

**Ballard, Michel (éd.) (2006). *Qu'est-ce que la traductologie ? Traductologie*. Arras : Artois Presses Université. 302p.**

*Qu'est-ce que la traductologie?*<sup>1</sup> Vingt-six spécialistes en matière de traduction se sont penchés sur cette question prégnante lors d'un colloque organisé dans le cadre des activités du Centre de Recherches en Traductologie de l'Université d'Artois (CERTA). Leurs contributions, répertoriant diverses facettes de l'étude de la traduction, ont été réunies en volume par Michel Ballard, selon leur ordre de présentation. Les thèmes que les auteurs ont dégagés sont les suivants : la question des origines et du début de la traductologie, des panoramas géographiques (établissant des lignes de recherche actuelles dans des pays différents), la relation aux autres sciences et les démarches spécifiques dérivées à partir de disciplines-mères, comme la relation à la linguistique et au monde professionnel.

La première question soulevée est celle de l'histoire de la traductologie. Seuls deux articles portent sur ce sujet : le premier est celui d'Henri Awaïss (p.13-21), évoquant trois hommes de lettres qui ont chacun dans son domaine et à sa manière parlé de l'opération traduisante lors de l'époque Abasside (IXe s.) et de la Renaissance (XIXe s.) au Moyen-Orient. Ce bref aperçu sur le travail de ces trois "traductologues primitifs" (p.20) prouve que la pratique a devancé les termes, les concepts et les théories. Le second article, de Claude Bocquet (p.23-36), présente le passé plus récent de la traductologie, établissant l'entrée (paradoxale) de cette démarche : l'enseignement des méthodes pratiques a précédé, à l'Université, le développement d'une théorisation scientifique. Marianne Lederer (p.37-51) établit un lien entre le passé et le présent de la traductologie en dégageant l'origine et l'évolution de la théorie interprétative développée par elle-même et ses collègues à l'ESIT. Elle se concentre plus précisément sur le processus même de la traduction.

Un deuxième groupe de textes portent sur les spécificités culturelles de la traductologie. Hassen Boussaha (p.53-59) s'interroge sur la traductologie en Algérie cherchant une réponse à trois questions fondamentales : pourquoi traduit-on, que traduit-on et pour qui traduit-on en Algérie ? Il soutient que la traduction est considérée à l'université algérienne comme la marche à suivre vers "l'acquisition des connaissances scientifiques littéraires et philosophiques universelles" (p.58). La contribution de Vu Van Dai (p.61-68) est axée sur le savoir-faire en traduction au Vietnam, plus spécifiquement sur la compétence minimale que l'apprenant-traducteur doit y acquérir à l'issue d'un processus d'apprentissage. Maria Tenchea et Georgiana Lungu Badea (p.69-79) esquissent la situation de la recherche traductologique en Roumanie. D'après les auteurs, celle-ci se caractérise par une diversité de perspectives et de démarches. Il reste à mener un dur combat en vue de la professionnalisation des traducteurs, pour que l'activité de traduction y acquière un véritable statut (p.77).

La relation aux autres sciences constitue le troisième volet. La contribution de Lieven D'hulst (p.81-93) porte sur l'apport des études de

traduction aux études littéraires francophones. À travers l'analyse d'une série d'exemples, l'auteur plaide pour une reconsidération de la catégorie 'traduction' par une approche intégrative des études descriptives de la traduction (J.S. Holmes 1972) (p.87), en agençant une perspective *discursive* et *systémique* vis-à-vis de la traduction. Christine Durieux (p.95-105), quant à elle, se propose de montrer que la traductologie est une discipline essentiellement limitrophe (p.95). Elle se concentre sur la théorie interprétative et essaie de formuler une réponse à des questions telles que : la traductologie s'applique-t-elle de la même manière à la traduction littéraire et à la traduction technique ? À quoi sert la traductologie ? Faut-il être traducteur pour parler de traductologie ? Daniel Gile (p.107-117), ensuite, fournit une contribution intéressante sur l'histoire de la traductologie depuis les années 1970, suivie d'une réflexion poussée sur l'interdisciplinarité *externe* (d'importation) et l'interdisciplinarité *interne* de la traductologie (du fait de la diversité naturelle des points de vue sur la traduction).

Le quatrième volet concerne des démarches spécifiques, dérivées à partir de disciplines-mères. La question de la relation à la linguistique est traitée par Jean-Claude Chevalier et Marie-France Delpont (p.119-132), qui posent que si toute transformation de la part du traducteur est prise pour un fait de langue, ceci ne met pas assez en relief les mérites créateurs du traducteur (p.120). André Dussart (p.133-144) est d'avis, lui aussi, que la traductologie requiert une approche multidisciplinaire. Dans son article, dont le propos et la structure ne sont pas toujours limpides, il donne un bref survol historique de la stylistique comparée, des approches lexicosyntaxiques et de la notion fonctionnelle de *skopos*, de l'herméneutique (Gadamer et Ricoeur) et de l'écriture (la faculté de produire un texte convaincant). On appréciera davantage la contribution suivante de John D. Gallagher (p.145-159), qui est consacrée à la théorie fonctionnelle de la traduction, également appelée la théorie du *skopos* (Vermeer). Gallagher expose les principes de la nouvelle doctrine, ses atouts, les rapports entre la théorie du *skopos* et les autres théories de la traduction, et les critiques émises à l'encontre de cette théorie avant de fournir quelques applications pratiques. L'enjeu d'une théorie sociologique de la traduction, tel est le sujet de l'article de Jean-Marc Gouanvic (p.161-170). Il commence par affirmer qu'il n'y a pas de contradiction, de principe, entre les idées d'Antoine Berman et une socio-analytique de la traduction (p.161). Il essaie ensuite de définir une "sociologie traductologique" en l'opposant à "l'entreprise polysystémique" et applique à la traduction les notions de champ, d'habitus et de capital symbolique (p.163). Andrew Chesterman (p.171-178), de son côté, propose une traductologie fondée sur la formulation et la vérification d'hypothèses, selon la position du philosophe Karl Popper. Cette traductologie poppérienne est basée sur "la découverte et la formulation de différentes hypothèses, qui sont soumises à l'épreuve pour être soit reformulées soit rejetées" (p.178). Le but serait de construire un réseau cohérent d'hypothèses et de formuler un programme de recherche

ou une théorie lakatosienne. Michel Ballard (p.179-194), ensuite, propose une démarche basée sur l'observation sur corpus. Celle-ci consiste dans un premier temps en un paramétrage du texte par l'identification des équivalences et dans un second temps en l'observation et l'interprétation de celles-ci. L'étude de la traduction sur corpus comporte dès lors trois activités majeures : l'herméneutique, la paraphrase synonymique à visée imitative et l'écriture (p.192). La contribution suivante, due à Teresa Tomaszkiwicz (p.195-211), enfin, porte sur l'analyse conversationnelle mise au service de la traductologie. L'auteur en dégage des principes pour la didactique de la traduction (p.209).

Le lien avec le monde professionnel, qui constitue le volet suivant, est assuré en premier lieu par la contribution de Christine Raguét (p.213-226), qui conserve les traces de la présentation orale. Universitaire, Raguét fait intervenir également son métier de traductrice littéraire. Sa communication porte sur la manière de 'traductologiser' : à partir d'exemples commentés, elle plaide en faveur d'une tolérance entre des approches différentes mais complémentaires. L'historien et enseignant de la traduction Christian Balliu (p.227-235), quant à lui, plaide pour "une autre traductologie pour une autre traduction" (p.227), assortissant histoire, théorie et pratique. Également universitaire et formatrice de traducteurs, Elisabeth Lavault-Olléon (p.237-250) s'attache à la traductologie dans ses rapports avec le monde des professionnels. Elle ressuscite la dichotomie qui s'en trouve à la base : "nombreux sont les traducteurs qui ne veulent pas entendre parler de traductologie", mais nombreux sont également "les universitaires qui enseignent la traductologie et ne pratiquent pas la traduction en dehors de l'université" (p.237). Elle examine si ces deux positions sont mutuellement exclusives ou si la traductologie peut contribuer bel et bien à la professionnalisation. Prenant pour appui l'évaluation des traductions, Freddie Plassard (p.251-269) explore comment les théoriciens d'une part et les praticiens d'autre part envisagent cet aspect. Sa contribution distingue les discours tenus par les uns et par les autres, et pose le problème des échanges entre les deux univers. Lance Hewson (p.271-281), quant à lui, ouvre un débat sur le métalangage de la traductologie. D'un côté, il évoque une série de métaphores (territoire, objet, enfoui, envahisseur, conquête, annexion, etc.), de l'autre, il se penche sur l'évolution des métaphores et leur emprise sur la traductologie.

Que la traductologie à l'université reste une grande absente, tel est l'enjeu de l'article de Delphine Chatrier (p.283-292). Elle évoque plusieurs raisons : le fait que l'institution universitaire n'accueille pas la traductologie en tant que discipline d'enseignement, à côté de raisons de type socio-historique, socio-linguistique et scientifique. Ainsi, la traductologie a de la peine à trouver son autonomie. Pour Daniel Gouadec (p.293-299), enfin, trop de traductologies tue la traductologie" (p.293). Il part de l'idée que c'est la prestation du traducteur qui devrait permettre de produire une traductologie unifiée. Selon Gouadec, il est urgent d'élaborer une analyse

*traductographique*, impliquant la définition des procédures de production, des objectifs et des règles de traductions.

En fin de compte, deux questions restent ouvertes : le présent recueil serait-il appelé à devenir un véritable ouvrage de référence ? Et est-ce qu'il permet de répondre à la question formulée dans le titre ? La structure peu claire et l'absence d'index entravent une lecture ciblée et le repérage d'idées-clefs. Le lecteur qui souhaite obtenir des informations précises se trouvera vite confronté au caractère disparate des différentes communications qui ne définissent pas toujours l'objet propre de leur recherche. Certes, la traductologie reste un champ disciplinaire en quête de sa cohérence, sollicitant l'apport de disciplines connexes. Malgré ce point de critique, le mérite du volume sur la traductologie est sans doute, comme l'affirme Michel Ballard, de mettre en relief "la diversité de ses démarches et l'abondance de sa production" (p.9). Nous signalons dès lors l'intérêt de l'ouvrage pour les jeunes chercheurs qui veulent se mettre au cœur des derniers développements de la traductologie.

**Karen Vandemeulebroucke – Subfaculteit Letteren  
K.U.Leuven Campus Kortrijk**

**Griesel, Yvonne (2007). *Die Inszenierung als Translat. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Theaterübertitelung*. Berlin: Frank & Timme. 341p.**

Within the broad field of translation studies surtitling in the theatre is a new subject that has been rather neglected. One reason might be that this form of translation came into existence only with the development of new technologies in the 1980s. Furthermore, the technological dimension as well as the situational complexity of surtitle production and reception make this a difficult object to study systematically. What little has been done in this area has tended to focus on the practical difficulties of rendering a spoken text in surtitles, with largely impressionistic considerations on the implications of surtitles for the performance. The same is true of other forms of theatre translation which gained importance especially with the internationalisation of theatrical performances and which are not based on the written text but on the performances themselves. These include resume translation, simultaneous interpreting and special arrangements such as the integration of a target-language actor into a performance in the original language (cf. p. 9). The present volume, based on the author's doctoral dissertation, sets out to investigate these forms both theoretically and empirically, with a focus on surtitling. The author's choice of the German term "Translation" for all these different forms seems highly appropriate since this notion, as used in functional theories of translation such as Vermeer's theory of purposeful action and Holz-Mänttari's theory

of translational action, encompasses all forms of written and spoken translation in a very broad sense.

Yvonne Griesel adopts an interdisciplinary approach and integrates semiotic, literary and theatrical concepts and insights into a translation theoretical framework. After a short introduction which presents “Translation” in the theatre as an object of study in its own right, Chapter 2 locates the various new forms of theatre translation in the general context of theatrical production, drawing on Fischer-Lichte’s semiotic approach to the performance as text. This broad definition encompasses the verbal and nonverbal elements of the theatrical text. Griesel completes this holistic textual view with two further components that influence and shape the translation: the different, often heterogeneous groups of audience, and the written text, which serves as a starting point for the theatrical production. The latter encompasses not only the original but also (canonized) translations that serve as a point of reference for the translator (“Referenzebene”, p. 22f.) and thus might influence his or her translational decisions.

Besides the sociological dimension, cultural factors are shown to play a decisive role in the translation process, as exemplified by a comparison of the German and the French theatrical systems. The internationalization of theatre performances, together with technological developments, is identified as a decisive factor for “Translation” in the theatre, which is defined by means of “dichotomies” such as literariness vs use, intercultural vs international theatre, multimediality vs intermediality, spoken vs written, and auditory vs visual reception. Translation in the theatre oscillates between these poles depending on the form and purpose of the translation.

In the third chapter, the author locates her object of study on the disciplinary map of translations studies, arguing that “Translation” in the theatre should be regarded as an object in its own right – similar to opera translation, film translation, etc. – which is located at the intersection of translation and interpreting studies. Griesel identifies the specifics of “Translation” in the theatre in relation to similar areas such as opera surtitling, subtitling for the media, drama translation, dubbing and voice over. In a very reader-friendly tabular overview (p. 67f.) she summarizes the specific features of surtitling in theatre and opera and subtitling in film, with reference to the source and target texts and the role of temporal, spatial and acoustic factors.

The holistic approach formulated in the first chapters requires a theoretical framework which encompasses not only the verbal but also the many nonverbal components and all the relevant factors of this “multidimensional translation process“ (p. 69). Thus, in Chapter 4 the author adopts a functional approach as has been developed since the 1980s by Hans Vermeer and Justa Holz-Mänttari and which has been refined by Erich Prunc with his *skopos* typology. This general theoretical basis, which views a translation not as a secondary text dependent on the original but as a text in its own right, is then applied to and specified for the area of

“Translation” in the theatre. By taking up Holz-Mänttari’s concept of translational action the author describes in Chapter 4 the roles and players involved in the theatrical transfer: the influence of the initiator, the commissioner, the role of the translator, the source text and its author, and – most importantly – the “splitting” (“Spaltung”, p. 93) of the source text into the text of the performance and the written original, both of which are important for any translational decisions. Special consideration is also given to the role of media – printed media, the interpreting booth, subtitling technology and other multimedial techniques. All these factors determine the choice of the mode of translation to be used. Besides the classical distinction between interpreting and translation as defined by Otto Kade, Griesel introduces a third mode: translation hybrids (p. 114f.) Due to the specific situational conditions of theatre translation, surtitles do not completely fulfil Kade’s criteria for translation, i.e. correctibility and repeatability, so that they have features of both translation and interpreting. According to the author these new forms of translation which do not fit into the classical distinction of translation and interpreting demonstrate the necessity of terms such as the German hyperonym “Translation”, which encompasses both translation and interpreting (p. 109). The last section of Chapter 4 is devoted to the evaluation of translations. Here, Griesel opts for a multi-perspective approach, taking into account the interests of various groups of receivers such as the public, the production team of the performance, the organizers of the festival and the press.

The subsequent empirical chapter focuses on one specific area of translation in the theatre: surtitles as a typical translation hybrid. The corpus consists of eight French theatre productions which were shown at international festivals in Germany and which are available on videotape. Four of them are fully transcribed and analysed for the degree of shortening of the source text in the translation; the others are analysed only in part. Griesel differentiates between the elimination and compression of words, phrases or passages. In addition to these two most frequent strategies, Griesel also discusses the extension of the source text in the surtitles (especially in the case of culture-specific terms); the influence of nonverbal elements (facial expression, gestures); and simplification, concerning in particular punctuation and syntax. The results of this empirical study show that there are many factors of a production that strongly influence the final quality of the translation product. These factors, which were identified in the theoretical part of the book as determining the translation process, are taken into account and integrated into the empirical analysis. This makes it possible to consider various reasons for the variable quality standards of the surtitles analysed.

In the last chapter of the book Griesel presents a model of the translation process for surtitles on the basis of her empirical data. The model includes all the different aspects and agents and identifies a variety of desiderata, all of which are included in a schematic description of the

ideal translation process, which is considered not as one possible but as the only adequate form of translation in the theatre (p. 298f.).

This book is the first comprehensive account of a previously neglected area of translation studies. The integration of translation theory, reception theory, action theory as well as technical and practical aspects of translation offers a holistic basis for further investigation. The empirical analysis is carried out with great accuracy and offers a fine example of interaction between theoretical concepts and empirical data. As Griesel herself concedes, the corpus is too small to allow general conclusions, but it paves the way for future investigations in this complex and new area. Those taking on this challenge will certainly find this book an indispensable reference.

**Klaus Kaindl – Centre of Translation Studies, University of Vienna**

**Hermans, Theo (ed.) (2006). *Translating Others*. Manchester : St. Jerome. Vol. 1, 256 p. & Vol. 2, 536 p.**

*Translating Others* regroupe plus de trente contributions dont la plupart ont vu le jour dans le cadre du projet “Translations and Translation Theories East and West” de la University College London et la School of Oriental and African Studies. La question de recherche qui fut à la base de cette entreprise visait à dessiner la mappemonde des théories de la traduction. Dans la mesure où la tradition traductologique est pour une très large part un fait européen, il s’agissait donc en premier lieu d’interroger d’autres traditions culturelles, tels l’Asie, l’Afrique et le Moyen Orient. Les préoccupations traditionnelles de la traduction s’expriment souvent en termes de (protection de) l’identité et à l’aide de métaphores portant sur la transposition et la transportation. Il y avait en effet lieu de compléter une telle conception du phénomène qui souligne avant tout l’importance des frontières, linguistiques, sociales, politiques ou historiques. Soulignons dès à présent que le titre rend bien compte de la double orientation donnée à cette question de recherche : *Translating Others* peut être rendu par *Traduire l’autre*, mais également par *Ces autres qui traduisent*.

La première section du volume, *Grounding Theory*, développe quelques réflexions plus générales concernant l’objet et la théorie de la traduction, non seulement dans le cadre des *translation studies*, mais aussi, plus largement, des *cultural studies* et de l’anthropologie culturelle. Ainsi, dans son article “Reconceptualizing Translation Theory”, Maria Tymoczko commence par rappeler qu’il ne suffit pas d’introduire des données non-occidentales dans les études de la traduction pour étendre véritablement la problématique: il faut réévaluer les concepts de base de la traduction tels

qu'ils ont bien souvent été formulés dans la tradition européenne. Elle insiste sur la façon dont l'Occident a étayé sa réflexion en la matière sur la traduction de textes sacrés (religieux et canonisés) et sur les textes écrits. A l'aide de très nombreux exemples, elle entend marquer les limites de cette approche.

“Meanings of Translation in Cultural Anthropology” de Doris Bachmann-Medick passe d'abord en revue les différents sens qu'a pu donner l'anthropologie culturelle à la traduction, pour arriver à l'acception qui présente la culture même comme un processus de traduction. A l'aide d'exemples tirés des romans de Salman Rushdie, l'auteur montre combien il est important de ne plus concevoir la traduction dans un cadre dichotomique opposant différentes cultures, mais comme un concept de base essentiel pour développer une anthropologie transnationale.

Ovidi Carbonell Cortés continue dans “Misquoted Others. Locating Newness and Authority in Cultural Translation” sa réflexion sur les différentes façons d'envisager la traduction comme négociation entre le *propre* et l'*autre* et montre que la simple opposition entre *domesticating translation* et *foreignizing translation* ne permet pas de rendre compte de la complexité des possibilités dont dispose le traducteur pour négocier ces différences. En opposition avec le courant largement accepté dans les études traductologiques occidentales qui considèrent la *foreignizing translation* comme la plus audacieuse, l'auteur explique, entre autres à partir de l'exemple des traductions des *Mille et une Nuits*, pourquoi une stratégie de domestication peut s'avérer tout aussi innovatrice.

Les 6 études reprises dans *Mapping Concepts* concernent la pratique et la théorie de la traduction dans différents contextes et traditions et tendent essentiellement à montrer combien il peut s'avérer difficile d'articuler les concepts de la traductologie occidentale autour des conceptions de la traduction telles qu'elles sont développées dans les traditions grecques antiques, chinoises (“Translation and the Language(s) of Historiography: Understanding Ancient Greek and Chinese Ideas of History” de Alexandra Lianeri, “From ‘Theory’ to ‘Discours’: The Making of a Translation Anthology” de Martha Cheung et “‘And the Translator Is –’: Translators in Chinese History” de Eva Hung), indiennes (“Our Own Time, On Our Own Terms: ‘Translation’ in India” de Harish Trivedi), arabes (“Translation into Arabic in the ‘Classical Age’: When the Pandora's Box of Transmission Opens ...” de Myriam Salama-Carr) et tibétaines (“Gained in Translation: Tibetan Science between Dharamsala and Lhasa” de Audrey Pros).

La section *Reflexive Praxis* récuse, à partir de différents points de vue et à l'aide d'exemples très divers, l'opposition tranchée entre traduction et texte (littéraire) original. Dans “The Translator as Theorist: Thoughts on Cogitation, Figuration and Current Creative Writing”, Carol Maier s'engage dans l'étude de la fictionnalisation de la traduction et constate la



réurrence tout à fait remarquable de la traduction comme thème et du traducteur/interprète comme personnage dans les textes de fiction depuis le début du XXI<sup>ème</sup>

**Katrien Lievois – Hoger Instituut voor Vertalers en Tolken, University College Antwerp**

**Nitsa Ben-Ari (2006). *Suppression of the Erotic in Modern Hebrew Literature*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press. 423p.**

The primary role of translated literature in the formation of Hebrew literature is well documented through the pioneering works of Toury, Shavit and others. These studies have revealed how a secular literature in Hebrew was built almost from the ground up with the aid of translations of mainly the classics and socialist-realist literature. In her book *Suppression of the Erotic in Modern Hebrew Literature* Nitsa Ben-Ari takes us one step further, dealing with a fundamental gap in modern Hebrew literature. Indeed, until the 1970s, all erotic literature, high and low, original, translated and pseudo-translated, was suppressed in the central literary repertoire.

This intriguing book gives a well-documented and multi-faceted answer to the causes and long-term effects of this absence. It therefore draws on an impressive variety of original/translated/pseudo-translated (sometimes almost untraceable) textual material: canonical literature, pseudo-scientific or paramedical texts, pulp fiction, the so-called ‘banned books’ of the Western world (e.g. Miller, Nabokov), next to pedagogical reports, newspaper reportages, love letters, archives. Abundant, well-chosen examples from all these sources have been translated from Hebrew into English by the author in order to make them accessible to the international public: a real drudgery. In line with actual sociological orientations within translation studies this study complements the analysis of source and target culture texts, models and repertoires with that of the cultural agents or agencies “involved in shaping, implementing, and materializing taste” (p.11): writers, translators, publishers but also pedagogues, doctors, politicians. Especially Ben-Ari’s insight in the underground world of translators and publishers of pulp fiction is remarkable. To a lesser extent, the author touches upon the creation of a target readership and its complicity in maintaining or changing literary norms. The book’s main theoretical-methodological background is nonetheless polysystemic, e.g. in its broad definition of pornography as “anything that has been so labelled by authoritative groups” (p.xiv), in its large diachronic and contextual approach towards international and Israeli legislation on obscenity (chapters 1 & 2), in its historical overview of the creation of Sabra Puritanism (chapter 3), and in its functional distinction between centre and periphery (chapter 5), to name just a few aspects. Of special interest moreover, is the polysystemic concept of ‘repertoire’ for analysing the causes and consequences of

the suppression of the erotic specific to Hebrew culture. In critical dialogue with Foucault, for whom the suppression and over-articulation of the erotic in Western society are “two sides of the same coin”, Ben-Ari suggests to “complement it with the hypothesis of cultural repertoires according to which the growth of cultural images – in fact the very emergence of ideas, symbols, and values – is subjugated to practical models known and available to people in the culture, in this case models of literary writing” (p.6). It is indeed the unavailability of both home and foreign erotic literary repertoires that helps to explain the impossibility to over-articulate sex, a void so specific for Hebrew culture. But then, how can one understand this absence in a culture that otherwise has leaned heavily on an imported modern literary repertoire to establish itself? This is the paradox that Ben-Ari sets herself to elucidate treating its societal and literary causes as well as its linguistic and literary consequences.

Causes (chapters 2 and 3). Although there are no ‘forbidden’ books as such in Israel, nor any literary pre-censorship board, the study demonstrates that the literary system, both original and translated, behaved as if it was subjected to such a censorship and adopted severe puritanical norms with regard to erotic representation up until the 1970s. The cultural ethos that dominated Israeli society and that was responsible for what Ben-Ari calls self-inflicted censorship up until the 1970s was that of the Sabra. The elitist Sabra model, which came to its peak in the 1950s, considered women as subversive elements to the collective ideology of a national movement. Love, as an individual feeling, was opposed to nationalism, and sexuality and eroticism were pushed aside. The purity code of the Sabra rejected pornography, dirty jokes, pulp fiction and cheap literature. Newspapers, love letters, pedagogical reports ... all contain evidence of this code. In chapter 4, we read how also in canonical Hebrew literature of the 1940s and 1950s, literary images of this puritan Sabra dominated, with negative connotations for the erotic and repression of the sexual. The centre thus was and remained puritan for several decades, not penetrated by subversive erotic models, not even in translation, only offering “a selective inventory of the “right” literature” (p.133). Disconnected from canonical literature, erotic literature was bound to flourish in the underground with different writers, translators, publishers and distributors (chapter 5). According to Ben-Ari’s systems theory’s perspective, we are confronted here with the paradox of a central repertoire not being stratified, dynamic ‘enough’, yet maintaining its central position for decades. “Since so much had to be translated, so many gaps closed, such enormous world classics rendered in Hebrew, is it at all surprising that the repertoire was at first not as stratified as it would be in cultures with a long and diversified tradition?”, the author wonders (p.133). Perhaps not. However, things are somehow put into a broader perspective a few pages further down when the focus briefly turns to the market and to readership.

The battle in Hebrew over Hebrew culture as opposed to multiculturalism well expresses the immense distance between ideology and

reality. Before and after the establishment of the state, most of the population in Israel was multicultural and multilingual, and that was the population that had the option of reading erotica in the original or in different translations. (139)

This target public's multilingualism, although seen as reactionary by the Sabra elite, and the possible corresponding availability of non Hebrew erotica on the multilingual literary market remain blind spots which would deserve further investigation. As in so many other situations, the construction of an official monolingual 'national' literature coexists with multifarious heterodox multilingual practices on the ground. In Hebrew culture, however, the national literature's special circumstances of inception are likely to have left more room for allophone practices. People whose origin and roots (often in terms of half a life time) are linked to a multitude of other, non Hebrew cultures do not leave behind their past together with their geographical displacement. They bring with them their (non Hebrew) linguistic and cultural habituses. This is what the book briefly points at when observing that "in the first ten years of existence, more than half of the population of the state of Israel could not speak Hebrew, and whole sectors of the population maintained newspapers, libraries, and theatres in their own tongues. (...) in 1967 (twenty years after the establishment of the state) the distribution of foreign-language newspaper was 100,000 a day" (p.139). Next to the repression of the erotic in official Hebrew literature, the question of alternative, be it less legitimate, circuits of erotica in the original language or in translations other than Hebrew is left open for further consideration. Among other things, it requires a further conceptualisation of the multilingual market and readership and of the reader's habitus.

Literary consequences (chapter 5). As a result of this systemic constellation, the author demonstrates how the erotic was channelled to the periphery of Hebrew literature where it flourished in the form of pulp literature, of pseudo-scientific textbooks and of so-called 'banned books' (see below). Translations and pseudo-translations of popular erotic literature started in the 1930s and 40s and reached a climax in the 1960s. They were published by ephemeral publishers or subsidiaries of established houses, created for the purpose. These were cheap booklets in the double sense of the word, read secretly by the readers, translated by separate groups of often anonymous translators and totally ignored by conformist journalism. Original and translated pseudo-scientific texts were a second popular channel dealing with sex and offering a forum for sexual excitement. These books formed for many years the only, and rather poor, language laboratory to shape a modern sexual literary repertoire in Hebrew. According to Ben-Ari, the goal of the culture shapers was to control the "truth" about sex: many famous books (Kinsey, Masters and Johnson) were very late or never translated in Hebrew because they were too revolutionary. However, this striking example of non translation again raises the question of the multilingual reading market. Would it be possible that

some groups of readers had access to these bestsellers in the original language or in translations other than Hebrew? After the 70s, Hebrew translations increased and were published by more central publishers. Again, the link of this development with a possible simultaneous evolution of the target public towards a more monolingual Hebrew readership remains unanswered. Thirdly, the so-called 'banned books' (Lawrence, Cleland, Miller, Nabokov and Réage), i.e. books on trial, banned abroad and translated into Hebrew in clandestine editions, remained unacceptable for canonical Hebrew literature long after the ban was lifted in the source culture (chapter 6). Comparison of subsequent translations of these novels in terms of the publisher's and translator's status, of format, price, front page, cover, and fullness of translation shows some books' progressive acceptance in the centre (*Lolita*) while others remained in the periphery (*Fanny Hill*). Translation strategies (chapter 7) oscillated between omission of pornographic elements and/or addition of epigonic elements from the high-literature repertoire.

Linguistic consequences (chapters 8-10). Attempts to build a linguistic erotic repertoire in written Hebrew had thus to develop completely outside the centre, in pulp fiction and pseudo-medical texts. Ben-Ari's analysis illustrates how the sex guides' limited, clean and conservative erotic repertoire in combination with clichéd metaphors and an artificially elevated language, formed for a long time the basic reference for translators and writers of pulp fiction. These restricted repertoires used by a relatively small number of translators/writers resulted in the stereotypical nature of Hebrew pulp fiction, while a vernacular of mainly foreign words developed in spoken language. Translated literature could have introduced primary models but failed to do so until well into the 1970s. Notwithstanding the introduction of new norms in the 1990s, the gaps in the repertoire need more time in order to be filled.

*The Suppression of the Erotic* is a fundamental contribution to the history of Hebrew literature and a remarkable illustration of the role of translation *and* non translation in literary dynamics more in general. In systemic terms, researching the absent, the non translated, the non sayable/writeable is less evident but as essential a condition to understand a system's diachronic and synchronic functioning as is analysing the translated, the sayable/writeable. Next to the question of the conceptualisation of the multilingual market and readership and of (the evolution of) the reader's habitus, the book raises that of the relation between censorship and self-censorship. How legitimate is it to oppose them as a stronger, formal, external, legal vs. an internal, self-inflicted, weaker variant? The present study demonstrates how the internalisation of erotic taboos can be maximally effective without special legal measures. Conversely, recent research (Vandaele 2006) has revealed that even under the strongest censorship regime, people are not necessarily just a cog in the machine.

## Bibliography

- Shavit, Zohar (1998). "The Status of Translated Literature in the Creation of Hebrew Literature in Pre-State Israel". *Meta* XLIII(1), 46-53.
- Toury, Gideon (1977). *Translational Norms and Literary Translation into Hebrew, 1930-1945*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University and the Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics. [Hebrew].
- Vandaele, Jeroen (2006). *Estados de Gracia. Traspases entre la semántica franquista y la poética de Billy Wilder (1946-1975)*. PhD thesis. K.U.Leuven.

Reine Meylaerts – Faculteit Letteren, KULeuven

**Stallaert, Christiane (2006). *Ni una gota de sangre impura. La España inquisitorial y la Alemania nazi cara a cara*. Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg. 537 p.**

Este libro trata de la política de expulsión de España de minorías, religiosas y otras, comenzada durante el Reino de los Reyes Católicos. Parte de los edictos de expulsión de los judíos de 1492. La vigilancia sobre la homogeneización de la población fue mantenida durante algunos siglos. El libro traza un paralelo entre esta política y la de los nazis. Este paralelo no es evidente. Christiane Stallaert llega a convencernos de que las diferencias son de dirección y de procedimientos, pero no de fondo. El punto de partida de los Reyes Católicos fue la religión, no así los nazis. Borges decía que a un español le costaba imaginarse que el mundo entero no fuese español. A los nazis les costaba imaginarse que Alemania no fuera totalmente aria.

Christiane Stallaert tiene dos puntos de partida. El primer punto de partida es una constatación traductológica. A la hora de traducir ciertos términos alemanes, los traductores españoles afirman no encontrar equivalentes en castellano. Christiane Stallaert se sorprende. Si en España hubo un movimiento en contra de los judíos semejante al que hubo en la Alemania nazi, ¿por qué sería difícil encontrar términos equivalentes? La palabra 'casta' es española. La palabra 'casticismo' lo es asimismo. *Volk* y *Völkisch* son palabras claves en la cosmogonía nazi. En la medida en que la ideología nacional socialista se va traduciendo en actos a partir de estas palabras se vuelven aparentemente cada vez más intraducibles. Después de la Guerra ya nadie encuentra equivalentes. En España tampoco. No se quiere traducir lo que no se quiere incorporar. No aprendemos la lengua de un pueblo cuyas costumbres culturales nos repugnan. No traducir significa no identificarse. No identificarse implica no traducir.

El segundo punto de partida es el ideológico. Se constata que en Europa el cruce de razas, o de nacionalidades, va en aumento. Esta amalgama genera tensiones. ¿Cómo manejar esta situación? Sabemos que Alemania aplicó una salida que no merece nuestra aprobación. Pero Alemania

fue derrotada. Los perdedores no tienen cómo hacernos olvidar sus pecados. Lo contrario ocurrió en España, donde los partidarios de la solución radical de expulsión de los judíos prevalecieron. ¿Será por esto que los paralelismos son aborrecidos por gran parte de los historiadores españoles, sin hablar de la opinión pública?

Christiane Stallaert constata que la cohesión social es necesaria para garantizar una convivencia pacífica. Esta cohesión social se define no pocas veces por medio de la pertenencia a una determinada raza. Cuanto más nos parecemos, menos nos peleamos.

La historia moderna y contemporánea de Europa ha conocido dos momentos particularmente dramáticos de ruptura del mecanismo descrito: la España inquisitorial y la Alemania del holocausto. Ambas experiencias históricas se caracterizan por una preocupación enfermiza por la cohesión social y la búsqueda de la solución en la eliminación brutal de la diversidad étnica. La idealización patológica de este bien social se tradujo en el caso de España en un asimilacionismo feroz, en el caso alemán en un segregacionismo genocida. (14)

Christiane Stallaert no hace una amalgama de la España Inquisitorial y la Alemania Nazi. Aunque el blanco era igual, los métodos a veces también, los puntos de partida eran diferentes. Se sabe que la Inquisición estaba preocupada, en principio, con una limpieza de ideas y prácticas. Inicialmente no le interesaban los argumentos hemofóbicos. Sin embargo, fue evolucionando en ese sentido.

Solemos tratar los crímenes del pasado con más indulgencia que los de hoy. Leemos con indiferencia sobre la matanza de tres mil presos musulmanes en San Juan de Acre en 1104. Contemplamos con horror las fotos de Srebrenica. Nos suenan como poesía pasajes como el siguiente del Poema de Mío Cid:

¡Oid a mi, Albar Fañez | e todos los cavalleros!  
 En este castiello | grand aver avemos preso;  
 los moros yazen muertos, | de bivos pocos veo.  
 Los moros e las moras | vender non los podremos,

que los descabeçemos | nada non ganaremos;  
 cojamos los de dentro. | ca el señorío tenemos,  
 posaremos en sus casas | e dellos nos serviremos.<sup>2</sup>

Es cierto que nos cuesta imaginarnos vividamente hechos ocurridos en una época de la que no conocemos los detalles emocionales. Nos dicen los libros de historia que la expectativa de vida era baja, la mortalidad infantil alta, que la gente era 'teocéntrica'. ¿Les habrá ayudado a relativizar la

muerte? ¿Les habrá dolido menos una orden de expulsión? La razón de nuestra impasibilidad tal vez sea el optimismo en el que nos educamos, que nos hace pensar que, de alguna forma, la humanidad va evolucionando, cambiando para mejor. ¿Será culpa del marxismo, de Hegel? ¿Será culpa de nuestra experiencia de vida individual en la que vemos desarrollarse nuestra empatía a lo largo de los años? ¿O será la información creciente que tenemos sobre los otros y que los vuelve menos extraños?

Hay los contemporáneos. En el Quijote, Cervantes toca una sola vez el asunto de los judíos. Dice Sancho que el judío es su 'enemigo mortal'. ¿Opinión de Cervantes o razones de labrador? ¿Cisma entre lo que piensa Sancho y lo que siente? Por fin, tenemos a Ricote, el simpático moro que volvió secretamente a España para recobrar su tesoro y a quien Sancho trata como amigo. Antes, Cardenio nos dice que sus padres son labradores 'sin mezcla de alguna raza mal sonante'. Los *foros* sobre Cervantes se preguntan si él era racista, si de derechas o izquierdas, si feminista o no. No se divulgaba tan liberalmente la opinión de uno como hoy. No se escucha en la historia de la expulsión de los judíos españoles la opinión de los contemporáneos. No tenemos a ninguna Anne Frank para darle cuerpo a los Edictos de 1492.

En su libro, Christiane Stallaert toma posición. Escoge la vía del inmovilismo: el ser humano no cambia. La ética tampoco. Lo que se condena hoy, se tiene que condenar en el pasado y se ha de lamentar de la misma forma. En las más de 500 páginas que cuenta su libro, la autora nos va confrontando con los varios aspectos de las políticas de expulsión española y alemana. La víctima siempre ha sido el objeto de estudio más evidente. Christiane Stallaert consultó una cantidad asombrosa de fuentes que nos acercan a los hechos desde el punto de vista del 'ejecutor', el 'executioner'.

El libro de Christiane Stallaert es indócil para quien, como el autor de esta nota, siempre aceptó la versión de la historia que no admitía paralelismos entre los dos fenómenos antisemitas. Como decía Mark Twain, uno es más crédulo en las materias de las que sabe poco. Este libro nos ayuda a ser menos crédulos.

**Philippe Humblé – Departamento de Língua e Literatura Estrangeiras, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Brasil.**

**Van Coillie, Jan and Walter P. Verschueren (eds.) (2006). *Children's Literature in Translation. Challenges and Strategies*. Manchester and Kinderhook: St. Jerome. 190p.**

The year 2006 saw the publication of two volumes on the translation of children's literature: Lathey's *The Translation of Children's Literature: A*

*Reader* and Van Coillie and Verschueren's book, the subject of the present review. This is a remarkable feat, given the fact that Baker's *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* from 1998 does not yet include the topic as a separate lemma. It illustrates yet again how Translation Studies is further expanding its research activities: while Lathey's reader covers almost three decades of research into the translation of children's literature, Van Coillie and Verschueren's volume presents eleven new explorations of the characteristics of translating literature for children, its subtitle 'Challenges and Strategies' capturing the disparate approaches very well.

Translators' practices are here described by Gillian Lathey, who also edited the other book on children's literature in translation ('The Translator revealed: Didacticism, Cultural Mediation and Visions of the Child Reader in Translators' Prefaces' on prefaces) and Belén González-Cascallana ('Translating Cultural Intertextuality in Children's Literature'). Riitta Oittinen ('No Innocent Act: On the Ethics of Translating for Children'), Anette Øster ('Hans Christian Andersen's Fairy Tales in Translation') and Isabel Pascua-Febles ('Translating Cultural References: The Language of Young People in Literary Texts') comment the ways in which translators deal with conflicting norms (e.g. accessibility vs. learning), suggesting educational or didactic norms play an additional role in translating literature for children. While the last already discusses culture-specific items, Jan Van Coillie focuses on the translation of one particular type, i.e. personal names ('Character Names in Translation: A Functional Approach').

How translations of children's literature play a role in the target community and its culture is the subject of Rita Ghesquiere's contribution ('Why Does Children's Literature Need Translations?'). A country in which this role was not taken light-heartedly is East-Germany: its translation policy with regard to children's literature is discussed by Gaby Thomson-Wohlgemuth ('Flying High - Translation of Children's Literature in East Germany').

Inversely, the target community may itself play a role in the translator's choices: Vanessa Joosen investigates this in a case study of Dutch translations of Aidan Chambers ('From *Breaktime* to *Postcards*: How Aidan Chambers Goes (Or Does Not Go) Dutch'). How the translator's view of what the target community expects of a translation of a children's book influences translation choices is illustrated by Mette Rudvin and Francesca Orlati ('Dual Readership and Hidden Subtexts in Children's Literature: The Case of Salman Rushdie's *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*').

And there is one contribution which seeks to answer a methodological question within Translation Studies: looking at how Nordic children's literature is translated, Isabelle Desmidt asks the question whether Chesterman's prototype approach to defining translation with his proposal for default values stands the applicability test ('A Prototypical Approach within Descriptive Translation Studies? Colliding Norms in Translated Children's Literature').



For readers not familiar with the topic of children's literature, the survey of its features by Peter Hunt summarized by Rudvin and Orlati (p. 162) is very useful. As for translating children's literature, the volume will teach them that the translation situation has the following specific features: like its source text, the target text is written for a dual readership that not only consists of children (so the translator's image of the child plays an important role) but also of adults; like its source text, the translation may not be held in such high esteem as (translated) adult literature; and like its source text, the translation may have a lasting influence on its young readership and the genre may therefore be thought by the target community to play an educational or didactic role. Although these circumstances do not make the translator's job any easier, the translation techniques adopted do not seem different from those in different adult translated registers, nor do the translators' general strategies that range between introducing the readership to a new culture by remaining faithful to the source text (exoticization) and prioritizing the accessibility of the translation to the target text readership (domestication). Interesting questions arise and still need to be investigated: has censorship been exercised with regard to the political subtexts in the Arabic and Farsi translations of Salman Rushdie's *Haroun* (Rudvin and Orlati 2006:183)? how exactly do children receive translated children's literature (Van Coillie 2006:137)? will more translation scholars follow Desmidt and test Chesterman's prototypical definition with its default values in order to arrive at a workable and agreed definition of translation?

All contributors and all languages discussed are clearly European. An exception is Ghesquiere, who opens up to a world outside the West and asks pertinent questions about the role of children's literature both in and outside western countries. The book's final paragraph by Rudvin and Orlati, too, wonders how translators transport the view of childhood into non-Western target texts.

Although the volume also allows for translators to reflect on the subject (Oittinen and Pascua-Febles), its voice is mainly that of the investigator. However, whether this volume also fully illustrates the translation studies shift from a prescriptive to a descriptive approach – a shift that is announced by Van Coillie and Verschueren in their introduction – is something that I would hesitate to agree to. Except for the smaller half of contributors – Thomson-Wohlgemuth (who also provides some excellent sources in her contribution), Joosen, Desmidt, González-Cascallana and Rudvin and Orlati – contributors do not refrain from including passages, especially in conclusions, in which they express what a translator should do (pp. 15, 31, 35, 39, 113-4, 137, 144, 149).

Whether all contributors have wholly reached their aims as promised in the suggestive abstracts is another question that is debatable. In some cases, the examples given are relevant, but, in the absence of investigation results of any more data, I am not convinced whether the argument really holds (does 'impatient' really belong to a more factual register than

'sensual' in Joosen 2006:69?; could the young people's language be illustrated by the small number of examples only in Pascua-Febles 2006?). In other cases, the examples are missing (for example, "translations greatly improved the status of children's literature" in Ghesquiere 2006:25). Unfortunately, some contributors seem to be hindered by a lack of knowledge of the state of the art within TS and its related disciplines (psychology and cultural studies could certainly teach us more on the concept of child image as presented by Oittinen; functional linguistics provides excellent means to discuss functions of utterances, which Van Coillie wishes to do; Øster might have benefited from Malmkjaer's work on the translation of Andersen's fairy tales), while others are struggling with describing the facts in the very complex polysystem of at least two texts, two audiences, two commissioners and two cultures that translation already is by itself (how can changes in language and content have "a negative effect on the original's literary style" – Øster p. 144?). The description of meanings or functions in texts could sometimes be more thorough (does the English text really give "the reader a helping hand" more than the Danish text does if the latter is explicit about Little Claus being supposed not to say a thing, while the English text does not repeat the instruction - Øster p. 146?). Other contributors are very good at writing a coherent essay or telling a persuasive story, but fail to define their concepts clearly or argue consistently (the reader is not given any argument why "translation as a labour of love will become less frequent", Lathey p. 16; relegated to footnotes, the translators and their works seem to disappear from Ghesquiere's focus on pp. 21-25; the translation issues mentioned by Thomson-Wohlgemuth on pp. 50-52 seem to apply to adult literature, too, so is the specificity of children's literature being elucidated? Is it because translated children's literature cannot be given Chesterman's default values for translation characteristics that this prototypical definition in and of itself needs to be adapted as Desmidt concludes on pp. 92-94?).

The editorial work seems to have suffered from a lack of time. Why does Joosen's text contain the abstract twice on the same page, be it with a somewhat different wording? Why does Ghesquiere's text not contain a clear subdivision: readers may find it hard to locate where the first part ends? Is there a complete paragraph missing on p. 28, probably referring to Roald Dahl – who else would "his success" in the first paragraph refer to? Why does the reader get an unordered series of elements in Pascua-Febles's chapter on tone? Why are sources missing: e.g. Bourdieu (p. 26) among Ghesquiere's references and Hämäläinen-Forslund 1988 and Hunt 1991 (both on p. 41) among Oittinen's references? Why do sources in the text not correspond to those in the references: Van Toorn & Spies 1989 (p. 21) should probably read Van Toorn, Spies & Hogerhuis? What are the Dutch texts translations of, where are the dates for the two editions of *Je moet dansen op mijn graf* and who is the German translator in Joosen's references? Linguistically and typographically, too, the reader's eyebrows are sometimes raised: does the name Thomson-Wohlgemuth end

in a ‘t’ or an ‘h’ (p. iii and 47ff); is Gonzalez-Cascallana with or without the accent on the first ‘a’ (p. iii and viii) and with or without a hyphen (p. iii and 97ff); I thought it was Wiebe Buddingh’ who was the translator of the Harry Potter series (not Cees Buddingh – p. 136); did Gorina and Quijada (1988) mistranslate *The Pilgrim Progress* as *La Colina de Watership* (p. 100) or did they correct it (p. 101)?; what does a reader need to understand by “his parents are been interviewed” (p. 119); alas the list does not end here.

To conclude, the collection of essays can be appreciated as a useful set of introductory excursions into the world that reflects on translating children’s literature, focuses on some of its basic elements and produces a range of interesting hypotheses and questions to be pursued. Inquisitive minds hankering after a convincing descriptive approach, sufficient empirical evidence and rigorous scholarly argument will have to wait, however, until a next volume.

**Sonia Vandepitte – departement Vertaalkunde, University College  
Ghent**

---

<sup>1</sup> Lorsque le Canadien Brian Harris créa le concept de ‘traductologie’ en 1972, celui-ci s’appliquait à une approche linguistique de la traduction. Désormais, les définitions ont beaucoup évolué de sorte qu’il finit par désigner, à l’heure actuelle, un faisceau d’approches de la traduction (p.8).

<sup>2</sup> ¡Escúchame, Álvar Fáñez, y todos los caballeros!/ hemos hecho mucho botín al conquistar este castillo / los moros yacen muertos, de vivos pocos veo. / Los moros y las moras no las podremos vender / poco ganamos si los decapitamos / acojámoslos porque somos los dueños ahora / viviremos en sus casas y de ellos nos serviremos.