it will be sent to Andaç for her "final approval" (Kür, 1966a, 1966b, 1966c), which shows Kür's recognition of Andaç's authority. This authority is gained not only by Andaç's inheritance of Hikmet's copyrights but also by her drawing on the symbolic capital of his works, replacing the deceased author as a surrogate authority. Lastly, as another indicator of Kür's recognition of this authority, she promises to send "a translation of a scene from the play immediately" to "give [her] an idea of their work," which she hopes will incite Andaç to "authorize" them to "continue working on it" and to "perfect" it (Kür, 1966c).

Another important aspect of these letters is the author-director collaboration, which requires a detailed investigation. As it was discussed above, Kür vaguely mentions her collaboration with a "French [speaker]" in one of her interviews (Karantay, 1989, pp. 16-17), although Vander's name is not given. She further argues that directors and translators should collaborate and read the text aloud, reading each line respectively in the source language and the target language, as if rehearsing the lines as actors (Karantay, 1989, pp. 13, 15). This provides an insight into her understanding of the collaborative practice in drama translation as well as the translatorial strategies that she followed in such collaborations. Accordingly, Kür

²⁹Although the words are not capitalized, she could also be referring to Radiodiffusion Française, a French public institution founded in 1944 that was responsible for public service broadcasting which was replaced by Radiodiffusion-Télévision Française in 1949 (Ferrari-Giovanangeli, 2021).

explains their collaboration to Andaç as the following: “*I asked for the collaboration of Mr. Vander in order to be able to give the full value of Nâzım Hikmet's text in French, because a literal translation could not provide anything in terms of transposition*” (Kür, 1966c).³⁰

First, this shows that Kür’s translatorial strategies as a drama translator and her perception of drama translation can be traced back to her collaboration with Vander. Moreover, Kür distinguishes between two strategies: “literal translation” and “transposition”. Although she does not explain the difference between the two in her letter, her interview sheds some light upon it, as she underlines that, in drama translation, the rhythm and the language of the drama text require the translator to go beyond literal translations (Karantay, 1989, p. 14). As a way of achieving this, she proposes lexical and semantic transposition (Karantay, 1989, pp. 14-15), which transforms the literal translations of sentences into sentences to be spoken on the stage. According to Kür, such transposition cannot be defined as “translation” but rather should be taken as “rewriting” (Karantay, 1989, pp. 14-15).

As for the method followed during the translation process of *Ferhat ile Şirin*, neither the letters nor the contract found in the archive, which will be further discussed below, provide specific details regarding the division of tasks between Kür and Vander. Nevertheless, considering Kür’s approach to drama translation along with the fact that there is no information indicating that Vander could speak Turkish, it is possible to suggest that they opted for a method similar to the following: Kür would first translate the texts into French and send them to Vander, who would transform them into a dramatic language to achieve the “transposition” effect. The process would culminate, if Andaç would give her permission, with the staging of the

³⁰ Emphasis added.

play as it could be “performed in a Parisian theater, which would be a wonderful tribute” (1966c) to Nâzım Hikmet, who had recently died in 1963.

The second important aspect of their collaboration is Kür’s emphasis on the reasons, the *need*, that led her to collaborate with Vander. Although this is explained to be stemming from the “difficulty of translating a piece like ‘Ferhad ile Şirin’ into French” and conveying its language with its “biblical and esoteric scope” (Kür, 1966c), I argue that this explanation only scratches the surface of her practice. What is underneath is a deeper and internalized self-perception shaped by her habitus as the “elaborate result of a personalized social and cultural history” (Simeoni, 1998, p. 32). This self-perception, which internalizes the subservient position of the translator and the “inherent defectiveness” of translation (Berman, 1995/2009), as was also seen above, directly affects her subjectivity both on textual (the translatorial strategies traced on the text) and extratextual levels (her selection of the text as well as her collaborator) (Berk Albachten, 2024). I further argue that Kür’s selection of the text and her position as the initiator of this collaboration places her individual subjectivity (Berk Albachten, 2024) at the heart of this collaboration.

Berk Albachten (2024) discusses individual subjectivity in relation to “collective subjectivity” as she traces them in the translation practices of several agents engaging in collaborative translations. She investigates a specific type of collaboration practice adopted by the Translation Bureau (1940-1966), which she calls *imece* (re)translation. This usage draws on Abidin Dino, a significant painter and intellectual from Türkiye, who coined the term to denote collaboration. This collaborative effort strived for the development of the country, at the heart of which was “[t]ranslating what were seen as the foundational texts of Western culture and civilization” (Berk Albachten, 2024, p. 40). This ideological role of translation in the

development of the country bestowed translation such a significance that it was not to be “left to a single person but benefitted from several experts relying on multiple sources and parallel texts” (Berk Albachten, 2024, p. 41).

A similar form of *imece*, a collaborative effort, can also be seen in the translation of Nâzım Hikmet’s works during the 1960s, including Kür’s translation. These translations also take on an ideological role since Hikmet’s works were subjected to full or partial censorship until the beginning of the 1990s, as it was discussed above. This can further be linked to *imece*’s agenda of contributing to the development of the country since it opposes censorship imposed on intellectual freedom and helps disseminate the works of an author from Türkiye who was censored at home due to his ideological stance. However, this collaborative endeavor also differs from that of *imece* within the national borders, as it extends beyond them and contributes to a portrayal of Nâzım Hikmet in various countries as a symbol of love, resistance, and freedom. Therefore, the telos and habitus of each translator and translation agent discussed here, meaning with what motivation and out of which internalized dispositions and personalized histories (Simeoni, 1998) they chose to translate Nâzım Hikmet, also connects to a collective telos, and to a cross-national collaborative effort.

During the late 1950s and onwards, translation was an ideological act that enabled the circulation of Hikmet's works, in addition to clandestine readings of illicit copies of his works, especially beyond the national literary field. The ban on the circulation of Hikmet’s works in Türkiye resulted in what is identified as a translation movement and, thus, led to his worldwide recognition (Mıgđıs Şeker & Bogenç Demirel, 2020). This translation movement took place as a political and intellectual initiative sparked by people who “shared the same ideology” with

Hikmet and saw him as a “symbol” of this ideology (Mıǧdıs Őeker and Bogenç Demirel, 2020, p. 105, my translation from Turkish). A significant example of this can be seen in Joyce Lussu’s translation of Hikmet’s works into Italian with the help of Műnevver Andaç (Berk Albachten, 2009, 2012). Since both Lussu and Kűr shared a similar personal and ideological interest in Hikmet’s works and turned to Andaç for translation-related matters, investigating Lussu’s role in the translation of Hikmet’s works can help identify similar patterns in Kűr’s case.

Lussu met Nűzım Hikmet in 1958, which was after Hikmet became a citizen of Poland (Lussu 1998a, p. 8, as cited in Berk Albachten, 2012, p. 98). They were both attending the Stockholm Peace Conference, where Lussu was first introduced to Hikmet’s works through their English translation, which later flourished into a friendship with the poet. Hikmet did not speak Italian, therefore “their language of communication was French. Already at the conference they start working on an unusual translation project where Nazım first read his poems aloud in Turkish, and then explained them to Lussu in French” (Lussu 1998a, p. 8, as cited in Berk Albachten, 2012, p. 98). Their collaboration lasted until the author’s death in 1963. Following Hikmet’s death, “Lussu visited his former wife, Műnevver Andaç in Warsaw and continued to translate Hikmet’s poems from Andaç’s French translations” (Lussu 1998a, p. 157 as cited in Berk Albachten, 2012, p. 98). Moreover, in Lussu’s efforts, one can trace both a political and an intellectual endeavor that is sparked by what she shares in common with Hikmet: “a love for the world, a responsibility in the struggle to change it, a historically and politically revolutionary duty and responsibility” (Lussu, 1998a, p. 5 as cited in Berk Albachten, 2009, p. 143).

Andaç was in a close relationship with the Italian translator Joyce Lussu, with whom she also engaged in collaborative translation practice through relay translation. Although Andaç was not happy with Lussu's translations at first, they became "good friends" after exchanging letters and discussing these translations (Meyer, 2020, p. 673). Meyer's (2020) study on the correspondence between Andaç and Hikmet sheds more light upon the details about this relationship as well as Andaç's relationship with Hikmet as both his former wife and his devoted translator. Andaç would translate Hikmet's works into French and send them to Lussu who would translate them into Italian. However, while she was still working fervently on the translations of Hikmet's works, Andaç was also suffering from being treated as a social outcast as she remained in Türkiye after Hikmet's exile. She was under constant surveillance by the police because of her connection to Hikmet, who was then living a separate life in the USSR and traveling around as a "celebrated figure in the socialist world" (Meyer, 2020, p. 666). After a while, the collaboration between Andaç and Lussu went beyond translation and became a solidarity between two women. Lussu even helped Andaç and her children to escape from Türkiye in 1961 (Meyer, 2020, p. 674; Berk Albachten, 2012, p. 98). However, on their way to Greece, their yacht was destroyed in a storm, and they were rescued by Greek fishermen. Having lost her Turkish identity card during the shipwreck, Andaç "told the Greek authorities she was a Polish citizen. The police contacted the Polish Embassy in Athens, and the Embassy, upon learning that she was Nâzım Hikmet's wife, backed up Münevver's story and issued travel documents to her and the children" (Meyer, 2020, p. 674). Andaç moved to Poland before marrying her latest husband, Volkoff, a French citizen, and, in the late 1960s, moved to France, where she lived until her death in 1997 (Meyer, 2020, p. 675).

To understand Lussu and Kür's shared ideological interest in Hikmet, one can look at Kür's text selection and the reasons that might have sparked her decision to translate *Ferhat ile Şirin* of all the works of the author. In *Ferhat ile Şirin*, Hikmet transforms the original love story into a story of a romantic hero devoted to saving his nation (Kavas, 2007). In the folk tale rooted in Persian mythology, which has several different versions, Ferhat falls in love with Şirin, who is the niece of a sultan called Mehmene Banu, but several people stand in the way of their marriage. At last, Ferhat is given the impossible task of piercing a mountain and is promised Şirin only if he can complete this task successfully. The task takes several decades but, in the end, Ferhat and Şirin are finally reunited — only in death. Moreover, in the legend's Sufi version, Ferhat's longing for a reunion with his mortal beloved turns into a love and longing for the divine. In Nâzım Hikmet's version, there is also a transformation in Ferhat's love for Şirin. However, in this case, it becomes overshadowed by his devotion to saving the people of the sultanate, who have been long suffering from illness and death because their only water resource was severely polluted. The only way to save them was by piercing the mountain and giving them fresh water. Therefore, it can be seen that Hikmet's *Ferhat ile Şirin* emphasizes romantic themes such as altruism and love for one's nation and for humanity, which are common themes in his other works as well.

Accordingly, during the play's translation, Kür and Vander's "essential concern" was "not to betray the poet and the man of thought that Nâzım Hikmet was") (Kür, 1966c), which emphasizes an effort to convey both the poetic language and the ideas presented in his play while also contributing to Hikmet's portrayal. Moreover, the ideological aspect of Kür's interest in Hikmet and his works can be further investigated in her letters to Andaç. In her first and second letters to Andaç,

Kür calls Nâzım Hikmet her “compatriot”, emphasizing their shared roots in Türkiye (Kür, 1966a, 1966b). At the time, Hikmet had died in exile away from his home country after having been declared a traitor to his country and denaturalized. Therefore, Kür’s emphasis on compatriotism reclaims a position for Hikmet as part of his home country while opposing his portrayal as the “poet in exile” and “traitor”. Instead, she underlines a sense of unity and connection between herself and Hikmet, as well as the romantic poet and his home country.

It is also important to take into account that, even though it was years after her studies in Paris, Kür’s original works were also banned, and she was also prosecuted because of the content of her literary works, having been accused of circulating “communist propaganda” and of “obscenity”. Thus, when her political stance is considered, it was not unusual for Kür to stand against censorship and help Hikmet’s works reach wider and more diverse audiences by translating a play by him. Nor would it be unusual to stage a play by a leftist author in France during a period of leftist movements. Moreover, Kür herself acknowledges that translating a work “extends its lifespan” (Söğüt, 2006, p. 11), although she also underlines that, in drama translation, it is hard to find a work that would “resonate with and attract the attention of audiences worldwide” (Karantay, 1989, p. 17). Since she attempted to translate and stage a play by Nâzım Hikmet during leftist uprisings in France, it can be suggested that Kür saw such influential potential in this work. In line with this, she also notes that Nâzım Hikmet was a “popular” author there, “liked by many” (Kür, 1967a, my translation from Turkish).

In Lussu’s and Kür’s endeavors as well as in other translations of Hikmet’s works, Münevver Andaç remains a key figure. Although Andaç’s translatorial identity has been overshadowed by her portrayal as one of the “former partners” of

Nâzım Hikmet, her role went beyond her romantic relationship with Hikmet where she is portrayed as the wife of the poet and mother of their shared child. It is often overlooked that Andaç was a prolific translator who translated various works by Hikmet into French and helped his works circulate in different literary and cultural fields. According to the catalog of Bibliothèque Nationale de France (The National Library of France), Andaç's translated the following works by Hikmet into French: *Şu 1941 Yılında* (*En cette année dix neuf cent quarante et un*, 1962); *Yaşamak Güzel Şey Be Kardeşim* (*Les Romantiques: La vie est belle, mon vieux*, 1964); *Sevdalı Bulut* (*Spectacle: Le nuage amoureux* [play text], 1973; *Le nuage amoureux*, 1979); *Allem Kallem: Bir Masal* (*Allem Kallem: conte*, 1979); *Un étrange voyage: poèmes épiques, poèmes lyriques* (includes a selection of epic and lyrical poems, compiled by Güzin Dino, translation by Münevver Andaç, Güzin Dino and Jean Marcenac, 1980); *Hasret* (*Nostalgie*, 1989); *Il neige dans la nuit et autres poèmes* (selection of texts and translation by Münevver Andaç and Güzin Dino, 1999); *Memleketimden İnsan Manzaraları* (*Paysages humains*, 1973); *Kemal Tahir'e Mapushaneden Mektuplar* (*De l'espoir à vous faire pleurer de rage: Lettres de prison à Kemal Tahir*, 1973); *Benerci Kendini Niçin Öldürdü?* (*Spectacle: Pourquoi Benerdji s'est-il suicidé* [play text], 1980; *Pourquoi Benerdji s'est-il suicidé?*, 1980).

As can be seen, some of these works were also published thanks to an *imece* effort and collective subjectivity. For instance, it can be seen that Güzin Dino, another important intellectual figure in the Turkish field of cultural production, compiled the texts in some published translations while Andaç translated them, sometimes in collaboration with Dino as well as other translators such as Jean Marcenac. Some of the published translations were illustrated by Abidin Dino (e.g., *Un Étrange voyage*, 1980) and Oya Lydia Bierschwale (e.g., *Le nuage amoureux*,

2013). In addition, Andaç's translations in French even became a source for relay translations into other languages, contributing to this collective effort by circulating Hikmet's works across the world. For instance, in 1979, *Le nuage amoureux* was published as a bilingual book in French and Arabic. The French translation of the book by Andaç was used as a source text for the Arabic translation by Nacer Khemir. The book was also illustrated by Sabiha Khemir.

Having already worked with another translator of Hikmet's works, who also helped her flee the suffocating surveillance and isolation that she was subjected to in Türkiye, Andaç was welcoming of Kür's efforts as well. In fact, she supported and guided her in her endeavor. In the only letter from Andaç that was included in the archive, Andaç explains the reason behind her late response, which was the sudden illness that she suffered from at the beginning of the year and, subsequently, a period of recovery that she went through after a medical operation (Borzęcki Andaç, 1967). After expressing her appreciation and approval of Kür and Vander's translation ("I was very happy to learn that you were Turkish. I really want you to do this translation, and I wish you success in your endeavor"), Andaç suggests that Kür should contact ZAiKS, a society of authors and copyright collective in Poland of which Andaç is also a member, and ask for their help in preparing a contract for the translation and staging of the play (Borzęcki Andaç, 1967, my translation from Turkish). Andaç also explains that she had been doing her taxes and other formal personal affairs via this organization since she moved to Poland, where she had then lived only for a few years. As Andaç had not been a Polish citizen for a long time then, she must have needed the help of an organization to get her official affairs in order in a country and a bureaucracy that she was not familiar with. Therefore, it can be suggested that ZAiKS, an organization founded with the mission to protect and

defend the copyrights of artists, especially of authors, performed another role in Andaç's case, which went beyond its main mission. They not only protected the copyrights of Nâzım Hikmet's works but also assisted his translator, former wife, and, most importantly, the inheritor of Hikmet's copyrights.

Moreover, it is also important to underline that ZAiKS, as "the largest and longest-running organisation for an interdisciplinary artistic milieu" (Pluszyńska, 2021, p. 94), protected its artists from "the restrictions imposed by the state on the rights of authors", including ideological restrictions on artistic freedom, during the communist regime in Poland between 1945 and 1989 (Pluszyńska, 2021, p. 97). During this period, the activities of ZAiKS were "perpetually monitored," and their "day-to-day decisions were subject to the approval of the authorities" (Pluszyńska, 2021, p. 97). Nevertheless, ZAiKS relentlessly fought to protect its member authors' rights and "sought to improve authors' living standards" (Pluszyńska, 2021, p. 103). This sheds a different light on ZAiKS' assistance to Andaç, who had lived under government surveillance and suppression for years as a result of her affiliation with an author accused of political crimes before she moved to another country that was foreign to her.

About a month later, Kür (1967a) responds to Andaç's letter, this time in Turkish, apologizing for her delayed response and, as it was discussed above, not writing her previous letters in Turkish because she had thought that "M. Borsecka" was not a Turkish name. Kür (1967a) further explains that they decided to slow down the pace of the translation process because she "had not heard from [Andaç] for some time" and also because she had a demanding schedule because of her doctoral studies. This demanding schedule can be traced in other documents in the archive, such as Kür's correspondence with her thesis advisor, Charles Dédéyan, and other

official documents related to her thesis. It is also illustrated in her famous biographical interview book *Aşkın Sonu Cinayettir: Pınar Kür ile Hayat ve Edebiyat* (Love Ends in Murder: Pınar Kür on Life and Literature) (Söğüt, 2006/2022). Kür had a tumultuous relationship with her thesis advisor Dédéyan, which made the process of writing very challenging for her. She had to change the subject of her doctoral thesis, which required a novel process of research and planning (Söğüt, 2006/2022, p. 106). This can partly explain her putting the translation project aside and focusing on her thesis.

Another reason could be the financial problems that Kür and her husband were facing at the time, which compelled them to work multiple jobs to make ends meet (Söğüt, 2006/2022, pp. 111-112). In addition, although there are no letters or other material that go further than June 1967, other reasons behind the project's failure after 1967 can be traced in her interview with Söğüt (2006/2022). Throughout most of 1968, Kür was pregnant, and she gave birth to her son in November 1968. After having submitted her thesis, Kür had to go back to Türkiye to give birth to her son, as she could not do so in Paris, which was also due to financial problems (Söğüt, 2006/2022, p. 127). Therefore, during the late 1960s, Kür had more pressing matters to attend to in her personal life, preventing her from continuing her endeavors for the translation of *Ferhat ile Şirin*.

Moreover, subsequent correspondence reveals that there may be other reasons behind the project's demise, besides Kür's living conditions, that involves other agents in the process. In the same letter to Andaç, Kür also states that, "Once the translation is completed, it will be sent to Société des Auteurs (the SACD), and they will contact ZAiKS, after which all the formalities related to the contract will be met" (Kür, 1967a, my translation from Turkish). Therefore, Kür, just like Andaç,

suggests that formalities should be taken care of by the organizations with which they are affiliated instead of by the individual agents involved in the process. This underlines the active role that organizations, which are third parties in the relationship between the translator and the author/copyright owner, play in dealing with formalities related to translation projects, including paperwork such as drafting contracts. It also shows that the fees related to translation and copyrights of the work will also be decided upon by these organizations that are considered experts in these matters, which also shows professionalism.

Like ZAiKS, the SACD is also a copyright collective that not only protects the rights of its member authors but also provides them “a full range of high-performance services” (Société des Auteurs et Compositeurs Dramatiques [SACD], n.d.). According to their website, these services include “collecting and efficiently distributing copyright, assisting in the negotiation of contracts and training needs, providing locations for meetings and working, encouraging discussions, and providing tools to simplify professional life” (SACD, n.d.). Moreover, just like ZAiKS, they also take on the responsibility of “support[ing] authors during difficult periods” which they call the “solidarity support” (SACD, n.d.). This shows the tendency among authors, and other copyright owners³¹, to be affiliated with an organization that would provide them services such as copyright protection, assistance with formalities, and even economic protection.

³¹Although Pınar Kür operates as a translator in this project, she is also a playwright at the time, allowing her to be a member of the SACD, an organization for authors, and benefit from their services. Similarly, Münevver Andaç is the legal copyright owner of Nâzım Hikmet’s works, which makes her eligible for a membership at ZAiKS. Although there is no information on whether translators were eligible for membership at ZAiKS during that period, today ZAiKS represents translators along with artists from various artistic fields according to their website (Związek Autorów i Kompozytorów Scenicznych [ZAIKS], n.d.-b).

Nevertheless, Kür's letter to ZAiKS dated June 7, 1967, shows that it is Kür herself, not the SACD, who contacts ZAiKS and kindly asks them to "establish a contract specifying the rights of translation, and of the possible publication and interpretation of the play "Ferhad and Shirine" by NAZIM HIKMET in French", which *she* translated into French (Kür, 1967c)³². This raises the following important questions: Did the SACD, being an "authors'" organization, refuse to represent Kür as a translator and to deal with the paperwork of a translation project? Or did Kür decide to take matters into her own hands without ever writing to SACD about the project?

A previous letter provides some clarification on this matter. In this letter, Kür (1967b) informs Vander about the preparation process of the translation contract and says that she called the SACD and "got the necessary information [herself]" for the contract. The emphasis on her personal effort ("*J'ai moi-même* téléphoné La Société des Auteurs") (Kür, 1967b)³³ in this sentence shows that she decided to take care of the formalities herself and possibly to speed up the process. The reason behind this can be explained by Kür's impatience and frustration caused by Vander's delay, as she writes to Vander, "[y]ou will agree that I have been more than a little patient, the play having been lying around in your hands since October" (Kür, 1967b).

Accordingly, in an earlier letter, Vander apologizes for another delay, which was due to a problem with his typewriter and also to "personal issues", but does not go into detail (Vander, ca. 1967)³⁴. Although he presents excuses for the delay, Kür does not seem to accept them. This shows that he must have been neglecting his

³² Emphasis added. In this letter, she states "*j'ai traduite*" in French which translates to "I translated". The letters written by Kür to Vander and ZAiKS (Kür, 1967b, 1967c) were written in French, therefore the English translations of certain parts referred to here belong to me.

³³ Emphasis added.

³⁴ The letter does not indicate the year but, judging by the course of the conversation and its contents, it must have been written in 1967.

responsibilities in the project, as is also implied in Kür's statement of her impatience above, leaving Kür alone to do all the work and lead the process. Thus, Kür (1967b) urges Vander to complete the translation as soon as possible and send it to her before June 15, that is before she leaves Paris, although it cannot be a permanent leave since it was not until 1969 that Kür moved back to Türkiye (Söğüt, 2006/2022).

In the same letter, Kür also informs (1967b) Vander that she wrote to ZAiKS and expects to "receive the official contract soon". Although Kür tells Vander that she had already written to ZAiKS, the dates on the letters show that her letter to ZAiKS (June 7, 1967) was sent after she wrote to Vander on May 23, 1967. This might be because she was planning to send the letter soon and decided to inform Vander beforehand. However, it is also important to point out that, in her letter to ZAiKS, Kür (1967c) does not mention Albert Vander and their collaboration, as it was also seen above with the emphasis on her personal effort (Kür, 1967b). This requires a close investigation for two reasons: In her previous letters to Andaç, Kür always mentions Vander's name and their collaboration. She even underlines that it was she who asked for his collaboration and also uses plural pronouns in her sentences, referring to herself and Vander collectively (e.g., "*We* slowed down the pace of the translation process") (Kür, 1967a).³⁵

In addition, considering that this letter was intended to request that ZAiKS establish a translation contract, it is difficult to figure out why Kür would leave out Vander's name despite her previous emphasis on the collaborative nature of the project. Moreover, in her letter to Vander on May 23, 1967, Kür refers to a document that Vander sent her, which is a statement that attests to their collaborative practice. Kür (1967b) thanks him for the document and says that it was "exactly what [she]

³⁵ Emphasis added.

had in mind” as well. This document, dated May 22, 1967, that Vander prepared, signed, and sent to Kür, states that:

I, the undersigned, Albert VENDEVILLE known as VANDER, residing in Paris (7) 14 Cité Vaneau, certify that I have worked on the translation of the dramatic piece by NAZIM HİKMET: - FERHAD ET SHIRINE [Ferhad and Shirine] in collaboration with Madame HAVVA PINAR KÜR KOLUKISAOĞLU residing in Paris (15) 114 Rue de l’Abbé Groult. This document asserts all rights and privileges pertaining to the case of publication of the translation or the case of the rendition [staging] of the play in French. In all cases, the translation will be signed by both parties. (Vander, A. & Kür, P., 1967, my translation from French)

Thus, this document asserts that the legal ownership of the rights pertaining to future publications of the translated play text and the play’s staging, the performance itself, will belong to both Kür and Vander. Another certificate was found in the archive with the same wording with Kür’s name on it, which she possibly prepared based on the document that Vander sent (Vander, A. & Kür, P., 1967, my translation from French).

To further explain the conflicts between Vander and Kür, which seem to go beyond her resentment toward Vander about his tardiness, it is important to take the following statements in her letter to Vander into consideration: As she underlines that Vander has been working on the text for quite a while, she adds “I’m not making any accusations although you have so kindly showed me that such a thing could happen between friends” (Kür, 1967b). This shows that while Kür expresses her impatience with him, she tries not to make any accusations, such as telling Vander that he does not have a valid reason for not doing his part in the process, or that he is being lazy or reluctant, or even delaying the process intentionally. Nevertheless, in this context, her emphasis on “such a thing could happen between friends” implies that Vander must have previously accused her of something, although it is unclear what it might be. With Kür’s emphasis on the imperative of drafting official documents to record the process, which relied on a collaborative action, some light is shed upon the issue,

as Kür (1967b) suggests: “Experience shows that it is better to settle everything in writing”. The conflict between them is further confirmed by Kür’s closing sentence in the same letter as she asks Vander to “believe in [her] sincere wishes/friendship despite everything” (“Je vous prie de croire malgré tout, mes sinceres amities [sic]”). Although such closing sentences are common and formed in a similar way to express one’s best wishes and regards in a letter in French, the wording here seems to be changed in a way that refers to the conflict between them.

The first and most obvious addition is the “malgré tout,” which means “despite everything” and does not usually appear in generic closing sentences. Another important indicator is the usage of the words “sincères” and “amitiés”. While “sincères” emphasizes her sincerity, “amitiés”, which is normally used in a sense to express “best wishes” as a closing remark in correspondence, its usage in Kür’s sentence also refers to “friendship”. When each statement and the course of events are taken into consideration together, one can argue that Kür and Vander have been in conflict regarding the translatorship of the text. As I mentioned above, their method in translating the play must have required a division of tasks between Kür and Vander, where the former would be responsible for translating the play from Turkish into French while the latter would edit the text with due attention to its performance dimension. Moreover, in her letter to Andaç, Kür (1967a) explains that “the Éditions Julliard is already interested in the play,” which implies that she may have made the necessary visits and communications. As it appears that Kür was the one making the necessary communication regarding the translation rights, she may have spoken to the publishing house alone. In such a case, Vander might have accused her of having intentions to leave his name out in the publication process and

benefiting from the translator's rights and recognition on her own, possibly with no prospects of staging the play.

However, these do not go beyond speculations since the details remain unknown. In her interview on drama translations, Kür mentions only that the translated play could not be staged due to production-related challenges, providing no further information on the process of this translation or any conflict with Vander. Moreover, as it was discussed above, she does not even mention his name while talking about this failed endeavor (Karantay, 1989, pp. 16-17). The archive also does not contain any additional materials that would shed further light on the process, which again underlines its fragmented composition and limitations. Therefore, as can be seen in this case, such gaps are filled by the researcher, whose gaze is also subjective and needs to be discussed further in relation to their agency.

As it was seen in this chapter, Pınar Kür's correspondence with other agents of cultural production, including individual agents such as Münevver Andaç and Albert Vander as well as institutional agents such as ZAiKS and the SACD, reveals important insights into the translation process of Hikmet's *Ferhat ile Şirin* into French. This process was influenced by diverse factors and ultimately could not be completed for several reasons. The most fundamental of these is Kür's habitus, shaped by her personalized history (her interest in theater, her multiple roles as a playwright, translator, and doctoral student, her admiration for Nâzım Hikmet with whom she shares an ideological affinity) as well as by external conditions imposed primarily by the political field (the military coup and censorship of Hikmet's works in Türkiye, in contrast to the relative freedom and ideological diversity in France during the 1960s).

At this stage, Kür was a translator with a budding career, little symbolic capital, and few connections in the literary field. Her position was further shaped by an internalized sense of subservience as a translator, leading to further conformity and also a drive to prove her competence. Her habitus, in turn, shaped her translatorial practice as her interest in theater steered her towards drama translation, while the ideological and literary significance of the text encouraged her to pursue collaboration as a translatorial strategy, a choice that also resulted in certain challenges and hindered the process. Additionally, Kür's assumption of multiple roles resulted in a demanding schedule, further complicated by financial pressures and personal obligations (such as her pregnancy and travel to Istanbul), which also disrupted the translation process.

Kür's efforts can also be understood as part of a collective endeavor aimed at translating, circulating, and promoting Nâzım Hikmet's works in other literary fields while simultaneously improving his public image (altruistic romantic poet instead of the traitor in exile) disseminating his ideas, especially in opposition to the censorship imposed on his works in Türkiye during the 1960s. Examining Kür's case alongside those of other translators reveals parallels between the habitus and practices of different translators of Hikmet, namely Andaç, Kür, and Lussu. One such parallel is the ideological affinity shared by Kür and Lussu, both with each other and with the author. Another is Kür and Andaç's mutual preference to delegate translation-related formalities to organizations that not only represented them but also offered personal and financial support. Finally, all of these translators, along with others who contributed to this collective endeavor, opted for collaboration, particularly during the translation of the work and also at other stages of the process.

CHAPTER 5

KÜR AND HER “MARGINAL” TRANSLATORS: (SELF-)PERCEPTION, PRACTICE, AND POWER RELATIONS IN THE LITERARY FIELD

This chapter will focus on Pınar Kür’s correspondence with other agents of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1993) performing various roles in different literary fields. As has already been discussed in detail, Kür’s archive presents invaluable materials of various kinds. Letters, on the other hand, as they are among the “personal papers” (Munday, 2014) of the agents presented here, have the potential to reveal the overlooked and even the unknown details about the lives and practices of translators and other translation agents. In addition to the letters, some translatorial notes, translation drafts, interviews, and other extratextual materials will also contribute to the discussion of a broader portrayal of the various agents involved in collaborative efforts to circulate Turkish literature in various literary fields in the 1980s and 1990s.

Although the main object of this study is Pınar Kür and her position and “microhistory” (Munday, 2014) as an author-translator, the correspondence in her archive reveals microhistories of other translators and translation agents situated at various translation events (Toury, 2012). As I have stated before, the reason behind my identification of these agents as “marginal” results from the limited attention paid to their translatorial practices. This marginality becomes even more apparent when their position is compared to that of Kür, who, as an author-translator, enjoys a different recognition and a more privileged status than the other translational agents presented in this study. Nevertheless, it is again this privilege, recognition, and her dual identity that allows Kür to form an archive of her own and include the papers of other translational agents while excluding others. Although it is unknown why Kür

chooses to include her correspondence with Christie, Fidan, Mizanoğlu Reddy, and Laně, the connections between these agents and the translation events that they are involved in can provide some clues.

Each of these agents is associated with one translation event (Toury, 2012) that involves Kür as the translated author, occurring in different literary fields around the same time. Therefore, they present a portrayal of the habitus, translational practice, self-perception, and living and working conditions of these individual translators and of their interactions with Kür. As they are situated in different sociocultural contexts and literary fields, these translation events will be discussed as separate cases in chronological order in this chapter, which is divided into four main sections.

5.1 “Kısa Yol Yolcusu” in English: Translating women authors of the Turkish literary field for the Anglo-American literary field in the late 1980s

The correspondence between Mizanoğlu Reddy and Kür marks the earliest correspondence in the archive between the author and her translators. It is one of the earliest published translations of the author’s works into another language as well. Only one letter from the correspondence between Mizanoğlu Reddy and Kür was found in the archive. However, Kür’s correspondence with İlhan Başgöz, which was also found in the archive, sheds more light upon the translation and publication processes of Mizanoğlu Reddy’s translation. In her letter to Kür, Mizanoğlu Reddy (1987) refers to an earlier postcard, which could not be found in the archive, where she had explained her enthusiasm to translate the author’s short story “Kısa Yol Yolcusu” into English. Moreover, Mizanoğlu Reddy (1987) also mentions that she sent the translation draft along with her letter, which also could not be found in the

archive. The translation appeared with the title “The Commuter” in *Twenty Stories by Turkish Women Writers*, the first collection that brings together the translations of works by various women authors from Türkiye (Akbatır, 2011, p. 171). The book was published in 1988 as part of Indiana University’s Turkish Studies series, and an updated version of it, including five more short stories, appeared with the title *Short Stories by Turkish Women Writers* in 1994.

This translation occupies a central position in Mizanoğlu Reddy’s translatorial career due to its literary significance, especially in terms of introducing the work of women authors from Türkiye to the Anglophone literary field, particularly in the U.S. Nevertheless, information on her translatorial practice remains limited and is mostly overlooked. Her memoir *The Embroidered Jacket*, is the only personal account I could find that delves into her translatorial practice.³⁶ Although the memoir focuses primarily on her personal life, recounting memories from childhood, reflecting on her travels, exploring her familial history and roots, and dedicating chapters to people who greatly influenced her, she also devotes a chapter to her translatorial practice (“Translation Journeys between English and Turkish, September 12, 2004”), albeit only three pages long. In addition, two of the influential people in her life to whom she dedicates a chapter are Nezihe Meriç, whose short stories she translated and published in *Twenty Short Stories by Women Writers* (and later in *Short Stories by Turkish Women Writers*), and Rosette Avigdor Coryell, with whom she co-translated some of Nâzım Hikmet’s poems, as will be discussed below (Ergil, 2005).

Moreover, in the chapter on her translatorial identity and practice, Mizanoğlu Reddy notes that she cannot define herself as a “bona fide translator” as she has

³⁶ I am grateful to my advisor Professor Özlem Berk Albachten for directing me to this memoir, which had initially escaped my attention.

“only translated about a hundred or so poems, mostly from Turkish into English and a few dozen from English into Turkish, about 35 or so short stories, a play and a couple of essays” (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 2015, p. 151). This seems a limited number to her since she thinks about “translators like Nermin Menemencioğlu and Talat S. Halman, who were pioneers in this field,” and feels “overwhelmed with a deep sense of modesty about [her] activity in translating Turkish literature into English” (p. 151). Yet, she acknowledges that her “personal journey into the realm of translation is something significant to write about because it is a journey centered in [her] love of literature, words, places and times.” (p. 151).

What is striking here is her reluctance to define herself as a “bona fide translator” as her perception of the translatorial role is shaped by the image of influential and well-known figures such as Nermin Menemencioğlu and Talât Sait Halman, who possess significant symbolic capital as a result of their pioneering endeavors in the field of translation, especially in translating Turkish literature into English. For instance, Menemencioğlu is the co-editor of *The Penguin Book of Turkish Verse* (1978), “that is the earliest most comprehensive anthology of Turkish poetry” (Akbatır, 2011, p. 174), and the translator of the works of significant authors from Turkish literature into English, including Leylâ Erbil, Melih Cevdet Anday, Nâzım Hikmet, Nazlı Eray and Nezihe Meriç (Paker, 1988).

Halman, on the other hand, is a recurring figure in various translation events, including the ones presented in this thesis, as he played multiple significant roles as a translator and the first Minister of Culture in Türkiye. While being recognized as the Turkish translator of Shakespeare’s sonnets, Halman also promoted the translation of Turkish literature and personally contributed to these endeavors by translating the works of various authors, including but not limited to Fazıl Hüsnü Dağlarca, Orhan

Veli Kanık, Sait Faik Abasıyanık, and Yunus Emre. He is also the author and the (co-)editor of several anthologies of Turkish literature in English, including *Contemporary Turkish Literature: Fiction and Poetry* (1982), *Nightingales and Pleasure Gardens: Turkish Love Poems* (1983), *A Brave New Quest: 100 Modern Turkish Poems* (2006), *An Anthology of Modern Turkish Drama* (2008), *A Millennium of Turkish Literature: A Concise History* (2011), and others.

As for Mizanoğlu Reddy's published translations, only two records appear in the bibliographies by Paker and Yilmaz (2004) and Horzum and Ağin (2021) and in Akbatur's (2011) study: *Twenty Stories by Turkish Women Writers* and Mizanoğlu Reddy's translation of Tomris Uyar's *Gecegezen Kızlar* (*The Guests at the Moribund Hotel*) published in the series "Turkish Literature by Quotations" by Epsilon in 2004. To these, one can add her translations of Nâzım Hikmet, which were among her earliest translations from Turkish literature. In fact, twenty-five poems which she co-translated with Rosette Avigdor Coryell, were published first in *Selected Poems* (1952) in India³⁷ and in *Poems by Nazim Hikmet* (1954) in the U.S., an "old book" that they later presented at Nâzım Hikmet Foundation, where they received a "certificate of appreciation" for their work (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 2015, p. 114). However, this was years after its publication. In fact, both versions were "published with a pseudonym" (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 2015, p. 113). The U.S. version appeared under the pseudonym Ali Yunus as the translator, a name chosen by the translators because it was a common name in Turkish and as an allusion to Yunus Emre, whom Hikmet admired (Ergil, 2005, p. 54).

³⁷ Mizanoğlu Reddy married an "Indian English [sic]" working at the United Nations and, travelled to India with her husband during "home leaves" (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 2015). The Indian version of the book does not list any individual translator name and only notes "English Translation by courtesy of Masses and Mainstream," that is the publisher of the U.S. version (Hikmet, 1952).

Although Mizanoğlu Reddy merely notes that they used a pseudonym “for obvious reasons” and does not provide further clarification, she also mentions a “world-wide movement to free the famous Turkish poet Nazim Hikmet from jail” taking place in 1949 (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 2015, p. 113). At this period, Hikmet’s “poems were not well known yet outside Turkey” (p.113), which also made this movement more significant, as it aimed not only to make his case known to the world and appeal for justice but also to introduce the author’s works to different literary systems. Accordingly, Hikmet was released from prison in 1950. Moreover, as it was seen in Andaç, Lussu, and Kür’s efforts, even after his death, circulation of his works through translation was continued by other agents. As for the “obvious reasons,” it was mentioned in the previous chapter that the circulation of Nâzım’s works were banned starting from the 1930s, resulting in serious punishment for those who violated it. This could be one of the reasons behind Mizanoğlu Reddy and Avigdor Coryell’s decision to use a pseudonym. Another one was the “McCarthyism” in the U.S. (Turgut, 2002, p. 269 as cited in Ergil, 2005, p. 54), which is known as the Second Red Scare, that brought about an oppressive atmosphere that targeted people who had left-wing ideologies.

Women authors and poetry stand out in Mizanoğlu Reddy’s translatorial practice. In addition to 20 women authors in *Twenty Stories by Turkish Women* (and in *Short Stories by Turkish Women Writers* since the number of authors stays the same), she also translated *Afife Jale* (1992) by Nezihe Araz (Akbatır, 2024). Her translation of “Yürekte Bukağı” by Tomris Uyar appeared in *The Guests at the Moribund Hotel* (2004) (Akbatır, 2024). Her other translations include works by various poets such as Pir Sultan Abdal, Gülten Akin, and Oğuz Tansel. Some of these translations were compiled in *An Anthology of Turkish Literature* (1996) by Kemal

Sılay, which was also published by Indiana University Turkish Studies in collaboration with the Turkish Ministry of Culture. Her translations of Oğuz Tansel's poems, on the other hand, were compiled in *Masal Dünyası / World of Tales* (2012).

Mizanoğlu Reddy's interest in women's literature can also be linked to a broader translation practice in the 1980s and 1990s, which is "to a great extent related to the bond between writing and women's increased consciousness" (Akbatur, 2011, p. 168). Akbatur states that "prior to 1980, Turkish women writers were almost non-existent in the Anglo-American system" and it was only in the 1980s and 1990s that they could get translated into English (Akbatur, 2011, p. 168). The prominent genre through which women authors, both in the Turkish literary field and other literary fields, could "make their voices heard" was the novel (Akbatur, 2011, p. 168). Women's fiction was the "most important domain for the growth of a feminist consciousness [because] distinctive female viewpoints in the 1960s [...] found, and continued to find, literary expression first in short stories and later in novels" (Paker, 1991, p. 286, as cited in Akbatur, 2011, p. 168). Pınar Kür is an especially significant author who is credited for "shaping modern and post-modern Turkish fiction" as it was also discussed above (Akbatur, 2011, p. 169).

Moreover, Akbatur (2011) also mentions Talât Sait Halman as another influential agent who played a significant role by contributing to the translation and promotion of Turkish literature in the Anglo-American sphere. This contribution can also be traced in the book reviews he wrote, especially on works by women writers and also translated collections of their works, which were published in *World Literature Today*. In addition to individual reviews of Leylâ Erbil and Nazlı Eray, he also published a review of *Twenty Stories by Turkish Women Writers* in 1990 (Akbatur, 2011). In this review, Halman (1990) celebrates women's writing in the

Turkish literary field and underlines that their collective work has “carried the day” (p. 359). He also praises Mizanoğlu Reddy for her work in *Twenty Stories by Turkish Women Writers* as a “conscientious master of the art of translating fiction” and for “do[ing] justice to the widely divergent styles of the twenty authors” (Halman, 1990, p. 359). Moreover, he observes that Mizanoğlu Reddy’s collection portrays an “image” of “modern Turkish fiction writers practic[ing] their art not as ‘women’ or ‘in imitation of men,’ but as authors who have the assurance of their creativity” (Halman, 1990, p. 359). Moreover, Halman’s name appears in the colophon of the book as a member of the editorial board of the Turkish Studies series of the publishing house. Accordingly, Mizanoğlu Reddy (1988) expresses her appreciation of Halman’s “invaluable help in editing” in the introduction (p. vii).

Another key agent in two of Mizanoğlu Reddy’s translations is İlhan Başgöz who was, at the time, the director of the Turkish and Turkic Studies Program at Indiana University as well as the general editor of the Turkish Studies series (Başgöz, 1986). The Indiana University also organized the Second International Conference on Turkic Studies, which took place between May 14-17, 1987 (Başgöz, 1987). The correspondence with Başgöz reveals that Kür was invited to present a paper at this conference upon his invitation (Başgöz, 1986), although it was not an official invitation since the conference’s realization depended on the “financial support” in the form of “grants from various foundations” which could only be solicited with the participants’ “expression of interest” in attending it (Başgöz, 1986). This demonstrates two key points: First, this intellectual conference was not sufficiently financed, possibly because of their “niche” interest in Turkish literature, prominently a restricted field of literature within the Anglo-American literary field. Second, it also underlines that the symbolic capital of authors could attract the attention of

prospective funders. Ultimately, Kür participated in this conference with a paper entitled “Women Characters in my Works” (Indiana University, 1987). The tentative program sent by Başgöz to Kür lists Talât Sait Halman’s name as a speaker at this conference, presenting a paper titled “Women in Classical [Turkish] Literature” (Indiana University, 1987). Although they present their papers on different days and different sessions (Kür in “Women in Turkish Literature” session and Halman in “Turkish Literature I” session), both Halman and Kür demonstrate their interest in women’s representation in Turkish literature.

Moreover, in his invitation, Başgöz (1986) also requests a list of the author’s translated works. As a response to this request, Kür explains that she has already asked Talât Sait Halman and Ellen Ervin to translate some of her works that year (Kür, 1986b). Therefore, she notes that “by the time of the conference, a few short stories and, perhaps, the translation of the novel *Asılacak Kadın* will have been completed” and sent to Başgöz (Kür, 1986b, my translation from Turkish).³⁸ Nevertheless, Halman had an “extremely busy” schedule at the time, “going from one town to the other and giving conferences there,” and thus, was not able to work on any translation (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 1987, my translation from Turkish). This specific reference to Halman and his inability to work on a translation shows that, as the conference approached, Kür must have started requesting translations of her works from the translators that she personally knows.

Accordingly, Mizanoğlu (1987) states that she completed the translation of “Kısa Yol Yolcusu”, a short story from Kür’s *Bir Deli Ağaç*, and even had initially planned to translate another short story, “Son Çizgi”, from the same book. However,

³⁸ As it was stated above, the translator of the failed English translation project of *Asılacak Kadın* is unknown. However, since her name is mentioned here, Ellen Ervin also appears as a person of interest.

this could not be realized due to her busy schedule (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 1987). At the time, Mizanoğlu Reddy was preparing the short story collection for publication and “had been working nonstop on translations for the last five and a half months which went by so quickly” (1987, my translation from Turkish). The book then included 18 short stories by 18 authors (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 1987) but it can be observed that, by the time of its publication, two more authors were added (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 1994).

As Mizanoğlu Reddy (1988) explains the reasons behind her selection of the short stories in this collection, she points out that the authors which she included “were all born after the inauguration of the Republic,” their works representing “the conflicts and aspirations of their social milieu” and dealing “explicitly and courageously with many taboos of Turkish society” (p. xii). Therefore, by presenting various works from women authors with their individual voices and unique experiences of being a woman, this anthology reflects “a previously absent dimension of the human experience,” that is, of women who have been long silenced and marginalized in Turkish society (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 1988, p. viii). It can be argued that since Kür’s works also tackle taboos and present social critique on various social issues, and also due to her position as a once-banned author, she also finds a place in this collection. In fact, when the translator sent the first draft of the translation to the author, Kür was going through a period of her life that was marked by the censorship of her books and ongoing prosecutions. It is important to underline again that she was being tried in court for the “obscene” content of her novels, which was due to the uncensored portrayal of women’s sexuality as well as the sexual harassment that they experienced. Mizanoğlu Reddy sympathizes with her as she understands “how wearing an extremely cold winter with the censorship committee and bans could be” (1987, my translation from Turkish). Therefore, she suggests that

“the conference in Indiana would also be a pleasant change” for the author (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 1987, my translation from Turkish).

The letter also provides insight into Mizanoğlu Reddy’s translation process, specifically her understanding of the original text and comments on its content and language. For instance, she is confident that she “conveyed the voice and the style well” and that the “*American* text of the story reads well” (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 1987, my translation from Turkish).³⁹ This immediately shows that a specific group, the readers in the American literary field, is designated as the target audience of the translation. Moreover, the translator also makes comments on the themes tackled in the story to present her interpretation of the story to the author. According to the translator, “this story has other dimensions that makes it go beyond being merely a tale of urbanization and alienation: and that is the presence of extraordinary events behind the ordinary life of an ordinary person (ordinary-extraordinary)” (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 1987, my translation from Turkish). These comments are illuminating in their demonstration of the translator’s primary role as the reader of the original text, and also function as an indicator of her translatorial competence, her ability to understand the text with all its dimensions of meaning and literary significance.⁴⁰ Moreover, they also help the author understand certain translation strategies and approach that the translator adopted in accordance with her interpretation of the text.

Although Kür likely kept this correspondence due to its connection to her authorial career and the reception of works in other literary fields enabled through translation, both Başgöz’s letters about the conference and Mizanoğlu Reddy’s letter on the translation process of *Twenty Stories by Turkish Women Writers* offer a

³⁹ Emphasis added.

⁴⁰ “Misreadings” of the original work can cause issues between the author and her translators as will be seen in Christie’s case.

glimpse into a broader, collective effort involving multiple agents striving for the translation and promotion of Turkish literature. Just like Nâzım Hikmet's works were translated thanks to a collaborative effort, the women's movements and the feminist awakening in the Turkish literary field in the 1980s and 1990s also brought about another collaborative translation effort that aimed to introduce Turkish literature to other literary fields by focusing on its "modern" face and "women-led" identity, two characteristics that were deemed to go hand-in-hand. On a broader level, these endeavors can also be seen as a contribution to women's movement by promoting women's literature and making their voice heard. In addition to key individual agents with multifaceted roles and significant symbolic capital such as Talât Sait Halman and İlhan Başgöz, institutions supporting publications and organizing conferences also stood out in these endeavors, as it was seen in the case of Indiana University.

On an individual level, focusing on the lives and working conditions and practices of translation agents, has uncovered several important patterns. Mizanoğlu Reddy's translatorial practice and her perception of the translation practice were shaped collaborative efforts, particularly with a focus on translating women authors and poetry. In terms of translatorial strategies, on the other hand, she opted for author-translator collaboration during the editing process, as can be seen in her efforts to prompt discussions on the translated text with the author. Nevertheless, her multifaceted role as an agent of cultural production also resulted in a demanding schedule, which was also the case for other agents on whom Kür relied for the translations of her works for an upcoming conference.

5.2 “Bir Deli Ağaç” in English: The working conditions and practices of Ruth Christie

Although no book-length translation of Kür’s novels have been published in English, individual translations of her short stories were published, marking an initial step for the author’s portrayal in the Anglo-American literary field. As it was discussed above, Mizanoğlu Reddy’s translation of “Kısa Yol Yolcusu” (“The Commuter”) can be considered a first step, although it is unknown whether there were other unpublished English translation projects of Kür’s works that precede it. Nevertheless, Mizanoğlu Reddy’s endeavor was followed by that of another translator who appears just as devoted to the translation of Turkish literature into English: Ruth Christie. Christie’s translation of Kür’s well-known short story “Bir Deli Ağaç” (*A Crazy Tree*) from her eponymous short story collection was published as a standalone book in 2004 by Epsilon, a publishing house based in Türkiye. However, the correspondence in the archive reveals that the actual translation process dates back to the 1990s. Since there have been no published materials, including interviews by the translator, that reveal any detailed information that would explain this gap, my investigation of the correspondence found in Kür’s archive is the first attempt to account for the reasons that led to the delayed publication of the translation as well as for the translation process itself, in which collaborative efforts once again stand out.

Before moving on to the contents of this correspondence and the process behind the translation of “Bir Deli Ağaç”, it is important to situate Christie as a translation agent who made significant contribution to the circulation of Turkish literature in the Anglo-American literary field through her translations, besides her position as one of the few translators who made efforts to translate Kür’s works into English. Ruth Christie was born in Scotland in 1923. She lived in Istanbul, Türkiye,

for two years between 1945 and 1947 (Demirkol Ertürk, 2010, p. 288). She was teaching English in Istanbul, which was her main profession as a professor of English language and literature who taught undergraduate students, and during her time in Istanbul she also picked up Turkish (Demirkol Ertürk, 2010, p. 286; Tekgül & Akbatur, 2013, p. 68). However, it was in the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in London, that she was properly introduced to Turkish and its literature, as she “attended many classes on Turkish literature and was especially struck by Yunus Emre and the Turkish ‘halk’ poets” (Demirkol Ertürk, 2010, p. 289). Accordingly, in her translations of Turkish literature, she was mostly interested in translating poetry, an interest that goes back to her school days when she translated poems from Latin by Catullus and Horace as well as works of French poets including Baudelaire (Demirkol Ertürk, 2010, p. 286). Accordingly, Christie later translated poetry collections by established authors such as Nâzım Hikmet, Oktay Rifat and Bejan Matur. Most of her translations resulted from “interest and liking for a particular work”, while others were a result of recommendations from people “whose judgement [she] respect[ed]”, such as her translation of Latife Tekin’s *Berci Kristin Çöp Masalları* (*Berji Kristin: Tales from the Garbage Hills*, 1993) which she co-translated with Saliha Paker, who recommended the novel to her in the first place (Demirkol Ertürk, 2010, p. 286).

Therefore, Christie’s translated not only poetry but also other genres. “A Chronological Bibliography of Turkish Literature in English Translation: 1949 – 2004”, prepared by Saliha Paker and Melike Yilmaz (2004), lists several translations by Christie that include translations of short story collections and novels as well as poetry collections: *Voices of Memory: Selected Poems of Oktay Rifat* (1993, co-translated with Richard McKane), *Berji Kristin: Tales from the Garbage Hills* by

Latife Tekin (1993, co-translated with Saliha Paker), *Beyond the Walls: Selected Poems* by Nâzım Hikmet (2002, co-translated with Richard McKane and Talât Sait Halman), and *In the Temple of a Patient God* by Bejan Matur (2004). To these, one can add her translations published in 2004 and onward (Horzum & Ağin, 2021): *A Crazy Tree* by Pınar Kür (2004), *I've Always Remembered You on Moonlit Nights* by Murathan Mungan (2004), *Mrs. Valley's War: The Shelter Stories of Feyyaz Kayacan Fergar* (2007, co-translated with Selçuk Berilgen), *Poems of Oktay Rifat* (2007, co-translated with Richard McKane), *Songs My Mother Never Taught Me* by Selçuk Altun (2008, co-translated with Selçuk Berilgen) *How Abraham Abandoned Me: Poems* by Bejan Matur (2012, co-translated with Selçuk Berilgen), and *Tanpınar's "Five Cities."* (2018).

It can be seen that, during the 1990s and early 2000s, Christie was a prolific translator, having published translations of literary works by various authors and poets in the Turkish literary field. A translation that is not listed in these bibliographies (possibly because it is a work of the non-fiction genre) is Mehmet Ali Birand's memoir *Emret Komutanım*, which was co-translated into English as *Shirts of steel: an anatomy of the Turkish armed forces* by Ruth Christie and Saliha Paker. The translation was published in 1991 by I.B. Tauris, and it is one of the earliest published book translations from Turkish by Christie that I have found (I will discuss another one below). When the original book was published in 1986, it became a bestseller (Bishku, 1996, p. 384). However, it also received heavy criticism from the General Staff of the Turkish Armed Forces as the book provided a detailed insight into the army, especially into the lives and families, working conditions and practices of the army officers as well as the rank system and promotion process in the army, and this insight was found to be "offending" the officers' families, especially their

wives (Birand, 2004). This was because Birand was talking about how the wives of these soldiers wanted the promotions more than their husbands, which was found to be implying that they had control over their actions, an implication that the General Staff firmly opposed (Birand, 2004). It is also important to point out that the book was published not long after the military coup of 1980. Therefore, one of Christie's earliest published translations, if not *the* earliest, was of a controversial and politically engaged book that received heavy criticism from the military, an official organization of the state. However, as it was mentioned, the book was also a bestseller, which indicates its popularity and might also account for Christie and Paker's selection of the text.⁴¹

Another important aspect of Christie's translations, especially of the works by women authors such as Kür, was that they were situated in the 1990s, a period that was marked by an interest in translating works by women authors in the Turkish literary field. As it was discussed above, it was only in the 1980s that such interest could fully develop and flourish. Moreover, Kür was a popular author during the 1980s and 1990s, with an established position in the Turkish literary field and considerable symbolic capital, having published her major works, which received both criticism and appraisal. As it was mentioned above, some of her books were banned in 1982 and 1986, which, despite marking a tumultuous period in the author's life, made her works even more popular. Moreover, Kür's short story collection *Bir Deli Ağaç* had recently been re-published in 1988, which was its fifth printing, thus it still preserved its relevance and importance in terms of reception.

⁴¹ It is unknown whether it was Paker who recommended the book to Christie and initiated the process. However, it is highly possible since, as it was discussed above, Christie mentions in her interview that she welcomed recommendations from her friends, including Paker.

Therefore, while Christie already expresses her enjoyment of the story and its translation process in her letter to Kür's literary agent Kezban Akçalı ("such a good story – the original; I enjoyed working on it!" (Christie, 1990b)), the popularity of the author and her works, her position as a woman author whose works have been labeled as "obscene" for addressing women's sexuality, as well as the growing interest in translating works by women authors in the Turkish literary field should also be taken into account as other possible factors that contributed to Christie's interest in translating Kür's work.

It is equally important to take into account that the 1990s also mark an important period in Christie's translatorial career and recognition in Türkiye, as well as her growing interest in translating Turkish literary works. For instance, although she had not yet achieved wide recognition as a translator in the Turkish literary field in 1990, her name appeared as "an admirer of Turkey" in an interview with Richard Kane, who had already established considerable symbolic capital in the field at the time as the translator of works by well-known authors such as Nâzım Hikmet, Orhan Veli, and Cahit Sıtkı (Öymen, 1990). The interview also mentions an upcoming translation of a selection of Oktay Rifat's poems which was due to be published that year, in 1990 (Öymen, 1990). Accordingly, three years later, the translation was published with the title *Voices of Memory: Selected Poems of Oktay Rifat* while, as can be seen, the actual translation process dates back to early 1990. In fact, a review from the *World Literature Today* also refers to this selection as the "1990 selection" (Messo, 2008, p. 74), although I could not find any record of its publication in that year. In this case, McKane and Christie's translation process of Rifat's poems possibly coincides with her translation process of Kür's "Bir Deli Ağaç" since

Christie's first letter to Kür's literary agent is also dated June 24, 1990, and it inquiries about the fate of an already sent translation manuscript (Christie, 1990a).

Thanks to the letters found in the archive, the gap between the translation process and the publication of *A Crazy Tree* can be traced in the correspondence between Pinar Kür, Ruth Christie, and Kezban Akçalı, who was the founder of the eponymous copyright agency that represented Kür at the time. Through the correspondence, it is also possible to trace what can be called a retranslation process of the short story through a collaboration between the author and the translator.

Moreover, the letters reveal the initial attempts to publish the short story, which failed due to financial issues, and another influential agent involved in this process: Dağyeli Verlag, that is a Germany-based publishing house which has introduced many works from Turkish literature into the international literary fields. The role of Dağyeli Verlag as an institutional agent, as will be discussed in this section, is a controversial one as it first enables and then, unexpectedly, hinders the publication process of the translation. Apart from the relations between these agents which reveal unconventional power dynamics, this section will also dive into Christie's working practices and conditions as a translator.

The first letter of this process, found in Kür's archive, is sent to Akçalı by an anxious Ruth Christie who inquiries about "the fate of [her] translation" of Kür's short story "Bir Deli Ağaç" (Christie, 1990a). This reveals that Christie and Kür were not in direct communication with each other at the beginning of the process. Instead, Akçalı acted as an intermediary between the two. In addition, the translation was sent by Roderick Conway Morris, possibly a friend of Christie or her literary agent, to the copyright agent "some time ago", which reveals another intermediary in the process (Christie, 1990a). Morris, in this case, seems to have performed in the capacity of a

literary agent on behalf of the translator, although details on the relationship between Christie and Morris are not revealed in the letters. Nevertheless, Morris' connection with Turkish culture and his position as an agent in the literary field can shed some light on their relationship.

Roderick Conway Morris has had a significant symbolic capital, having worked as a publishers' editor, and a researcher and scriptwriter for BBC and, since the 1990s, as the author of various articles on arts and culture in well-known magazines and newspapers such as the *International Herald Tribune*, *The Spectator*, *Times Literary Supplement*, and *The New York Times*, and of other publications (Morris, n.d.). In addition, he also conducted post-graduate research in Greece and Türkiye on Rebetika music, which was followed by his studies on Modern and Ottoman Turkish at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in London, the same school to which Christie went in the 1970s to study Turkish (SOAS, 2022). In 1990, the same year Christie first reached out to Akçalı Agency, Morris' novel *Jem: Memoirs of an Ottoman Secret Agent* had just been published in Turkish by Milliyet Yayınları where Akçalı had worked as a translator before founding her own copyright agency in 1985 (Şüyün, 2010). Therefore, it is possible to suggest that Christie's selection of Morris as an intermediary for initiating the process was not coincidental. On the contrary, his connection with the Turkish literary and arts scenes and its agents must have made him a guiding figure and a good reference for Christie in her efforts to publish her translation.

There are other agents who act as intermediary as well. For instance, Christie's letter to Akçalı reveals that Saliha Paker, whose collaborative translations with Christie appeared in the following years, was the first to tell Christie that "Pınar Kür was unhappy about the translation" (Christie, 1990b). Apparently, Paker and

Akçalı had met that summer, and Christie's translation was among their conversation topics (Christie, 1990b). Having learned about Kür's comments, Christie underlines her willingness to work on the text in line with the author's criticism. For instance, she accepts the changes initially proposed by the author while she still has certain reservations for the title: "I would be perfectly happy to drop the italics – they do overclarify – and to change the title, though not to 'A MAD TREE'!" (Christie, 1990b; Kür, 1990a).⁴² The reason behind this is explained in one of her subsequent letters: "Mad Tree is quite a sticky title to the ear because two staccato syllables are joined by consonants" (Christie, 1991a). Instead, Christie comes up with the title "Tormented Tree," which "might better imply ideas of anguish and distortion" (Christie, 1990b). This response challenges the conventional hierarchy between an author and translator since, from the very first criticism she receives, Christie rejects to present a complete subservience to the author. Instead, she asserts her position as a "visible" agent in the process while embracing a collaborative approach, which would enable her to discuss the issues related to her translation and exchange ideas with the author as equals. This can be seen in her remarks on collaborative translation, where she suggests that translators working in collaboration can "learn from each other" and defines collaboration as "a unity of purpose, honest discussion of doubts and an overall agreement on the style and atmosphere of the text", and states that "[i]t can be helpful if the writer gets involved" in the translation process (Christie, 2013, as cited in Tekgül and Akbatur, 2013, pp. 69-70).

As can be seen in her other published translations, Christie has often opted for a collaborative method in her translatorial practice, which, as this correspondence shows, dates back to her earlier translations. Therefore, her early translatorial

⁴² Original emphasis.

practice must have significantly shaped her habitus as a translator. However, as can be seen in Kür's initial comments, an author-translator collaboration brings about a different dynamic because of Kür's authorial authority. This dynamic is further shaped by Kür's translatorial identity since her revisions on the translation and identification of the "problematic" parts of the text also reveal a translatorial approach to her own original text. In this case, Kür also performs the role of a translation critic, that is a critic's critic (Berman, 1995/2009) since the translator is also a critic of the original text. Therefore, their collaboration differs from other collaborative processes that Christie had engaged in up to that point.

Therefore, in their collaborative process, Kür adopts two main roles: the "exacting" author, who asserts her ownership of the text, and thus of its meaning, and the translation critic with a translatorial eye. Her authorial position and exacting approach can be traced in her letter to Christie, which appears in the form of two unsent drafts and one final sent version, all of which were included in Kür's archive (Kür, 1990a; Kür, ca. 1990b; Kür, 1990c). Although some of these comments were passed on to Christie via Akçalı and Paker, it is seen that they were only a glimpse into the full picture. It appears that the first draft of the author's notes was written down by Kür right after Christie inquired about the "fate" of her translation (Christie, 1990a), which must have prompted Akçalı and Kür to take action.

A striking feature of this first version of the notes is its quite prescriptive tone: In general, Kür explains what the "problems" are in detail and provides solutions as to what "should be done instead" (Kür, 1990a). Accordingly, she starts her notes by identifying "the main problem with the translation" which, according to Kür, is that "it does not read like a literary text" (Kür, 1990a). However, Kür's criticism also provides quite precise and technical details, which demonstrates the impact of her

translational experience and habitus. Therefore, while her translational eye identifies the “problematic parts” and offers detailed solutions that can be useful for the translator, it is still accompanied by the reserved position of the author, underlining her authority as the owner of the text.

An example of this can be seen in her discussion on selecting an adjective to depict the tree in the title of the story. According to Kür, “the adjective ‘crazy’ *does not sound right*” and “the use of italics (and extra paragraph spacing) to distinguish between first person and third person narration is *wrong*” (Kür, 1990a).⁴³ Therefore, she offers several alternatives for the title, such as “mad”, “demented”, “wild”, “insane”, and “foolish” to describe the tree (Kür, 1990a). However, at the same time, her suggestions also aim to limit the translator to these words, since she is not pleased with Christie’s word choice for the title (“crazy”). Moreover, Kür explains that most of the “notations”⁴⁴ were “necessary to clarify the misreadings and/or misunderstandings of the original text; some others, because the expression in English of feeling and content does not correspond to the character and expression of the narrator” (Kür, 1990a). In this way, she makes it clear that Christie, as the translator, must have misread the author’s text in terms of its narrative voice and the character’s mental and emotional state.

Therefore, to *inform* her translator, she also expands on the “schizophrenic” state of the narrator, and the split voices in the narrative getting “mixed up” towards the end of the story by giving a detailed description of the character’s mental and emotional state, once again proving her perfect knowledge of the text as its author while also enabling the translator to get a deeper understanding of the character (Kür,

⁴³ Emphasis added.

⁴⁴ Here, it is observed that she first wrote “corrections” but then crossed it out and changed it to “notations”.

1990a). She suggests that the narrator is “naïve [sic] but this naiveté should not sound like inept writing” (Kür, 1990a), which is also a critique of the translator’s knowledge of the target language. She also underlines that her revisions regarding the expressions used in the target text are “certainly not final” since “they should be rewritten in better English because I’m not sure about whether they are good ‘written English’” (Kür, 1990a).⁴⁵ “So”, she prescribes the translator, asserting her authority, “No italics and the paragraph spacing should conform to the original text” (Kür, 1990a).

The document also shows some marginalia on her typewritten notes, which indicates that she later edited her own notes as well. For instance, at first, she writes, “I feel the whole text needs to be reworked because it sounds too naïve,” whereas she later crosses it out and writes, “most of the text” needs to be reworked (Kür, 1990a). Similarly, a second draft of these comments shows that Kür was prompted to edit her initial comments (Kür, ca. 1990b). Unlike the first draft, which was titled and formatted as the “author’s notes”, the second draft of the notes is written in the format of a letter in which Kür directly addresses Christie (Kür, ca. 1990b). This suggests that instead of sending her notes to her agent and asking her to pass them on to the translator, she decides to address the translator herself. The reason behind this can also be traced in the second draft as Kür notes that her agent forwarded Christie’s letter to her (Kür, ca. 1990b). As it was discussed above, in this letter, Christie expressed her enthusiasm to work on the translation despite the author’s criticism. Therefore, upon receiving her letter, Kür decides to revise the translation and send the edited manuscript to Christie via Akçalı “to see whether [sic] anything can be done about them” (Kür, ca. 1990b). Moreover, in this second draft, Kür makes some

⁴⁵ Original emphasis.

changes to her initial comments, such as adding more suggestions for the title and omitting some of the harsh criticism in her previous draft.

For instance, Kür starts her letter by thanking Christie for her enthusiasm to work on the translation and adding that she has “certain reservations” about the translation (Kür, ca. 1990b) instead of directly pointing out “the main problem with the translation” (Kür, 1990a). Although this can be regarded simply as a standard and polite way of opening a letter, I argue that it marks a shift from Kür’s firm and discouraging stance and her reluctance to work with the translator to a more encouraging stance upon seeing her enthusiasm and willingness to work in collaboration. Accordingly, the author’s tone also becomes visibly less prescriptive. For instance, she writes, “most of these notations *I* found necessary to clarify misreadings and/or misunderstandings of the original text” (Kür, ca. 1990b). Similarly, she adds, “the adjective crazy does not sound right *to me*” and also politely asks, “[s]o, *please*, no italics and the paragraph spacing should conform to the original text” (Kür, ca. 1990b).⁴⁶

Moreover, in this draft, Kür presents an offer to the translator regarding the translation’s publication: “[I]f a translation which is satisfactory to both of us emerges, not only will it be helpful in getting the rest of the book translated and published,” but it could also be submitted to a magazine in the USA by Kür and to one in England by Christie (Kür, ca. 1990b). She adds that “in that case”, they both could “get royalties – and that would be very nice” (Kür, ca. 1990b). First, this can be regarded as an indirect response to Christie’s question to Akçalı in her second letter, asking if she may “use the translation elsewhere; perhaps not, without [Kür’s]

⁴⁶ Emphasis added to point out the changes that Kür made in the text to emphasize the subjectivity of her notes which ultimately makes her tone less prescriptive and, in all, offers a more constructive criticism that would encourage the translator to continue working on the text.

approval of it?” (Christie, 1990b). Second, I argue that this is also aimed at easing the anxious translator who, at the time, still did not know whether there was “any possibility at all of the writer accepting the translation” (Christie, 1990b) or getting the translation published somewhere (Christie, 1990a, 1990b).

This shows that the author expects her translator to act as a literary agent, and “seem[s] to assume that the translator should be like an agent, responsible for finding publishers and conducting the necessary transactions” (Christie, 2013, as cited in Tekgül and Akbatur, 2013, pp. 69-70). However, Kür is willing to share the responsibility with her as she suggests sending the translation to several magazines in different countries for publication. Moreover, while publicity and worldwide success may be the author’s primary concern in having her books published in another language, which highlights the importance of symbolic capital, the economic capital also remains significant, as can be seen in Kür’s emphasis on both parties receiving payment for the publication of the translation.

It takes five months for Kür to finalize her letter and send it to Christie. In this final version, Kür makes even more changes and additions to her initial drafts. For instance, the letter no longer informs Christie that the author has “certain reservations” about the translation (Kür, 1990c). Kür also takes out the part where she suggests changes to the use of italics and extra paragraph spacing, whereas she keeps the suggestions for the title, which shows that the title of the short story remains an unresolved subject of discussion between the author and the translator. As for the omitted parts in the letter, since Christie had previously been informed about the issues related to italics, extra-paragraph spacing, and the title and she must have made the necessary changes in the manuscript that she had sent in early November of that year (Kezban, 1990), that is before Kür sent her first official letter to Christie.

Moreover, in this final version, Kür provides an almost apologetic self-explanation of her exacting approach to the translation of her original works:

Dear Ms. Christie, I do hope that you will find solutions to these problems as I'm anxious to be published in English but feel that even a 'near-miss' translation may ruin my chances in that language. I do worry so terribly about the Turkish part of it when I write, so bear with me and don't think me too exacting about the English. (Kür, 1990c).

As can be seen here, Kür underlines her willingness to make the necessary efforts to publish her books in other languages, which, she argues, extends the "lifespan" of an original work (Söğüt, 2006, p. 11). However, her fear of having "near-miss translations" also makes the author anxious, which can lead to an involuntary and often subjective "gatekeeping" on her part. It is important to remember at this point that she withheld permission for the English translation of *Asılacak Kadın* to be published because she did not "like it at all" (Söğüt, 2006, p. 11). Thus, this reserved position of the author could also be the reason behind the delay in her response to Christie and the possible reluctance to start direct communication with the translator.

Although no explicit reason is given for the author's delay in giving feedback to the translator, it is also important to remember that Kür was a prolific and celebrated author with a busy schedule, working on several projects. For instance, in 1989, Pınar Kür had just published her novel *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (A Murder Novel), through which Kür made her entrance to the scene of "murder" genre, which was followed by *Sonuncu Sonbahar* (The Last Autumn) (1992) and *Cinayet Fakültesi* (The Faculty of Murder) (2006). Moreover, during the period of her collaborative efforts with Christie, Kür was busy with other projects, such as conference invitations abroad, at the time (Kür, 1990d; Scharf, ca. 1990). Thus, for the translator, working with a popular author-translator could also entail delayed responses, which could have various reasons, such as an author's demanding schedule that pushes back

a translation project or their reservations about the original text, both of which seem to apply in Christie's case. However, Christie's persistence and being open to collaboration with the author must have finally persuaded Kür to spare the time and give the translator an opportunity to come up with a more "satisfactory" text.

After Christie receives further feedback from the author and starts working on the edited manuscript, which arrives in about a month due to slow mail connections (Kür, 1990c; Christie, 1990d), the discussion on the translation between the translator and the author continues for three more months as the notes related to the title, specific words or sentences (such as whether to opt for a literal translation for "Ay Dede" in Turkish which portrays the moon as a grandfatherly figure), and the style of the author go back and forth (Christie, 1991a). The correspondence reveals further translatorial strategies and translational discussions such as reception: For instance, Christie supports her choice for the title by comments from Turkish and non-Turkish readers, "none of whom found 'crazy' inappropriate" (Christie, 1991a). While expanding on this issue, she also underlines that the target audience of her translation is the British audience which is why she "tried to keep the text free of Americanisms" (Christie, 1991a). At this point, Christie indeed acts like the "foster-parent" (Christie, 1991c) of the work, which has become a product of the target culture (Toury, 1995, 2012) through translation, as she expresses her responsibility for the text's reception in the target language and by a target audience for whom she translates this text.

Similarly, following Kür's critique of the narration and the style of the translated text, Christie again opts for a revisioning method based on reader reception, which puts readers in a position of authority in terms of quality assessment of a translation. The translator juxtaposes the assessment of readers with the author's

assessment while using the readers' comments to support her own translatorial decisions:

The greatest difficulty a literary translator has to face is the assessment of the style of the original as distinct from the content. What has to be done (as I have) is to consult closely with highly literate native speakers. After such consultation I am confident that the style of the translation does largely reflect that of the original. In fact, the story has been found by English readers to have a subtle and powerful flavour. (Christie, 1991a)

Therefore, the translator consults both the source and target language readers, such as Turkish and non-Turkish readers, and even chooses a specific reader group, "highly literate native speakers" (Christie, 1991a) in accordance with the specific issue at hand. These reader groups perform an initial "quality assessment" of the translation, and their evaluation is expected to increase the objectivity and validity of the translator's choices, showing that this is not a personal, subjective intervention on the translator's part.

Nevertheless, despite these efforts to ground and support her arguments, the translator acknowledges the author as the final authority by stating that "[o]f course the final decision must rest with [the author]" (Christie, 1991a). This is because the main objective of these revisions is "mak[ing] for a *more satisfactory* and *acceptable* result" (Christie, 1991a), where both of these are assessed by the author who, as it was discussed above, presented them as a priori condition for the author's authorization and eventually the translation's publication. Therefore, although the reader's reception is of great importance, the power of decision-making still resides with the author since it is only if the author "like[s] the translation better, and well enough to consider publishing it" that the translation can be published (Christie, 1991a). However, pursuing a goal that can never be reached unless the two parties reach an agreement through compromise or one of the parties yielding to the other also entails problems related to the time factor as it will be expanded on below.

Interestingly, despite the author's concerns regarding her portrayal in the Anglophone literary field, Christie's translation was not going to be the first English translation of an original work by Kür at the time. As it was discussed above, in 1988, Kür's short story "Kısa Yol Yolcusu" ("The Commuter") was translated by Nilüfer Mizanoğlu Reddy, and included in the *Short Stories by Turkish Women Writers* (and later in its edited version *Short Stories by Turkish Women Writers* published in 1994), published by Indiana University – Turkish Studies (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 1987). Nevertheless, there is no information on whether Kür was actively involved in the translation process after Mizanoğlu Reddy had first asked for her feedback on the translation in a previous letter, and whether Kür found this published translation "satisfactory" (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 1987). Kür does not mention this translation in her correspondence with Christie, either. In addition, these two projects differ in certain ways, which could have also resulted in a different approach on the part of the author.

For instance, Christie's translation project held the potential for the whole book to be published in English, although it was on the condition that the translator would eventually submit a translation that was "satisfactory" for both parties. Mizanoğlu Reddy, on the other hand, was working on an already-initiated book project where she would compile her translations of works by various Turkish women authors (Mizanoğlu Reddy, 1987). Moreover, at the time, Kür was primarily in need of shorter English translations, such as short stories or excerpts from her novels, which she could use for readings at the Indiana University conference. Therefore, if the whole book, *Bir Deli Ağaç*, had been translated and published, as it was planned to be the case for Christie's translation, this would indeed have been a first for Kür since no book-length English translation of Kür's works had been

published at the time. This could also explain the author's anxiety since a whole book appearing in English for the first time would also mean the first individual portrayal of the author in the Anglophone literary field, attracting wider publicity and readers, which makes the translated book's impact more vital for the author's international reputation and overall symbolic capital.

Moreover, although Mizanoğlu Reddy's and Christie's translations have undoubtedly contributed to the symbolic capital of Pınar Kür, it is seen that their impact was limited regarding the reception of Kür's works in the Anglophone literary field. As it was discussed above, Kür's anticipation and awareness of this limited impact must be the reason behind her lack of recognition of them. It is also important to remember that both of these translations were eventually published by and with the help of individual and institutional agents, often originally from Türkiye, striving to circulate and promote works of Turkish literature in the Anglo-American literary field (İlhan Başgöz from the Indiana University and the Turkish Studies series as well as Talât Sait Halman in Mizanoğlu Reddy's case, and the Turkey-based Epsilon publishing house in Christie's case). Since these individual translations of two short stories did not incite more translational activity and a wide interest that would draw the publisher's attention to Kür's works, her original works have remained largely unpublished in the Anglo-American literary field. This also explains why the interest in her works in other literary fields also remained relatively limited since translation into English "has become the most widely accepted means of symbolic exchange" (Cronin, 1998, p. 152, as cited in Guzmán, 2013, p.186). This results from the position of English as the "language of global linguistic primacy" in the contemporary context" and "the realm of literary practices—which are, in turn, part of the larger spectrum of social practices" (Guzmán, 2013, p. 186). Guzmán (2013)

further underlines that “English translation gives way to new and potential readerships and is also a condition of possibility for translation into other languages (p. 186). Therefore, in addition to its symbolic significance and its position as the contemporary lingua franca, translation into English also enables relay translations, worldwide examples of which are plenty.

After the revision process was completed, Christie sent her final draft to Akçalı and to Talât Sait Halman and expressed her hope that the story would be “well-received” in the U.S. (Christie, 1991c). This indicates that the translation was initially going to be introduced to the American readers, as the author also talked about it as a possibility in her first letter to Christie (Kür, 1990c), and this was to be done with the help of Talât Sait Halman. Halman was in the U.S. at the time, teaching courses on Turkish literature in the New York University (Tan, 2015) and writing articles and book reviews in the *World Literature Today*, an established international literary magazine that also published translations. He was focusing on translations of Turkish literature, especially of its women authors, in the Anglo-American literary field (Akbatır, 2011). Since the name of Dağyeli Verlag as a prospective publisher was already mentioned early in the correspondence (Christie, 1990c; Kezban, 1990), Halman was possibly going to try and get the translated short story into the magazine or write a review for the book to be published in the *World Literature Today* and make an initial contribution to the English translation’s reception in an international magazine.

Nevertheless, new concerns had already arisen during the process on the part of the translator, particularly regarding issues related to payment and the publication of the short story by Dağyeli Verlag. On January 11, 1991, Christie (1991a) writes, “Up to a few days ago, my bank account had not yet been credited with any sum

from Germany”, meaning from Dağyeli Verlag that was supposed to pay the translator back in October 1990 (Christie, 1990c). Dağyeli Verlag was founded by the journalist and activist Yıldırım Dağyeli and with the efforts of “a group of Turkish intellectuals some of whom had fled before the 1980 military coup” and have published “exiled authors, classics of Turkish literature, and writers from the Soviet Union” (Dağyeli Verlag, n.d.).⁴⁷ Although most of its publications are translations into German, I have also found several publications in Turkish and in English, especially in the form bilingual and trilingual editions. Nevertheless, despite “an initial period of success, the publishing house had to cease its operations in 1991” (Dağyeli Verlag, n.d.). The reason behind this is not clearly explained on the website but merely touched upon as “the times were not favorable” (Dağyeli Verlag, n.d.).

On April 28, 1992, Christie decides to write to Kür whom she hoped would provide her with some information:

Since July 1991 I’ve heard nothing directly from Kezban Akcalı. At that time she wrote that Dağyeli Verlag would be sending me a cheque by the end of July. Nothing arrived. I then heard indirectly that there had been a problem with Mr (?) Verlag in Germany but I’ve heard nothing since from Kezban. (Christie, 1992)

Christie further explains her disappointment at not getting a “financial acknowledgement” for the “care and time” she spent while “translating such a good story” (Christie, 1992). As it was discussed above, Christie’s interest in translation practice is mostly an intellectual activity, based on a personal interest and further encouraged by recommendations of books, which would result in symbolic capital. Thus, as she states in an interview, the reason has “seldom” been related to “financial reward” although she “was not at all averse to this form of recognition!” (Demirkol Ertürk, 2010, p. 286), which once again underlines the importance of economic

⁴⁷ I used a machine translation tool to translate the relevant information taken from Dağyeli Verlag’s website from German into English.

capital in translation practice. Therefore, the publishing house not only failed her in publishing her translation but also did not make any payment to the translator, which deprived her of both forms of capital. Moreover, in the letter, Christie further expresses her hope that “the whole business has been overlooked in the stress of an agent’s life” (Christie, 1992), underlining that the literary agent Akçalı also left the translator in the dark for months.

The last letter written by Kür sheds some light upon this issue. Kür (1992b) informs Christie that Dağyeli Verlag held the translation copyrights of Kür’s book *Bir Deli Ağaç* for “more than three years” and was interested in publishing Christie’s translation as well. Moreover, the author was in a similar position as she also did not get any payment from the publishing house (Kür, 1992b). However, since she was the author and had closer connections to Akçalı, she was informed, at least to some extent, on the subject. The reason behind Dağyeli Verlag’s failure to publish the translation and pay her fee to Christie is also revealed by Kür, who notes that “Dağyeli Verlag seems to have gone bankrupt” (Kür, 1992b). Therefore, Akçalı canceled their contract with the publishing house, although it was unknown whether Akçalı was able to “get the texts from him,” possibly meaning from Yıldırım Dağyeli, the founder and owner of Dağyeli Verlag (Kür, 1992b). Although she had some information on the subject, Kür was also left in the dark by her agent since she last heard from her “six months ago” when Akçalı told her that “she was trying to get another publisher for the German translation” (Kür, 1992b). This suggests that the story was going to be published in German as well, possibly in the form of a multilingual book, since the publishing house had a practice of publishing such works at the time.

Kür further explains to Christie:

Kezban *led me to believe* that you would try and get the story into a periodical in England and keep half of the royalty for yourself. Eventually, when she found a new publisher, you would get additional payment – and, hopefully, a commission to translate the rest of the book. (...) Unfortunately, my own enlightenment goes not further than this. I very much want to see the book published in English, and *I'm seriously wondering whether I don't need a new agent*. (Kür, 1992b)⁴⁸

Therefore, both the author and the translator have been failed by the same third parties in the process. Moreover, the mutual trust between Kür and her literary agent who represented her was broken, which entails grave problems for an author.

The problems related to Dağyeli Verlag further illustrate that, even after long discussions and a collaboration between the author and the translator, which finally yield to a satisfactory end-product, other agents in the field, especially institutional ones, still hold the power to hinder the publication process as the decision-making bodies. In addition, it is important to point out that the publication of Christie's translation project was hampered by an urgency, that is, the "bankruptcy" of Dağyeli Verlag. This also underlines that prolonged discussions that arise from author-translation collaborations cause delays in the translation process, which further affect the publication process since the publishers also have busy schedules and, as it was seen in this case, may encounter serious problems that might lead to a sudden halt in their operations.

Years later, Christie's translation, *A Crazy Tree*, which consisted only of the eponymous short story, was finally published as a standalone book in 2004 by Epsilon, as part of its series "Turkish Literature by Quotations" which offered a glimpse into the works of various authors in the Turkish literary field by publishing their shorter works.⁴⁹ This also shows that the short story was published with the title

⁴⁸ Emphasis added.

⁴⁹ No further information could be found regarding the series objective. It is only known that it precedes TEDA which was initiated in 2005. I emailed the publishing house and asked if they could provide or direct me to more information on the series. However, I could not get a response.

that was originally proposed by the translator and not with the one suggested by the author. Considering that even the final draft had four different versions with different titles and Kür was expected to select among them, the title discussion was never resolved, and Christie was persistent about her choice (Christie, 1991c).

Nevertheless, since no further correspondence was found in the archive specifically covering the period between Kür's last letter and the short story's publication, there is no information on her involvement in this second publication process or her thoughts on the chosen title. The only notable connection appears in "The Bibliography of Translated Works of Turkish Literature into English" (Akbatır, 2024), which lists various English translations of Turkish literary works published by Epsilon in 2004 and 2005, including translations by Ruth Christie and Işıl Kür, who is Pınar Kür's sister. This suggests that Kür may have had knowledge of the series through her sister, although no further information is available on this connection.

Therefore, Christie's translation efforts also reveal a collaborative endeavour at both the translation and the publication levels, in which Pınar Kür, Kezban Akçalı, and Talât Sait Halman appear as key agents. Her work can be viewed as part of the broader collective efforts to translate women's literature that marked the 1980s and 1990s, a period when Kür was a popular author with significant symbolic capital. Although, at an individual level, Christie favors collaboration in her translatorial practice, her perception of it was mainly shaped by co-translation practices with fellow translators at the time where both parties were equals in terms of position. Therefore, the hierarchical power dynamics that is commonly found in author-translator collaboration offered a different experience, which compelled Christie to compromise. In order to prove the "quality" of her translation and justify her

translational decisions to Kür, Christie relied on the feedback from native speakers on her translation, thereby recognizing reception as a criterion for quality assessment.

Kür's dual identity as an author-translator, on the other hand, further complicated the process since her translational eye and authorial reservations worked hand in hand. The prolonged discussions over various elements in the translated text led to significant delays, which were among the main reasons behind the failure of the initial publication plan. Another one was the bankruptcy of the translation's prospective publisher, Dağyeli Verlag. Along with Kür and Christie's concerns about payment, Dağyeli Verlag's bankruptcy further emphasized the importance of economic capital in translation practices. Moreover, although the short story was published as a standalone book years after the initiation of the process, the rest of the book is yet to be translated and published in English. The absence of a book-length translation in English also hindered further translations through relay translation and, ultimately, a wider, international recognition of Kür's works in the Anglophone literary field.

5.3 *Asılacak Kadın* in French: Ferda Fidan's symbolic capital and practice as a translator

Another translation event that can be traced in the archive is the French translation of Pınar Kür's acclaimed novel *Asılacak Kadın* by the translator Ferda Fidan. The project was initiated in 1991 by Publisud, a publishing house based in France, as part of the series "Des Orient," which was planned to feature translations of works of "Eastern" literature. However, although three books have been published as part of Des Orient series to this day, Fidan's translation does not appear among them. The correspondence between Pınar Kür, Ferda Fidan, and other agents involved in the

process reveals that Publisud did not go through with the publication. After the initial plan had failed, the translation was taken in by *ANKA: Revue d'Art de Litterature de Turquie*, a literary magazine focusing on Türkiye's arts and literary scenes. Only a small part of the novel appeared in *ANKA*'s "Le roman turc" (The Turkish Novel) issue in 1992. The correspondence in the archive has proved to be a fundamental source for tracing the power dynamics between these various agents involved in the translation and publication processes. Moreover, on a broader scale, this project also offers an insight into the restricted field of Turkish literature and its various agents in the French literary field in the 1980s and early 1990s.

Before moving on to what the correspondence reveals, it is important to take a closer look at the various agents involved in the translation process of *Asılacak Kadın* as well as the restricted field of Turkish literature in the literary field of France in the 1990s. The most prominent agent in this case is Ferda Fidan, who has translated significant works by established authors of Turkish literature since his first translation of a poem by Ahmet Haşim, which dates back to his high school years (Lajus, 2020a). In his interview with Lajus, Fidan states that he also translated a short story by Aziz Nesin into French, which was published in *Le Monde* with the title "Les Trois Sentinelles" in 1984 (Lajus, 2020a; Nesin, 1984). However, his visits to *Le Monde*'s office in Paris introduced him to Frédéric Gaussen, "who advised [Fidan] to turn to novels" in his future translations, explaining that short stories were not "in demand" in France, that they received little recognition, and that the newspaper was also "planning to stop publishing them" (Lajus, 2020a, my translation from French). This shift is also reflected in his preference to translate a novel by Kür, unlike Mizanoğlu Reddy and Christie who preferred to translate short stories. Moreover, after introducing himself to Aziz Nesin at a book signing event and not

receiving the praise or even the recognition that he expected from the author, except for a simple “Oh, so that was you,” Fidan was also left disappointed (Lajus, 2020a). Therefore, he possibly wanted to work on larger-scale projects, like book-length translations, which would bring him more recognition as a translator. While his initial approach to translating novels was based on a “personal interest” and self-initiative, this also changed in 1992, the year he published his translation of Yusuf Atılgan’s *L’Hôtel de la Mère Patrie*, “with the publishers and authors contacting [him]” to commission “various projects” (Lajus, 2020a).

The catalog of the National Library of France lists the following translations in French by Fidan, which shows that he has been at his most prolific since the 2000s, while also having translated works with significant symbolic capital in the Turkish literary field during the late 1980s and 1990s, a period in which he was working on his translation of *Asılacak Kadın* as well: *L’Étranger* (1989) by Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu; *L’Hôtel de la Mère Patrie* (1992) by Yusuf Atılgan; *Atlas des continents brumeux* (2001) by İhsan Oktay Anar; *Amer savoir: une tentative de roman sur l’art de la fugue* (2002) by Enis Batur; *Le traité de mécanique: les vies incroyables et joviales des ingénieurs d’antan* (2004) by İhsan Oktay Anar; *Mani est vivant!* (2005) by Özdemir İnce; *D’autres chemins: récits* (2008) by Enis Batur; *Ankara* (2008) by Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu; *Le tyran et le poète* (2009) by Özdemir İnce; *Histoire de la littérature turque du XIXe siècle* (2011, co-translated with Faruk Bilici, Catherine Erikan, and Gül Mete-Yuva) by Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar; *Istanbul était un conte* (2011) by Mario Levi; *Encyclopédie privée* (2011) by Enis Batur; *Nuit d’absinthe* (2013) by Ayfer Tunç; *Le sultan de Byzance* (2013) by Selçuk Altun; *L’homme désœuvré* (2014) by Yusuf Atılgan; *La toile blanche* (2014) by F. Tülin; *À quoi bon la révolution si je ne peux danser* (2016) by Ece Temelkuran; *Les*

gilets de sauvetage: réflexions poétiques (2020) by Özdemir İnce; *Trois chambres, une caserne: roman-mémoires* (2021) by Şule Türker; and *Un fou rire d'opéra: suivi de Cinquante moèmes primeur pour la jeunesse* (2022) by Özdemir İnce.

Another important agent involved in the publication process of *Asılacak Kadın* is Timour Muhidine, a translator and publisher of Turkish literature and professor of Turkish language. Muhidine has been recognized for his contribution to the circulation of Turkish literature in the French literary field through his connections with literary magazines and publishing houses, and especially by working on the special series of these publishing houses dedicated to translations of Turkish literature. Among these, Actes Sud stands out with its “La Bibliothèque turque” (Turkish library) series which was initiated by Stephane Yerasimos in 1998 and lived on with the efforts of Levent Yılmaz and Timour Muhidine (Demirkol, 2010, pp. 100-101). Gouanvic (2005) points out that “publishing translations in special series has the effect of putting translations at a distance, as though in a gesture of respect” (p. 154). In this regard, these series can be recognized as part of the productions in the restricted field of Turkish literature in the French literary system, where the competition for a higher and precisely intellectual symbolic capital is sought by the agents of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1993). Eventually, once it is “discovered by the national literary field,” a restricted field becomes “integrated into general series and assimilated in the literary field” (Gouanvic, 2005, p. 154).

Although Muhidine is now a well-known figure as the director of the “Lettres turques” (Turkish literature) series of the same publishing house that is dedicated to the contemporary authors of Turkish literature, his endeavors of literary translation date back to 1985, and especially to the foundation of the literary magazine *ANKA* in 1986 (Lajus, 2020b). As it will be discussed in detail below, *ANKA* circulated French

translations of Turkish literature for ten years with the contributions of other significant intellectual figures of Turkish origin, such as Ataoğlu Behramoğlu and Nedim Gürsel, who then lived in France (Lajus, 2020b). Muhidine states that *ANKA* was particularly interested in supporting the “younger generation of translators”, including Ferda Fidan, Anne-Marie Toscan du Plantier, Stéphane Dudoignon, and Muhidine himself, who was surprised at his “sudden” promotion to the position of editor-in-chief of the magazine (Lajus, 2020b, my translation from French). Therefore, it was in the 1980s and through his position at *ANKA* that Muhidine found himself at the heart of these translation and publication activities.

The restricted field of translated literature in France, on the other hand, had been built on a web of relations from 1905, the year *Anthologie de l'amour turc*, the first “notable” translation from Turkish to French in the literary field, was published, to the 1980s (Muhidine, 1998, p. 166).⁵⁰ In this extended period during which translated titles appeared “sporadically”, Turkish authors who lived in France at the time benefited from their personal relations with various agents in the literary field, especially with “potential translators,” which led to the appearance of these “French versions” while “major novelists remained unpublished” (Muhidine, 1998, p. 166). Nevertheless, these translations had a “limited impact” in terms of reception (Muhidine, 1998, p. 166). In this period, “three editorial milestones mark the appearance of Turkish literature in French until the 1980s”, and these are translations of works by three authors: Nâzım Hikmet, Mahmut Makal, and Yaşar Kemal (Muhidine, 1998, p. 167). As was previously discussed in this chapter, the poetry of Nâzım Hikmet has been translated into French, thanks to the efforts of various people

⁵⁰ Any reference to Muhidine’s writings provided in this section is my translation from French.

and institutions, among which Münevver Andaç had a special position.⁵¹ Mahmut Makal and Yaşar Kemal, on the other hand, were leading figures who focused on the Anatolian landscape and its people, instead of the “city” and upper-class circles which had been at the heart of Turkish literature up to that point, although from different perspectives. The village literature gained its momentum after the education reforms of the Republican era, which resulted in higher literacy and a closer and curious look at the realities of the countryside by authors not only from the village but also from the city. Makal pioneered this movement, portraying the ruthless realities of the village while Kemal complemented this portrayal with the “richness of traditions” in the Anatolian culture (Muhidine, 1998, p. 167).

Beginning in the 1980s, this approach was replaced by both individual and institutional endeavors to present a more comprehensive portrayal of Turkish literature in French. A pioneering figure in these endeavors is Nedim Gürsel, whose “permanent presence in Paris” as an author, an essayist, and the editor of several publications, thus, in general, as an influential figure, changed the “fixed image of an essentially political or rural literature” (Muhidine, 1998, p. 167). Gürsel later published a compilation of short stories by Turkish women authors, *Paroles Devoilées: Les femmes turques écrivent*, published in 1993 in collaboration with UNESCO, which also included one of Kür’s short stories, “Kısa Yol Yolcusu”, translated into French (“Les Petits Trajets”) by Süleyman Durmaz. In the preface and the introductory essay of *Paroles Devoilées*, both Nedim Gürsel (1993a) and Güzin Dino (1981/1993) emphasize the role of Republican reforms in the representation of two marginalized groups in Turkish society: authors from the countryside and women. According to them, it was the educational reforms that enabled the

⁵¹ This is also emphasized by Demirkol (2010) as Andaç translated 30 books between 1962 and 2002 (p. 97).

flourishing of rural literature, and the Kemalist ideology that granted women better social and political status, which together allowed these voices to gain prominence in Turkish literature. These are the voices of two social groups who were “silenced the longest” and who also represented “the two most striking and original literary currents of the past twenty years” (Dino, 1981/1993, p. 8, my translation from French).

Moreover, although “it was not until the 1950s that they found their voice” (Gürsel, 1993a, p. 16, my translation from French) and although this voice was not exactly a “feminist” one, women authors offered “a more complete and faithful reflection” of the Turkish society and they did this “at multiple levels of writing, from the conscious to the unconscious, from the most lucid image to most delirious fantasies” (Dino, 1981/1993, p. 9, my translation from French). Therefore, the appearance of these pioneering works by Turkish women authors was a significant step in the ultimate goal of offering a more complete portrayal of contemporary Turkish literature in French.

In addition to Publisud (which has an influential role both in this case and in its collaboration with UNESCO to publish Turkish literature in French), publishing houses such as Éditions Fata Morgana and Gallimard, which initially published the well-known names and works of Turkish literature, also later turned to contemporary literature. They were followed by others such as Flammarion, Actes Sud, Harmattan, Stock, Le Seuil, and Albin Michel, which also showed an interest in publishing translations of more various contemporary works of Turkish literature since the 1980s and 1990s (Muhidine, 1998). Pursuing the same goal, an influential literary magazine, *ANKA: Revue d'Art et de Littérature de Turquie*, came into the scene in 1986, as it was mentioned above, expressing its dedication to discovering

contemporary Turkish literature in its diversity and publishing “the greatest number of texts bilingually” which could be achieved only in the poetry issues of the magazine (Muhidine, 1998, p. 168). *ANKA* published 30 issues, the latest of which appeared in 1997, its thematic issues focusing on diverse subjects, varying from well-known literary figures to specific genres and movements of Turkish literature.

Publisud’s series “Des Orients,” the main objective of which was initially described as “publishing Turkish, and also Arab and Iranian authors”, was launched with Demir Özlü’s *Hallucination à Berlin*, appearing in December 1993. The original plan was to publish this title and at least four translated titles in total by Turkish authors by the end of 1992 (Muhidine, 1991), which, as it appears, could not be achieved within the preorganized schedule. One of these titles was Pınar Kür’s novel *Asılacak Kadın*. The correspondence between Pınar Kür, Ferda Fidan, Timour Muhidine, and Nejat Firuz reveals that Nedim Gürsel, whose significant role in the field was previously explained, was the first to inform Pınar Kür about the series and the ongoing translation and inclusion of *Asılacak Kadın* in its publication program (Muhidine, 1991). However, it was only after Nejat Firuz, a translator and a friend of Kür who then lived in Paris, reached out to Timour Muhidine (Firuz, 1991), the editor of the series at Publisud, on behalf of Kür that Muhidine provided her with further information regarding the project: It was initiated by a translator named Ferda Fidan, who had sent his initial translation draft of *Asılacak Kadın*, which consisted of around nine pages, to Muhidine in July 1991, and the publishing house took it in. However, no official contract was made with the translator as they did not have the author’s authorization and her verification of the “quality” of the initial draft (Firuz, 1991; Muhidine, 1991).

Fidan was expected to inform Kür after the translation was taken in to get her approval and authorization. However, his delay in initiating a conversation led Kür to start the conversation herself. As previously discussed, Kür often had certain reservations about her translations and showed a tendency to collaborate with her translators, which would enable her to have a supervisory role in the process. It would also give her certain control over her image to be introduced to the target literary field by translations of her works, which would eventually affect her symbolic capital as an author in a foreign literary system. This explains her enthusiasm to learn more about the process and to be involved in it. Her request is also encouraged by Muhidine, who assured her that “[i]n any case, it goes without saying that you will be able to review the translation to be done”, which was yet to be completed, and that it was her “natural right” to do so (Muhidine, 1991, my translation from French).

Firuz and Muhidine’s letters, as well as Fidan’s own letters to Kür, reveals an important insight into the position and role of translators as well, which is reflected in the portrayal, and especially in the self-introduction of translators. Moreover, this portrayal also sheds light upon the assessment of translatorial symbolic capital at that period. First, both Firuz and Muhidine provide information on Fidan, who was to undertake the translation of Kür’s *Asılacak Kadın*, including references to his past work and recognition as a translator. For instance, in the accounts of both Firuz and Muhidine, there is a special reference to Fidan’s experience of having translated works by well-recognized names in the Turkish literary field, such as Yakup Kadri and Yusuf Atılgan (Firuz, 1991; Muhidine, 1991). Moreover, it is also underlined that Fidan has translated not just any other work but the widely acclaimed works by these authors, which are *Yaban* and *Anayurt Oteli*. These two works also share some

characteristics, such as presenting social commentary and tackling the theme of isolation from different perspectives. Besides Yakup Kadri and Yusuf Atılgan, Fidan, was then also known for his translations of several short stories by Aziz Nesin (Muhidine, 1991; Lajus, 2020a). Therefore, at the time of this correspondence, he had already proven his success as the translator of significant works and authors of his time.

This was complemented by “the quality of the few pages” of the first translation draft of *Asılacak Kadın* that Fidan had sent to Publisud., which was found promising enough that it could persuade Muhidine and other decision-making agents in the publishing house to take in his translation (Muhidine, 1991). It is important to point out that, as he mentions in his interview, Fidan was translating these works out of personal interest and often was not commissioned by any publisher (Lajus, 2020a). Moreover, as it was discussed above, his special interest in translating novels was also the result of his disappointment at the reception of his previous translations of short stories, which could not provide him with the intellectual recognition, thus the symbolic capital, that he aimed at. This further explains his interest in translating a popular novel by Kür, as it was promising in terms of bringing him more recognition.

As it can be observed above, in several years, especially during the 2000s, Fidan became a prolific translator of Turkish literature into French, whose efforts were finally recognized in the intellectual sphere. However, at the time, Fidan was not very different from other “young” and “good” translators working in a market that presents them “few offers” while trying to “attract the attention of publishers who are already overwhelmed with propositions in other languages and are sometimes reluctant to look into the ‘treasures’ of a literature that seems

uninteresting or too local to them” (Muhidine, 1998, p. 171, my translation from French). The only difference was that Fidan had gained a certain symbolic capital from his previous translations and was given the opportunity to translate another Turkish author by a publishing house already interested in publishing contemporary Turkish literature.

In Fidan’s first letter to Pınar Kür, he also benefits from this portrayal, referring to his translations of these well-known names, and introduces himself as “a Turkish citizen living in France for thirteen years,” providing a background that enables him to establish necessary connections with publishing houses without intermediaries (Fidan, 1991, my translation from Turkish). Moreover, he also explains the motives that led him to take up the translation of Turkish literature, and, more specifically, Kür’s novel, which gives an insight into his *telos*:

I have been working on translations to make a contribution, as best as I can, to the promotion of Turkish literature here [in France]. So far, I have translated several stories by Aziz Nesin, and the novels *Yaban* by Yakup Kadri and *Anayurt Oteli* by Yusuf Atılgan. Recently, I have been working on your work *Asılacak Kadın*, which I admire very much. Publisud, the publishing house in Paris, is already determined to publish your book. (Fidan, 1991, my translation from Turkish)

Therefore, Fidan had two main motives, which led him to take up the task of translating *Asılacak Kadın*. One of them is a personal motivation, which Fidan explains as his “admiration” of Kür’s novel. The other, and the primary reason behind his interest, was his agenda to promote Turkish literature in the French literary system through translation, which makes the translation of Kür’s novel a single small-scale project in a bigger-scale plan.

Accordingly, the issue of the literary magazine *Anka*, in which an excerpt from Fidan’s translation was later published, is also dedicated to the “Turkish novel,” providing a chronological portrayal of the genre’s development in Türkiye and

offering translations of representative works from different periods by various authors. Among these authors, Pınar Kür appears, through Fidan's translation, as one of the novelists of the 1970s who differ from their contemporaries "not because they lack any political concerns" but because of their focus on the "individual," which Kür tackles through the themes of "solitude" and "isolation" in *Asılacak Kadın* (Semizoğlu, 1992, p. 117, my translation from French). Therefore, the translation of *Asılacak Kadın* also entails translating a representative work that enables a more comprehensive portrayal of Turkish literature in French, which not only explains the reason behind Fidan's text selection but also aligns with both publishers', first Publisud's and then *Anka*'s, agendas.

Moreover, *Asılacak Kadın* also has a special position among its contemporaries since it openly deals with subjects such as women's sexuality, rape, and sexual perversion that were considered taboo in "a society that remained quite prudish" and because of its denunciation of such taboos, *Asılacak Kadın* "caused the biggest stir" at the time (Muhidine, 1992, pp. 184-185, my translation from French). In fact, as Kür repeatedly states in her interviews, the novel was banned in Türkiye on the grounds of "obscenity" in 1985, an accusation that was raised due to the explicit descriptions of sexual intercourse, which actually occurs in the form of abuse. Therefore, since Muhidine also underlines the "stir" caused by the novel in *Anka*, its status as a "once-banned" novel was also intriguing, and publishing such a novel also had certain ideological implications. The fact that *Publisud* and later *Anka* were still interested in publishing *Asılacak Kadın* also shows their approach to censorship and how it would, otherwise, hinder their ultimate goal of offering a "complete portrayal" of Turkish literature in French.

In addition, the correspondence between Fidan and Kür reveals insights into the translation process of *Asılacak Kadın*, where one can trace the possible challenges foreseen by the author, her suggestions to Fidan regarding these challenges, and Fidan's own experience working on the text. These insights are especially important since they do not appear in the translated text, as it is the "end product" and, thus, can only be unearthed in paratextual materials, which are, in this case, letters. As only a small part of the work was eventually translated and published in *ANKA*, it is not unusual that Fidan, as a "young translator", was not given the opportunity to write a foreword, an introduction or any kind of commentary for his translation. Therefore, it is only through the letters one can learn about his initial thoughts on the process as well as his response to the author's comments regarding the translation-related challenges that the text presents.

As the author of the text and also a translator herself, Kür can make predictions regarding the "problematic" parts of the work that could present certain challenges in the text's translation into French. In fact, in her first letter to Fidan, she immediately suggests that "translating this text will be truly difficult" although she would "most certainly be pleased to see [it] published in French" (Kür, 1992a, my translation from Turkish). She further explains that this novel challenged her the most in the writing process in terms of its language, especially in terms of its usage of different dialects, which she was able to create only after numerous interviews with people who actually speak that dialect (Kür, 1992a). She then expresses her concerns about how Fidan would convey this dialect-related complexity of the language in his translation. She asks if he will use *patois*, a dialect associated with the people in rural France, or a dialect that immigrants in France speak, and also how he will convey the sentences that are originally in French but phonetically written in

Turkish (e.g., “el sapel jozef” (Elle s’appelle Joseph)) in the text (Kür, 1992a). Kür also gives an insight into the development of the main character’s, Melek’s language use and how changes in her environment also affect her language. Eventually, although she suggests that he would benefit more from a native speaker’s critiques on his translation, she also offers to help Fidan on these or any other issues (Kür, 1992a).

Fidan also agrees with the author that the translation of this text is not going to be an easy task but adds that this is “the most interesting” thing about working on a translation (Fidan, 1992a, my translation from Turkish), which shows his dedication and enthusiasm to overcome the challenges. Moreover, he also sheds light upon the methods that he will adopt to overcome them. He explains that he does not intend to use *patois* or immigrant dialect as it is impossible for *patois* “to be understood outside the region (or even the village) it is spoken in” and “the immigrant dialect is full of errors” whereas “Turkish is Melek’s mother tongue” and “it is not a language that is completely impossible to understand although it can be challenging for those who don’t speak the Middle Anatolian dialect” (Fidan, 1992a, my translation from Turkish). This shows the translator’s attention to detail and his well-developed analysis of the character as well as the language of the text. Eventually, he offers a solution that is different from those of the author, as he suggests that he could use the regional, rural dialect. To present an initial portrayal of his translatorial methods put to use and not to make the author wait any longer, he also sends a draft translation of the first page of *Asılacak Kadın*, asking Kür for her feedback and promising to send longer parts of the translation.

However, because of miscommunication between the author and the translator, the project comes to a halt after about a year. After not receiving the rest of

the translation that the translator promised to send, Kür (1992d) reaches out to Fidan to inquire about the fate of the translation. This correspondence reveals that Timour Muhidine was to leave Publisud, which made the author concerned about whether the translation project had been postponed or canceled altogether. Since it was Muhidine who was responsible for the series in which the translation of *Asılacak Kadın* was supposed to appear, the author likely attributed the halt in the project to his departure.

Moreover, after not inquiring about the progress of the translation for about a year, Kür's interest in this project was re-sparked by an upcoming literary event, Les Belles Étrangères, which was to take place in France in May 1993, and Kür was among the ten authors who were invited to participate in that edition (Kür, 1992d). Les Belles Étrangères was a prestigious literary festival which was organized by Centre national du livre (CNL) with the support of the Ministry of Culture in France every year between 1987 and 2010. Therefore, it was the perfect medium for promoting a newly published translation which was also emphasized by the author in her letter to Fidan as she also advised him to share this information with the people at the publishing house who "would be interested in benefiting from a nationwide promotion" through CNL's support, and Kür was certain that this would "speed up" the process (Kür, 1992d, my translation from Turkish). Being invited to such an event indicated a certain privilege and recognition on the part of the author, thus a certain symbolic capital, and also entailed the promise of selling more books through such promotion, which was the implication behind Kür's encouragement.

In addition, although the author merely suggests that she would also benefit from having a published translation of her work in French at the time of her participation, and does not delve into details in her letter, it is nonetheless clear that a published translation would have attracted more immediate interest from French-

speaking readers and from other prospective publishers who might have been interested in Kür's works, which had yet to be translated into French at the time. Therefore, with the help of this event, Kür could have made her debut in the French literary field as an already accessible author who was willing to introduce more of her works to curious readers. Accordingly, in the same letter, Kür asks whether Fidan would also be willing to translate one or two stories from her short story books, which she sent to the translator along with her letter, suggesting that their translations could be used in the "reading sessions" at the literary festival Les Belles Étrangères. In this way, they could also be presented to "publishers with the aim of getting all of them translated and published in the future" (Kür, 1992d, my translation from Turkish).

Nevertheless, despite Kür's suspicions, the reason behind the delay in the project did not result from a decline of interest or willingness on the part of the publisher. It is revealed that Fidan was discouraged after receiving no response from the author to the letter in which he explained his solutions to the challenges she had foreseen, in addition to sending a one-page draft (Fidan, 1992b) along with the letter so that Kür could see his translatorial strategies at work (Fidan, 1993a). This led him to put the project aside, believing that the author did not reply to him because she found his translation "inadequate" (Fidan, 1993a, my translation from Turkish).

This reveals an interesting portrayal of the subservience in the translatorial habitus, which makes the translator dependent on approval from the author, as it was also seen in Fidan's interaction with Aziz Nesin, as explained above. Because of this subservience, the translation process was hindered by delays and could only be continued after Kür's letter of inquiry, which indicates a sign of approval that was sought by the translator. This delay also results in a demanding schedule for the

translator, as Fidan had less than four months to complete the translation so that it could be published and ready to be promoted at the event. Although Fidan was willing to meet this deadline, he was not sure whether the publishing house would agree or be able to publish it on such short notice (Fidan, 1993a). As for Kür's request regarding the translations of her short stories, Fidan only promised to get back to her about it (Fidan, 1993a). Again, this could be linked to his reluctance to work on the translations of short stories, which is tied to his experience of lack of recognition in his translatorial experience.

After this letter, there is a five-month gap in the correspondence. Therefore, it is not possible to trace the process during which Fidan was supposed to contact the publishing house, learn about the possibility of publishing the translation at the end of April 1993 and complete the translation within this timeframe. Nevertheless, the letters written in the summer of 1993 shed some light upon this gap, along with other information found through additional research outside the archive, as they provide some clues as to what might have led to the failure of Publisud's publication project and later to the collaboration with *ANKA*. Moreover, these letters also reveal an insight into the power dynamics between the translator and the publisher, where the latter's editorial interference with the translated text results in a "mistake" that is falsely attributed to the translator by the author, eventually resulting in a conflict in the process.

On 13 June 1993, Fidan starts his letter by expressing his joy about how he could finally meet Kür in person thanks to *Les Belles Étrangères*. However, he also expresses his resentment towards Kür regarding some comments that she had shared with him in a letter about the misuse of punctuation in the translated text:

You should have guessed that I wouldn't make such a rookie mistake with the punctuation... The stuff that you mentioned, like commas and question

marks, were added by writers at ANKA, who have a remarkable understanding of literature. What's more, they didn't even consult me at all!.. They must have thought that my typewriter didn't have these symbols. And this is nothing but disrespect and ignorance... (Fidan, 1993b, my translation from Turkish)

As can be seen in this case, because of the magazine's editorial interference to Fidan's translation, the translator ended up in a difficult position where he was blamed for a mistake that was not his. The fact that the writers at *ANKA* did not consult the translator also shows a lack of recognition and trust on their part, which evidently offended the translator. Since the translated text is the translator's intellectual property, Fidan expected to be consulted about any interference with it, while the publishing agents failed to recognize his agency. On the other hand, it is possible that the writers at ANKA might not have been familiar with the novel, which could explain the disregard for the tools and techniques the author uses. However, in any case, it is evident that they also did not trust the translator and consider the possibility that these "mistakes" might be deliberate choices. Instead, they chose to revise Fidan's translation according to certain standards of punctuation and make "corrections" without prior consultation with the translator.

However, punctuation, or lack of it, is not an arbitrary element in Kür's novel. On the contrary, it has a special function that affects the pace of the novel, its register, and complements the flow of the characters' thoughts, which the author conveys by employing the technique of stream of consciousness. Therefore, a change in the text's punctuation disrupts this flow, which the translator seems to be well aware of, as opposed to the writers at *ANKA*, since he reassures the author that he would "surely try to preserve the punctuation of the original as much as possible" (Fidan, 1993b, my translation from Turkish). As an attachment to this letter, Fidan also sends the initial draft of the text (Fidan, 1993c), the version not revised and

“corrected” by *ANKA*, to the author so that they can work on it together and make necessary changes (Fidan, 1993b).

In his subsequent letter, Fidan once again complains about being reduced to a position that made him look like an “ignorant translator” because of “ANKA’s ridiculous approach” (Fidan, 1993d, my translation from Turkish). Although Fidan does not provide any details regarding this “ridiculous” approach, it is possible that the magazine had its own rules for spelling and punctuation, which they applied to each text without considering the formal elements of each text, such as style and register. Since they sent their “revised” version of the text directly to the author, Kür must have thought that Fidan did not understand the importance of this element in the text, which further justifies Fidan’s concerns about being labeled as “ignorant”. In fact, this interference and lack of consultation even led the translator to reconsider working with the same publisher on any other future projects, or trusting any revisions made by the publisher, “at least not unless they [would] promise not to make any changes” (Fidan, 1993d, my translation from Turkish). Moreover, such interference also raises questions about the agency of translators over the texts they translate. Although any issue related to the translated text is attributed solely to the translator, various agents play a role in the translation process, during which the text also changes. However, these changes and interventions often go unnoticed, especially if the only source available is the final product.

Another example of a text-related issue that becomes a subject of conversation between the translator and the author includes the translation of culture-specific and context-specific elements in the text, such as idioms and certain expressions (Fidan, 1993d). One such expression in the text is “kalem kırmak” which means “to break a pen”, related to the actual gesture of a judge breaking his pen after

awarding the death sentence to a defendant. The expression is used in the excerpt that depicts the scene where Melek is sentenced to death, having been convicted of murdering her ex-husband. The gesture of breaking the pen in this context suggests that the judge has declared his final judgment. Additionally, in this context, since this final judgment entails taking away the life of a person, the pen becomes symbolically tainted with that person's "blood" and should not be used again for other purposes and decisions.

However, this expression and gesture do not exist in French culture, creating a challenge for the translator. Accordingly, Fidan suggests that "[t]he most challenging thing in translation is finding equivalents for idioms related to cultural traditions. Since such a tradition does not exist in France, translating it becomes quite difficult..." (Fidan, 1993d, my translation from Turkish). Eventually, Fidan translates this sentence as "Le crayon s'est cassé", which roughly translates to "The pen is broken" in English. Nevertheless, it seems that Kür was not pleased with this translation as Fidan tries to justify his word choice and the usage of the passive voice in the sentence, explaining that "crayon" is the general term used for pens and pencils and, thus, does not suggest a single type of pen. He also notes that using passive voice in this sentence is also a correct usage in French (Fidan, 1993d). Since "it is not possible to find a perfect solution," Fidan thinks that the best solution would be to "add a note [possibly a footnote] to the text which explains this tradition," which he thinks is "inevitable" (Fidan, 1993d, my translation from Turkish). Moreover, he also suggests that, since "there seems to be a lot of such nuances to be discussed," they better "come together and work on it side by side" if they can "find the time" (Fidan, 1993d, my translation from Turkish). Nevertheless, it was difficult to realize this plan since Fidan then was about to move to Paris from

Grenoble and did not have the time to visit Kür in Türkiye (Fidan, 1993d). However, it is also evident that the translator was eager to collaborate with the author and even work with her side by side, which would not only speed up the process but also help the translator come up with a text that the author would approve.

Although it does not seem as crucial and illuminating compared to other insights that the letters provide, Fidan and Kür's correspondence also traces the flourishing of a friendship between the author and the translator, who did not know each other before the project. This also affected the dynamics of their professional relationship. The letter that Fidan sent to Kür after they had met in person at the literary event *Les Belles Étrangères*, where Fidan expands on his resentment towards Kür about the punctuation issue, is also reflective of this change. Although it is natural for the translator to receive a critique from the author, the friendship between them makes this critique more damaging on a personal level.

Moreover, besides translation-related issues, they also share personal details from their daily lives, such as Fidan's being preoccupied with his lectures and his distress about moving from Grenoble to Paris for his new position, as a professor of modern literature, at Académie de Versailles. These preoccupations in the translator's daily life are also important since they could prevent him from working on the translation, as can be seen in his having difficulty arranging a visit to Istanbul so that he can work together, in person, with Kür on the text. Similarly, Fidan's residence in France also caused delays in their communication, and thus in the translation of the text, since it took longer to exchange letters between different countries.

In his letter dated June 13, 1993, where he complains about the revision made by *ANKA*, Fidan notes "I am also thinking about recommending *Asılacak Kadın* to publishers", which shows that, after Muhidine's leave from the publishing house,

their initial agreement with Publisud had failed, which led them to seek new publishers for a book-length publication (Fidan, 1993b, my translation from Turkish). Since Muhidine was then working at *ANKA*, it is possible that it was through his initiative that Fidan's translation of the excerpt from *Asılacak Kadın* could be published in the magazine. Although it would not be possible to publish the whole book in the magazine because of space limitations, an excerpt could still attract the reader's and other publishers' attention and could also spark interest in a possible future publication of the entire novel.

The translated excerpt was published in *ANKA*'s "Le roman turc", meaning "The Turkish Novel", issue, that is a genre-oriented issue tracing the development of the Turkish novel from the pioneering works of the Tanzimat period to contemporary postmodern literature. Besides other excerpts from various authors and different periods of Turkish literature, this issue also features brief informative articles on these periods and authors. Pınar Kür's *Asılacak Kadın* is categorized under contemporary postmodern novels of the 1970s, along with authors such as Ferit Edgü, Selim İleri, and Yusuf Atılgan, as a representative of a novel genre that focuses on the individual, the relationship between the individual and the society, and themes such as the individual's isolation and solitude. Nevertheless, the entire novel has not yet been published in French to this day.

In addition to the editorial interferences and other changes to the translated text that one can learn about through the conversations between the author and the translator on the translation process, the letters also provide drafts of different translated excerpts, sent as attachments, where one can trace different stages of this process. Although this study is not interested in a genetic analysis of translated texts, drafts from different stages of the period can shed light upon the development of the

text with collaborative efforts of the translator and the author. For instance, Fidan sent the earliest draft of the novel's translation, a one-page excerpt (Fidan, 1992b), to Kür on January 20, 1992, so that the author could evaluate it and decide whether the translator should pursue his endeavors. Moreover, this specific excerpt was taken from the part where Melek's voice is heard for the first time in the novel since Fidan was addressing Kür's concerns about challenges related to the registers in the novel, and showcasing his strategies through this draft (Fidan, 1992a, 1992b).

Later in the process, another draft was sent, different from the initial one. As mentioned earlier, this draft consists of the first nine pages of the novel (Fidan, 1993c). Since the last page of the draft has an abrupt ending and Fidan (1993b) notes that he sends the "first 10 pages" of the novel, the last page of the draft may be missing. Moreover, the punctuation of the published excerpt is different from the nine-page draft translation of the same excerpt. While the nine-page draft follows the same punctuation scheme as the original novel (using full stops and question marks only), the published excerpt uses various punctuation marks and uses them more frequently. Except for the text's punctuation and a few other minor changes, the initial translation draft of the first nine pages of the novel remained the same, and eight pages of it were published in *ANKA*'s issue in 1992. Nevertheless, the frequent usage of more questions marks in the published version of the text suggests that *ANKA* may have decided to publish the text with the corrections that they made to it, while ignoring the translator's concerns and expertise.

Therefore, as it was seen in this case, various agents played a role in the translation and publication processes of *Asılacak Kadın* in the French literary field. While some of these agents were individual agents, such as Ferdan Fidan, Nejat Firuz, Pınar Kür and Timur Muhidine, others were institutional agents, such as the

literary magazine *ANKA* and the publishing house *Publisud*. While both individual and institutional agents played significant roles at different stages of the translation and publication processes of *Asilacak Kadın*, the diasporic individual agents, such as Muhidine who strove to promote Turkish and other Eastern languages, held key decision-making positions and acted as both initiators and coordinators of translation and publication projects. Moreover, it was seen that their efforts were not limited to publications, as literary events have also been influential initiatives for the translation and promotion of Turkish literary works.

Fidan's efforts can also be seen as part of a broader, collective endeavor to present a more comprehensive portrayal of Turkish literature, at the heart of which was the marginalized and the underrepresented, including women's literature and authors who faced ideological censorship. While he explicitly situates his translations from Turkish literature within these broader efforts, it was also revealed that his translatorial habitus played a significant role in his interest in translating Kür's work, a popular novel with considerable symbolic capital at the time.

Finally, during his translation process of *Asilacak Kadın*, Fidan was also in close communication with Kür, like other translators of her works, and the dynamics in their relationship were shaped significantly by Kür's precise eye for detail as a translator and her authorial position as the final judge in authorizing the publication. This process was further complicated by *ANKA*'s editors' unauthorized intervention with the translator's text, which led the author to believe the translator was not competent of understanding her work. This has revealed not only the process of translation but also the text itself could be shaped by various agents, although any "errors" found in it were immediately attributed to the translator. Moreover, as their relationship began to turn into friendship, Kür's professional comments, especially

regarding the changes that were actually made by the editors of *ANKA*, were met with increasing resentment on the translator's part.

5.4 *Bir Cinayet Romanı* in Czech: Tomáš Laně's efforts in translating Turkish (crime) novels

Pınar Kür's first murder mystery novel *Bir Cinayet Romanı* (A Murder Novel) (1989) marked a change in her authorial practice since she was entering uncharted territory, of which she walked out with more success. The work has been celebrated as a "meta-fictional" look at the genre of crime novel (Canatak, 2013) while others have underlined its importance as one of the first examples of a postmodern crime novel in the Turkish literary field (Aral, 2019). The book was so well-received among the readers that it encouraged the author to write more works in this genre, which led to the publication of *Sonuncu Sonbahar* (The Last Autumn) in 1992 and *Cinayet Fakültesi* (Faculty of Murder) in 2006. In fact, its recognition even crossed the borders of the Turkish literary field and reached the Czech literary field, attracting the interest of its agents, as can be seen in the case of Tomáš Laně, the Czech translator of Turkish literature who reached out to Pınar Kür with questions about the novel.

Before moving on to the contents of their correspondence, it is important to situate Laně as a translator of Turkish literature in the Czech literary field. Although the sources that provide biographical information about the translator are quite limited, there is still some information that can offer some insight into Laně's translatorial practice: Laně learned Turkish in the Faculty of Arts at Charles University. He is a translator of significant works of Turkish literature and has also worked intermittently as an interpreter since the 1970s in various fields, including

foreign trade, court interpreting, and interstate negotiations. Between 1995 and 1999, he served as the first ambassador of the Czech Republic to Türkiye, and also as an ambassador to Jordan between 2002 and 2006. Laně also worked as a professor of Turkish language, offering lectures in the Turkology program of Charles University in Prague until 2013. Therefore, in addition to his role as a translator and interpreter, Laně has worked in various positions in the social, cultural, and political fields of the Czech Republic (*Tomáš Laně – Wikipedie*, 2024; *Databáze Překladů*, n.d.).

As for the Czech literary field, it was only after the establishment of Turkish Studies as a field of research that “a vigorous interest in Turkish literature and [translations] from Turkish” emerged (Kučera, 2010, p. 4). The Charles University in Prague and the Oriental Institute were established in 1922. After the communist coup d'état of 1948, translation activities flourished in the Czech literary field, although this interest was shaped under the restrictions of the new regime, which determined “what could be published and was considered worth publishing” and thus was mostly limited to “leftist” authors who produced ideologically-laden works such as Nâzım Hikmet and Sabahattin Ali (Kučera, 2010, pp. 4-5). Works by these authors were published as books and also in literary magazines and dailies of the period. Besides these popular authors, two other names, Yaşar Kemal and Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar, stand out in this period as their works were also published as books. However, “a staggeringly low total of 4 book translations were published in the period between 1970 and 2001,” which can be explained by “the end of ‘Turkish studies’ as a field of study at the Faculty of Arts of the Charles University – conditioned to a certain extent by the communist ruling class’ [discontentment with Türkiye’s position] as a pro-American country and a member of NATO” (Kučera, 2010, p. 6).

While the number of published books was low, literary magazines stand out as an important medium for translational activities in the Czech literary field, especially between 1945 and 1988, during which a majority of all translations from Turkish were published in the magazines *Nový Orient* (1945-), and *Světová Literature* (1956-1996) and the total number of translations published in them was 164 (Kučera, 2010, pp. 6-12). The book translations of Turkish literature continued to be low in number, as only 35 books were translated between 1945 and 1988, and 16 of them were relay translations (Kučera, 2010, pp. 6-11).⁵² No translations appeared from 1989 until 2001 (Kučera, 2010, pp. 16-18). After the Velvet Revolution, a nationwide protest movement that ended the communist regime of more than 40 years in the country, and the literary market boom in 1989, “[n]ew publishing houses mushroomed, books previously prohibited or censored started to be brought out (including religious literature) and the number of translations skyrocketed (many times at the expense of quality)” (Kučera, 2010, p. 16). Nevertheless, this was not reflected in the number of published book translations of Turkish literature. Instead, “English dominated the chart of most translated languages,” which accounted for half of all the translations (Kučera, 2010, p. 16). According to the numbers given in the study, fewer than ten books were translated from 1989 until 2010, both direct and relay translations included (Kučera, 2010, p. 10).

As for Laně’s translatorial activity, the list covering the period between 1945 and 1988 shows that nine translations by him were published around the 1970s and 1980s. However, none of these translations were book-length translations. These were translations of short stories and other prose works by diverse authors such as

⁵² Kučera (2010) also includes the five partial translation cases in this list, which were conducted within the scope of M.A. and PhD theses, and they remained unpublished.

Muzaffer Abayhan, Fakir Baykurt, Sulhi Dölek, Orhan Kemal, Ömer Seyfeddin, Mehmet Seyda, Dinçer Sümer, and Haldun Taner, published in the literary magazines *Nový Orient* and *Světová Literature* (Kučera, 2010, pp. 11-16). Between 1989-2010, seven additional translations by Laně were published in *Nový Orient* (Kučera, 2010, pp. 21-23). It was only in the 2010s that Laně could publish book-length translations. During this period, he emerged as a prolific translator of Turkish novels, having translated seven titles by various contemporary authors, such as Ayşe Kulin, Ahmet Ümit, Nedim Gürsel, Zülfü Livaneli, and Burhan Sönmez, between 2010 and 2020.

Nevertheless, Kučera's (2010) study does not list any translations of Kür's works, which suggests that Laně's efforts did not result in any publication.⁵³ At this point, the low number of book-length translations in the Czech literary field, along with the literary magazines' position as the primary medium for publishing translations, might shed some light upon the reason behind the failed translation and publication of *Bir Cinayet Romanı* in Czech. Moreover, as it was explained above, other factors such as the arbitrariness of text selections and the communist ideology dominated the period between 1948-1989 had a further impact on publications. This continued well into the early 2000s, during which text selection in the translation market of Turkish literature was marked by various factors such as good marketing strategies, existence of other translations of the same work in Western languages, and the popularity of the author in general (Kučera, 1990).

⁵³ I would like to thank Professor Kučera for answering my questions about this study and confirming that he has not come across a published translation of Kür by Laně, or any other translation of Kür's works into Czech, during his research of significant literary magazines in the Czech literary field. I also checked the online catalog of National Library of the Czech Republic for any translations of Kür's works into Czech, but it yielded no result.

At this point, the correspondence between Laně and Kür offer an insight into the translator's motivation, which is explained by Laně (1992) who notes that "with its content, its form as a novel within a novel, and the way the story unfolds through the diary entries by characters might be of interest to our readers" (my translation from Turkish). This shows that the translator was intrigued by the literary characteristics of the work as a murder mystery showcasing various postmodern techniques. As it was mentioned above, *Bir Cinayet Romanı* was Kür's first attempt at writing postmodern crime fiction, although she had already used postmodern techniques such as stream of consciousness in her previous novels dealing with the themes of love, betrayal, women's subjugation, social stratification, and self-isolation. *Bir Cinayet Romanı*, on the other hand, took her postmodernist approach a step further by integrating the structure and techniques of crime novels, such as misleading the reader, obscuring the details of events, and presenting them through the perspective of multiple unreliable narrators. As Laně (1992) also points out, each chapter presents the account of its narrator in the form of dated diary entries through which the reader can trace the chronological order of events. In fact, the book is divided into chapters where the reader can see the events from the characters' perspective but is left to figure out the identity of the narrator in each chapter. The first letters of the characters' names are given as clues. However, multiple characters' names start with the same letter, intentionally creating confusion in the reader.

In fact, while the postmodern techniques used in the novel's form intrigued the translator and motivated him to take up the translation, they also caused a degree of confusion and entailed certain challenges on the part of the translator as well, prompting him to reach out to Kür for additional information that could help him find solutions. For instance, since several characters' names start with the same letter

(“A” in Czech, “Y” in Turkish) and each chapter of the novel is written from the perspective of a character in the novel and titled with the first letter of that character’s name, this becomes a challenge for the translator since it is not easy to distinguish between the chapters and characters, leading to confusion. This confusion is resolved by Kür (1992c), who provides Laně with a chronological record of the narrative voices in the story, showing which character writes their entry on which date in the novel, hence revealing the biggest mystery in the book.

Moreover, they even discuss Laně’s translatorial strategies. For instance, the original text plays with the letters in the characters’ names, using the first letter of the Turkish word “yazar”, which means “author” in English, and creates the characters’ names with this first letter (Yıldız and Yeşim) (Kür, 1989). Since there is an emphasis on the authorial character and this specific word, Laně (1992) notes that he decided to preserve this reference by changing the characters’ names into names that start with “A”, that is the first letter of the word “author” in Czech. Kür also approves his strategy and even makes further suggestions such as changing the author’s name (Kür, 1992). In addition to this, another challenge that Laně encounters on a linguistic level is the usage of wordplays. Nevertheless, although the Czech language is “quite different from Turkish”, the translator notes that he often did not encounter any difficulty finding solutions to them (Laně, 1992, p. 1, my translation from Turkish).

Apart from the literary significance of Kür’s work in its usage of postmodern techniques on an individual level, Laně’s interest in this particular genre is also reflective of a broader interest in the genre of crime fiction in the Czech literary field. In fact, detective novels have been quite popular in the Czech literary field since the 1960s, being “one of the few gripping styles of fiction that was tolerated” during the

period of communist censorship, a toleration that also led to the (re-)emergence of translated crime fiction beginning in the 1960s (Mandys, 2016). This broader interest also explains the translator's emphasis on the novels' reception in the Czech literary field.

Finally, the correspondence helps shed further light upon power dynamics between the author and the translator as well as the role of institutional agents in the publication of translations: It is revealed that Laně first reached out to Kür in 1991 but could not get a response for nine months, which discouraged the translator and led him to put the project aside (Laně, 1992). It is also important to note that Laně had not yet been in touch with any publishers at the time and, therefore, had no obligations to complete the translation. For this reason, he also asks Kür not to cut off communication with him just because he had not made any arrangements with a publishing house (Laně, 1992). This indicates that, according to the translator, his personal initiatives in translating a work may not be considered serious enough by the author, underlining the importance of intermediary institutional agents who would ensure the publication of the translation in the Czech literary field.

Although the fate of Laně's translation of *Bir Cinayet Romanı* is unknown, it is possible to suggest that even if it had been completed, the translation may not have been published. This is because Kür's works remained largely unpublished in other languages, especially in English, the language dominating the market of translated works in the Czech literary field and attracting Czech publishers' attention (Kučera, 2010). Therefore, she lacked the "international recognition" that would have resulted in more translations in various languages, including Czech. Kučera (2010) also underlines the "[a]vailability of grants/subsidies" which are "also instrumental in the decision making process of a publisher" (p. 33). It is seen that Laně's project was

supported by neither, which can also explain its demise, along with Czech publishers' lack of interest in publishing book-length works of Turkish literature, which have, for the most part, appeared in periodicals.

Therefore, although the actual reasons behind why the translation could not get published (or whether it was ever completed) remain unknown, the letters found in the archive shed some light upon the translatorial strategies of Laně, who is a prolific, and yet overlooked, translator of Turkish literature within the limited translational activities of the Czech literary field, while marking an initial attempt to translate Kür's works into Czech. It also reveals an interest in writing and translating works of crime fiction in the Czech literary field as an important factor shaping the translatorial telos of Laně, along with the literary significance and popularity of Kür's novel which might have further attracted the translator's interest. The correspondence also provides an insight into further author-translator collaboration on the translation, which appears in the form consultation and discussion on translatorial strategies. Nevertheless, these discussions did not result in a publication, due to the novel's lack of "international recognition" and the publishers' lack of interest in publishing Turkish literary works, particularly a voluminous piece such as a novel, which also could not find a place in periodicals.

CHAPTER 6

TRACING THE AGENT IN TRANSLATION CRITICISM:

SAYDAM ÖZEL'S CRITICISM ON *GENİŞ*, *GENİŞ BİR DENİZ* AND THE AUTHOR-TRANSLATOR'S RESPONSE

Important insights into Kür's habitus and perception of her translatorial identity are revealed in another correspondence, and also the last one found in the archive: the letters of Pınar Kür and Saydam Özel. Özel is a translator and a language enthusiast who writes to Kür to deliver his critical comments on one of her most famous translations, *Geniş, Geniş Bir Deniz*, the Turkish translation of Jean Rhys' novel *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966), which was published in 1982 by Can Yayınları, a prestigious publishing house in the Turkish literary field. In this discussion, I treat these letters as a piece of translation criticism, which unfold a fruitful discussion on different levels. First, Özel's "judgment" on the translation and his search for "errors" in translation provide insights into the habitus of the translation critic shaped by the dominant "norms" of translation and allow for metacriticism through a comparison between Özel's criticism and the other written translation criticism in that period as well as an existing and relevant model of translation criticism. Second, Kür's response to Özel sheds light upon the translatorial motives and strategies adopted by the former in her translation of the book while providing a portrayal of her approach to translation. Finally, the correspondence also sheds light upon the possible motives behind Kür's including this letter in the archive, which is also a self-portrayal of the author-translator and a curated source of paratextual materials surrounding her works.

Geniş, Geniş Bir Deniz was Kür's first published translation of a book by Rhys, although she had previously translated several short stories by the author, which were published in *Yazko Çeviri*, a significant translation magazine in the Turkish literary field in the early 1980s.⁵⁴ However, as it was discussed above, this was not the first translation of a book or an individual work by Rhys to ever appear in the Turkish literary field. Instead, it was the Turkish translation of *Good Morning, Midnight*, which was published with the title *Günaydın Geceyarısı* in 1972 by Tel Yayınları, by another translator, Nuray Kermen (Aka, 2011, p. 11). However, this translation must have failed to attract readers since many, including herself, have credited Kür with introducing Rhys' works to the Turkish literary field (Kür, 1982; Aka, 2011). In fact, in the preface of the first print of *Geniş, Geniş Bir Deniz*, Kür suggests that "Jean Rhys, whose life was as interesting as her works, has been virtually unknown in our country" (Kür, 1982, p. 5). The translation has been received well in the Turkish literary field, just like all of Kür's translations of Rhys published by Can Yayınları and even made its second printing in 1989, although it is currently out of print. The reason for the absence of new prints could be the expiration of the publishing house's copyright term.

The success of *Geniş, Geniş Bir Deniz* in that period also attracted Özel's (1983) attention and, evidently, his critical eye as he suggests he started reading Kür's translation following the suggestion by a friend who found it "very impressive". However, his reading experience was immediately disrupted by, as he suggests, "the irregularity of the sentences containing parenthetical phrases and

⁵⁴ Kür's translations of Rhys' short stories include: "Böceklerin Dünyası" ("The Insect World") in *Yazko Çeviri*, May-June 1982; "Gece Gezmesi" ("Night Out 1925") in *Yazko Çeviri*, July-August 1982; "Uyursan Geçer Hanım Teyze" ("Sleep It Off Lady") in *Yazko Çeviri*, May-June 1983. The original short stories were compiled in the short story collection *Sleep It Off Lady* published in 1976 which includes 16 short stories, some previously published in various literary magazines, by the author.

additional information”.⁵⁵ This disturbed him so much that Özel (1983) “put the subject matter aside and finished the book purely out of curiosity about where this irregularity would lead”, which eventually led him to write to the author and talk about this issue. Apparently, this “irregularity,” which he almost instantly marked as a mistake, resulted from a shortcoming on the translator's part: her lack of linguistic knowledge of Turkish. Özel (1983) argues that Kür was “shackled by the sentence structure of English,” and therefore, she abode by the linguistic rules of that language instead of Turkish, especially in terms of sentences that feature parenthetical statements and additional information, which “Rhys seems to often use” in her novel as well (Özel, 1983).

It is important to point out that the main “problem” with the translation is not its correspondence to the original, since parenthetical statements and dashes are also used by Rhys in the original work, and not later added by Kür in the translation. Instead, Özel analyses the translation, without reference to the original, as a “written text” in the target language and assesses its compliance with Turkish linguistic rules. Therefore, his critique is more concerned about whether the translated text “stands” in the Turkish literary field, meaning that it is not “outside the written norms of this language” (Berman, 1995/2009, p. 50), especially that of syntax in this case. According to Özel (1983), Kür’s translation of sentences with parenthetical statements and additional information and the use of em dash in these sentences show a lack of linguistic awareness and expertise in Turkish. Therefore, to show her “mistakes” to the translator and to share his knowledge on the subject, Özel first explains the usage of em dash and its functions, how it can be used as a substitute for other punctuations in certain sentence structures and then moves on to various

⁵⁵ The letters by Özel (1983) and Kür (1983a) were originally written in Turkish. Therefore, any quotation provided here was translated into English by me.

“faulty” syntactical examples from Kür’s translation. In total, Özel provides 16 sentences taken from the translated text, each featuring “problematic” sentence structures. As this study is not a linguistic analysis/evaluation of Kür’s translation, it will not dwell on each example and investigate the linguistic ground of Özel’s comments. However, it suffices to say that these comments tackle a variety of “issues,” including misplaced modifiers, underuse of connectives, disregard of stress and intonation, syntactic deviations, and so on, often accompanied by misuse (e.g., using double whereas it should be single) or overuse of em dash, all leading to structural and/or lexical ambiguities and disrupting the flow of sentences.

The most striking aspect of this critique, on the other hand, is the tone and approach in which Özel chooses to convey his comments on the translation, and they are overtly negative and unconstructive. Because of a repeated syntactical “error”, Özel (1983) denounces Kür for being “*shackled* by the sentence structure of English”, and “lacking linguistic awareness”, stresses how “the syntactical irregularities in the book [the translation] are so evident and indisputable that they leave no room for debate,” points out “linguistic distortions” and irregularities that “grate on one’s ear” in Kür’s translation while complaining about “bad translations” in the market to which he does not even give the benefit of the doubt.

Such an approach to translations, whether in the form of criticism, a theory, or a simple commentary, is not an unfamiliar one, appearing in the form of what Berman (1995/2009) calls a “judgment”, instead of “criticism” (p. 28). As Berman suggests:

[The] tendency to want to judge a translation, and *to want to do this only*, refers back to two fundamental traits of any translated text, one being that this ‘secondary’ text is supposed to correspond to the ‘primary’ text, is supposed to be truthful, true; the other trait being what I will call *defectivity*, a neologism attempting to gather all the possible forms of defects, failings, and errors that affect *any* translation. The translated text *calls for* judgment

because it gives rise to the question of its own truthfulness and because it is always (which brings into question this truthfulness) defective somewhere. (Berman, 1995/2009, p. 29)

Therefore, it has been the “original flaw” of its secondariness and its resulting defectivity that has led translation scholars and critics to pass “judgments” on translations (Berman, 1995/2009, pp. 28-29). Berman (1995/2009) suggests that although “we will never be able to remove all negativity” associated with the “critical act,” translation criticism can and should go beyond the “negative evaluation of a translation” that has dominated the field (pp. 25-26).

According to Berman (1995/2009), this can be achieved through the development of what he calls “productive criticism” for which he offers a model that studies the “translating position”, “translation project”, and the “translation horizon” through readings and re-readings of the original and the translation, and through a series of comparisons between the two as well as between the translation and other translations. It can be seen that Özel also carefully reads the translated text as a text that “stands” in the target literary system and moves on to identify “problematic textual zones” in which “defectiveness can be glimpsed”, which Berman (1995/2009) presents as the first step of a productive criticism project (p. 50). However, other than stating that Rhys “seems to often use” parenthetical statements and em dashes in *Wide Sargasso Sea* and making a brief comment on the author’s motive behind such usage, Özel (1983) does not make any reference to the original text or include it in his critique. Neither does he take into account several factors that might have shaped Kür’s translation such as translatorial motives, the translator’s conformity with translational norms of the period, and so on. The “errors” that are made in the translation surpass every other aspect and leave no room for further discussions.

Nevertheless, this was a common approach in translation studies, which had been dominating the field of translation, and especially the literary field, until the relatively recent development of descriptive approaches to translation in the 1970s and the following momentum of a more “productive” translation criticism (Bengi, 1993; Toury, 1995, 2012; Berman, 1995/2009). However, in her study of the five translation criticism pieces in the ninth issue of *Metis Çeviri*, a well-known translation magazine actively contributing to the translation discourse in Türkiye between 1987 and 1992 with writers among whom were significant translation scholars, Bengi (1993) reveals that the critics who wrote these pieces still followed “a paradigm whose essence has been shaped by ‘contradictory’ prescriptive theories” (p. 46, my translation from Turkish). She argues that this resulted from the lack of a fundamental “structure” that revisits and “questions translation theories and contributes to the cultivation of a critical awareness” in that period (Bengi, 1993, p. 46, my translation from Turkish). Although Özel’s (1983) critique is a more conversational one that only presents his commentary and does not refer to any theoretical framework, he also shares the same prescriptive approach that leads to what Bengi Öner (1995/1999) highlights as an “error hunt” in the criticism of a translation.

Apart from these errors, Özel (1983) emphasizes another point which also explains the reason and motive behind his concerns about the linguistic irregularities in the translation. He points out that the em dash is a novel component that was recently introduced in the writing system of Turkish at the time (Özel, 1983). Therefore, its “proper and correct usage” is vital as each prototypical usage will “set an example for its subsequent usages” and broaden its definition and function. Moreover, Özel reminds Kür of her position as an author with considerable capital in

the literary field of Türkiye. This position as a “well-known and authoritative” author creates a positive bias in readers (Özel, 1983). Although there are many other “bad translations” that present similar or different mistakes, in Kür’s case, they become more influential since “out of their pre-established respect” for the author, the audience “either overlooks the [linguistic] mistakes and shortcomings in the translations into Turkish or considers them as a new form of expression”, and, in the latter case, the result is “the dissemination and normalization of such structural irregularities,” especially by the common reader who does not have the expertise to “assess the inaccuracy/accuracy of a translation” (Özel, 1983). Therefore, it is the responsibility of a translator, or “anyone who has the privilege of speaking a foreign language in Türkiye, and thus, has, in one way or another, the ability to translate, whether as a translator or an interpreter” to avoid such errors and misuses of language which could eventually lead to a detrimental impact in the language, with each small “injury leading up to a necrosis” (Özel, 1983).

Therefore, his concerns about linguistic irregularities reflect a high sensitivity to the impact of foreign languages on Turkish, which he shared with many others. This sensitivity was initially pronounced in the Turkish language reform of 1932 and was taken up by Türk Dil Kurumu (Turkish Language Association), the regulatory body for the Turkish language, as a legacy of Atatürk’s reforms and was followed by the “purification of the Turkish language” movements, which subsided and resurfaced in accordance with the changing language policies that follow the changes in the political and ideological conjuncture until the 1980s (Argunşah, 2014). Although discussions on the purification of language were substituted by an approach that sees language as a living and evolving entity, there were others who still held on to their own side of such binary oppositions (Argunşah, 2014). In fact, in

her response to Özel, Kür also suggests that his letter displays “the attitude of a strict grammar teacher reminds of the conservative stance of Türk Dil Kurumu on the pure Turkish words” and this “seemingly progressive but, in actuality, quite conservative” stance, “in its efforts to cleanse our language of foreign words”, will eventually “reduce Turkish to nearly 500 words, eliminate every nuance, and render texts written ten years ago unreadable at this rate” (Kür, 1983a).

Finally, although Özel (1983) acknowledges the vital and guiding role of translators in introducing what is “new” into the Turkish literary field, he disregards “bad translations” by translators who do not enjoy the same literary capital, thus credibility, as well-known translators, such as Kür. Therefore, literary recognition and a “good” translation become a prerequisite for achieving such a contribution to the target language. However, since *Geniş, Geniş Bir Deniz* is the first translation of the novel in Turkish, it is bound to be “imperfect” because the translation’s innate “defectiveness” and the “impact of ‘norms’ appear often heavily” (Berman, 1995/2009, p. 67). In addition, it is also an “introduction,” that is, the introduction of a literary work into the target literary field, which makes it “impure.” Because of these two aspects, “every ‘first’ translation calls for a retranslation (which does not always come to be)” (Berman, 1995/2009, p. 67). Therefore, instead of “systematic attacks” (Berman, 1995/2009) that only discourage the translator from engaging in a discussion, a more constructive approach is needed even if a translation is somehow lacking, which, as Özel (1983) argues, is the case for *Geniş, Geniş Bir Deniz*, and calling for a retranslation.

In her response to Özel’s critique of her “errors” and “lack of linguistic awareness”, the first thing that Kür (1983a) points out is that her usage of em dashes and a certain sentence structure is not an unintentional mistake arising from a lack of

knowledge since, as an author, translator and an instructor of English, she has “an adequate knowledge” of the languages that she speaks (Turkish, English, and French) as well as the “structural differences” between these languages. Instead, as she explains, it is a deliberate choice, a translatorial strategy with a motive to emphasize that the “thought” reflected in the parenthetical or additional statements “occurred subsequently” and, therefore, can be placed after the word, the phrase, or the sentence that it signifies. Moreover, Kür identifies sentence structure, and the use of em dashes forming this structure, as part of her “style,” a style that can also be traced in her original works. In fact, she argues that “each author has their own style” and “syntax is not a God-imposed rule”, and that it “should be challenged” since it is “through such challenges that great authors create authentic styles” and it is also the *authors* in a language system “who make the most contribution to the evolution of a language” (Kür, 1983a).⁵⁶

This identification of the syntactical elements as components her “style” creates an ambiguity since, after this initial identification, her arguments start to revolve around her own authorial style instead of Rhys’ style, which she conveys, or at least is expected to convey, through translation. For instance, she does not attempt to justify her translatorial choices and strategies regarding syntax through giving examples from the original text to show that Rhys also follows the same syntactical structure in her work. Instead, to refute the argument that she internalizes the syntax of English, she points out that her original works also employ the same usage. This raises the question of whether Kür’s stylistic choices as a translator mirror that of the original, meaning Rhys’ *Wide Sargasso Sea*, or reflect Kür’s own authorial style. The answer is both, as Kür explains that she translates Rhys’ works because she

⁵⁶ Emphasis added.

“admires” the author and acknowledges the “affinity” between them, as well as the similarity in their authorial styles (Özgüven, 1983, p. 132). When asked whether she imposed her own style as an author on the translation of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, on the other hand, she refutes this claim (Özgüven, 1983, p. 132). A comparative corpus study on Kür’s authorial and translatorial styles also confirms that Kür and Rhys’ authorial styles and the themes that they deal with are quite similar (Aka, 2011). In addition, she also acknowledges the interaction between her own authorial and translatorial styles as she uses translation as a tool for experimenting with language and challenging herself (Aka, 2011, pp. 205, 313-318). She brings “a new aspect to her writing by changes in style and translating works by authors who have not been published before in the field of Turkish literary translation” (Aka, 2011, p. 295). Moreover, translation also helps the author to practice, to put her writing skills to work so that they will not get rusty in between periods of “stagnation” in her authorial career (Kür, 1982, p. 5; Aka, 2011, p. 296). All of this results in her authorial and translatorial styles becoming intertwined, in constant interaction, and mutually influencing one another.

Kür’s author-translator identity also has a certain impact on the power relations presented in this discussion. The emphasis on her authorial style and recognition as well as her competence as an author who speaks three languages and as “a professor who teaches English courses at Istanbul University” shows that she relies heavily on the symbolic capital endowed to her by these multiple positions. In contrast, she never mentions her translatorial competence or recognition. This may be resulting from the fact that this was her first book translation by Rhys, and her other translations by the same author had not yet been published in 1983. Therefore, she had not yet gained recognition as the “translator of Jean Rhys” in the Turkish

literary field and still associated herself more with her authorial identity. Moreover, after the publication of her first novel and the prolific period of authorship that followed, translation was a secondary activity that would prepare her for a new authorial production, which might also be the cause behind her reluctance to “defend” herself through her translatorial recognition and competence.

As another indicator of her privileged position as an author, Kür (1983a) invites Özel to send his critique to the magazine *ÇEVİRİ* to which she would write a response.⁵⁷ She suggests that “perhaps others would also get involved” in their conversation, fostering further discussions (Kür, 1983a). As no record of such a published critique could be found, it is safe to say that Özel was not interested in making this discussion public, or, possibly, he had other reasons for choosing not to do so. However, it is evident that Kür found this correspondence somehow insightful and, thus, included it in the archive, which shows that she valued any kind of criticism of her works, whether original or translated, and wanted to spark discussions that would revolve around them. In fact, regarding negative comments on her original works, she suggests that negative criticism is more beneficial than a positive one as the former encourages one to work more and be better while the latter is more comforting, which becomes a problem in terms of self-improvement (Söğüt, 2004, p. 58).

However, one cannot argue for a total awareness of the role and importance of translation criticism on the part of the author-translator, either. As for the motives behind her inclusion of this correspondence in the archive, it is possible to say that

⁵⁷ It is unclear which magazine she refers to here. The only record that could be found for the magazine titled *ÇEVİRİ* is its first issue, published in 1979. No records of a subsequent issue could be found. Another magazine titled *ÇEVİRİ* was also published between 1987 and 1988, but as the letters were exchanged in 1983, the dates do not match. The most likely case is that this was a typo and Kür was actually referring to *YAZKO ÇEVİRİ*, a well-known translation magazine at the time in which she had published several translations between 1982 and 1983.

creating a space for discussion also had another layer to it. For instance, Kür (1983a) asserts, with her self-righteous tone and decisive statements, that “the problem stems from a difference in understanding regarding the usage of dashes in a sentence”, which actually is “not a problem” as this usage is “not open to interpretation”. She further argues that the parenthetical statements between the dashes refer to the preceding word, and not to the following one, that follows, “as [Özel] think[s] they do” (Kür, 1983a). Similarly, when she proposes to send Özel’s critique to a magazine, she highlights that “it was based on a wrong foundation” and suggests that publishing this critique in the magazine could lead to further discussions and would “uncover certain truths” (Kür, 1983a), that are her own “truths”. In this case, such a discussion would have deviated from productivity, as it would have served primarily to provide the author-translator with a space to respond to the critique of her translation from a perspective of self-justification. Since her position as a well-known author endows her with the trust of her readers, it would also have given Kür an advantage if their discussion had been made public, as she would likely have been supported by her readers and fellow literary figures whereas, Özel might not have enjoyed the same privilege.

Therefore, this correspondence between Pınar Kür and Saydam Özel has revealed that investigating personal letters that provide feedback on a translated work can offer significant insight into the perception of the translatorial role and translation criticism in a literary field. Moreover, Kür’s response to Özel’s criticism has further highlighted the interplay between Kür’s translatorial and authorial identities, which also influence her practice of each role as well as her self-perception. This was clearly observed in her justification of the translatorial strategies by drawing on her authorial practice and recognition. While Özel also

acknowledges Kür's position as a respected expert and figure of authority in matters of standard and correct language use, his concerns reflect the norms and "judgments" surrounding language use and translation of the period which heavily shaped his habitus as a translation critic.



CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

This thesis has offered a detailed insight into the translation-related materials that were found in the Private Archive of Pınar Kür housed at the Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation in Istanbul, Türkiye. As the first translator-oriented investigation of Kür's private papers, it has unearthed significant and overlooked details related to the multiple roles that Kür has adopted as an established author-translator, as well as her habitus and telos as a translation agent engaging in collaborative translational practices at home and abroad. In these collaborative efforts, she has been accompanied by other translation agents, primarily translators, whose papers have survived to this day thanks to Kür's archive. Both Kür's and other translators' papers, among which the correspondence stands out, have further revealed the power dynamics between different agents involved in the translation events presented in this study. The archival documents have also shed light upon their working conditions, practices, and self-perceptions, which further shaped and were shaped by their habitus and telos, while revealing certain common patterns. Moreover, this investigation has situated their efforts on the broader scale of a translator-oriented historical trajectory, particularly focusing on collaborative translation practices. While delving into a multi-approach research, this thesis has also scouted the borders of archival methodology and offered a detailed discussion of its strengths and limitations.

To begin with, working with archival materials in the context of translational research has proven to be challenging, yet a truly fruitful method for translator-oriented historiography. It was challenging because translators, as key agents of a

field of cultural production, have yet to be recognized for their invaluable efforts and yet to be offered a permanent repository where they can preserve and pass on their histories. Nevertheless, this thesis has also underlined that their “microhistories” can be “excavated” from the repositories of other agents involved in translation events worldwide, especially those who possess enough symbolic capital to have dedicated categories and even their own archives, which was the case for Pınar Kür.

My investigation at Pınar Kür’s archive has revealed several challenges on two primary levels: physical and epistemological. The most fundamental physical challenge was the lack of classification in the archive, where a relatively small but considerable number of translation-related materials have been found, but in an unclassified state. Therefore, working with archival materials required significant effort from the researcher, especially in terms of identification and (re-)classification. The process was further complicated by the lack of professional personnel and limited budget at the library, which also led to limited progress in its digitalization efforts and thus eventually to limited accessibility. Moreover, the materials were fragmented and incomplete, which was accompanied by their fragile condition in certain cases, as they were the result of a selection, a kind of curatorship carried out by Kür in the formation of the archive, and before that, in the preservation of the materials. Therefore, although the archive offered a rich variety of materials, they were incomplete, with missing pages or unkept copies of letters, and also fragmented, in the sense that they often did not offer enough material that would help trace a translation event from beginning to end. Nevertheless, I have overcome these challenges by dedication, volunteering, and consulting multiple sources, including other archives.

Another significant challenge was related to subjectivity. As these materials were “curated” by Kür, they were aimed at presenting a certain portrayal, one that aligned especially with the multiplicity of her roles (author, translator, dramaturgist, playwright, professor), as well as her identity as a woman, since the collection was to be housed at WLICF, the first and only women-oriented library in Türkiye.

Moreover, it is important to point out that it was the symbolic capital that Kür enjoyed as an author that enabled her to have an archive of her own, which is a privilege that cannot be enjoyed by most of the translators. Having said that, this archive has also allowed for other translators to “survive” as Kür kept records of her correspondence with her translators, which also shows her awareness as a translator.

Another layer of subjectivity emerged in my own “gaze” as the researcher, since I approached the materials with certain questions and presumptions about what I was about to encounter, and examined them from a specific perspective, one that has centered around the “agents” of translation. Therefore, to overcome the limitations of this subjectivity, I also attempted data triangulation by consulting other sources outside the archive. This was complemented by my choice to focus on the correspondence among other materials that I have encountered in Kür’s archive, as the letters were likely to offer less overtly mediated accounts, as well as little-known, overlooked, or unearthed details regarding the lives of translation agents presented in this study.

One of the most significant of these is Kür’s position as a “marginal” translator in the 1960s, a period that marks one of her earliest translation projects and the roots of her interest in drama translation, which has significantly shaped her translatorial habitus and practice, resulting in more projects in the following years. Since her correspondence with Özel, which takes place about 20 years later and

portrays Kür in a period when she was more recognized both as an author and a translator, is also included in the archive, it is possible to trace the development of her translatorial identity, especially under the influence of having made her successful debut as an author in the late 1970s.

Another significant yet overlooked role of Kür is her position as a translated author. As it was observed in this study, the limited number of translations of Kür's original works in other languages does not stem from a lack of interest in the author's works. On the contrary, the correspondence has revealed that, in the 1980s and 1990s, four translators living in different literary fields were interested in translating Kür's works. While only one of these projects actually failed, the others also encountered delays and significant changes in their publication plans. *Asılacak Kadın* and *Bir Deli Ağaç* could not be published as complete book translations, and only parts of them could be published. Although several translations of Kür's works have been published in periodicals and anthologies, these must have had limited impact as the majority of her works have not been translated to this day. I argue that this resulted from the absence of a book-length English translation, which could have sparked more interest from a wider group of readers and could have been used as a source for relay translations. Nevertheless, as it was seen, Kür's concerns regarding the reception of her works and her portrayal in a language were also influential in the demise of certain translation projects, especially into English.

The materials found in Kür's archive made it possible to trace other translators back to the early years of their translatorial practice. The existence of multiple translators' papers also revealed certain patterns in these translators' habitus and practice. For instance, most of these agents had multiple roles and professions. As it was mentioned above, Kür was involved in various fields of cultural production

in addition to being a professor. Başgöz and Fidan were also professors, the latter organizing conferences to promote Turkish literature in the U.S. along with others such as Scharf and Kleinmichel. Although they are not discussed in detail due to obvious limitations of scope and space, these literary events initiated the translation process of these works through reading sessions, which, I argue, calls for more study. Moreover, Halman featured as a speaker in these conferences, while also contributing to publication efforts through editing the translations of Turkish literature and writing reviews on them, which would attract the attention of readers. Mizanoğlu Reddy also contributed to the publication efforts by not only translating but also compiling short stories by women writers to be introduced to the Anglo-American literary field. While these roles enabled them to promote the translation of Turkish literature in various literary fields, they also led to demanding schedules, resulting in delays in translation processes.

In addition, seemingly unimportant, little details related to the living and working conditions of the translators also influenced the process of translation projects discussed in this thesis. For instance, Chapter 5 has traced an anxious Ruth Christie inquiring about the payment that she had not received for her translation. Similarly, in Chapter 4, Pınar Kür faced more urgent matters such as financial problems, writing a thesis, and her pregnancy, during the translation process of *Ferhat İle Şirin* which she co-translated with Albert Vander. Nevertheless, Vander's delay in sending his revisions for the translation, accusations regarding the co-ownership of the text, and lack of enthusiasm to share the responsibilities of the process left Kür alone in her endeavors. In addition, as a friendship had flourished between them, Fidan was offended by Kür's comments on his "mistakes" regarding the punctuation on a more personal level. His translation process of *Asılacak Kadın*,

on the other hand, was interrupted by his obligation to move from Grenoble to Paris as a result of his appointment to a new teaching position there. Moreover, the translation process was further delayed by slow mail connections, and Kür's translators' residence in different countries.

Another important pattern was seen among the translators of Kür's works, which was the tendency towards author-translator collaboration. While Kür's eye for detail, complemented by her translatorial expertise, enabled discussions on the translated text between the author-translator and her translators, it also slowed down the process as every detail was discussed, and compromise was not always the first option. While the projects still succeeded in terms of publication, it was also seen that certain opportunities could not be seized before it was too late. The halt in Dağyeli Verlag's operations due to financial struggles led to the demise of a prospective book translation project by Christie. In Fidan's case, on the other hand, Muhidine left the publishing house before Fidan and Kür could resolve the issues related to translation and get it published by Publisud. Contrary to these translators' perception of it, author-translator collaboration and the author's approval of the text were not a prerequisite for successful translations. This can be seen in Caner's translations of Kür's works into German, a language that Kür does not speak, being the only published book-length translations of Kür's works.

Nevertheless, just as Kür constantly emphasized the importance of Andaç's approval of her co-translation of Hikmet's play into French with Vander, Kür's translators also demonstrated a similar "internalized subservience" of their role as the performers of a "secondary" and "derivative" task, which relied on approval to make its way towards publication. This was seen in Christie's emphasis on the translator's role as a "foster parent," Fidan's and Laně's leaving the translation aside after not

getting a response from the author, and Kür's slowing down the translation process as she could not get a response from Andaç.

On a more collective level, on the other hand, I have also found certain parallels among these agents, which helped me situate their endeavors within broader, collective efforts across various literary fields and in different periods. For instance, Kür's efforts to translate Nâzım Hikmet's *Ferhat ile Şirin* were part of a collective endeavor to disseminate the author's works, first as part of a global campaign advocating for his freedom during the 1950s, and later as a reaction against the censorship that was imposed on his works. During the 1980s and 1990s, on the other hand, translation was an important tool for promoting Turkish literature in other languages, especially through a more comprehensive portrayal that goes beyond the "exotic" and gives a voice to its "modern" face with its inclusivity of the "marginalized". Especially in the French literary field, this modernity was associated with the Republican reforms, and also included the rights given to women during this period. Therefore, the increasing interest in translating women's literature in the 1980s also brought about an ideological discourse, that is nationalistic and pro-reformist in its essence, which was disseminated along with the translations of Turkish women authors in *Paroles dévoilées: Les femmes turques écrivent*. A similar discourse was also seen in *ANKA*, complemented by a focus on authors who were subject to censorship at home as a result of the oppressive post-coup atmosphere. It is also important to underline that these endeavors were pursued mainly by diasporic individuals, that is, intellectuals originally from Türkiye living in different parts of the world and contributing to the circulation of Turkish literature.

At this point, it is also important to underline once again that my thesis focused mainly on the correspondence, complementing it mainly with extratextual

and, occasionally, with textual and paratextual sources found within and outside the archive, and specifically from an agent-oriented perspective. Nevertheless, as it was emphasized, the archive presents a rich variety of materials, including published and unpublished translation drafts and working papers of various translators, official documents related to legal processes, biographical writings, criticism articles, clippings, and various other materials, which invite other, and diverse, approaches to the translator's archive. Among these, one can count genetic translation studies, which would use the drafts to trace the genesis of the texts. Another possible approach would be using the archive for bibliographical research, while tracing published titles. As it was seen in this study, the archive presents forgotten, or not-widely-known, published translations of various literary works, especially those that were published only in periodicals which have been overlooked in most of the anthologies and bibliographies of translated works of Turkish literature. While these are only some of the other possible approaches that can be adopted in the investigation of "translator" archives, the rich variety of materials in these repositories and the histories they preserve are awaiting to be explored by interested researchers.

REFERENCES

- Aka, E. (2011). *A critical study on Pınar Kür as author-translator: Authorial and translatorial styles in interaction* [Doctoral dissertation, Boğaziçi University]. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
<https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=unJvoQqHlCd4SmB9gnJdcQ&no=QVn28fVs6fO5HKyVbv9Lpg>
- Akbatur, A. (2011). Turkish women writers in English translation. *MonTi: Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación*, (3), 161–179.
<https://doi.org/10.6035/MonTI.2011.3.6>
- Akbatur, A. (2024). *A Bibliography of translated works of Turkish literature into English (1882-2023)*. [Unpublished].
https://www.academia.edu/114558619/A_Bibliography_of_Translated_Works_of_Turkish_Literature_into_English_1882_2023_
- Akçalı, K. (1990, November 9). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Antmen, A. (1992, December 22). Yazmak eylemini seviyorum [I love the act of writing]. [Interview]. *Cumhuriyet Kültür*. Copy retrieved from Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Aral, İ. (2004). *Two Stories: Assimilation – The Door* (I. Kür, Trans.). Epsilon.
- Aral, T. (2019). *1980 sonrası Türk edebiyatında polisiye romanın toplumsal gelişimi: Ahmet Ümit ve Osman Aysu romanları* [Master's thesis, Mersin University]. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
<https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=a1Ncyip2a0FsHN2mrmgH2w&no=W9KVnf6iGF3-x9KW0fcp8Q>
- Argunşah, M. (2014). 1938-1980 yılları arasında Türkiye’de siyaset-dil ilişkileri. In H. Argunşah (Ed.), *Türk edebiyatına açılan pencere: İnci Enginün armağanı* (pp. 77–96). Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları.
- Atefmehr, Z., & Farahzad, F. (2022). Microhistorical research in translator studies: An archival methodology. *The Translator*, 28(3), 251–262.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2021.1944022>
- Avcı Solmaz, S. G., & Karadağ, A. B. (2024). The translation of women within the context of the Ottoman-Turkish women’s movement (1868–1935). *Women’s History Review*, 33(4), 592–613.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09612025.2023.2252223>
- Aygündüz, F. (1999). Pınar Kür: Yazar hayattan beslenir [Pınar Kür: Life is a writer’s source of inspiration] [Interview]. *Milliyet*. Copy retrieved from Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.

- Ayral, C. (1983, December 9). Pınar Kür’le “fena halde feminist” söyleştiklerimiz [Our “unapologetically feminist” exchange with Pınar Kür]. [Interview]. *Somut*, 2. Copy retrieved from Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Başgöz, İ. (1986, March 26). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [English and Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Başgöz, İ. (1987, March 13). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [English and Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Bassnett, S. (1991). Translating for the theatre: The case against performability. *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, 4(1), 99–111. <https://doi.org/10.7202/037084ar>
- Begley, L. (2001). *Savaş yalanları* (P. Kür, Trans.). Can Yayınları. (Original work published 1991)
- Behramoğlu, A. (1986). Entre deux feux. *ANKA: Revue trimestrielle d’art et de littérature de Turquie*, (1), 6–7.
- Bengi-Öner, I. (1999). [Öz-]sorgulamalar: Hata avcılığı 1: Yazın çevirisiyle neden uğraşmalı? Nasıl uğraşmalı? In I. Bengi-Öner (Ed.), *Çeviri bir süreçtir... Ya Çeviribilim?* (pp. 137–148). Sel Yayıncılık. (Original work published 1995)
- Bengi, I. (1993, January 1). Çeviri eleştirisi bağlamında eleştirel bilincin oluşması ve eleştiri, üst-eleştiri, çeviribilim ilişkileri. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (4), 25–50. <http://dad.boun.edu.tr/tr/pub/issue/4537/289870>
- Benjamin, W. (2002). The Task of the Translator. In M. Bullock & M. W. Jennings (Eds.), *Selected writings I Walter Benjamin* (pp. 253–263). The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1923)
- Berk Albachten, Ö. (2009). Dil sınırlarını aşan bir çeviri ortaklığı: Joyce Lussu ve Nazım Hikmet. *Ç.N.: Çeviri Edebiyatı*, (7), 140–145.
- Berk Albachten, Ö. (2012). Turkish Literature in Italian: 1923-2012. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Çeviribilim Dergisi*, (5), 89–120. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/iuceviri/issue/1233/14481#article_cite
- Berk Albachten, Ö. (2024). *İmece* as collaboration: Azra Erhat’s collaborative retranslation projects. *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, 37(2), 33–60. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1116639ar>
- Berman, A. (2009). *Toward a translation criticism: John Donne* (F. Massardier-Kenney, Ed. & Trans.). Kent State University Press. (Original work published 1995)
- Bibina, Y. (2013). Çeviride buluşmak yahut iki ülke arasındaki köprü. *Balkan Araştırma Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2(1), 55–88.

- Bibliothèque nationale de France. (n.d.). *Catalogue général*. Retrieved May 8, 2025, from <https://catalogue.bnf.fr/>
- Birand, M. A. (2004, February 4). Emret komutanım! *Hürriyet*. <https://www.hurriyet.com.tr/yazarlar/mehmet-ali-birand/emret-komutanim-240667>
- Bishku, M. B. (1996). [Review of *Shirts of steel: An anatomy of the Turkish armed forces*, by M. A. Birand]. *Journal of Third World Studies*, 13(1), 384–387. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45197702>
- Boğaziçi University Library. (n.d.). *Online catalogue*. <https://library.bogazici.edu.tr/en>
- Borzecki Andaç, M. (1967, March 24). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990a). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology* (M. Adamson, Trans.). Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990b). *The logic of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1980)
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature* (R. Johnson, Ed. & Trans.). Columbia University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste* (R. Nice, Trans.). Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1979)
- Brontë, A. (2024). *Agnes Grey* (P. Kür, Trans.). Can Yayınları. (Original work published 1847)
- Byatt, A. S. (2013). *Bülbülün gözündeki cin: Beş peri hikâyesi* (P. Kür, Trans.). Can Yayınları. (Original work published 1994)
- Byatt, A.S. (1994). *Çeşm-i bülbülün içindeki cin* (P. Kür, Trans.). YKY. (Original work published 1994)
- Can, H. (1984, October). Turkish writers on trial. *Index on Censorship*, 13(5), 3–4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03064228408533768>
- Canatak, A. M. (2013). Postmodern polisiye roman ve Pınar Kür'ün *Bir Cinayet Romanı*. *A. Ü. Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi (TAED)*, (49), 223–238. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/33673>
- Caner, B. (Ed.). (2008). *Alles blaue, alles grüne dieser welt: Türkische Erzählungen*. Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

- Canlı, G. (2023). Tracking the translator in the translation of the post-modern novel *Frankissstein – A Love Story*. *transLogos*, 6(1), 75–97.
- Chesterman, A. (2007). Bridge concepts in translation sociology. In M. Wolf & A. Fukari (Eds.), *Constructing a sociology of translation* (pp. 171–183). John Benjamins.
- Chesterman, A. (2009). The name and nature of translator studies. *HERMES - Journal of Language and Communication in Business*, 22(42), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.7146/hjlc.v22i42.96844>
- Chesterman, A. (2017). A causal model for translation studies. In *Reflections on translation theory: Selected papers 1993–2014* (pp. 123–135). John Benjamins Publishing Company. (Original work published 2000)
- Christidou, S. (Ed.). (2002). *To violi tis kalokairines nyhtes [The violin of summer nights]*. Kastaniotis Editions.
- Christie, A. (1992). *Roger Ackroyd cinayeti* (P. Kür, Trans.). Metis Yayınları. (Original work published 1926)
- Christie, R. (1990a, June 24). [Letter to Kezban Akçalı]. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Christie, R. (1990b, October 21). [Letter to Kezban Akçalı]. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Christie, R. (1990c, October 28). [Letter to Kezban Akçalı]. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Christie, R. (1990d, December 20). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Christie, R. (1991a, January 11). [Letter to Kezban Akçalı]. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Christie, R. (1991c, March 25). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Christie, R. (1992, April 28). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Christie, R. (ca. 1991b, January 11) [Draft translation of Pınar Kür's "Bir Deli Ağaç" sent as an attachment to Christie's letter to Akçalı on January 11, 1991] [Unpublished manuscript, 50 pp., in English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Cordingley, A., & Montini, C. (2015). Genetic translation studies: An emerging discipline. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies*, 14, 1–18.

- Cordingley, A., & Hersant, P. (2021a). Translation archives: an introduction. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs (Meta: Translators' Journal)*, 66(1), 9–27.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1079318ar>
- Cordingley, A., & Hersant, P. (Eds.). (2021b). Archives de traduction (Translation archives) [Special issue]. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs (Meta: Translators' Journal)*, 66(1).
- Dağyeli Verlag. (n.d.). *Über uns*. Retrieved January 28, 2025, from <https://dagyeliverlag.com/ueber-uns/>
- Databáze Překladů. (n.d.). *Tomáš Laně – překladatel*. Retrieved February 1, 2025, from https://www.databaze-prekladu.cz/prekladatel/_000005838
- Demirkol Ertürk, Ş. (2010). *The city and its translators: Istanbul metonymized and refracted in the literary narratives of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar and Orhan Pamuk in Turkish, English, and French* [Doctoral dissertation, Boğaziçi University]. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
<https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=1x7LpbRQY5MQxdgUIbt-KQ&no=nKu6Vk9SJlah5x1p5KTpNg>
- Demirkol Ertürk, Ş. (2019). 2008-2018 yılları arasında Türkçeden Fransızcaya yapılan edebiyat çevirileri bibliyografyası ve bir değerlendirme. *Frankofoni Dergisi*, (34), 95–108.
- Demirkol, Ş. (2010). 1934–2008 tarihleri arasında Türkçeden Fransızcaya yapılan edebiyat çevirileri üzerine bir bibliyografya çalışması ve eleştirel bir inceleme. In *Akşit Göktürk'ü Anma Toplantısı 13–14 Mart 2008: Yazında politika – Çeviri politikaları* (pp. 95–101). Dilita Dil Hizmetleri.
- Dino, G. (1993). Aux avant-postes de la littérature: Femmes de la Turquie nouvelle. In N. Gürsel (Ed.), *Paroles dévoilées: Les femmes turques écrivent* (pp. 7–13). UNESCO. (Original work published 1981).
- Drenthe, G. & Van der Sommen, M. (1992). *Vrouwen thesaurus: lijst van gecontroleerde termen voor het ontsluiten van informatie over de positie van vrouwen en vrouwenstudie* (M. Boere, Ed.). Internationaal Informatiecentrum en Archief voor de Vrouwenbeweging (IIAV).
- Drenthe, G. & Van der Sommen, M. (1998). *European women's thesaurus: A structured list of descriptors for indexing and retrieving information in the field of the position of women and women's studies* (J. Vaughan, Trans.). International Information Centre and Archives for the Women's Movement (IIAV). (Original work published in 1992).
- Dündar, L. (2016). 12 Eylül 1980 darbesinin basına etkileri. *Tarihin Peşinde: Uluslararası Tarih ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, (16), 125–154.
- Egghardt, H., & Güney, Ü. (Eds.). (1984). *Aufbruch aus dem Schweigen: Erzählerinnen aus der Türkei*. Buntbuch Verlag.

- Ekşigil, H. (2003, November). “Kitabını bitirebildiğim genç yazar çok az” [There are few books by young authors that I could read from cover to cover]. *Picus*, (4), 25–30.
- Emiroğlu, Ö. (2019). Nazım Hikmet'in Polonya vatandaşlığı meselesi. *Türk Dünyası Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi (Turkish World Journal of Language and Literature)*, (48), 289–298. <https://doi.org/10.24155/tdk.2019.121>
- Ergil, B. (2005). *The Image of Nazım Hikmet and his poetry in Anglo-American literary systems in 2002* [Master's thesis, Boğaziçi University]. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=0TP0gU42I-zN11kFwxyXQA&no=_qWzefsT_osW1JQgp4B1dg
- Ettinger, E. (1996). *Hannah Arendt – Martin Heidegger: Bir aşkın anatomisi* (P. Kür, Trans.). Oğlak Yayınları. (Original work published 1995)
- Even Zohar, I. (1979). Polysystem theory. *Poetics Today*, 1(1–2), 287–310. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1772051>
- Even-Zohar, I. (1978). The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In J. S. Holmes, J. Lambert, & R. van den Broeck (Eds.), *Literature and translation: New perspectives in literary studies* (pp. 117–127). Acco.
- Even-Zohar, I. (1990). The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. *Poetics Today*, 11(1), 45–51. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1772668>
- Fallaci, O. (1977). Doğmamış çocuğa mektup (P. Kür, Trans.). Hürriyet Yayınları (Original work published 1975)
- Ferrari-Giovanangeli, J. (2021). Traces et outil d'analyse: la mise en patrimoine d'archives audiovisuelles. *EPISTÈME (International Journal of Applied Social and Human Sciences)*, 26, 221–240.
- Fidan, F. (1991, December 11). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Fidan, F. (1992a, January 20). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Fidan, F. (1992b, January 20). [Draft translation of an excerpt from Pınar Kür's *Asılacak Kadın*, sent as an attachment to Fidan's letter on January 20, 1992] [Unpublished manuscript, 1 p., in French]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Fidan, F. (1993a, January 11). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Fidan, F. (1993b, June 13). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.

- Fidan, F. (1993c). [Draft translation of an excerpt from Pınar Kür's *Asılacak Kadın*, sent as an attachment to Fidan's letter on June 13, 1993] [Manuscript, 9 pp., in French]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Fidan, F. (1993d, July 12). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Firuz, N. (1991, October 9). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Fişekçi, T. (2012, August 26). Nâzım'ın yasaklı kitapları. *Altüst Dergisi*.
<https://www.altust.org/2012/08/nazimin-yasakli-kitaplari/>
- Fuat, M. (2002). *A'dan Z'ye Nâzım Hikmet*. Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Fuentes, C. (1996). *Diana: Yalnız avlanan tanrıça* (P. Kür, Trans.). Can Yayınları. (Original work published 1994)
- Genette, G. (1997). *Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation* (J. E. Lewin, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1987)
- Ginzburg, C. (2013). *The cheese and the worms: The cosmos of a sixteenth-century miller* (J. Tedeschi & A. Tedeschi, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press. (Original work published 1976)
- Göktürk, D., & Şenocak, Z. (Eds.). (1991). *Jedem Wort gehört ein Himmel: Türkei literarisch*. BABEL Verlag.
- Goldes, S. (1962). The first University of the Theater of Nations. *Educational Theater Journal*, 14(2), 148–153. Johns Hopkins University Press.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3204531>
- Gouanvic, J. M. (2005). A Bourdieusian theory of translation, or the coincidence of practical instances: Field, 'habitus', capital and 'illutio'. *The Translator*, 11(2), 147–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2005.10799196>
- Greenaway, P. (2004). *Altın* (P. Kür, Trans.). İletişim Yayınları. (Original work published 2002)
- Günay-Erkol, Ç., Esen, Ö. İ., & Alaçan, S. (2022). Ayla Kutlu ve Pınar Kür ile “12 Mart” üzerine [A Conversation on March 12, with Ayla Kutlu and Pınar Kür]. *kitaplık*, 29(222), 5–12.
- Gürsel, N. (1993a). Avant-dire. In N. Gürsel (Ed.), *Paroles dévoilées: Les femmes turques écrivent* (pp. 15–21). UNESCO.
- Gürsel, N. (Ed.). (1993b). *Paroles dévoilées: Les femmes turques écrivent*. Arcantère; UNESCO.
- Gürsel, N. (Ed.). (1993c). *ANKA: Revue d'art et de littérature de Turquie*, (18–19) [Special issue: Littérature turque d'aujourd'hui – publié à l'occasion des “Belles Étrangères–Turquie”].

- Guzmán, M. C. (2013). Composing the translator's archive. *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, 26(2), 171–192. York University.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1037136ar>
- Guzmán, M. C. (2020). (Re)visiting the translator's archive: Toward a genealogy of translation in the Americas. *Palimpsestes*, 34(1), 45–58.
<https://doi.org/10.4000/palimpsestes.5538>
- Halman, T. S. (1990). [Review of *Twenty stories by Turkish women writers* edited and translated by N. Mizanoğlu Reddy]. *World Literature Today*, 64(2), 359.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/40146594>
- Hammett, D. (2012). *Ailenin laneti* (P. Kür, Trans.). Everest Yayınları. (Original work published 1928)
- Hersant, P. (2020a). Présentation. *Palimpsestes*, 34, 7–13.
<https://doi.org/10.4000/palimpsestes.4863>
- Hersant, P. (Ed.) (2020b). Dans l'archive des traducteurs [Special issue]. *Palimpsestes*, 34. <https://doi.org/10.4000/palimpsestes.4863>
- Highsmith, P. (1998). *Küçük g: Bir yaz masalı* (P. Kür, Trans.). Can Yayınları. (Original work published 1995)
- Hikmet, N. (1952). *Selected poems*. Asoke Ghosh / Parichaya Prakashani.
- Hikmet, N. (1954). *Poems by Nazim Hikmet* (A. Yunus [pseudonym for Münevver Mizanoğlu Reddy & Rosette Avigdor Coryell], Trans.). Masses & Mainstream.
- Hikmet, N. (1965). *Ferhat ile Şirin*. De Yayınevi.
- Holmes, J. S. (1988). The name and nature of translation studies. In J. S. Holmes, *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies* (pp. 67–80). Rodopi. (Original work published 1972)
- Horzum, Ş., & Ağın, B. (2021). A chronological bibliography of Turkish literature in English translation: 2004–2020. *Translation Review*, 110(1), 39–47.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07374836.2021.1939214>
- Iacob, V. (2020). The University of the Theater of Nations: Explorations into Cold War exchanges. *Journal of Global Theater History*, 4(2), 68–80.
- Indiana University. (1987). *Tentative program: Second International Conference on Turkic Studies (May 14–17, 1987)* [Conference program, attached to a letter from İlhan Başgöz on March 13, 1987]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- James, H. (2003). *Dostlarımızın dostları* (P. Kür & F. Özgüven, Trans.). Dost Kitabevi.

- Johnson, R. (1993). Editor's introduction: Pierre Bourdieu on art, literature and culture. In P. Bourdieu, *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature* (pp. 1–25). Columbia University Press.
- Karantay, S. (1989). Pınar Kür ile tiyatro çevirisi üstüne söyleşi [An interview with Pınar Kür on drama translation] [Interview]. *Metis Çeviri*, (9), 11–17. Copy retrieved from Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kartoğlu, (1985, November). Pınar Kür: “Edebiyata çocuk şair olarak atıldım” [Pınar Kür: “I embarked on my literary journey as a child poet”] [Interview]. *Sanat Olayı*, 55–56. Copy retrieved from Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kavas, E. (2007). *Ferhat ile Şirin öyküsünden uyarlanan oyunlar* [Master's thesis, Anadolu University]. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi. https://acikbilim.yok.gov.tr/bitstream/handle/20.500.12812/331732/yokAcikBilim_9005188.pdf?sequence=-1
- Kleinmichel, S. (1991, January 9). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kobler, J. (1973). *Al Capone: Gangsterler kralı* (P. Kür, Trans.). E Yayınları. (Original work published 1971)
- Kocabay, F. G. (2013). *Gender and translation: A case of Jeanette Winterson* [Master's thesis, Atılım University]. Atılım University Institutional Repository. <https://acikarsiv.atilim.edu.tr/handle/20.500.12954/1131>
- Koestler, A. (1999). *Gün ortasında karanlık* (P. Kür, Trans.). İletişim Yayınları. (Original work published 1940)
- Kolukısaoğlu, C. (n.d.). *Curriculum vitae (CV)*. [French and Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Krol, T. (2012). *Yunus insanlar* (P. Kür, Trans.). Everest Yayınları. (Original work published 2006)
- Kučera, P. (2010). *Translations from Turkish in Czech Republic, 1990-2010*. Next Page Foundation.
- Külsoy, A. (2023, July 24). Yasaklı kitaplar: Sevgilim, onlar kitaba düşman. *Journo*. <https://journos.com.tr/yasakli-kitaplar>
- Kür, P. (1966a, October 22). [Letter to Münevver Borzecki Andaç]. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1966b, November 28). [Letter to Münevver Borzecki Andaç]. [Polish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1966c, December 27). [Letter to Münevver Borzecki Andaç]. [French]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.

- Kür, P. (1967a, May 5). [Letter to Münevver Borzıeckı Andaç]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1967b, May 23). [Letter to Albert Vendeville “Vander”]. [French]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1967c, June 7). [Letter to ZAiKS]. [French]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1968, August 28). [Letter to Charles Dédéyan]. [French]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1976). *Yarın... yarın*. YAZKO Yayınları.
- Kür, P. (1977). *Küçük oyuncu*. Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Kür, P. (1979). *Asılacak kadın*. Bilgi Yayınevi.
- Kür, P. (1981). *Bir deli ağaç*. YAZKO Yayınları.
- Kür, P. (1982). Çevirenin önsözü [Translator’s preface]. In J. Rhys, *Geniş geniş bir deniz* (pp. 5-16, P. Kür, Trans.). Can Yayınları.
- Kür, P. (1983a). [Letter to Saydam Özel]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1983b). *Akışı olmayan sular*. Can Yayınları.
- Kür, P. (1984a). Pınar Kür: “Tüm yapıtlarımda asıl konum uyumsuzluk. Çünkü ben de uyumsuz bir kişiyim” [Pınar Kür: “In all my works, my main theme is alienation. Because I myself am an alienated person”] [Interview]. *Milliyet Sanat*, 22–25. Copy retrieved from Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1984b). Pınar Kür: “İlk romanım yayımlanınca yazarlığım çoğu kişiye sürpriz oldu” [Pınar Kür: “When my first novel came out, many were surprised to discover I was a writer”] [Interview]. *Gösteri*, (40), 84–85. Copy retrieved from Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1986a, May 20). [Letter to İlhan Başgöz]. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1986b, May 20). [Letter to İlhan Başgöz]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1986c). *Bitmeyen aşk*. Can Yayınları.
- Kür, P. (1989). *Bir cinayet romanı*. Can Yayınları.
- Kür, P. (1990a, June). [Author’s notes draft to be sent to Ruth Christie]. [Unpublished manuscript, 1 p., in English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, İstanbul, Türkiye.

- Kür, P. (1990c, November 23). [Letter to Ruth Christie]. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1990d, November 27). [Letter to Kurt Scharf]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1990e, December 17). [Letter to Sigrid Kleinmichel]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1992a, January 2). [Letter to Ferda Fidan]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1992b, May 17). [Letter to Ruth Christie]. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1992c, July 15). [Letter to Tomáš Laně]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1992d, December 30). [Letter to Ferda Fidan]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (1992e). *Une femme à pendre* (F. Fidan, Trans.). *ANKA: Revue d'Art et de Littérature de Turquie*, (16–17), 150–155. [Special issue: Le roman turc]. (Original work published in 1979)
- Kür, P. (1992f). *Sonuncu sonbahar*. Can Yayınları.
- Kür, P. (1993). *Haï de tous* (A. Özadanır, Trans.). *ANKA: Revue d'art et de littérature de Turquie*, (18–19), 183–200. [Special issue: Littérature turque d'aujourd'hui – publié à l'occasion des “Belles Étrangères–Turquie”]. (Original work published in 1981)
- Kür, P. (2004a). *Hayalet hikâyeleri*. Everest Yayınları.
- Kür, P. (2004b). *A crazy tree* (R. Christie, Trans.). Epsilon. (Original work published in 1981)
- Kür, P. (2006). *Cinayet fakültesi*. Everest Yayınları.
- Kür, P. (2006). *Ein verrückter baum* (B. Caner, Trans.). Literaturca Verlag. (Original work published 1981)
- Kür, P. (2008). *Mordsfakultät* (B. Caner, Trans.). Literaturca Verlag. (Original work published 2006)
- Kür, P. (2008). *Жена за обесване* [Jena za obesvane] (Y. Bibina, Trans.). Lettera. (Original work published 1979)
- Kür, P. (2016). *Sadık Bey*. Can Yayınları.
- Kür, P. (Ed.). (2004). *Short fiction in English*. Istanbul Bilgi University Press.

- Kür, P. (ca. 1965). *Amour d'os* [Unpublished manuscript, 19 pp., in French]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (ca. 1986). *Curriculum vitae (CV)*. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. (ca. 1990b, November). [Draft letter to Ruth Christie]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P. & Vander, A. (n.d.). [Translation draft of the second act of Nâzım Hikmet's *Ferhat ile Şirin*] [Unpublished manuscript, 29 pp., in French]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P., Çapan, C., & Uyar, T. (1993). Dilinin “namusunu koruyabilmek” [Protecting the purity of one's language]. *Cumhuriyet*. Copy retrieved from Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Kür, P., et al. (Trans.). (1975). *Kadın ve erkek: Ruhsal ve cinsel ilişkiler ansiklopedisi* (5 vols.). Gelişim Yayınları.
- Kür, P., Oker, C., Şafak, E., Ulay, F., & Mungan, M. (2004). *Beşpeşe*. Metis Yayınları.
- Lajus, C. (2020a). *Paroles de traducteurs: Entretien avec Ferda Fidan*. *Revue Ayna*. Retrieved November 17, 2024, from <http://revueayna.com/focus/paroledestraducteurs/>
- Lajus, C. (2020b). *Paroles de traducteurs: Entretien avec Timour Muhidine*. *Revue Ayna*. Retrieved November 17, 2024, from <http://revueayna.com/focus/paroledestraducteurs/>
- Laně, T. (1992, May 27). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Lawrence, D.H. (1982). *Yılan* (M.C. Köksal & P. Kür, Trans.). *Yazko Çeviri*, (9), 27–31. Copy retrieved from Atatürk Library Periodicals Collection, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Literaturca. (n.d.-a). *Autoren: Pınar Kür*. Retrieved January 8, 2025, from http://www.literaturca.de/html/pinar_kur.htm
- Literaturca. (n.d.-b). *Bücher*. Retrieved January 8, 2025, from <http://www.literaturca.de/html/bucher.htm>
- London, J. (1971). *Âdemden önce* (P. Kür, Trans.). Bilgi Yayınevi. (Original work published 1907)
- Malaymar, D. (2021). Revealing the translator as a political and cultural agent: An archival research on Sabahattin Ali's translational practices. *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, 34(2), 43–68. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1086622ar>
- Mamet, D. (1999). *Bağla şu işi* (P. Kür, Trans.). (Original work published 1988)

- Manderino, J. (2018). *Sinemada ađlarken* (P. Kür, Trans.). Can Yayınları. (Original work published 2008)
- Mandys, P. (2016, December 6). *New Czech authors of crime fiction*. Czech Literary Centre. <https://www.czechlit.cz/en/feature/new-czech-authors-of-crime-fiction/>
- Martin, V. (2007). *Mal* (P. Kür, Trans.). Everest Yayınları. (Original work published 2003)
- Maunick, É. J. (1986). A library of world classics. *The UNESCO Courier*, 39(1), 5–6, 8. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000068084>
- McEwan, I. (1991). *Yabancı kucak* (P. Kür, Trans.). Can Yayınları. (Original work published 1981)
- Messo, G. (2008). [Review of *Poems of Oktay Rifat* translated by O. Rifat, R. Christie, & R. McKane]. *World Literature Today*, 82(2), 74. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40159698>
- Meyer, J. H. (2020). Echoes across the iron curtain: The letters of Münevver Andaç to Nâzım Hikmet. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 56(4), 664–679. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00263206.2020.1753708>
- Mizanođlu Reddy, N. (1987, April 6). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Mizanođlu Reddy, N. (2015). *The embroidered jacket: Memories and other essays*. Harvard Book Store.
- Mizanođlu Reddy, N. (Ed. & Trans.). (1988). *Twenty stories by Turkish women writers*. Indiana University Turkish Studies.
- Mizanođlu Reddy, N. (Ed. & Trans.). (1994). *Short stories by Turkish women writers* (2nd ed.). Indiana University Turkish Studies.
- Mıđdıs Şeker, L., & Bogenç Demirel, Z. E. (2020). The positive effects of constraints on Nâzım Hikmet's position in the field of literature and the circulation of his works through translation. *Çeviribilim ve Uygulamaları Dergisi*, (29), 83–116. <https://doi.org/10.37599/ceviri.811068>
- Morris, R.C. (n.d.). *Roderick Conway Morris*. Encounters with the Arts, Cultures, People and Places: An archive of articles by Roderick Conway Morris. <https://www.roderickconwaymorris.com/RCM.html>
- Muhidine, T. (1991, October 9). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [French]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Muhidine, T. (1992). Notice sur les auteurs. *ANKA: Revue d'art et de littérature de Turquie*, (16–17) [Special issue: Le roman Turc], 183–187.

- Muhidine, T. (1998). La littérature turque en français. *Hommes & Migrations*, (1212), 166–171. https://www.persee.fr/doc/homig_1142-852x_1998_num_1212_1_3162
- Munday, J. (2014). Using primary sources to produce a microhistory of translation and translators: Theoretical and methodological concerns. *The Translator*, 20(1), 64–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2014.899094>
- Nabokov, V. (1993). *Karanlıkta kahkaha* (P. Kür, Trans.). İletişim Yayınları. (Original work published 1932)
- Nabokov, V. (2000). *Bir günbatımının ayrıntıları: Toplu hikâyeler 1* (P. Kür, Trans.). (Original work published 1976)
- National Academic Library and Information System Foundation. (n.d.). *NALIS Union Catalogue*. Retrieved December 23, 2024, from <https://www.nalis.bg/en/union-catalogue>
- National Library of the Czech Republic. (n.d.). *Online catalogue*. <https://www.nkp.cz/en>
- National Library of Turkey. (n.d.). *Online catalogue*. <https://kasif.mkutup.gov.tr/>
- Nesin, A. (1984, February 13). *Les Trois Sentinelles* (F. Fidan, Trans.). *Le Monde*. https://www.lemonde.fr/archives/article/1984/02/13/les-trois-sentinelles_3004599_1819218.html
- Nuri, A. (2024). The historical and literary context of *Ateşten Gömlek*'s Swedish translation (*Eldskjortan*): The translation strategy, the letters between the translator and Halide Edib, and the reception of the novel in Sweden. *TUDED*, 64(1), 117–156. <https://doi.org/10.26650/TUDED2024-1379519>
- Obama, M. (2019). *Benim hikâyem* (P. Kür, Trans.). Mundi Kitap. (Original work published 2018)
- Öymen, E. E. (1990). Richard McKane, Nâzım Hikmet'i İngilizceye çevirdi: Bu hazin hürriyet [Richard McKane translated Nâzım Hikmet into English: Bu hazin hürriyet]. *Cumhuriyet Kitap*, (7), 4. Copy retrieved from Atatürk Library Periodicals Collection, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Ozbirdinci, P. (2017). Pınar Kür as a bold female translator: Translating Sam Shepard's *Curse of the Starving Class* for a Turkish audience. *eTropic*, 16(2), 141–151.
- Özel, S. (1983, April 25). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Özgüven, F. (1983). Pınar Kür'le Jean Rhys üzerine [A conversation with Pınar Kür on Jean Rhys]. *Yazko Çeviri*, (11), 132–134. Copy retrieved from Atatürk Library Periodicals Collection, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Özlü, D. (1993). *Hallucination à Berlin* (N. Gürsel, Trans.). Publisud.

- Öztürk Baydere, H. (2014). *An analysis of the Turkish translation of obscene words in Jeanette Winterson's Written on the Body and Sexing the Cherry in the light of relevance theory and norm theory* [Master's thesis, Hacettepe University]. Hacettepe University Institutional Repository. <https://hdl.handle.net/11655/2221>
- Paker, S. (1988). Nermin Menemencioğlu ile söyleşi [Interview with Nermin Menemencioğlu]. *Metis Çeviri*, (4), 13–21.
- Paker, S., & Yilmaz, M. (2004). A chronological bibliography of Turkish literature in English translation: 1949–2004. *Translation Review*, 68(1), 15–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07374836.2004.10523860>
- Paloposki, O. (2016). In search of an ordinary translator: Translator histories, working practices and translator–publisher relations in the light of archival documents. *The Translator*, 23(1), 31–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2016.1243997>
- Pignarre, R. (1975). *Tiyatro tarihi* (P. Kür, Trans.). Gelişim Yayınları. (Original work published 1945)
- Pirandello, L. (1992). *Oyunun kuralları* (P. Kür, Trans.). Yapı Kredi Yayınları. (Original work published 1919)
- Pluszyńska, A. (2021). Collective management of copyright during communism and transition – A case study of the Society of Authors ZAiKS. In P. Galuszka (Ed.), *Eastern European music industries and policies after the fall of communism: State control to free market* (pp. 94–106). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429273988>
- Qi, R., & Gerber, L. (2021). Archival research as method: A study of “non-professional” agents of literary translation. In L. Gerber & L. Qi (Eds.), *A century of Chinese literature in translation (1919–2019): English publication and reception* (pp. 9–22). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429316821-3>
- Redfield Jamison, K. (1996). *Durulmayan bir kafa: Bir delilik ve duygudurumları güncesi* (P. Kür, Trans.). Oğlak Yayınları. (Original work published 1995)
- Rhys, J. (1982a). *Böceklerin dünyası* (P. Kür, Trans.). *Yazko Çeviri*, (6), 22–31. Copy retrieved from Atatürk Library Periodicals Collection, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Rhys, J. (1982b). *Gece gezmesi–1925* (P. Kür, Trans.). *Yazko Çeviri*, (7), 30–34. Copy retrieved from Atatürk Library Periodicals Collection, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Rhys, J. (1983). *Uyursan geçer hanım teyze* (P. Kür, Trans.). *Yazko Çeviri*, (12), 37–45. Copy retrieved from Atatürk Library Periodicals Collection, İstanbul, Türkiye.
- Rhys, J. (1985). *Dörtlü* (P. Kür, Trans.). Can Yayınları. (Original work published 1928)

- Rhys, J. (1989). *Karanlıkta yolculuk* (P. Kür, Trans.). Can Yayınları. (Original work published 1934)
- Rhys, J. (1990). *Dalda duran kuşlar* (P. Kür, Trans.). Can Yayınları. (Original work published 1976)
- Rhys, J. (1990). *Günaydın geceyarısı* (P. Kür, Trans.). Can Yayınları. (Original work published 1939)
- Schaefer, B. (2007, July 31). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [English]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Scharf, K. (ca. 1990). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [Turkish]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Semenov, J. (1979). *Himmeler'in oyunu* (P. Kür, Trans.). Hür Yayınları. (Original work published 1970)
- Semizoğlu, A. (1992). Aspects du roman turc après 1960. *ANKA: Revue d'art et de littérature de Turquie*, (16–17) [Special issue: Le roman Turc], 105–121.
- Şentürk, S. (2009, June 26). Türkiye'de kitabın yargı serüveni. *Milliyet*. <https://www.milliyet.com.tr/kultur-sanat/turkiye-de-kitabin-yargi-seruveni-1110840>
- Serafidari, K. (2008). Du mouvement féministe au mouvement pacifiste. Winpeace, une organisation de militantes grecques, chypriotes et turques. *Nouvelles Questions Féministes*, 27(3), 57–71. <https://doi.org/10.3917/nqf.273.0057>
- Shepard, S. (1990). *Aç sınıfın laneti* (P. Kür, Trans.). Remzi Kitabevi. (Original work published 1976)
- Simeoni, D. (1998). The pivotal status of the translator's habitus. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, 10(1), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.10.1.02sim>
- Sılay, K. (Ed.). (1996). *An anthology of Turkish literature*. Indiana University Turkish Studies.
- SOAS (2022). *Gained in translation: Remembering Ruth Christie (1923–2021)*. SOAS University of London. <https://www.soas.ac.uk/about/event/gained-translation-remembering-ruth-christie-1923-2021>
- Société des Auteurs et Compositeurs Dramatiques (SACD). (n.d.). *The SACD's missions and values*. <https://www.sacd.fr/en/sacd's-missions-and-values>
- Söğüt, M. (2004, July-August). Pınar Kür: “‘Ah, ne güzel!’ dediğim bir kitap okuyalı çok oluyor” [“It's been ages since I read a book that truly made me go, ‘Wow, this is beautiful!’”] [Interview]. *kitap-lık*, 11(74), 52–62. Copy retrieved from Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.

- Söğüt, M. (2006, April). Pınar Kür: “Ben hiçbir zaman okur ne istiyor diye düşünerek yazmadım” [Pınar Kür: “While writing my works, I never thought about what the reader would want”]. *Gösteri*, (279), 5–11. Copy retrieved from Atatürk Library Periodicals Collection, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Söğüt, M. (2022). *Aşkın sonu cinayettir: Pınar Kür ile hayat ve edebiyat*. Can Yayınları. (Original work published 2006)
- Şüyün, F. (2010, September 20). Yayıncılık ticari bir metaya dönüştü: Faruk Şüyün'un bu haftaki konuğu: Kezban Akçalı [Publishing has become a commercial merchandise: Faruk Şüyün's guest for the week: Kezban Akçalı]. *Dünya*. <https://www.dunya.com/ozel-dosya/yayincilik-ticari-bir-metaya-donustu-haberi-126013>
- Şüyün, F., & Işıltan, N. (1999, May). On beş yıldır öykü, yedi yıldır yeni kitap yayınlamayan Pınar Kür anlatıyor [A conversation with Pınar Kür who has not published a new short story for fifteen years, and a new book in seven years]. *Dünya Kitap*, 13–15. Copy retrieved from Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Devlet Tiyatroları. (n.d.). *Çevrilmiş ve sahnelenmiş oyun arşivi* [Archive of translated and staged plays]. <https://www.devtiyatro.gov.tr/DevletTiyatro/tr/Basdramaturgluk/9018>
- Tahir-Gürçağlar, Ş. (2002). What texts don't tell: The uses of paratexts in translation research. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *Crosscultural transgressions* (pp. 45–60). St. Jerome Publishing.
- Tan, N. (2015, January). Yitirdiklerimiz: Talât Sait Halman. *Türk Dili: Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi*, 108(757), 110–112. <https://tdk.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/20150129.pdf>
- Tansel, O. (2012). *Masal Dünyası/World of Tales*. Elips Kitap.
- Tekgül, D., & Akbatur, A. (2013). *Literary translation from Turkish into English in the United Kingdom and Ireland, 1990–2012 (Original report by D. Tekgül, updated by A. Akbatur)*. Literature Across Frontiers. <https://www.lit-across-frontiers.org/publications/literary-translation-from-turkish-into-english-uk-ireland-1990-2012/>
- Thomson, P. (2012). Field. In M. Grenfell (Ed.), *Pierre Bourdieu: Key concepts* (pp. 65–80). Acumen Publishing.
- Timur, T. (Ed.). (1992). *ANKA: Revue d'art et de littérature de Turquie*, (16–17) [Special issue: Le roman Turc].
- Tomáš Laně – Wikipedie. (2024, January 15). *Wikipedia*. https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tom%C3%A1%C5%A1_Lan%C4%B
- Toole, J. K. (1992). *Neon ıııklı İncil* (P. Kür, Trans.). Simavi. (Original work published 1989)

- Toury G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive translation Studies and beyond* (Revised ed.). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.100>
- Université du Théâtre des Nations. (1965). *Session 1965: Cycle de réalisation artistique – Programme*. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Van Gogh, V. (1985). *Kardeşi Theo 'ya mektuplar* (P. Kür, Trans.). Ada Yayınları.
- Van Gogh, V. (1996). *Theo 'ya mektuplar* (P. Kür, Trans.). Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Van Gogh, V. (2016). *Dostlukla: Seçme mektuplar* (P. Kür, Trans.). Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Vander, A. (ca. 1967, January 7). [Letter to Pınar Kür]. [French]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Vander, A., & Kür, P. (1967, May 22). [Two documents asserting the co-ownership of the translation *Ferhad et Shirine* by Pınar Kür and Albert Vendeville “Vander”, each signed by one of the parties]. [2 pp., in French]. Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Vardar, N. (2011, April 5). *Avrupa'da 100 yıllık kitap yargılanamaz*. Bianet. <https://bianet.org/haber/avrupa-da-100-yillik-kitap-yargılanamaz-130853>
- Ve Pınar Kür 'ün nefis çevirisi* [The exquisite translation by Pınar Kür]. (n.d.). [Promotional clipping from an unidentified periodical]. Copy retrieved from Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Vendeville, S. (2005). *Au maître nu, Albert Vander*. Éditions L'Harmattan.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.
- West, M. (1975). *Şaklaban* (P. Kür, Trans.). E Yayınları. (Original work published 1974)
- Wilss, W. (1997). Translator awareness. *Ilha do Desterro: A Journal of English Language, Literature in English and Cultural Studies*, (33), 89–102.
- Winterson, J. (1995). *Vişnenin Cinsiyeti* (P. Kür, Trans.). İletişim Yayınları. (Original work published 1989)
- Winterson, J. (1997). *Tutku* (P. Kür, Trans.). İletişim Yayınları. (Original work published 1987)
- Wolf, M. (2007). The emergence of a sociology of translation. In M. Wolf & A. Fukari (Eds.), *Constructing a sociology of translation* (pp. 1–36). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation. (n.d.-a). *About us*. Retrieved November 15, 2024, from <http://kadineserleri.org/aabout-us/>
- Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation. (n.d.-b). *Özel arşivler koleksiyonu* [Private archives collection]. Retrieved November 15, 2024, from <http://kadineserleri.org/koleksiyonlar/ozel-arsivler-koleksiyonu/>
- Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation. (n.d.-c). *Özel Arşiv Koleksiyonu: Rezzan Yalman Arşivi* [Private Archives Collection: Private Archive of Rezzan Yalman: Contents] [PDF]. Retrieved November 14, 2024, from <http://kadineserleri.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/19-Özel-Arşiv-Koleksiyonu-Rezzan-Yalman-Arşivi-.pdf>
- Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation. (n.d.-d). *Özel Arşiv Koleksiyonu: Pınar Kür Arşivi* [Private Archives Collection: Private Archive of Pınar Kür: Contents] [PDF]. Retrieved November 14, 2024, from <http://kadineserleri.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/18-Özel-Arşiv-Koleksiyonu-Pınar-Kür-Arşivi.pdf>
- Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation. (n.d.-e). *Tez koleksiyonu* [Library's thesis collection]. <http://kadineserleri.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Tezler-Son.pdf>
- Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation. (n.d.-f). *Kütüphane kataloğu* [Library's general catalog]. <http://176.236.94.38/yordam/>
- Women's Library and Information Centre Foundation. (n.d.-g). *Pınar Kür's Private Archive*. WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Woods, M. (2022). Translator memory and archives. In S. Bermann & C. Porter (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of translation and memory* (pp. 328–343). Routledge.
- Yılmaz, İ. (2004, February 5). 12 yıl sonra yeni kitabı *Hayalet Hikâyeleri*'ni yayınlayan Pınar Kür: Sanki ben de bir hayalete döndüm [Pınar Kür publishes her new book *Hayalet Hikâyeleri* after 12 years: It's as if I, too, turned into a ghost]. *Hürriyet Keyf*. Copy retrieved from Private Archive of Pınar Kür, WLICF, Istanbul, Türkiye.
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu (YÖK) Ulusal Tez Merkezi. (n.d.). *Ulusal Tez Merkezi* [National Thesis Center of the Council of Higher Education]. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/>
- Zähringer, M. (2006, April 22). Anatolische lebenswelten: Aktuelle einsichten. *taz.de*. <https://taz.de/Anatolische-Lebenswelten/!5189760/>
- Zürcher, E. J. (2004). *Turkey: A modern history* (Revised ed.). I.B. Tauris.
- Związek Autorów i Kompozytorów Scenicznych (ZAIKS). (n.d.-a). *History of ZAIKS*. <https://zaiks.org.pl/en/about-us/history-of-zaiks>

Związek Autorów i Kompozytorów Scenicznych (ZAiKS). (n.d.-b). *What we do*. <https://zaiks.org.pl/en/about-us/what-we-do>

