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ABSTRACT

This paper descriptively examines two Turkish translations – one published before Sherlock Holmes was popularized in visual media in the 2000s and one thereafter – of a Sherlock Holmes story entitled “The Adventure of the Speckled Band” by Arthur Conan Doyle to establish how the two translators handled certain aspects of the story deemed important for a literary interpretation. In determining these important aspects, it develops and uses an “interpretive scheme” inspired by Damrosch’s (2003) ruminations on “world literature.” The interpretive scheme contains three aspectual categories, i.e., “referential,” “genre-related” and “stylistic” aspects. The aim of this examination is twofold: first, it seeks to find out whether there are differences between the interpretations of these important aspects in the two translations and if so, whether these differences may be a result of the popularization of Sherlock Holmes. Second, it aims to explore the educational implications of translators’ choices in translating the aforementioned aspects, discussing how the use of an interpretive scheme in the analysis of translations may be helpful in choosing texts for the teaching of English literature to a Turkish-speaking audience.
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Doyle’un “Speckled Band” İsimli Öyküsünün İki Türkçe Çevirisinin Bir Yorumlama Şemasıyla İncelenmesi

ÖZET
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Introduction
Written by Arthur Conan Doyle (1859-1930), Sherlock Holmes stories began in 1887 with A Study in Scartlett and became an instant success in Britain, bringing their author fame and fortune. British public was so taken with Holmes stories that they went as far as protesting Doyle when he killed off Holmes due to his dislike for writing crime fiction (Drabble 2000; Sutherland 2014). Currently one of the most typical representatives of British literature, Sherlock Holmes, has become a household name all across the world. Canonized as the paragon and quintessential classic of crime fiction, Doyle’s work has had a momentous influence on world fiction, having lead to countless
translations, adaptations and imitations. In Jakobson’s words (2000), intersemiotic translations of Holmes stories such as films and TV series have contributed to the figure’s phenomenal popularity, turning Holmes into one of Britain’s most remarkable cultural exports. Now a quintessential figure of world literature, Holmes has attained the kind of universal recognition of the likes of Hamlet, Madame Bovary, Don Quixote or Count Dracula by way of worldwide dissemination.\(^1\)

There is no obvious way to address the question of how Sherlock Holmes must be approached as a figure of world literature in the Turkish context by readers who do not know English or have a sufficient command of it to be able to read Doyle’s fiction in the original. In introducing Holmes narratives to Turkish readers, different translators make different interpretive choices throughout their translations, and the question of how they have interpreted the source text cannot be answered immediately and is in need of elaboration. Bearing in mind Doyle’s status in world literature as a canonical author, one may identify the aspects that will receive particular attention in literary interpretations that view his works as world classics and use such aspects to determine what to elaborate on while analysing translators’ choices in their renditions of Holmes narratives. In specifying these aspects, Damrosch’s (2003) ruminations on “world literature” inspired by Goethe’s approach to Weltliteratur may serve as a starting point. Damrosch (2003: 15) notes that the term “world literature” has been understood in three distinct ways: “as an established body of classics, as an evolving canon of masterpieces, or as multiple windows on the world” (emphases ours). Classics, Damrosch continues,

\(^1\) Despite its popularity, Sherlock Holmes within the Turkish context has not been studied sufficiently by translation researchers. To the best of our knowledge, only Tahir-Gürçağlar (2008a; 2008b) paid some attention to the Turkish (pseudo)translations of Sherlock Holmes from a historical perspective. The present study addresses the lack of research on the translation choices of Turkish translators of Holmes in Translation Studies.
are mostly understood as works that have had a “transcendent” and even a “foundational value, often identified particularly with Greek and Roman literature” (ibid). Masterpieces are great works of literature that have begun to be regarded as accomplished in terms of literary value as the ancient classics by Goethe. Damrosch does not dwell on the third understanding of world literature, i.e., “windows on the world,” which he may have deemed self-explanatory; he merely mentions Goethe’s interest in Chinese novels and Serbian poems as possible “windows into foreign worlds, regardless or not these works could be construed as masterpieces…” (ibid).

The first two definitions of world literature converge in the case of Sherlock Holmes, which has come to be regarded as a classic or masterpiece of a particular genre of literature, namely crime or detective fiction. Doyle’s fiction has been treated as having a “foundational value” for the entire genre, constituting an example or a template for other works of fiction in the same genre. Yet the “masterpiece” quality may be sought not just in the fiction’s generic exemplariness but also in the literary quality (or value) of Doyle’s writing. A translation that attempts to reflect the work’s status as a classic or masterpiece would potentially be attentive to Doyle’s rendering of the generic conventions, which he has invented to a significant extent, as well as his literary style. The third category implies that Turkish readers may be interested in those aspects of Doyle’s fiction that reflect the specific English world depicted in it, or more clearly, the social, cultural and historical aspects of this world. All these categories are likely to be commingled: the social aspects of 19th century England detectable in Doyle’s fiction will be inextricably linked with Doyle’s own literary choices that we associate with his style, and these choices may themselves be regarded to constitute a literary window on the author’s world.

There is no immediate answer to the question of what particular windows on this world deserve more attention than others. Obviously,
such windows are to be determined by perspectives or viewpoints perceived as relevant or significant by the reader. It is indeed possible to transpose Damrosch’s designations “classic,” “masterpiece” and “window on other worlds” into the categories of “genre,” “literary style” and “referentiality,” the last term referring to the textual material related to the actual contexts (social, cultural, historical) relevant to the interpretation of the work. In providing a window onto Doyle’s world, each translation also provides an interpretation of it, which may be shaped by translation choices regarding referential, generic and stylistic aspects of the source text. It is indeed these aspects and translators’ choices in handling them that will be the focus of this paper. In doing so, this paper descriptively examines two Turkish translations of Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes story entitled “The Adventure of the Speckled Band”. The two translations chosen for this purpose consist of a translation published before Sherlock Holmes has become highly popular thanks to BBC’s 2010 TV series Sherlock and another that was published thereafter. The paper aims to investigate how the two translators reflect the referential, generic and stylistic features of the source text through their interpretive choices. Furthermore, it seeks to explore to what extent differences in the translators’ interpretive choices may have resulted from the popularization of Sherlock Holmes in the 2010s.

The paper further aims to examine the educational implications of translators’ choices in translating the aforementioned important aspects, discussing how the use of an interpretive scheme in the analysis of translations may be helpful in choosing texts for the teaching of English literature to a Turkish-speaking audience. Turkish academia is home to a considerable number of English Language and Literature programs, where interpretations of literary works written in English and particularly of those deemed classics or masterpieces of English literature are being produced consistently and in great numbers as part of the educational curricula and academic scholarship. Such
interpretations have the benefit of picking out, negotiating and defining the relevant or salient features of a literary work. Collaborations between students, scholars and professionals working in the fields of English literature and translation may greatly help resolve the issue of what particular interpretive windows and consequently what referential, stylistic and generic aspects of the source text would be relevant for Turkish readers who are after obtaining education in English literature. The determination of such aspects may also prove useful in understanding how translators interpret the source texts with which they work. Within the framework of such a collaboration, the translator may grow more sensitized towards the aspects of the source text picked out for interpretation among English-speaking Turkish students in an academic setting, and may become more attentive in translating these aspects for non-English-speaking Turkish readers.

It must be emphasized that this paper, although an interdisciplinary collaboration between the fields of Studies in English Literature and Translation Studies, does not necessarily adhere to the commonly accepted or conventional uses of terminology or methodologies in either field. However, we loosely follow Toury’s (1995) three-step methodology for descriptive translation studies: we first study the target texts under investigation as translations within the target culture. We then conduct a descriptive textual analysis of ad hoc coupled pairs, which are determined through an “interpretive scheme” that is used to map segments from the TTs onto the source text. Last, we comment on the results of the analysis, developing case-specific generalizations.² It is also important to note that we are interested in interpreting the text to the extent that this may help us come up with an “interpretive scheme” that will pick out or indicate the same relevant features or aspects. Such a scheme will include a plurality of aspects such as genre-related, stylistic and referential (ideological, racial, 

² Also see Munday 2001.
gender-specific etc.) ones, and would differ from a *unified*, thesis-driven interpretation that concentrates on one particular aspect, which characterizes the kind of essayistic writing that prevails in Studies in English Literature. Our interest lies not in the development of one particular interpretation but in the discernment of the relevant aspects in the text that make a plurality of interpretations possible. This is also the reason why we prefer to use the designation “interpretive scheme” as different from “interpretation.” In coming up with this scheme, we do focus on particular passages and comment on them in order to establish their connection with the relevant aspects and hence justify their significance, a methodology that is commonly referred to as “close reading” in the teaching of English Literature. We do not have any interest, however, in unifying such commentaries or close readings for the purpose of developing a particular thesis or composing a coherent interpretive essay that proves it. Our interpretive scheme does not serve any ultimate interpretation; it serves the act of translation.

In the next sections, we first introduce the Holmes story and the two translations that we have chosen for our study and provide a justification for our choice of these texts. We then present the interpretative scheme that we use in examining the two translations. We discuss how each translator reflects the referential, generic and stylistic aspects of the source text in their translations by providing and examining key passages from the source text that encompass one or more of these aspects. In coming up with the interpretive scheme and choosing the relevant passages, we are guided by the interpretive strategies deployed in English Language and Literature programs that enable the student to concentrate on particular referential, generic and stylistic features of the source text and perform close readings. Finally, we conclude by discussing the results of our examination in terms of the effects of popularization of Sherlock Holmes and the educational implications of translators’ choices.
Material

In this paper, we examine Arthur Conan Doyle’s “The Adventure of the Speckled Band” (“Speckled Band” henceforth) and its two translations entitled “Benekli Kordon” and “Benekli Şerit Macerası” translated by Saffet Günersel and Kaya Genç and published by Metis Publishing in 1992 and Everest Publishing in 2013, respectively. The former is from a book entitled Sherlock Holmes Ölüm Döşeğinde, which consists of 13 Holmes stories, and will be referred to as TT1 (“Target Text 1”). The latter is from a book entitled Sherlock Holmes’un Maceraları, which consists of 12 Holmes stories, and will be referred to as TT2 (“Target Text 2”). There are several other Sherlock Holmes books including the aforementioned story published by different Turkish publishing houses and translated into Turkish by various translators (e.g. Sherlock Holmes: Akıl Oyunlarının Gölgesinde translated by Cumhur Mısırlıoğlu and published by Martı Publications in 2012, Sherlock Holmes Sırlar Okulu translated by Zeynep Adaligil and published by Siyah Beyaz in 2016, Sherlock Holmes: Gizemli Suçların Peşinde translated by Begüm Öztürk and published by Yakamoz Publications in 2017, Sherlock Holmes’un Maceraları: Boscombe Vadisinin Esrarı translated by Ecem Kodak and published by Oda Publications in 2017 and so on). Since we intend to explore whether there are differences in translation choices regarding referential, genre-related and stylistic aspects in the two TTs and if so, whether these differences may be a result of the immense popularity of Sherlock Holmes around the globe following the 2010 BBC TV series entitled Sherlock, we chose a translation of “Speckled Band” published before Sherlock was aired and one thereafter.

The paratextual materials of the two books, in which TTs under investigation are published, are suggestive of the impact of the

---

3 We use TT1 and TT2 to refer both to their respective translators and translations.
popularity of the TV series, *Sherlock*, on the translation of Sherlock Holmes stories. A paratextual examination of the book in which TT1 is published reveals that Metis spelled out the genre of the book as crime fiction (“Metis Polisiye”). Metis further emphasized the genre of the book through visual cues such as the logo of the publishing house (a crow) dressed as a detective on the front cover and a magnifying glass on the back cover (see Appendix). Additionally, the book features an allographic preface on Conan Doyle, i.e., a preface written by someone other than the author (Genette 1997), who in this case is the translator. This preface, in Genette’s (1997) terms, not only “presents” but also “recommends” Doyle, his style and literary oeuvre. In this sense, it seems that Doyle’s authorial status is of importance for Metis and Günersel.

Unlike the first book, the book in which TT2 is published does not feature a lengthy preface on Doyle but a brief biographical note

---

4 Several examples of Günersel’s presentation and recommendation of Doyle, his style and literary oeuvre are given below:

“When we examine the history of crime novels, we can undoubtedly suggest that Arthur Conan Doyle is the author who made a breakthrough and fill the gap in the *nouvelle* style.” (translation ours, Günersel 1992: 7)

“Doyle studied medicine in Edinburgh.” (translation ours, Günersel 1992: 7)

“His first stories were considerably successful in terms of technique.” (translation ours, Günersel 1992: 8)

“Conan Doyle initially wrote historical novels: *The Exploits of Brigadier Gerard* (1869), *Rodney Stone* (1869) and *Sir Nigel* (1900).” (translation ours, Günersel 1992: 9)
both on the author and the translators of the book. Doyle’s authorial status therefore does not appear to be as important for Everest Publishing as it is for Metis. Moreover, Everest classifies the series of the book as “Short Story,” which, although not an incorrect classification, does not underline the fact that the stories in question are pieces of crime fiction. The book cover also gives the impression that Everest attempts to highlight the image of Sherlock Holmes: it features a conspicuous caption that reads “Sherlock Holmes” which covers half of the page (see Appendix). This is not surprising given that Everest published the book post-Sherlock, i.e., after Holmes emerged as a highly popular fictional figure. On the contrary, publishing Sherlock Holmes Ölüm Döşeğinde almost two decades before Sherlock was aired for the first time, Metis appears to be concerned with promoting Doyle as an important writer and the adventures of Sherlock Holmes as a cornerstone of crime fiction. Considering these paratextual cues, we are interested in finding out whether the referential, genre-related and stylistic aspects pertaining to Doyle’s works, which help place the very works as canonical pieces of (crime) fiction, are translated differently. By doing so, we aim to establish whether the focus on Doyle and his fiction in the book published by Metis and that on Holmes’ image in the book published by Everest are also reflected in the translation choices in TT1 and TT2, respectively.

“Speckled Band” is an immensely interesting Sherlock Holmes story whose title, based on an ironic wordplay in the English language, happens to be a challenging one for the purpose of translation. In its general outline, the story is about a case in which a murderous British doctor, belonging to an aristocratic but impoverished family and with professional experience in the Orient (India), attempts to murder his soon-to-be-married stepdaughter, Helen Stoner. The attempt is fortunately thwarted by Holmes, who uses his extraordinary powers of acumen and reasoning to reveal that the doctor is also responsible for
the suspicious death of his other stepdaughter, Julia Stoner, several years prior.

**Interpretive Scheme**

In this section, we describe the interpretative scheme that we use in examining the source text and its two translations. As mentioned previously, our interpretive scheme is divided into three main aspects that are referential, genre-related and stylistic and we focus on these aspects as they constitute the most important aspects in literary interpretations that acknowledge the status of Doyle’s works as “classics,” “masterpieces” and “windows on other worlds” within world literature. Each aspect also has sub-aspects as shown in Table 1 below, which contains brief explanations on why we deem these sub-aspects important. The determination of referential aspects is hardly straightforward, and will depend on the heuristic examination of the text by the reader. These aspects concern various contexts of representation related to a theme, issue, field, event or subject. They are closely related to each other and even intermingled: exoticism is often related to Orientalism; the aspect of animal imagery, which performs a symbolic function, is related to both primitivism and exoticism. As for genre-related aspects, the story is exemplary detective/crime fiction that may be understood formulaically as a sequence of predictable actions (the setting of the mystery/secret, investigation, thwarted murder, revelation). But it also contains an aspect rather characteristic of Doyle’s fiction, i.e., the use of red herring. As for stylistic aspects, we emphasize Doyle’s use of gothic language and irony. The former is deemed particularly important as Doyle “was a major figure in the great period of the history of the Gothic tale” (Jones 2016: x).

---

5 For a discussion of the concept “red herring” within the framework of translation, see Seago (2014).
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Table 1. Interpretive scheme: main and sub-aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretive Scheme</th>
<th>Referential aspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Race and the Oriental:</td>
<td>The context that we delineate as the most significant and striking in the story is that of race, which also relates to the representations of the Orient. The story intimates that the doctor’s evil primarily stems from his experience in India encoded as the colony and the Orient in 19th English culture (Favor 2000). As the selected passages in the next section indicate, the doctor became hybridized through this experience, and has turned into a monster. Instead of perpetuating his aristocratic position, he has degraded himself by insisting on his Oriental habits upon his return to England as well as by befriending and hosting racial others, i.e., gypsies on his ancestral estate. In the story’s racial universe, the doctor appears to have lost both his racial/national purity and morality by being too intimate with other races and cultures. The story contains only one reference to Indians, and the most remarkable racial references are made in relation to the “gypsies,” who perform as a stand-in for the Orient in the West (England).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Using Damrosch’s language, we acknowledge that the window that the story offers on 19th century attitudes toward gender and particularly the female gender is rather small. But given that gender is a prominent and popular aspect of literary and cultural interpretations in the 21st century, this window might be deemed significant regardless of its limited scope. There might not be extensive material in terms of the representation of women in the story, but the few passages in which such representations occur are indeed suggestive and significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Imagery:</td>
<td>There are several important references in the story to exotic and non-exotic animals, wild and domesticated species, which symbolically display the dichotomy between Eastern excess and Western restraint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Exotic:</td>
<td>Closely related to the above aspect of race and the Oriental is that of the exotic. The story includes references to exotic objects and animals that point to the evils of the doctor’s cultural hybridization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitivism:</td>
<td>Having received his training in the East, the doctor has turned into a hybrid monster that exhibits primitive traits, as revealed in the representations of his demeanour and appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class:</td>
<td>The story repeatedly delineates the aspect of the doctor’s belonging to a withered branch of aristocracy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Favor (2000) explores the portrayal of foreign/other/exotic as evil in Doyle’s fiction, paying particular attention to Roylott in “Speckled Band.”
7 For a discussion of primitivism in Doyle’s The Sign of Four see Frank (1996).
The Use of Red Herring ("The Speckled Band"): The story’s mystery depends on a wordplay in English (i.e., “band” as a group of people or a strip alluding to a snake) which leads to misleading suggestions and misplaced suspicions, and whose revelation incites readerly surprise and pleasure.  

**Stylistic aspects**

*Gothic language:* Characterized as a tale of “colonial horror, shot through with a variety of imperial anxieties” (Jones 2016: xx), “Speckled Band” uses the language of fear intensively. In the story, Doyle deploys a multiplicity of words to reflect variations and shades of fear, and to heighten the overall atmosphere of suspense and mystery.

*Irony:* A renowned characteristic of English literature, irony is used in a couple of instances where Holmes points to Dr. Roylott’s primitive demeanour.

### Key passages and evaluation of translations

The following key passages below reflect the referential, genre-related and stylistic aspects described above. We include the source text passage and its two translations, identify the relevant aspects that the passage in question exemplifies, offer commentary on the source text and then examine the two translations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Dr. Roylott and the Wandering Gypsies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Helen]: “He had no friends at all save the wandering gypsies, and he would give these vagabonds leave to encamp upon the few acres of bramble-covered land which represent the family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 See Hodgson (1992: 315) for a discussion of the phrase “speckled band” as a red herring.
In this passage, Helen explains to Holmes and Watson that her stepfather Dr. Grimesby Roylott is rather asocial and withdrawn, and the only people with whom he is friendly are the gypsies who live on the lands of his family estate. This key passage displays the racial prejudices of the 19th century in relation to the “gypsies,” an ethnic minority whose nomadic lifestyle was perceived as not conforming to the standards of acceptable society. The passage contains words that would be somewhat scandalous to the 19th century British upper-class ear, especially because they have been used in the context of an aristocratic family/household. The most significant of these is the thrice-repeated “wandering.” Not only is the existence of “wandering gypsies” on the premises of an ancient household unacceptable, but an aristocratic “wandering away” with them is also equally disturbing. In the third use of the word, we are given the shocking image of two exotic animals “wander[ing] freely over his grounds.” Significantly, the passage establishes a strong semantic link between the racial category of “gypsies” and the exotic category of the animals and Oriental/Eastern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Aspects: Other Race, The Exotic, Animal Imagery, Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| estate, and would accept in return the hospitality of their tents, wandering away with them sometimes for weeks on end. He has a passion also for Indian animals, which are sent over to him by a correspondent, and he has at this moment a cheetah and a baboon, which wander freely over his grounds, and are feared by the villagers almost as much as their master.” (Doyle 1892: 181) |
| Diğer bir merakı da Hindistan’dan getirtiği hayvanlar; şu sırada terbiye edilmiş bir leoparı, bir şebeke maymunu var. Onların serbest dolaşmalarınaizin veriyor ve köy halkı da bu hayvanlardan, en az sahibinden olduğu kadar çekiniyor.” (Doyle 1992: 14) |
| çadırlarında kalıyor, bazen haftalar boyunca Çingenelerle geziyordu. Bir mektup arkadaşının kendisine Hindistan’dan gönderdiği hayvanları seviyordu bir de; şu anda, ona ait topraklarda özgürce dolaşmakta olan ve kasabalılar için en az sahibi kadar korkunç olan bir çitası ve bir Habeş maymunu var.” (Doyle 2013: 187) |
imagery. Also to be noted are those more “weighty” words that suggest stability and normativity: “family estate” and “his grounds.” These however have been undermined by the “encamp[ing] gypsies,” and here encampment suggests the nomadism of the gypsies. Tints of irony may be discerned in the reference to the “hospitality of their tents.” Helen could have merely said that Roylott returns “their hospitality” but instead chooses to remark the kind of dwelling specific to the gypsies as if to suggest the grotesqueness of a member of aristocracy seeking hospitality in the tents of vagabonds.

For the word “gypsy” both TT1 and TT2 opt for the word “çingene,” which has the same racial undertones as “gypsy.” However, it seems that TT1 undermines Helen’s disapproval of her stepfather’s fraternizing with the gypsies by omitting the first use of the word “wander” and “vagabond” and thus, turning her contemptuous tone regarding the gypsies into a matter-of-factly one as if she were merely giving an account of how her stepfather spends his time. TT1 also minimizes the gypsies’ undesired presence in the family estate by specifying the number of gypsies, unspecified in the source text, as only two (“iki çingene”). TT2, on the other hand, uses the words “avare” and “serseri” in characterizing the gypsies, making clear that Helen is not fond of them at all. In this sense, it can be suggested that TT2 reflects the intensity of Helen’s antipathy towards the gypsies, while TT1 plays it down considerably. The translations of the second “wander” is also striking. While the author seeks to show that Roylott aimlessly roams with gypsies as if he himself was one of them by using the phrase “wander away,” neither TT1 nor TT2 reflects such aimlessness. Rather, by using “dolaşıp durmak” and “gezmek,” they give the impression that Roylott merely goes on journeys with the gypsies without transforming into one. Additionally, TT1 spells out the places that Roylott and the gypsies travel to as “villages” and “towns,” (“köy kasaba”) which further downplays the aimlessness of Roylott’s wanderings.
In addition, TT2 mirrors the contrast between the gypsies’ nomadic lifestyle and the rootedness of 19th century aristocratic lifestyle indicated by “family estate” and “his grounds” in the source text. The former, which hints that Roylott’s land is passed down from his aristocratic family, is translated as “ailesine ait topraklar” in TT2, which makes it clear that Roylott’s land is inherited. Furthermore, TT2 clearly conveys Helen’s condemnation of gypsies’ nomadic lifestyle and encampment on Roylott’s land by using the negative word “serseri” while referring to the gypsies. On the other hand, for “family estate,” TT1 uses the word “arazi,” which is a broader term that may refer to any type of land, omitting the fact that the land is inherited. TT1 also omits “his grounds” altogether. TT1’s rendering of the passage therefore gives no indication of Roylott’s aristocratic background and of the aforementioned contrast.

The two animals in question “cheetah” and “baboon” are translated differently by the two translators. While TT1 opts for the words “leopar” and “şebek maymunu,” TT2 chooses “çita” and “Habeş maymunu.” Additionally, both translators choose to underline that these animals are sent from India. These choices both highlight the image of exotic animals from the Orient. However, there appears to be a translation mistake in TT1, which is the use of “leopar” (Turkish word for leopard) for the word “cheetah”. This does not reduce the emphasis on the image of exotic animals. Yet, TT1 chooses to characterize the “leopar” as tame by using the phrase “terbiye edilmiş,” which is not the case in the source text. By doing so, TT1 downplays the shocking image of an exotic animal wandering around in Roylott’s land: a tame feline would certainly not be as frightening as a wild one.
Table 3. Roylott’s Corpse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **It was a singular sight which met our eyes. On the table stood a dark-lantern with the shutter half open, throwing a brilliant beam of light upon the iron safe, the door of which was ajar. Beside this table, on the wooden chair, sat Dr. Grimesby Roylott, clad in a long gray dressing-gown, his bare ankles protruding beneath, and his feet thrust into red heelless Turkish slippers…his eyes were fixed in a dreadful, rigid stare at the corner of the ceiling. Round his brow he had a peculiar yellow band, with brownish speckles, which seemed to be bound tightly round his head…**

“**The band! the speckled band!”** whispered Holmes.

I took a step forward. In an instant his strange head-gear began to move, and there reared itself from among his hair the squat diamond-shaped head and puffed neck of a loathsome serpent.

“**It is a swamp adder!”** cried Holmes; “**the deadliest snake in India. He has died within ten seconds of being bitten…**”

[Holmes] drew the dog-whip

Masada bir denizci feneri yanmaktaydı. Işığı, kapısı açılmış çelik kasanın üstüne düştü. Masanın yanında ropdöşambı ve ayağındaki takımları ile Dr. Grimesby Roylott oturuyordu…

Korkudan yuvarlanan fırlatılmış gözleri, odanın bir köşesine yöneldi. Alının üzerinde kahverengimser noktalı garip sarı bir kordon dolanmıştı…

Holmes fısıldadı:

“Kordon! Benekli kordon!”

Bir adım öne attım. Aynı anda Roylott’un başını süsleyen o acayip kordon kımıldayrıyordu. Ve doktorun saçları arasında bir yılanın yassı kafası yükseldi.

“**Bir bataklık yılanı!”** diye haykırdı Holmes. “**Bir kere soktu mu, insanı kesinlikle öldürür.”**

[omitted part]


Görüdüğümüz manzara tuhaftı masanın üzerinde kapağı yarı açık bir fener vardı, kapısı aralık duran demir kasanın üzerinde buradan parlar bir ışık vuruyor. Masanın yanında tahta sandalyede Dr. Grimesby Roylott oturuyordu, uzun gri bir sabahlık giymişti, çıplak ayak bilekleri dışarı çıkıntı, ayaklarında kırmızı Türk terlikleri vardı… gözleri tüyler ürpertici, dimdik bir baksıya tavanın köşesine sabitlenmişti. Alının tuhaf, sarı bir şerit bağlandı, bunun üzerinde kahverengimser benekler vardı ve bu şerit kafasının sımsıkı sariyor gibi görünüyor…

“**Şerit! Benekli şerit!”** diye fısıldadı Holmes.

Bir adım ilerledim. Bir an kafasındaki tuhaf şerit hareket etmeye başladı ve saçlarının arasında içremen bir yılan, baskın, elmas şeklindeki kafatası ve şişkin boynuyla dikendil. “**Bu bir bataklık engereği!”** diye bağırdı Holmes,
swiftly from the dead man’s lap, and throwing the noose round the reptile’s neck, he drew it from its horrid perch, and carrying it at arm’s length, threw it into the iron safe, which he closed upon it. (1892: 201-202).

“Hindistan’ın en ölümcül yılanı. Adam ısırıldıktan sonra on saniye içinde ölmüş… Konuşurken köpek kamçısını ölü adamın avucundan çekip aldı ve kemendi sürüngenin boynuna atarak onu tünediği yerden indirdi, sonrasında hemen kapaşını kapattığı demir kasanın içine fırlattı. (2013: 206-208)

Relevant Aspects: Other Race and the Oriental, The Exotic, Animal Imagery, Gothic Language

This is the most crucial image in the entire narrative, in which Holmes and Watson discover Roylott’s dead body. The scene strikingly reveals Doyle’s art of creating symbolic and ideologically charged images, one of which is the hybridized image of Roylott. We are cued to the extraordinariness of the scene with the word “singular,” which happens to be a popular epithet for uncanny characters in Gothic literature. Chiaroscuro is effectively deployed in the rendering of the setting where the “brilliant beam of light” throws light on the secret of the iron safe. Most strikingly, the representation of the dead Roylott suggests that Roylott has practically turned into an Oriental figure or a gypsy in death, completing his transformation into a “lowlier” race initiated during his time in the East. A strange kind of newly acquired intimacy is intimated in Watson’s gaze at the corpse, which provides us with details of Roylott’s bedroom wardrobe: “long gray dressing-gown” and most significantly, “red heelless Turkish slippers.” So when Watson notes that Roylott’s “bare ankles” protrude beneath the gown, such protrusion or baring may be understood symbolically as the revelation of an awful private secret. This secret is Roylott’s sustained
identification with the East, as indicated previously in his smoking Indian cigars and here in his wearing Oriental, red “Turkish slippers.” The reference to Turkishness in the passage is also a reference to the 19th Century Orient and must be rendered with special attention to the Turkish readers of the 21st century, whose relation to their Ottoman Turkish heritage is far from being immediate. Doyle is gradually drawing the terrifying image of an aristocratic British man who has become a gypsy in appearance. Note that Watson does not notice the snake immediately but perceives a “speckled band” (“a yellow band” with “brownish speckles”) around Roylott’s brow, the kind of decorative band specific to the gypsies, that Helen previously thought as the mysterious reference of Julia’s strange dying words. On closer look, the speckled band first becomes a moving “head-gear,” still akin to the decorative band, enforced by the reference to the pattern of “diamond shape” but ultimately yielding to the image of the head and neck of a “loathsome serpent.” Having transformed into an Oriental and a gypsy, Roylott has become the evil agent of a deadly exotic animal, a murderous “snake trainer.” The “safe” has ironically become a “den” for the “creature”: Roylott has forfeited the safety of the ancient house by hosting a swamp adder. In a most forceful image, Doyle conveys the sense that Roylott’s Western mind has been taken over by Eastern evil: the seat of his reason, i.e., his head, has been reduced to the “horrid perch” of a deadly animal.

Examining the translations, one can notice that “singular” is omitted in TT1, while TT2 renders it as “tuhaf,” which does not evoke the same meaning as “singular” since it merely suggests the bizarreness of the scene without emphasizing its extraordinariness. Both TT1 and TT2 retain the chiaroscuro, although TT1 omits the word “brilliant” and therefore is not as specific as TT2. TT1 also omits “bare ankles” from the translation and uses such words/phrases as “ropdöşambır” and “topuksuz terlik,” which are pieces of clothing that anyone could wear at night time. Therefore, the exotic image of Roylott’s corpse is not
replicated in TT1. On the other hand, TT2 recreates the specificity of Doyle’s image by using the phrases “uzun gri bir sabahlık,” “çıplak ayak bilekleri” and “kırmızı Türk terlikleri.” However, the phrase “kırmızı Türk terlikleri” does not evoke the same exotic meaning in Turkish as “red heelless Turkish slippers” does in English since “Türk terlikleri” (emphasis ours) is not an image as exotic for the Turkish audience as it is for the British audience. Nevertheless, the Turkish audience would potentially notice the exotic effect in that they would be aware that the Turkish slippers in question are used within a British context.

As to the image of the snake as a head-gear, TT1 has created a similar image by using the phrase “başını süslemek” for “head-gear.” By using the word “kafasındaki,” however, TT2 undermines the very image. On the other hand, the implicit reference to head-gear through the use of the word “diamond-shaped” is retained only in TT2. Strikingly, TT1 does not characterize the snake in question as “loathsome” and omits the phrase “horrid perch”. Therefore, it neutralizes the image of Roylott as a gypsy taken over by Eastern evil. To the contrary, TT2 highlights the loathsomeness of the snake by using the word “ışğrenc.” Furthermore, it does not omit the word “perch” and translates it as “tünediği yer.” At this point, it is important to note that although in Turkish the verb “tünemek” is typically used for birds, and “çöreklenmek” for snakes, TT2 might have chosen the former to reflect the metaphoric use of the word “perch,” which is also typically used for birds in English, in the ST.
Table 4. Holmes Indicates a Curious Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Holmes:] “Now, when young ladies wander about the metropolis at this hour of the morning, and knock sleepy people up out of their beds, I presume that it is something very pressing which they have to communicate.” (1892: 177)</td>
<td>[Omitted]</td>
<td>“Genç bir hanımfendi sabahın bu saatinde şehir merkezinde dolanıp da uyuyan insanları yataklarından kaldıryorsa anlatacağı meselenin çok mühim olduğunu varsayarım.” (2013: 138)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant Aspects: Gender

This passage, in which Holmes informs Watson about Helen’s early arrival in the morning to seek his help in the beginning of the story, reveals that Holmes’ and Watson’s is a commonsensical and gentlemanly world of habits and regularities, where young women do not “wander about” in early hours. As discussed above “wander” is a very important word, but the “lady” here wanders out of urgency and not out of choice as gypsies do.

As to the translations, TT1 completely omits the reference to the social convention that young women do not wander about early in the morning whereas TT2 retains it. The use of the word “hanımfendi” in TT2 is also notable in that it conveys a degree of respect in Turkish, which is also the case for “lady” in English.
Table 5. Roylott as a “Beauty” and a “Gentleman”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I have seen the will of the deceased wife,” said [Holmes]. “…if both girls had married, this beauty would have had a mere pittance,… I should be very much obliged if you would slip your revolver into your pocket. An Eley’s No. 2 is an excellent argument with gentlemen who can twist steel pokers into knots…” (1892: 189-190)</td>
<td>“Mrs. Roylott’un vasiyetnamesini gördüm… Her iki kardeş de evlenmiş olsaydı, üveybabalarına pek az bir şey kalacaktı … Watson, en iyisi sen silahını yanna al! Demir çubuğu lastik gibi bükebilen bir herife ancaq silah etkili olur.” (1992: 20)</td>
<td>“Ölen kadının vasiyetnamesini gördüm,” dedi. “…Yani eğer iki kız da evlenmiş olsala, bizimkinin eline azıcık bir para geçecekti… Cebine silahını da alırsan çok sevinirim. Eley’nin 2 numaralı silahı, çelik bir çubuğu düşüm yapacak guçte bir beyefendiyle tartışırken kullanılabilecek mükemmel bir enstrümandır…” (2013: 195)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant Aspects: Irony, Primitivism

While Holmes observes that Roylott would be financially distressed if his stepdaughters married, he makes two ironic statements. He first refers to Roylott whose manners are uncivilized and unattractive as “this beauty.” In the second instance, he says that an effective gun must be used to fight “gentlemen who can twist steel pokers into knots”; clearly, the brutal and brutally strong Roylott is being ironically referred to as a “gentleman.”

A comparison of the translations of “this beauty” and “gentleman” in TT1 and TT2 reveals that the latter reflects the ironic language used in the source text to some extent while the former eliminates it altogether. TT1 specifies who “this beauty” refers to by using the word “üveybaba,” which does not convey any undertones of irony. Although “bizimki” the word that TT2 uses for “this beauty” does not have the same meaning as the source text phrase, it does convey irony as it is a term Turkish people use in referring to their
friends and/or intimate acquaintances. Holmes’ use of “bizimki” in referring to “Roylott,” with whom Holmes has a single unfriendly encounter, therefore, creates a comical effect. As to the translation of “gentleman,” TT2 replicates the ironic effect of the source text in his translation by using the word “beyefendi.” However, TT1 uses the word “herif,” which evokes hostility and aggression on Holmes’ part rather than any sense of irony. Another point to consider here is the ironical use of a gun (“Eley’s No. 2”) as an “argument” in the ST. TT1 and TT2 respectively use the phrase “etkili olmak” and the word “enstrüman” in translating “argument,” both removing the irony in this particular instance. Overall, it can be suggested that TT2 is more concerned with reflecting the irony in this passage than TT1. Additionally, both seem to have reflected the primitivism suggested by the subordinate clause “who can twist steel pokers into knots” by translating it as “demir çubuğu lastik gibi bükebilen” and “çelik bir çubuğu düğüm yapacak güçte.”

Table 6. Red Herring and Julia’s Death

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT1</th>
<th>TT2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“as I bent over her [Julia] suddenly shrieked out in a voice which I shall never forget, ‘Oh, my God! Helen! It was the band! The speckled band!’”</td>
<td>…ama üzerine eğilince, ömrüm boyunca unutamayacağım şekilde kesik bir sesle: ‘Aman Tanrı, Helen! Şeritti! Beneaksi şerit!’ diye inledi…”</td>
<td>“It is my belief that she died of pure fear and nervous shock, though what it was that frightened her I cannot imagine.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is my belief that she died of pure fear and nervous shock, though what it was that frightened her I cannot imagine.”</td>
<td>…üzere eğildiğimde asla unutamayacağım bir sesle, “Aman Tanrı! Helen! Şeritti! Beneaksi şerit!” diyerek ani bir çıkık attı.</td>
<td>“Were there gypsies in the plantation at the zaman orada birkaç çingene olurdu.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Were there gypsies in the plantation at the …as I bent over her [Julia] suddenly shrieked out in a voice which I shall never forget, ‘Oh, my God! Helen! It was the band! The speckled band!’”</td>
<td>“Korkudan öldüğüne eminim ben, ama onu bu derece şoke edecek korku nereden geldi, bilemiyorum.”</td>
<td>“O sırada Çingeneler koruda mıydilar?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is my belief that she died of pure fear and nervous shock, though what it was that frightened her I cannot imagine.”</td>
<td>“O sırada civarda çingeneler var mıydı?”</td>
<td>“Evet, neredeyse her zaman orada birkaç Çingene olurdu.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
time?”
“Yes, there are nearly always some there.”
“Ah, and what did you gather from this allusion to a band—a speckled band?”
“Sometimes I have thought that it was merely the wild talk of delirium, sometimes that it may have referred to some band of people, perhaps to these very gypsies in the plantation. I do not know whether the spotted handkerchiefs which so many of them wear over their heads might have suggested the strange adjective which she used.” (1892: 183-186)

“Kardeşinizin son sözleri, ‘kordon… benekli kordon’… Bununla ne demek istediğinizi acaba?”

“Peki şeritten, şu benekli şeritten bahsetmesini nasıl yorumladınız?”
“Kimi zaman bunun yalnızca hezeyan olduğunu, kimi zamansa bir insan grubundan, belki de korudaki Çingenelerden söz ettiği düşünüyordum. Başlarına taktıkları o benekli mendiller yüzünden mi onlardan bahsederken bu sıfatı kullandığı, emin değilim.” (2013: 189-191)

---

**Relevant aspects:** The Use of Red Herring, Gothic Language

The main interest in the passage in which Helen relates Julia’s death is the mention of the story’s eponymous object-mystery: “the speckled band.” This indefinite object functions as a red herring during the remainder of the story. As the passage above indicates, the initial speculations mainly reinforce the suggestion that it has something to do with the “band” of gypsies. “Speckled” evokes something ornamental and extraordinary, while “band,” being associated with the gypsies, intimates a foreign/exotic culture. The final revelation that “the speckled band” is indeed a swamp adder brought from India still preserves the initial sense that invokes the deadly intrusion of an ornamental thing originating in a foreign/exotic culture or setting.
Regarding the use of red herring, neither TT1 nor TT2 seems to have found a Turkish equivalent for the word “band” which in punning fashion invokes both the meanings of “a group of people” and “a strip.” Instead the translators use the words “kordon” and “şerit” which only invoke the latter meaning. The purpose of the use of this particular red herring in the story is to divert readers’ attention from the actual murder weapon (which in this case is a swamp adder) to gypsies as Julia’s potential murderers. Although the translators’ choices of words do not reflect the meaning of the word “band,” they do point at the gypsies as the potential murderers: both “benekli kordon” and “benekli şerit” are linked to speckled pieces of clothing that gypsies wear on their heads (i.e., “yemeni” and “mendil”). Consequently, the red herring originally based on a pun (“band”) becomes one depending on the interpretation of the phrases “benekli kordon” and “benekli şerit” in the translations, which might not be as convincing or compelling as the source text.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

As the above findings indicate, TT1 and TT2 handle the referential, genre-specific and stylistic aspects of Doyle’s story differently in their translation processes. To start with referential aspects, it appears that while in TT1, some of these aspects are either omitted or downplayed, TT2 transfers them in a more source-text-oriented fashion. An instance for this is the different ways through which the two TTs handle Helen’s contempt for the gypsies (see Table 2): TT1 omits “vagabond,” a word that hints at this contempt, and TT2 uses the word “serseri,” reflecting Helen’s dislike in the translation. This is also the case with “family estate” (see Table 2). While TT1 translates this phrase as “arazi,” discarding the class-related undertones of the ST phrase, TT2 uses “ailesine ait topraklar,” indicating, as in the ST, that the land is inherited. Similarly, TT1 omits a gender-related social convention (i.e., that young women do not wander about alone in the streets early in the morning) altogether, while TT2 retains it (see
Table 4). As to exotic animals, neither TT1 nor TT2 omits any of the references to them. However, TT1 downplays their exotic nature by suggesting that one of the animals (“leopar”) is tamed (see Table 2). With respect to stylistic aspects, neither one of the TTs reflects fully the ironic and gothic language that Doyle uses in his story, although TT2 once again seems to be more source-text-oriented. For instance, the ironical phrase “this beauty” and the words “gentleman” and “argument” are rendered in Turkish through “üveybaba,” “herif” and “etkili olmak,” which do not bear any trace of irony, in TT1. On the contrary, through the use of “bizimki” and “beyefendi” for “this beauty” and “gentleman,” TT2 reflects some irony (see Table 5). An instance of gothic language is the use of chiaroscuro, which seems to be retained in both TT1 and TT2. The word “singular,” which is used in describing uncanny characters in Gothic literature, is omitted in TT1. On the other hand, TT2 translates it as “tuhaf,” which results in the exclusion of extraordinariness that the word “singular” suggests (see Table 3). With regard to genre-related aspects, while both translations omit the wordplay, i.e., “band” as referring both to a group of people and the shape of the snake, they do indeed misdirect the reader into thinking gypsies are the ones who murdered Julia. Considering all these, we can suggest that while TT1 takes greater liberties in rendering the referential, genre-specific and stylistic aspects of the story (even omitting chunks of text at times as seen in Table 3 and 4), TT2 adheres more closely to the source text in transferring them into Turkish.

As mentioned earlier, TT1 appears to be more concerned with Doyle as an important literary figure and TT2, with Sherlock Holmes as a fictional figure. Keeping this in mind, one might expect to find translation choices in TT1 to show adherence to referential, genre-specific and stylistic aspects of Doyle’s narrative. However, our findings reveal that this is not the case. To the contrary, TT2 is more source-text-oriented than TT1. Moreover, the translation choices in TT2 do not indicate any emphasis on Holmes, although paratextual material
of the book, in which TT2 is published, brings the character to the fore, which can be interpreted as a result of popularity of the character post-
Sherlock. Overall, the post-Sherlock popularity of Holmes did not direct TT2 to pay special attention to Holmes at the expense of the referential, genre-specific and stylistic aspects of the story at textual level. However, this conclusion is based on an analysis of two translations and, as Toury suggests (1995), should be tested by studies with a larger corpus.

As to the educational implications of translators’ choices in translating the referential, stylistic and genre-related aspects, one can suggest that the interpretive scheme that we employed is helpful in choosing which text to use in teaching English literature to a Turkish-speaking audience. To exemplify this, we can discuss the findings of our analysis: the analysis showed that TT2 retains most of the elements related to referential aspects, while TT1 omits quite a few of them. In this sense, one can suggest that for an educator who seeks to teach his/her Turkish-speaking students about Doyle’s use of referential aspects, TT2 would be more useful than TT1. Obviously, each piece of literature would have its own interpretative scheme. However, developing one includes the following four steps: 1) the determination of the important aspects and sub-aspects of the text in question, 2) the selection of key passages that contain these important aspects, 3) the interpretation of the key passages and the selection of particular words and phrases therein 4) the determination of the ways in which a translation reflects the key aspects and hence interprets the world depicted in the source text for their Turkish readers. Although we have chosen a short story as our case-study, we believe that interpretative schemes may well be implemented in translations involving other literary genres, a possibility which we look forward to exploring in future work.
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EXTENDED ABSTRACT

The objective of this essay is threefold: 1) It formulates the referential, stylistic and generic aspects of a Sherlock Holmes story—namely “The Adventure of the Speckled Band.” The referential aspects denote the social, cultural and historical aspects of the story. In determining these aspects, the article is inspired by Damrosch’s discussion of world literature as “classics,” “masterpieces” and “windows on another world” 2) It examines the interpretive strategies of two translations of the story in Turkish by concentrating on the most significant passages in the source text that reflect these key aspects and their translations. One of these translations was published before the popularization of Sherlock Holmes in the 2010s through the TV series Sherlock while the other translation was published thereafter. 3) It intends to find out to what extent the differences in the interpretive strategies of the translations may be understood as resulting from the popularization of Sherlock Holmes and how such differences may play a role in determining the choice of the translation(s) to be used in the teaching of Doyle’s fiction to a Turkish-speaking audience.

This article is an interdisciplinary collaboration between the fields of Studies in English Literature and Translation Studies. As such, it does not necessarily adhere to the commonly accepted or conventional uses of terminology or methodologies in either field. In the article, we loosely follow Toury’s (1995) three-step methodology for descriptive translation studies by first studying the target texts under investigation as translations within the target culture and then conducting a descriptive textual analysis of ad hoc coupled pairs, which are determined through an “interpretive scheme” used to map segments from the TTs onto the source text. Last, we comment on the results of the analysis, developing case-specific generalizations. We are interested in interpreting the source text to the extent that this may help us come up with an interpretive scheme that will pick out or indicate the relevant features or aspects in the text. Such a scheme includes a plurality of aspects such as genre-related, stylistic and referential (ideological, racial, gender-specific etc.) ones, and differs from a unified, thesis-driven interpretation that concentrates on one particular aspect, which characterizes the kind of essayistic writing prevailing in Studies in English Literature.

The specific structure of our paper may be described as follows: as our case study, we choose Arthur Conan Doyle’s “The Adventure of the Speckled Band” (“Speckled Band” henceforth) and its two translations entitled “Benekli Kordon” and “Benekli Şerit Macerasi” translated by Saffet Günersel and Kaya Genç and published by Metis Publishing in 1992 and Everest Publishing in 2013, respectively. We
establish that the paratextual materials of the two books, in which the two translations under investigation are published, are suggestive of the impact of the popularity of the TV series, *Sherlock*, on the translation of Sherlock Holmes stories. We come up with an interpretative scheme that picks out the relevant features of “Speckled Band.” We then choose and concentrate on key passages in the story that reflect these aspects in the most typical, striking or suggestive manner. We provide an explanation for the choice of a particular passage, emphasizing the words and phrases in the passage that reflect the referential, generic and stylistic features of the source text. Finally, we move to the examination of two translations for each relevant passage. We determine the interpretive strategies that the translations deployed while reflecting the referential, generic and stylistic features of the source text. We establish whether the differences in interpretive strategies may be traced to the popularization of the Holmes figure in the 2010s as reflected in the differences in paratextual materials. We emphasize the educational implications of our study by noting that the use of an interpretive scheme in determining and comparing the interpretive strategies of different translations may be helpful in choosing a particular translation for the teaching of English literature to a Turkish-speaking audience. Although we have chosen a short story as our case study, the interpretive scheme that we developed in this paper may well be adjusted for and implemented in translations involving other literary genres, a possibility which we look forward to exploring in future work.