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This article addresses the relationship between text and paratext in the publication history of Vladimir Nabokov’s novel Lolita. Such paratexts include Nabokov’s own afterword to the 1958 American edition and his postscript (published in 1967) to his own translation of Lolita into Russian, as well as various introductions and afterwords, both in English-language editions and in translations of Lolita into Russian and other languages. A particularly interesting type of paratext is constituted by annotations to the main text, and the analysis focuses on parallel examples published in annotated editions of Lolita in English, Russian, Polish, German, Ukrainian, and French. The analysis shows that the most detailed annotations concerning the totality of the English and Russian Lolita text and paratexts can be found in editions published in languages other than English and Russian, whereas most English or Russian editions seem to focus on the respective language version. There is still no complete, annotated edition of the bilingual text containing all the authorial paratexts.
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**Introduction**

Vladimir Nabokov’s novel Lolita, originally published in English in 1955 and subsequently translated into many other languages (including Nabokov’s own translation into Russian), is, undoubtedly, a modern classic. Its status is illustrated by the inclusion of different types of paratextual elements in many of the published editions of Lolita. The purpose of the present article is to investigate the text/paratext relationships that can be observed in the various editions of the novel to see how these relationships inform the perception of Lolita in different language communities.
Following Gérard Genette’s seminal work *Seuils* (Genette 1987, 1997 [published in English as *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*]), I will use the term ‘paratext’ for all textual and non-textual materials that accompany the main text of a literary work: forewords, afterwords, footnotes, dedications, bookcovers, etc. However, for reasons of space, the present discussion will be limited to written paratexts. Among the different types of paratexts, Genette views translation as a type of paratextual practice, particularly “when it is more or less revised or checked by the author” (1997, 405). However, for the purposes of the present discussion, this terminological choice seems less fruitful, and I will therefore discuss text/paratext relationships in both source-language and target-language versions of *Lolita*.

The discussion of text and paratext in *Lolita* will focus on three main topics: 1) the text/paratext relationship in English-language editions of *Lolita* (*LolitaE*); 2) the text/paratext relationship in translations of *Lolita* into Russian (*LolitaR*), French, German, and other languages; and 3) the function of the particular paratextual category of annotations with respect to the different language versions of *Lolita*. Finally, the text/paratext relationship in both *LolitaE* and the translated versions will be viewed in connection with the evolving status of the novel as a classic of world literature.

**Text and paratext in the English-language Lolita**

The original 1955 edition of *Lolita*, published in two volumes by Olympia Press in Paris (*LolitaE*, EN 1955), was presented as the edition of an autobiographical manuscript written by an unnamed person, called “Humbert Humbert” by the editor. This manuscript was preceded by a foreword by its editor, “Dr. John Ray, Jr.,” in which he introduces the manuscript and provides the background of its publication. This type of preface, allegedly written by someone different from the author, is described by Genette (1997, 179) as an “allographic preface,” and the reader of *Lolita* thus appears to be offered this type of

---

1 See Genette 1997, 23–32, for a discussion of the paratextual characteristics of the cover, and 1997, 406, on illustration in general. The cover layout of various editions of *Lolita* is discussed, for example, in Bertram 2010, and the website “Covering Lolita” by Dieter E. Zimmer (http://www.dezimmer.net/Covering%20Lolita/LoCov.html [accessed 5 November 2015]) provides illustrations of covers of many editions of *Lolita*.

2 See Genette 1987, 372: “[…] la traduction, en particulier lorsqu’elle est plus ou moins revue ou contrôlée par l’auteur.”

3 See Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002, 47, who concludes: “In short, viewing translations as paratexts will not serve a broader view of translation based upon a consideration of the textual features, functions, reception or effects of translated texts […].”
paratextual preface followed by the text. However, on both of the front covers of the two-volume first edition of 1955 and on its title pages, the text in its entirety, i.e., both the foreword by “John Ray, Jr.” and the manuscript by “Humbert Humbert,” are presented as the work of a third author, “Vladimir Nabokov,” although his name does not appear anywhere else in the book.

Thus, instead of constituting an “authentic allographic preface,” the foreword by “John Ray, Jr.” is in reality what Genette calls a “fictive allographic preface.” Indeed, Genette explicitly mentions the foreword in Lolita as an example of this type of paratext (see Genette 1997, 289). However, due to the intricate relationship between the foreword and the ‘main’ text of Lolita, I will, at least within the framework of the present analysis, treat the fictional foreword by ‘John Ray, Jr.’ as text rather than paratext. In doing so, I view it as a particular type of text, namely a text that is presented as a paratext, or what we could call “pseudo-paratext” (see Beliaeva 2008). The text/paratext configuration of the first edition of Lolita is illustrated in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>‘Pseudo-paratext’</th>
<th>‘Main text’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreword</td>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOLITA: Volume One</td>
<td>LOLITA: Volume Two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Text and paratext in the original edition of Lolita (EN 1955)

In addition to the original pseudo-paratext foreword, many subsequent English-language editions of Lolita include several types of ‘authentic’ paratext, of which only some have authorial origin. The most significant paratext authored by Nabokov himself is his afterword “On a Book Entitled Lolita,” written in 1956 and included in most English-language editions

---

4 For a more detailed discussion of the relationship between the foreword and the ‘main’ text of Lolita, see, for example, Narins 2001.
of *Lolita* since 1958. In this afterword Nabokov explains the status of the foreword, comments on the publication history of the novel, and discusses other aspects of the text. Paratexts not authored by Nabokov include various prefeces and afterwords by editors and literary scholars, as well as excerpts from previously published reviews of the book. The main types of text/paratext configurations in post-1958 editions of *Lolita* are shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Paratext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author: Vladimir Nabokov</td>
<td>Author: other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Pseudo-paratext’</td>
<td>‘Main text’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Original authorial postface’</td>
<td>‘Original allographic paratext’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreword</td>
<td>Part 1 + Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterword 1956 (‘On a Book Entitled <em>Lolita</em>’)</td>
<td>Editors’ prefeces and afterwords, excerpts from reviews, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Text and paratexts in most post-1958 English-language editions of *Lolita*

**Text and paratexts in translations of Lolita**

The first two published translations of *Lolita*, into Danish and Swedish (DK 1957, SE 1957), appeared as early as 1957, that is, prior to the publication of the 1958 Putnam edition of *Lolita*. Consequently, they included only translations of the text part of Nabokov’s work.

---

5 Genette mentions the afterword to *Lolita* as a typical example of a “later postface” (1997, 237 [1987, 219 “postface ultérieure”]).
(including the pseudo-paratextual foreword); the paratextual afterword was not yet available. However, in almost all later translated editions, the afterword is included, and it has become a standard component of editions of Lolita.

With the publication of Nabokov’s own translation of the novel into Russian (LolitaR) in the United States in 1967 (RU 1967), two additional paratexts were added: a new afterword (Postskriptum, ‘postscript’) to the Russian edition, and a short glossary (under the heading Perevod inostrannykh terminov, ‘translation of foreign terms’), in which the author explains certain words and literary allusions for the Russian-speaking reader, and also, in a few cases, expresses his opinions. The text/paratext configuration in RU 1967 is shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Paratext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author: Vladimir Nabokov</td>
<td>Author: other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Pseudo-paratext’</td>
<td>‘Main text’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Original authorial postface’</td>
<td>‘Original authorial postface’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predislovie</td>
<td>Pervaia + Vtoraia chast’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predislovie</td>
<td>“O knige, ozaglavlennoi «Lolita»”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predislovie</td>
<td>“Postskript um k russkomu izdaniiu”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predislovie</td>
<td>“Perevod inostrannykh terminov”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front cover inside, photograph etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Text and paratext in the 1967 Russian edition of Lolita

---

6 It is possible that the translation into Finnish, first published in 1959 (i.e., after the 1958 publication of Nabokov’s afterword), followed the same model, see FI 1986, which still does not include this standard Lolita paratext.

7 See, for example, RU 1967, 300 “Jean-Christophe,—posredstvennyi roman R. Rollana” [Jean-Christophe—a mediocre novel by Romain Rolland]; RU 1967, 301 “chto nazyvaetsia «Diksiland» (poshloe prozvishche iuzhnykh shtatov)” [that is called Dixieland (a vulgar nickname for the southern states)] (see Barabtarlo 1993, 112, 141).
According to Dolinin (1995, 323), “the Russian Lolita should in fact be considered a new redaction of the novel, its second avatar in a parallel linguistic and cultural reality, rather than a bleak copy of the dazzling original” (original emphasis). Similarly, Cummins (1977, 354) stresses the creative role of the Russian Lolita with respect to the original version: “the new Lolita has exegesis right in the body of the text.”

With regard to the present discussion, I find it useful to see the Russian version of Lolita as a result of self-translation as defined by Hokenson & Munson (2007, 2): “Self-translation, the specific ways in which bilinguals rewrite a text in the second language and adapt it to a different sign system laden with its own literary and philosophical traditions […].”

The two additional authorial 1967 paratexts (the postscript and the glossary) are, as a rule, not included in post-1967 translations from the English source text (see, for example, SP 1975, FI 1986, IT 2012, FR 2005, SE 2007, as well as—perhaps somewhat unexpectedly—the annotated FR 2010), and they are not included in the standard annotated edition of LolitaE (EN 1991), either. They seem to be included primarily in two types of editions of Lolita: editions of LolitaR published in Russia, and translations into other languages based on the LolitaR source text, such as, for example, the translation into Ukrainian published in 2008 (UA 2008), and the translation into Serbo-Croatian published in 1968 (SC 1968—the latter, however, is claimed to have been checked against the English text, see SC 1968, [2]). In addition, the annotated German edition (DE 2005), which is based on the LolitaE source text, includes also the Russian Postskriptum in German translation. However, the annotated Polish edition published in 1991, for which the translator used both LolitaE and LolitaR as source texts (see PL 1991, [3]), omits both the 1967 postscript and the glossary.


9 See also Grutman (2013, 200), who identifies two main types of self-translators: those who translate between languages that have unequal social and symbolical prestige, and those, including Nabokov, whose work involve “widely distributed languages that occupy comparable positions on the world stage”.
The first publication of LolitaR in the Soviet Union occurred in 1989 (RU 1989), with an allographic preface by Viktor Erofeev, and it has since been published in Russia in many different editions. Many of these editions include all of the authorial paratextual elements present already in RU 1967 (the translation into Russian of the 1956 afterword, the postscript to the Russian edition, the glossary of foreign terms), as well as the pseudo-paratext foreword by “John Ray, Jr.,” but there are also Russian editions that fail to include one or several of these elements. See, for example, RU 1991a, which includes the main text of LolitaR (part 1 and 2), as well as the glossary of foreign terms, but neither the pseudo-paratext foreword nor any of the paratextual afterwords; RU 1992 (the fifth, additional, volume of the four-volume edition of Nabokov’s collected works published in 1990) and RU 2005, both of which include the main text of LolitaR (part 1 and 2) but omit the pseudo-paratext foreword, all afterwords, and the glossary, and do not mention the existence of LolitaE.10

The annotated Lolita

Yet another type of paratext comprises annotations to the main text (see Genette 1997, 319–343). Most editions of Lolita are not annotated, but there are some annotated editions in English, Russian, and other languages, which can be seen as an indication of the growing academic interest in Lolita as a literary work and in Nabokov’s authorship in general. For the present analysis, I have compared seven annotated editions of Lolita: two American, one Russian, one Polish, one German, one Ukrainian, and one French, all of which include a separate section with notes on the text of Lolita:

1) EN 1991. The Annotated Lolita (EN 1970, 1991), in addition to a corrected version of the original English text of the novel, includes a separate original allographic preface by the editor of the volume, Alfred Appel, Jr.; a fictive allographic preface by “Charles Kinbote” (borrowed from Pale Fire); and almost 140 pages (EN 1991, 319–457) of detailed notes to the text. EN 1991 has become the ‘standard’ text of LolitaE not only for subsequent English-language editions but also for many translations into other languages. The annotations include no references to LolitaR.

10 However, RU 1992 includes a separate section comprising Nabokov’s Russian translations of Shakespeare’s Hamlet’s monologue, Baudelaire’s L’Albatros, Goethe’s Zueignung (Dedication) to Faust, and Rimbaud’s Le Bateau ivre (The Drunken Boat). For additional details on the publication and discussion of LolitaR in the Soviet Union and Russia, see, for example, Zverev 1995, 294f; Shekhovtsova 2005, 2006; Beliaeva 2008.
2) EN 1996. The edition of LolitaE included in volume two of the three-volume edition of Nabokov’s works in the Library of America series includes, in addition to the main text, Nabokov’s 1956 afterword, a list of Nabokov’s own revisions and corrections that have been incorporated into the text, a list of corrected typographical errors, and thirteen pages with annotations to LolitaE by Brian Boyd (EN 1996, 873–885). With the exception of a short discussion of Nabokov’s translation of his 1956 afterword into Russian on page 885, the annotations include no references to LolitaR.

3) RU 1997. The second annotated edition11 of LolitaR, published in 1997, includes, in addition to the main text of LolitaR, both the 1956 afterword in Russian translation and the 1967 postscript.12 The 1967 glossary is included in the commentary (RU 1997, 601–652), although it is not marked as such. According to the annotator, A. Liuksemburg, the comments are based on (unspecified) works by Appel and Dolinin (apparently, this refers to RU 1991b).

4) PL 1991. The first complete Polish translation of Lolita, published in 1991 and translated “from English and Russian” (z angielskiego i rosyjskiego)13 by Robert Stiller, includes a Polish translation of the main text of Lolita and the 1956 afterword, and approximately 50 pages of annotations by Stiller (PL 1991, 349–404). In the translator’s afterword, Stiller explains that the translation is made from the English source text, but that consistent consultation of the Russian version made it possible to better understand the intentions of the author and to choose among different translation possibilities. He stresses the necessity for any student or translator of Lolita to know also the Russian version of the text: “Podejmowanie się studiów nad Lolitą albo jej tłumaczenia bez dokładnej znajomości tego przekładu rosyjskiego jest niepoczytalne” [To engage in studies of Lolita or in translating it without a profound knowledge of the Russian translation is insane] (Stiller 1991, 429).14

---

11 An earlier Russian annotated edition of LolitaR, RU 1991b, with an introduction and extensive annotations by Aleksandr Dolinin, has unfortunately not been available for the present analysis.
12 According to the editors, the text has been slightly adapted in order to adhere to the norms of modern standard Russian without, however, disturbing the author’s intentions (see RU 1997, 601: “[…] popytka priblizit’ tekst k normam sovremennogo russkogo iazyka i v to zhe vremia ne narushit’ avtorskogo zamysla”).
13 According to the translator, the Polish text is based on EN 1970, RU 1967, and Proffer 1968 (see Stiller 1991, 435).
14 Cf. Genette 1997, 405, who emphasizes that translations made by the author of the source text “must, in one way or another, serve as a commentary on the original text,” and thus has important “paratextual relevance.”
5) DE 2005. The German annotated edition, published in 2005, includes, in addition to the text of the novel, both the 1956 afterword and the 1967 postscript, and approximately 100 pages of annotations by Dieter Zimmer (DE 2005, 586–690), based on works by Proffer, Appel, Dolinin, and others. The edition also includes a separate afterword by Zimmer and a detailed bibliography, but not the 1967 glossary.15


7) FR 2010. A French annotated edition of Lolita is included in the second volume of works by Vladimir Nabokov published in the prestigious Pléiade series in 2010. The text of the novel is followed by the 1956 afterword. The volume also includes an afterword by the translator, Maurice Couturier, a chronology, a short note on the text as a whole and a short bibliography, and almost 100 pages of numbered notes to the text and the 1956 afterword (FR 2010, 1627–1726).

As the overview indicates, the number of pages dedicated to annotations differs considerably among the seven editions, from approximately 140 pages in EN 1991 to only eight pages in UA 2008, and only a limited number of text items have been commented on in all or most editions. In what follows, I will provide a short analysis of the annotations of three excerpts from the text of Lolita:

1) the mention of Vivian Darkbloom (in the English text)/Vivian Damor-Blok (in the Russian text) in the foreword by ‘John Ray’

2) some items in the “paper chase” section in part two, chapter 23

---

15 See, for example, the annotation on p. 596 “Jean-Cristophe – zehnbändiger Gesellschaftsroman (1904–1912) von Romain Rolland”, which does not include any reference to Nabokov’s evaluation of the novel (cf. above, note 7).

16 However, at least some of the glossary items appear as footnotes to the text, see, for example, UA 2008, 58, fn. 1 “«Jean-Christophe»--poserednii roman R. Rollana” [Jean-Christophe--a mediocre novel by R. Rolland], which includes Nabokov’s original opinion of the text (see above, note 7); compare, however, the explanation of the French expression “ce qu’on appelle Dixieland” in UA 2008, 201, fn. 1: “Tak zvanyi Diksilend (fr.; pivdenni shtaty SShA).” [The so-called Dixieland (Fr.; the southern states of the USA).], where Nabokov’s evaluation of the expression as “vulgar” has been omitted.
3) the reference to Shakespeare (in the English text) and Pushkin (in the Russian text) in part two, chapter 35

**Vivian Darkbloom / Vivian Damor-Blok**

An associate of Clare Quilty, Vivian Darkbloom (LolitaE) / Vivian Damor-Blok (LolitaR) is explicitly mentioned three times in the text of the novel (see EN 1991, 4 [Foreword], 31 [Part 1, chapter 8], 221 [Part 2, chapter 18]; RU 1997, 12 [Foreword], 44 [Part 1, chapter 8], 271 [Part 2, chapter 18]). She is introduced in the Foreword:

(1a) “Vivian Darkbloom” has written a biography, “My Cue,” to be published shortly, and critics who have perused the manuscript call it her best book. (EN 1991, 4)

(1b) G-zha Vivian Damor-Blok (Damor—po stsene, Blok—po odnomu iz pervykh muzhei) napisala biografiuu byvshego tovarishchaa pod kalamburnym nazvaniem «Kumir moi», kotoraia skoro dolzhna vyiti v svet; kritiki, uzhe oznakomivshiesia s manuskriptom, govoriat, chto éto luchshaia ee veshch’. (RU 1997, 12)

[‘Ms. Vivian Damor-Blok (Damor—her stage name, Blok—afer one of her first husbands) has written a biography of her former companion with the punning title My Idol, which is soon to appear; critics, who have already acquainted themselves with the manuscript, say that it is her best piece’.]


FR 2010 explains only the English version of the name, but both DE 2005 and PL 1991, in addition to explaining the English version, also add a reference to the Russian version. In UA
2008, which reproduces the Russian version of the name (UA 2008, 32: “Pani Vivian Damor-
Blok (Damor—stsenichne prizvyshche, Blok—prizvyshche odnoho z ïï pershykh cholovikiv”
[Ms. Vivian Damor-Blok (Damor—her stage name, Blok—the last name of one of her first
husbands], the Russian version is explained, but there is also a reference to the English
version’s “Vivian Darkbloom,” and the fact that she is the author of the notes to Nabokov’s
Ada: “[…] anahrama imeni i prizvyshcha pis´mennika. Dodane v rosiis´kii versii […]
natiakaie na rol’, iaku zihrala poeziia A. Bloka v stanovlenni Nabokova-poeta. […] V
anchliis´kii versii kokhanku Kuïlti zvaty Vivian Darkbloom. Vona zh «ie» avtorom prymitok
do romanu Nabokova «Ada».” [an anagram of the first and last name of the author. Added in
the Russian version […]], it alludes to the role of the poetry by Aleksandr Blok for the
formation of Nabokov as a poet. […] In the English version Quilty’s mistress is called Vivian
Darkbloom. She “is” also the author of the comments to Nabokov’s novel Ada.] (UA 2008,
404).

The “Paper Chase”
The so-called “paper chase,” in part two, chapter 23 of Lolita, includes a number of puns and
literary allusions that offer an obvious object for commentary and annotations (see, for
example Proffer 1968, 11–19; 2000, 30–43; and Barabtarlo 1993). In order to illustrate some
of the strategies employed by the respective annotators, I will look closer at three of the
“paper chase” items:

(2a) what a very quaint name for a home town, Kawtagain (EN 1991, 248)

(2b) na kakoi smeshnoi ulitse goroda zhivet étot mister Kuk: Isho 5. (RU 1997, 304) (see
Barabtarlo 1993, 127: “Kuk = Cooke; kukish = fig (obscene digitation); opiat´ = again.
‘Cocked a snook at you again’”)

According to Appel, the name Kawtagain refers to the words “caught again”: “‘Caught
again.’ Needless to say, there is no such town” (EN 1991, 424). Barabtarlo (1993, 127) reads
the Russian version as Kukish opiat´ (with the number five spelled out as piat´). In RU 1997,
however, no explanation is given (RU 1997, 639); similarly, EN 1996 lacks any comment on
the English version (EN 1996, 882). The French edition, repeating the English variant of the
name (FR 2010, 1069: “quel drôle de nom pour une ville, Kawtagain”) explains the English
pun (FR 2010, 1701: “Réécriture fantaisiste de l’expression caught again (« attrapé à nouveau »).”) but does not mention the Russian version.

However, in the Polish, German, and Ukrainian editions, the source text pun is translated into the respective target languages with a focus on the punning effect (PL 1991, 276: “cóż to za nazwa miasta: Phiggae”; DE 2005, 403: “Was für ein komischer Name für einen Heimatort, Greater-Rhinefall.”; UA 2008, 314: “Iaka smishna nazva sela, de zhyve tsei mister Vam, — Duli.”), but in neither DE 2005 nor in UA 2008 is there any explanation of the target text puns. In PL 1991, by contrast, the target text pun is explained and compared with both the English and Russian versions of the pun (PL 1991, 390: “Phiggae czyli figę! to po angielsku Kawtagain: caught again znów się nabrałem, a po rosyjski w retranskrypcji zapewne: Mr Cook, Eashaw 5, czyli kukisz opiat’: znowu figę.” [Phiggae or figę! is in English Kawtagain: caught again I have got you again, in Russian in retranscription supposedly: Mr Cook, Eashaw 5, or kukisz opiat’: once again figę.]).

(3a) and one hardly had to be a Coleridgian to appreciate the trite poke of “A. Person, Porlock, England.” (EN 1991, 250)

(3b) i edva li sledovalo byt znatokom kinematografa, chtoby raskusit’ poshluiu podkovyrku v adrese: “P. O. Temkin, Odessa, Tekhas”. (RU 1997, 307). (see Barabtarlo 1993, 128: “One hardly had to be a cinema expert to detect the pedestrian teaser in the following address: ‘P.O. Temkin, Odessa, Texas ’”)

The English version’s reference to Coleridge is explained by Appel (EN 1991, 426), who also adds a reference to the character Porlock in Nabokov’s short story “The Vane Sisters” (1959), but the Russian version is not mentioned. In a similar way, RU 1997 comments only on the Russian version. However, only the place name Odessa is explained: “v shtate Tekhase sushchestvuet vpolne realnyi gorod Odessa” [in the state of Texas there is a completely real town Odessa] (RU 1997, 640). Perhaps the allusion to Potemkin was considered to be too obvious to comment on for a Russian reader.17

17 See, for example, Proffer 2000, 33 (the translators’ footnote): “Razumeetsia, liubomu russkoiazychnomu chitateliu, nesmotria na sushchestvovanie takogo goroda v Tekhase, ochevidna ten’ bronenosta iz fil’ma Éizenshteina.” [Of course, to any Russian-speaking reader the shadow of the battleship in the film by Eisenstein is obvious, notwithstanding the existence of such a town in Texas.]
But the most penetrating bodkin was the anagram-tailed entry in the register of Chestnut Lodge “Ted Hunter, Cane, NH.” (EN 1991, 251)

No bol’nee vsego pronzila menia koshchustvennaia anagramma nashego pervogo nezabvennogo privala (v 1947-om godu, chitatel’!), kotoruiu ia otyskal v knige kasbimskogo motelia, gde on nocheval riadom s nami: “Nik. Pavlych Khokhotov, Vran, Arizona”. (RU 1997, 308f) (see Barabtarlo 1993, 130: “But the most painful stab was the sacrilegious anagram of our first unforgettable layover (in 1947, O Reader!), which I spotted in the register of the Kasbeam motel where he had spent a night next to us: ‘Nick. Pavlych Hohotov, Vran, Arizona’”; 18

18 In addition, Barabtarlo (1993, 114), provides a translation into English of “Nick. Pavlych Hohotov, Vran, Arizona”: “‘Mr. Guffaw’ from ‘Raven, AZ’; Vran suggests ‘lies’ or ‘folderol’ […].)”
In EN 1991, the English version is explained as an anagram of “Enchanted Hunter,”¹⁹ but the Russian version is not mentioned (EN 1991, 428), whereas RU 1997 does not comment on the Russian or the English version.²⁰ FR 2010 follows EN 1991 closely, noting, however, that “Hunter” must be in the singular (FR 2010, 1704), whereas EN 1996 offers no comment on the anagram.


Macbeth vs. Evgenii Onegin

(5a) I have not much at the bank right now but I propose to borrow—you know, as the Bard said, with that cold in his head, to borrow and to borrow and to borrow. (EN 1991, 301)

¹⁹ See, however, Naiman (2010, 38), who criticizes Appel and other commentators for seeing “no more than the surface anagram here” and draws attention to a possible connection with Shakespeare’s use of bawdy language.

²⁰ The Russian version is an anagram of “Prival zacharovannykh okhotnikov,” see RU 1997, 320; Proffer 2000, 41 (the explanation of the Russian version is added by the translators, and is not discussed in the source text, see Proffer 1968, 18). For a detailed discussion of the relationship between Nabokov’s English and Russian names of the hotel, see Cummins 1977, 357f, who argues that the Russian version adds important meanings: “But to this central equivalence [i.e., between “Enchanted” and “Zacharovannye”. PA] the Russian Lolita adjoins an array of secondary associations.”

²¹ Similarly, both SC 1968 and IT 2012 present new target text anagrams of the respective translated names of the hotel, see SC 1968, 248 “Ivo Lačar, Cazin” (an anagram of “Začarani lovci”, see SC 1968, 258) and IT 2012, 314 “Icaro Cantici, Attica, In.” (an anagram of “I Cacciatori incantati”, see IT 2012, 326), whereas, for example, FI 1986 does not indicate any connection between the two (see FI 1986, 301 “Ted Hunter, Cane, NH” vs. 313 “LUMOTUT METSÄSTÄJÄT”).

(5b) u menia seichas malovato v banke, no nichego, budu zhit’ dolgami, kak zhil ego otets, po slovam poèta. (RU 1997, 367) (see Barabtarlo 1993, 140: “I haven’t got much in the bank right now, but that’s all right, I’ll live by means of debts, as his father did, in the Bard’s words”)
pożyczać i pożyczać.”), the note explains in some detail the reference to Macbeth in LolitaE, but adds also a short reference to Evgenii Onegin.26

Conclusions

By applying the paratext concept introduced by Genette (1987), as well as the distinction between paratext and text, to both the English-language and Russian-language versions of Lolita, we can distinguish three distinct stages in the development of Lolita as a complex literary work:


2) The first American publication of Lolita in English in 1958. In addition to the original text of LolitaE, this edition included the paratextual authorial afterword “On a Book Entitled Lolita.”

3) The publication of Nabokov’s Russian translation of Lolita in the United States in 1967 (LolitaR). In addition to a Russian version of both the foreword and the main text of the novel, LolitaR also includes a Russian version of the afterword “On a Book Entitled Lolita,” as well as two new authorial paratexts originally written in Russian: the Postskriptum k russkomu izdaniiu [Postscript to the Russian edition] and the glossary of foreign terms (Perevod inostrannykh terminov).

As a result, the ‘total’ version of Lolita that became available beginning in 1967 includes the following authorial components: English and Russian versions of the foreword, the main text, and the 1956 afterword, as well as exclusively Russian versions of the postscript and the glossary. This final version of Lolita has, to the best of my knowledge, never been published as a separate, combined bilingual edition. Similarly, critical discussion of Lolita has, particularly in the Anglophone world, with few exceptions been limited to either LolitaE or LolitaR. For example, Michael Wood mentions the Russian translation of Lolita (Wood 1994, 5), but his analysis in chapter five, entitled “The Language of Lolita,” seems to be based exclusively on the text of the 1955 LolitaE. Complaining about the lack of knowledge of the English original of Lolita in Russia, including its critical response, Alexander Dolinin also

---

26 See PL 1991, 402 “The Bard czyli Wieszcz to po angielsku Shakespeare. W jednej wersji aluzja werbalna do Makbeta, nibi że zakatarzonego i przez to mówiącego (w 5 scenie V aktu) to borrow pożyczać zamiast to-morrow jutro; a w drugiej do Onegina” [The Bard or Wieszcz ['bard'] is in English Shakespeare. In one of the versions there is a verbal allusion to Macbeth, albeit with a runny nose, and because of that saying (in the 5th scene of Act V) to borrow […] instead of to-morrow […]; and in the other version to Onegin.]
recommends that the readers of the English text acquaint themselves with the Russian version of the novel in order to come “nearer to the totality of the author’s vision” (1995, 328).

Existing monolingual editions of either LolitaE or LolitaR can be divided into two groups:

1) ‘Complete’ editions, which include both the main text and all the paratexts of either LolitaE or LolitaR. These include, among others, the English and Russian annotated editions EN 1970, EN 1991, RU 1991b, and RU 1997 (the very first edition of Lolita [EN 1955] was, of course, complete at the time of its publication).

2) ‘Incomplete’ editions, which may lack the pseudo-paratextual foreword, as well as all or some of the authorial paratexts of either LolitaE or LolitaR. These include, for example, EN 1979 (which includes only the main text of the novel, omitting both the pseudo-paratextual foreword and the 1956 afterword), RU 1991a, RU 1992, RU 2005 (see Beliavea 2008).

Translations of Lolita into languages other than Russian are, as a rule, based on either LolitaE or LolitaR. The translations can be divided into ‘complete’ translations, which include translations into the target language of both text and paratext (to this type belong, for example FR 2010, DE 2005, PL 1991);27 ‘incomplete translations,’ which include translation into the target language of the complete text (including the pseudo-paratextual foreword), but in which target language translations of one or more of the authorial paratexts included in the respective versions are absent (see, for example, UA 2008); and ‘defective’ translations, which lack the pseudo-paratextual foreword, as well as all or some of the authorial paratexts of either LolitaE or LolitaR, or else fail to offer a reasonably complete (compared to the respective source text) target text; these include, for example, the first translation into Swedish (SE 1957), in which substantial parts of the source text were omitted from the translation.

Thus, as I have tried to show, more than fifty years after the first publication of Lolita in English and after more than forty years since the completion of the ‘total’ Lolita, there is still no edition offering the reader the complete literary work, including both versions of the text and all authorial paratexts.28 Furthermore, the allographic paratexts (prefaces, afterwords, 

---

27 A special case is comprised by the first Swedish and Danish translations (SE 1957, DK 1957), which do not include Nabokov’s paratextual afterword, which at the time of these translations had not yet been published together with the text of Lolita in a book edition.

28 Cf. Cechanovičius & Krūminienė 2012, 127: “the complete Lolita may best be appreciated by bilingual readers through an interactive reading of the original English version and the author’s own Russian translation, as they offer two distinct expressions of Nabokov’s poetics.” Gentes (2013, 275–277) offers a preliminary typology of bilingual editions,
annotations, etc., by other persons) included in the monolingual English and Russian editions of *Lolita* that have been analyzed in the present article, as a rule relate exclusively (or predominantly) to only one of the two versions of the text.\textsuperscript{29} Thus, for the reader who wishes to appreciate *Lolita* in its entirety, the best choice might actually be one of the annotated translations into Polish (PL 1991), German (DE 2005), or French (FR 2010). Paradoxically, for the time being it is primarily the non-English, non-Russian editions that offer at least a glimpse of the whole complexity of the English/Russian bilingual literary classic *Lolita*.
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