

Merkle, D., O'Sullivan, C., van Doorslaer, L., & Wolf, M. (Eds.). (2010). *The power of the pen. Translation & censorship in nineteenth-century Europe (Representation – Transformation 4)*. Wien/Berlin: LIT Verlag, 298p.

This collection of essays by scholars from different European countries addresses various aspects of the intricate bond between *translation* and *censorship* in different nineteenth-century European contexts.

In their introduction the editors define censorship as “blockage of a cultural product from entry into a cultural space, the elimination of a product from a cultural space or its modification through attenuation or cutting.” (p. 14). However, such interventions/manipulations (blockage, elimination, modification) must not always be regarded as censorship: “While censorship is a manifestation of manipulation, not all manipulation is censorship” (p. 14). Censorship happens when the manipulation of a cultural product “is motivated by a desire either to protect the vulnerable [...] or to create and maintain a religious, cultural or political system [...]” (p. 14). One might add: or by the desire to challenge, protect or gain (structures or positions of) power within such systems. In other words, whether or not an act of manipulation qualifies as censorship depends as much—if not more—upon the intended effect of the manipulation as upon the act itself.

The link between censorship and translation is obvious: “As a form of traffic between cultures, translation [...] has an important role to play in sustaining or subverting cultural blockage” (p. 15). Quoting Holman and Boase-Beier, the editors hold that “the activities of translator and censor are in many ways related. Both are gatekeepers, standing at crucial points of control, monitoring what comes in and what stays outside any given cultural or linguistic territory.” (p. 12).

The idea of the translator as gatekeeper is further elaborated in the first case study by Norbert Bachleitner and Michaela Wolf (“ÜbersetzerInnen als “gatekeepers?” (Selbst-)Zensur als Voraussetzung für die Aufnahme in das literarische Feld der späten Habsburgermonarchie”), which draws on Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of ‘structural censorship’ to demonstrate how self-censorship affected different nineteenth-century German translations of Gustave Flaubert’s *Madame Bovary* and Giuseppe Garibaldi’s *Clelia*.

The second case study, by Luc Van Doorslaer, focuses on the selection policy of serial prose translations in three nineteenth-century Flemish newspapers. It opts for a purely quantitative approach—“(F)or the purpose of this study the content of the cultural news is not pertinent,”(p.66) the author writes—to argue for the existence of a “relationship between the ideological orientation of the newspaper and the source language or source culture of the translated literary texts.” (p. 64).

In the third case study Ibon Uribarri examines the reception of Immanuel Kant's writings in nineteenth-century Spain. In his very informative contribution, Uribarri demonstrates how a repressive, intolerant Catholicism hampered the translation and assimilation of Kant's magnum opus *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (1781) into Spanish culture. More generally, Kant's work suffered from "a sort of structural preventive censorship" which "was working through symbolic violence that imposed the dominant national-Catholic discourse and excluded and silenced foreign, modern, secular ideas from the public sphere" (p. 92).

A fourth case study, by Denise Merkle, examines how and why a translator rather than a translation can provoke heavy cultural resistance to the point of being excluded from the literary field altogether. Merkle compares the first Victorian translations of Gustave Flaubert's erotic text *Salammô* (1862), one by the American feminist author Mary French Sheldon and one by John S. Chartres, published in 1885 and 1886 respectively. While Chartres' translation was received quite positively, Sheldon's was not. Merkle holds that "French Sheldon's translation was censored if not censored by the literary translation field" (p. 107) due to Sheldon's limitations as a translator: "(S)he seemed not to be aware of the linguistic failings of her work and not to have the requisite mastery to recreate linguistic transgression." (p. 111).

A fifth contribution, by Carol O'Sullivan, examines a more straightforward case of censorship in Victorian England, namely the modified translations of six "Extra Volumes" in Henry Bohn's Standard Library, published between 1846 and 1855. Drawing (as many authors in this volume do) on Pierre Bourdieu's concept of 'structural censorship' and on Phillips Davidon's "third-person effect hypothesis", O'Sullivan demonstrates how Bohn's translations of texts by (among others) Rabelais, Boccaccio and Cervantes obviated blockage by omitting certain passages deemed inappropriate or by publishing them in French or Italian.

These five examples of "Forms of Cultural Blockage" as the first section of this volume is called, are followed by four essays on "The Permeability of Institutional Censorship". In a first case study Elisabeth Gibbels concentrates on the complete ban of Social Democratic writings in Bismarck Germany ("Zensur und Translation in Deutschland zwischen 1878-1890: Das 'Sozialistengesetz' und die Exilzeitung der Sozialistischen Arbeiterpartei."). In a piece entitled "Translation, Censorship and Romanticism in Portugal, 1800-1850", Rita Bueno Maia produces "documentary evidence of preventive and repressive censorship and its consequences for the delayed development of Portuguese Romanticism" (p. 170). Censorship in nineteenth-century Portugal also affected translation policies, especially when it came to French literature. Canonical Portuguese Romantic authors and translators preferred moralistic literature by second-rate authors over acknowledged masterpieces by Jean-Jacques Rousseau or Voltaire, for instance. "(S)everal Portuguese writers and intellectuals of the

period still pointed to the potential for corruption inherent in such translations, for all French novels were considered to be a danger to good conduct.” (p. 175-176).

In a similar vein, Maria Eugenia Perojo Arronte examines the role translation and censorship played during Spanish Romanticism (“Spanish Romanticism and the Struggle for Legitimation: Translation, Censorship and the Development of the Movement.”). Brian James Baer concludes this section with an essay that explores “how the liberal-minded elite in Russia around the time of the Decembrist uprising of 1825 developed strategies for evading censorship of translated texts in order to introduce into Russia a civic-minded literature and to construct the poet as an important public figure.” (p. 213).

The third and final section, variously called “Censorship and Norms” and “Censorship and social convention”, contains an essay by Benoit Léger about “censure and censorship in the case of Dante’s *Divine Comedy* during the French Second Empire (1851-1870) and a piece by Outi Paloposki about two Finnish translators, Carl Niclas Keckman and Samuli Suomalainen, who worked as censors in nineteenth-century Finland. Paloposki returns to the notion of the translator/censor as cultural gatekeeper and stresses “the need to contextualize the work of past translators not only within institutional and historical frameworks but also within an experiential framework, taking into account the ethnography of translation.” (p. 281).

The Power of the Pen contains many illuminating and thought-provoking essays—case studies as well as more general, historical overviews—about the ways in which nineteenth-century translations and translators either endorsed or challenged multiple kinds of censorship.

Frank Albers, Department of Translators and Interpreters, Artesis University College Antwerp

Peeters, J. (2010). *Traduction et communautés*. Arras: Artois Presses Université. 212 p.

Traduction et communautés regroupe treize contributions, en français et en anglais, issues d’un colloque qui s’est déroulé en 2006 à l’Université de Bretagne-Sud. La question qui avait retenu l’intérêt des chercheurs concerne l’identité sociale des traducteurs. Partant du constat que, ces dernières années, l’identité subjective des traducteurs avait souvent été envisagée dans les études traductologiques, les auteurs de ce recueil ont voulu analyser plus avant les liens entre les actants de la traduction et différentes communautés.

L’« Introduction » de Jean Peeters ouvre le volume de façon tout à fait convaincante. Ce chapitre introductif propose une analyse approfondie

de la problématique et la situe dans un cadre plus large. Il détaille tous les angles de recherche qui permettraient de s'atteler à l'étude de la question annoncée. Loin de se limiter à la synthèse des contributions, Peeters propose une véritable analyse et suggère de nombreuses réflexions qui éclairent les points de rencontre et d'écart entre les articles.

Plusieurs articles s'engagent dans la réflexion sur le traducteur comme acteur engagé et parfois militant. Il s'agit de situations où l'on peut distinguer des langues minoritaires et majoritaires, dominées et dominantes et où la traduction « témoigne de relations de pouvoir asymétriques entre les langues. » (p. 11)

Ainsi la réflexion de Paul F. Bandia dans « La traduction aux carrefours de la mondialisation : voyage entre l'oralité et l'écriture » est à situer dans un contexte de « cohabitation dichotomique des communautés issues de la colonisation et des communautés issues des puissances coloniales » (p. 23) et pose la question de la traduction comme voie médiatrice entre la tradition et la modernité. Bandia rappelle la spécificité de la littérature africaine en langue européenne qui a été, à de nombreuses reprises, comparée à la traduction dans un sens figuré. Il souligne également l'importance des textes euro-africains qui se caractérisent par un style innovateur et explosif et pointe la problématique de la traduction de ces textes en une autre langue européenne.

La situation sud-africaine est illustrée par Ilse Feinauer dans « Antjie Krog, author and translator: the twain does meet ». Comme l'indique le titre de l'article, l'approche ici part du cas d'un traducteur individuel, Antjie Krog. L'analyse démontre l'influence que peut avoir un individu comme Krog, un auteur considéré dans son pays et à l'étranger, pour ce qui est des traductions dans des situations de pouvoir asymétriques. L'article pointe aussi la manière dont l'écrivaine sud-africaine exprime sa sensibilité par rapport aux différentes communautés linguistiques dans son pays : elle a en effet traduit en afrikaans des œuvres écrites en anglais (e.a. l'autobiographie de Nelson Mandela), en néerlandais et en langues africaines indigènes existantes ou disparues. Sa méthode de traduction, c'est ce que constate Feinauer, fait preuve d'un grand respect de la voix de l'Autre. L'engagement politique qu'elle a déployé dans son œuvre personnelle se traduit donc de la même façon dans son travail comme traductrice, dans la mesure où elle est « interested in bringing alternative perspectives on South African history into the domain of Afrikaans » (p. 53)

Si l'objet dans « Traduction et médiation, les incontournables de l'intercommunautaire : cas du Lexique Foncier Franco-Malgache dans la sécurisation foncière à Madagascar » de Lucie Raharinirina Rabaovololona semble de prime abord essentiellement terminologique, l'auteur démontre très vite que la transposition d'un lexique adéquat d'une langue majeure vers une langue mineure peut avoir pour enjeu les relations heureuses entre différentes communautés ethniques et culturelles. La problématique ne relève pas seulement d'un écart linguistique entre la majorité (75%) de la

population malgache qui est rurale, analphabète et malgachophone et les services de l'Etat, malgachophones, mais qui utilisent des documents français. L'opposition fondamentale concerne surtout la notion même de propriété. Si la conception juridique de celle-ci est largement d'inspiration française, les Malgaches en général « donnent un caractère quasi sacré à la terre » et perçoivent leur patrie comme « un ensemble de terres léguées par les ancêtres. » (p. 166) À partir de cette constatation fondamentale, l'auteur explique concrètement comment il a été procédé pour élaborer le lexique concerné.

« The Scandal Translates Back. La dernière offensive des langues vaincues : traduire le majeur par le mineur » de Giovanni Nadiani prend comme point de départ le phénomène, constaté actuellement partout en Europe, mais plus spécifiquement en Italie en Allemagne, de la traduction d'œuvres poétiques et théâtrales écrites dans la langue nationale vers les nombreuses langues mineures dialectales. Sans développer plus avant des exemples spécifiques, Nadiani entend analyser ces pratiques de traduction que l'on pourrait qualifier de « redondantes », « anachroniques » et « linguistiquement et culturellement afunctionnelles » (p. 39). Il souligne l'importance de ces traductions, aussi bien pour la langue mineure, que pour la langue majeure. Ainsi le « majeur local » apprendra en effet que « les rapports entre les langues les cultures différentes seront toujours des rapports de force symétriques et [...] un jour, ils pourront également [l'] intéresser. » (pp. 45-46)

« Le traducteur : équilibriste des frontières » de David ar Rouz apporte une autre approche encore concernant les rapports entre langues majeures et mineures et concerne la perception qu'a le traducteur de la communauté dont il fait partie. Au moyen d'une enquête auprès d'une vingtaine de traducteurs vers/du breton se dessinent en effet un certain nombre de caractéristiques et de points de vue de ce groupe étudié. L'analyse montre qu'il s'agit le plus souvent d'hommes (82%) néo-bretonnants qui voient leur travail surtout comme une façon de promouvoir la langue bretonne. Ar Rouz pointe le manque de formation et de considération professionnelle ainsi que les problèmes terminologiques auxquels les traducteurs bretons ont à faire face.

Il convient de souligner que la contribution de Nadiani, plus générale et théorique sur la traduction littéraire vers les variantes dialectales des langues européennes, et celle de Ar Rouz sur les traducteurs bretons, permettent une intéressante lecture en pendant.

La question que pose Thomas Buckley dans « Le traducteur littéraire est-il prisonnier ou créateur de l'image du pays-source dans le pays-cible ? » est tout à fait intéressante et porte sur la façon dont nous recevons les traductions d'œuvres étrangères et surtout sur la manière dont elles confortent ou mettent en question nos préjugés concernant la culture de départ. L'auteur s'intéresse également à quelques exemples de traductions de textes qui ont vu le jour en Albanie, en Lituanie, en Russie, en Turquie et

Union soviétique, mais ce sont essentiellement les rapports entre la France et les États-Unis qui sont analysés. Si le questionnement proposé est on ne peut plus pertinent, la méthodologie adoptée par le chercheur convainc nettement moins. Il est fait usage de l'*Index Translationum* et de certains comptes rendus de *Momus* et *The Guardian*, mais les constatations de l'auteur ne sont pas le fruit d'une analyse exhaustive à partir de sources clairement identifiées. L'intérêt de cet article est donc programmatique : la question de recherche mérite en effet d'être traitée de façon plus structurée.

Erwan Sommerer, dans « Peut-on traduire les idéologies politiques ? L'exemple de la diffusion du fascisme au Brésil et en Argentine », s'intéresse à la traduction de concepts et de discours politiques. Sa contribution est à situer dans le domaine qui relie celui de la traduction à la communication interculturelle. Selon Sommerer, ce n'est pas tant la dénotation des concepts politiques, que leur connotation, leur surplus de sens, dont il convient d'étudier le passage d'une communauté à une autre. Ses exemples concernent la traduction du fascisme (d'origine italienne) au Brésil et en Argentine et montrent, entre autres, la problématique de la traduction d'une idéologie nationaliste, celle-ci étant par essence cantonnée à l'intérieur de certaines frontières et celle-là appelée à les franchir.

Certaines contributions insistent sur l'importance de la traduction dans l'établissement et le renforcement de la communauté-cible.

Ainsi, dans « The Role of Literary Translation in the Survival of Hungarian Language and Culture or One of the Ways for a Nation to Maintain Its Identity », Ágnes Somlé donne un aperçu historique, du Moyen-Âge au XX^e siècle, du rôle qu'a pu jouer la traduction dans la survivance de la langue et de la culture hongroises. Somlé montre que la traduction n'a pas seulement permis d'établir des relations entre la communauté hongroise et les autres langues et cultures, mais qu'elle a également servi à légitimer l'identité communautaire même.

Le parti pris de Michèle Laliberté est fascinant. Dans « Paris, Berlin, New York en chansons traduites : l'affectivité du traducteur face à l'altérité », elle entend montrer combien le psychisme du traducteur, qui est nécessairement influencé par le contexte sociopolitique, ne se présente pas nécessairement comme ce qui est le plus individuel, le plus personnel, mais relève bel et bien du communautaire. Partant d'un corpus de chansons françaises et américaines, dont elle étudie les traductions anglaises, allemandes et françaises entre 1910 et 1960, elle affirme que la part du psychologique (collectif) n'a pas été assez étudiée en traductologie et présente une démonstration convaincante pour pallier ce manque. Reste qu'il est dommage que les sources utilisées dans l'article—et parmi les plus intéressantes— ne se retrouvent pas dans la bibliographie et que, inversement, celle-ci contient de très nombreuses références que le lecteur ne retrouve pas dans le corps du texte.

Ce sont des traductions « du plus francophile des tous les écrivains tchèques de la fin du XIX^e siècle » (p. 105) que présente Miroslava

Novotná dans « Le sens et l'effet des adaptations des chansons médiévales françaises par Julius Zeyer ». L'analyse proposée, plutôt littéraire que purement traductologique, entend montrer comment les adaptations des chansons de geste françaises par Zeyer ont permis de relier le passé de la communauté des chevaliers médiévaux à la réalité poétique et politique tchèque de la fin du 19^{ième} siècle. Les adaptations de Zeyer nourrissent en effet autant la poésie fin-de-siècle que les idéaux de renaissance nationale tchèques.

Dans « Réception des traductions et appartenances communautaires : étude de trois collections de catalogues éditoriaux espagnols », Claudine Lécrivain évalue comment les éditeurs créent des appartenances communautaires et « catégorisent le même et l'autre » (p.15). Par une analyse détaillée et à l'aide de tableaux, l'auteur montre que l'épitéxte éditorial crée également les attentes de la culture-cible.

« Hégémonie culturelle, choix traductionnels et relations intercommunautaires : étude d'un cas » de Simos P. Grammenidis présente des cas très intéressants de traductions en grec de textes écrits en français, mais comportant des éléments ottomans. Grammenidis étudie le passage de ces éléments relativement exotiques dans le texte français vers le grec et distingue deux attitudes de la part des traducteurs : la « loyauté » et la « servilité ». Parfois les éléments exotiques dans le texte français, souvent accompagnés d'explications et de marquages typographiques spécifiques, sont éliminés dans le texte-cible grec. Ce changement s'explique évidemment par le fait que le passage de la traduction leur a conféré un statut endogène. Dans d'autres cas, ces éléments sont rendus tels quels et constituent donc des explications plus ou moins circonstanciées de concepts tout à fait familiers au lecteur grec. C'est surtout le regard de la communauté grecque sur celui que porte sur elle la communauté française qui est analysé.

Le groupe social virtuel des traducteurs est analysé par Freddie Plassard dans « Les communautés des traducteurs communautés réelles, communautés virtuelles en traduction ». C'est la constitution d'une communauté par le biais de listes de diffusion professionnelles qui est étudiée à partir des cas concrets de la liste des traducteurs de l'Institute of Translating and Interpreting et de celle de la Société Française des Traducteurs. Plassard y argumente de façon fort convaincante qu'une communauté peut se construire sur un territoire dématérialisé et porte un regard nouveau sur des communautés de traducteurs.

L'intérêt de ce recueil est entre autres de montrer combien la traduction joue avec les frontières entre identité et communauté et les brouille par la même occasion. Les traducteurs ainsi que les lecteurs de traductions se positionnent dans un territoire qui est en même temps séparé et solidaire d'autres aires linguistiques, culturelles et idéologiques. Le traducteur comme être « social [qui] participe de plusieurs groupes en

même temps et [qui] est acteur de communautés différentes » (p. 7) est mis à l'honneur dans cette publication.

Katrien Lievois, Department of Translators and Interpreters, Artesis University College Antwerp

Franco, Eliana, Anna Matamala and Pilar Orero. (2010). *Voice-over Translation: An Overview*. Bern/Berlin/Bruxelles/Frankfurt am Main/New York/Oxford/Vienna. 248p.

One of the main challenges facing the authors of this extremely useful volume was to work through the terminological confusion that surrounds this subject, voice-over translation. The authors provide a valid definition of this concept, taking into account previous discussions by Translation Studies and Film Studies scholars, but distancing themselves from them. More specifically, they remind us that in Film Studies (as in filmmaking), voice-over is usually understood in the sense of “a disembodied voice” (Wikipedia) or “the voice of an unseen narrator” (Merriam Webster) and is therefore distinct from the practice of revoicing a text in another language, which is the topic of this book. Further, in an original move, the authors differentiate between voice-over, which is always superimposed over an audible voice in a different language, and narration/commentary, which fully replaces the language of the original audiovisual product. They are thus able to define voice-over translation as “oral or spoken rendering that is delivered simultaneously and in synchrony with original speech length, recognisable words and images” (p. 43). Having pinned down the identity of their research object, the authors are in a position to explore its main uses and features from various professional and scholarly perspectives.

The outcome of their effort is an innovative book in many ways. The problem of terminological inconsistency referred to above is symptomatic of the lack of any comprehensive study of voice-over translation. This book clearly aims to fill this gap. It constitutes an “Overview”, as per its title, in the sense that it accounts for the history of voice-over translation, explains the current state of research into that topic, examines voice-over translation in relation to the professional structures and workflows within which it takes place, associates this practice with specific film genres, and covers a range of languages and national traditions from Eastern Europe to South America. The three authors (one of whom, Eliana Franco, completed the first ever doctoral thesis on voice-over translation in 2000), follow a structured approach through which the theoretical and technical complexities of this particular type of translation are gradually revealed. A singular strength of the book is that it is largely based on actual professional

experience and offers an impressive amount of genuine examples from practice.

In the first chapter, the thorny issue of terminology is addressed. The decision to define voice-over as “the translation voice on top of the original voice, which remains audible” (p. 39) is not without risks. The authors’ concern with establishing voice-over translation as a unique recognisable research object is legitimate, and an unambiguous definition of that object is crucial to that effect. However, by excluding commentary from that definition, and by relegating it to the status of “off-screen dubbing” (pp. 41-42), the authors perhaps unnecessarily narrow down their scope of primary reference. Meanwhile, commentary and narration continue to be common practices carried out by voice-over translators and voice-over talents, regardless of academic distinctions. The relevance of commentary is indirectly acknowledged in the book, since small sections in Chapters 3 and 4 are dedicated to it.

Another potential problem ensuing from the strict definition of voice-over translation in this book is that it could alienate Film Studies scholars who, as the authors’ research shows, understand voice-over in a less prescriptive manner. Indeed in a rather simplistic statement, the authors refer to the “good and bad influence of Film Studies on voice-over translation” (p. 42), as if the latter were an abstract notion that needs to be protected from conceptual contamination rather than a flexible and evolving practice that needs to be understood and described as it actually happens.

Chapters 2 and 3 are dedicated to voice-over for post-production (once the source audiovisual product has been completed and is ready for translation for a new audience), while Chapter 4 focuses on voice-over for production (where voice-over translation is an integral part of the product.) Working conditions are described in detail, with an emphasis on the variety and unpredictability of situations that translators may find themselves faced with. Specific issues that relate to the genre of source materials (fictional products, documentaries), the typology of audiovisual texts (narration, interviews, on or off-screen speakers), and the main difficulties encountered in the process of translation (orality, accents, synchrony, terminology etc.) are addressed systematically and with constant reference to indicative examples. The semiotic analysis of synchrony in voice-over translation is based on an older paper by Orero, but remains extremely insightful, relevant and useful (Orero, Pilar. (2006). ‘Synchronization in Voice-over’, in Bravo, J. M. (ed.) *A New Spectrum of Translation Studies*. Valladolid: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Valladolid. 255–264).

It would of course not be possible to cover all possible typologies and working conditions in one volume. It is worth noting, however, that the experience of translating for voice-over can be widely different from that described in this book. In the UK, for instance, where translation projects tend to be large, multilingual and centrally managed, translators often download their material from ftp servers, have some of the factual research

done for them by the agency, have their work proof read, and are sometimes asked to oversee the recording process. It is also increasingly common to work with short commercial videos for the Internet, rather than with longer documentary productions. Thus, while the main principles of voice-over translation remain as described in this book, it is important to acknowledge that professional contexts and practices merit further scholarly attention, as they evolve constantly and vary from place to place.

Chapter 5, “Training in voice-over”, discusses the specific competences and skills that voice-over trainees ought to develop. The authors draw on existing literature on the didactics of Translation and on their own experience of setting up the first ever course on voice-over translation in the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, in 2001. This clearly pioneering course offers theoretically informed and systematic training at postgraduate level, and its description here is intended as a model for similar courses elsewhere. There are examples of voice-over translation exercises, a useful discussion of assessment methods, and a brief presentation of the same University’s online course in voice-over translation - a further innovation in the field of translator training.

The special emphasis placed in this book on translator education is demonstrated by the authors’ decision not only to devote an entire chapter to voice-over training, but also to supplement each chapter with “suggested exercises”. These encourage trainees to think on theoretical aspects of voice-over translation, to investigate the audiovisual landscape of their country, to develop research skills, to respond to tricky translation problems that may well occur in actual situations, and generally to begin thinking as professional translators faced with real voice-over assignments.

The authors turn their attention back to “practitioners and academics” in Chapter 6. Here “a global survey on voice-over” is offered, based on a questionnaire which was designed to record existing perceptions on the nature and main features of voice-over translation. The 43 respondents (a number which, in fairness, hardly justifies the qualification “global”, with only three responses from Asia and one from Africa, for instance) answer both closed and open questions, and it is the latter ones that incite the most informative and critically aware responses. The authors do excellent work in analysing these responses, ultimately showing that voice-over translation is an “underestimated mode of translation lacking [...] serious study”, despite the fact that it is “widely used” and is sometimes backed by “very strong tradition[s]” (p. 186).

The book closes with a “commented bibliography on voice-over” (Chapter 7), which is arguably the most comprehensive account of existing literature on this topic. That the entire body of literature on voice-over translation (at least in Catalan, English, French, Italian, Polish and Spanish) consists of around 70 titles, most of them journal articles, can only serve to prove the main point advanced by the authors, namely that this is an enormous field of practice and study that awaits to be properly researched.

There are further merits to this book. In terms of content one could point out the brief reference to “Gavrilov translation” (§2.1, the main technique for revoicing feature films for TV broadcast in many Eastern European countries), which is also gaining recognition as a separate research topic. In terms of presentation, one could mention the many images, screenshots and tables used to illustrate the abundance of examples offered by the authors.

Unfortunately, there are major shortcomings too. The absence of an index is deplorable, especially for a volume that aspires to be a reference work in the field of Audiovisual Translation. Readers who wish to look for a specific term, for example, “audio subtitling”, would have to do plenty of guesswork, before they can locate that term (it is on p. 49).

There is, however, an even more important problem with this publication, which will hopefully be mended in a future revised edition. The problem consists in the lack of good linguistic editing. Careless writing and a plethora of typos and syntax errors very often render the reading of this book a daunting task. Here are a few examples:

- “In addition to [exercises and hard work], the student is also believed [*sic*] to reap the rewards from the benefits of the interaction between. [*sic*]” (p. 144).
- “But Darwish [...] analysed the text and discovered that while the first Arabic words of the excerpt below are audible the English, the voice-over does not match. [*sic*]” (p. 118).
- “The concepts in the text have not elaborated on [*sic*] in too much detail [*sic*]” (p. 88).
- “Six years later, [...] Orero provided an updated [*sic*] on the amount of research performed” (p. 20).

The list of similar errors is long; while in most cases the intended meaning can be deduced, in others - such as the first two examples above – this is not possible. It is a great shame, especially in view of the fact that the book is authored by professional translators and academics and is intended for the benefit of trainees.

Despite these faults, Franco, Matamala and Orero’s book remains a valuable and necessary one. It constitutes the most comprehensive and most updated overview of voice-over translation available, and it will be essential reading for students, teachers and scholars working in this under-researched field.

Dionysios Kapsaskis, University of Roehampton, London

Rundle, C., & Sturge, K. (Eds.). (2010). *Translation under fascism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 285p.

Among the different readings that this book invites, especially two have retained our attention. First, this work offers an excellent overview of historically oriented translation research in four countries during twentieth century dictatorship (Hitler, Mussolini, Franco and Salazar). The collected overview essays and case studies can be read independently of the whole, although the authors never lose sight of the common thread (translation under fascism). A second reading would start from the idea expressed in the title and look, throughout the chapters of the book, for specific translation strategies and mechanisms under a fascist regime. This, however, is a more problematic reading as the editors very well realize. The challenge posed by the title has been solved conveniently by surrounding the overview essays (Part II) and case studies (Part III) with an Introduction (Part I) and Response (Part IV). For this review, let us start with the ‘unproblematic’ reading, which considers the distinct contributions of the volume as independent units.

Part II consists of four overview essays dedicated to translation policies and practices in four countries: Italy, Germany, Spain and Portugal. According to the chronological landmarks of the regimes under consideration, the time spans of the studied periods vary considerably. Whereas the Italian and German cases end with the defeat of fascism in 1945, the Spanish and Portuguese cases continue into the post-war period, entering the cold war and finally coming to an end in the 1970s. Even without taking into account the conceptual problem raised by the use of ‘fascism’ as an overarching label for the four historical cases, it is obvious that the differences in time span and international context make any comparison between the four cases extremely difficult, also because of the fact that each author has used a different methodological approach.

In the first essay, *Translation in Fascist Italy: ‘The Invasion of Translations’*, Christopher Rundle focuses on the attitude of the Italian fascist regime towards translation in light of an emerging translation industry. An interesting date is the role played in the debate on cultural (including translation) policies by the statistical information on translation rates and flows as facilitated from 1932 by Index Translationum along with national publishing figures. Rundle’s analysis clearly shows that even under a fascist regime, the political attitude towards translation does not necessarily mean effective intervention in the publishing industry or in translatorial practice, an insight that also applies to the other case studies presented in the volume. For fascist Italy, the ‘invasion’ of foreign literature through translation was first and foremost a matter of ‘loss of face’, the

painful awareness of the gap between the fascist imperial dream and the subalternized cultural reality.

In her essay on translation in Nazi Germany (*'Flight from the Programme of National Socialism'? Translation in Nazi Germany*), Kate Sturge privileges a specific genre (i.e., translated fiction) as the focus of analysis. This shift in focus offers insights that complement those presented in Rundle's essay. Sturge explores the margins of tolerance of Nazism towards an activity, translation, which by definition runs counter to the *völkisch* protectionist concerns of the regime. As the different levels of analysis reveal—from the microlevel of the text to the macrolevel of the market—translation under a fascist regime does not differ in an *absolute* way from translation in other historical and political contexts. Rather, the specificity should be seen as a matter of *degree*.

The Spanish case is treated by Jeroen Vandaele, who, firstly, reflects on what translation studies can offer to the study of Francoism, and, secondly, provides an overview of existing translation research on the Franco period. This second section of the chapter is organized according to 'realms of discourse' or genres (press, prose, film, etc.) in combination with countries of origin or source languages. As a valuable contribution of Translation Studies to our understanding of Francoism, Vandaele points to the *non-dits*, the unveiling of the 'negativities' of cultural politics, which leads the author to the remarkable conclusion that "Francoist culture in general was what it was *not*" (p.113).

In *Translation in Portugal during the Estado Novo Regime*, Teresa Seruya is forced to cope with a double handicap. Firstly, the lack of research on Portuguese translation history, and secondly, the fact that Portugal has been absent, up to now, from research on translation under fascist regimes (see the landmark conference held at Forlì (Bologna) in April 2005, *Translation in Fascist Systems: Italy, Spain, Germany*). From her disadvantaged position, Seruya tries to fill this double gap by sketching an overall picture of the place of translation within the cultural politics of the *Estado Novo* regime. Seruya records some specific conditions strange to the ideology of the regime that influenced the translation policy and practices under Salazar and Caetano. As such, she acknowledges the huge illiteracy rate among the Portuguese people, the cultural dominance of the neighbouring country Spain, as well as the proficiency of the Portuguese elite in foreign languages, which explains the presence of non-translated books available to a small minority and out of the regime's concern.

Part III (Case Studies) is less systematically structured than the former part. Spain disappears from the scene in favour of a strong interest in the Italian case, beside Germany and Portugal. The first case study analyses the interaction of two fascist regimes, Germany and Italy, from the viewpoint of literary exchange, viz. German literature in Italian translation. In a second case study, Francesca Nottola reveals the many inconsistencies of Italian fascist policy on translations by focusing on an emblematic anti-

fascist publishing house, Einaudi. Frank-Rutger Hausmann sheds light on how the Franco-German border was crossed during the heydays of the Second World War through translation of poetry. The publication of a French-German and a German-French Poetry Anthology in 1943–1945 presents the editor with a double challenge of ‘translating the untranslatable’, as a result of both the ethnic ideological constraints—the essentialist view of the uniqueness, and hence untranslatability of the *Volk*—and the literary discursive constraints imposed by the inseparability of form and contents in poetry. This case study still needs some further elaboration, which the author acknowledges in his conclusion (“A full history of German-French and French-German poetry anthologies has yet to be written”, p. 210), and we can only hope that a full discussion of this exciting case will be undertaken very soon. Finally, in a fourth case study, Rui Pina Coelho studies Shakespeare translations and performances during nearly half a century of Portuguese ‘Salazarism’ (1926–1974). If we take into account the specificities of cultural life in twentieth-century Portugal as discussed in Seruya’s overview essay, the question arises as to the extent to which Pina Coelho’s findings are to be ascribed to the political context of Salazarism itself. Shortly after the Carnation Revolution of 25 April 1974, the theatre professionals described themselves in a manifesto as a “generation that was sacrificed by the outgoing regime during their most creative years” (p. 229). In light of this assertion, it would be interesting to extend Pina Coelho’s analysis to present-day translations and stage performances of Shakespeare in Portugal to assess, from a comparative point of view, the true impact of the former dictatorial regime on cultural life.

As stated at the start of this review, a second reading of this book—bearing in mind the title *Translation under Fascism*—is more problematic. The editors are well aware of this difficulty and offer some valuable interpretive tools to cope with this problem in Part I, Chapter I (*Translation and the History of Fascism*) and Part IV, Chapter 10 (*The Boundaries of Dictatorship*). In their introduction, Rundle and Sturge contend that translation practices are “a prime area of interest for scholars of fascist cultural policy” (p. 4), a contention which is convincingly demonstrated throughout the volume. However, what remains less convincing is why the editors so eagerly adhere to the problematic use of the term *fascism* as a common label for the selected regimes and countries. In the introduction, Rundle and Sturge argue that their “use of the term is informed by a body of historical research which, while making all the necessary distinctions, includes these regimes in the debate on comparative fascism” (p. 5). Nevertheless, Jeroen Vandaele opens his overview essay on Spain by stating that “[i]t would be wrong to call Francoism a fascist regime” (p. 84). The discomfort about the choice of the term *fascism* as a common feature accompanies the reader until the final chapter, which happily broadens the perspective by abandoning the problematic label of *fascism* in favour of

dictatorship, a perspective that better fits the scope of the volume, which includes also post-fascist Francoism and Salazarism. In his highly illuminating ‘*Response*’, Matthew Philpotts clearly shows how the insights into translation policies, rhetoric and practices as revealed in the essays of the volume contribute to our understanding of the ‘boundaries of dictatorship’. As translation is by definition a border-crossing activity, translation research can be, for the cultural historian, a privileged tool to scrutinize the porosity of the dictatorial boundaries.

Finally, if we try to define the specificity of fascist dictatorial regimes with respect to translation as it appears throughout the essays collected by Rundle and Sturge, we would say that this specificity lies in the fact that such regimes have to deal with the same paradox as the translator. It is the paradox created by the need to conciliate two antagonistic objectives: to translate or not translate itself, and to exoticize or domesticate the foreign. While the fascist dream of imperial regeneration depends on translation as a means of increasing the nation’s cultural capital, the dictatorial ‘fear of the invasion of the foreign’ fiercely condemns translation as a source of ethnic contamination. This paradox probably explains the many inconsistencies in translation rhetoric and practices recorded by the authors of this volume and distinguishes—as far as translation is concerned—a fascist dictatorship from other dictatorships.

Christiane Stallaert, Department of Translators and Interpreters, Artesis University College Antwerp / Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, Catholic University of Leuven

Gambier, Y., & van Doorslaer, L. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of translation studies (Volume 1)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (printed edition (p. 458) & online version)

The broad selection of contributions found in the *Handbook of Translation Studies (HTS)* makes an all-inclusive book review problematic in the spatial limitations imposed on book reviews in this section. Consequently, this book review will adopt a different approach. It consists of two sections: a general introduction to the edited *HTS* and a discussion of some carefully selected themes of importance in the *HTS*.

In the introduction to the 74 contributions that make up the *HTS*, editors Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer state the following: “The *HTS* aims at disseminating knowledge about translation and interpreting studies. It is an academic tool, but one that is also directed at a broader audience. It addresses the needs of students (who often prefer to surf the net, to skim and make do with short texts rather than studying long monographs), researchers and lecturers in Translation Studies and practitioners, as well as

scholars and experts from other related disciplines (linguistics, sociology, history, psychology, etc.)” (p. 1). It is in this light that all of the contributions should be read and evaluated. The handbook adopts a dictionary-style format with 74 discrete overview articles on a wide range of translated-studies-related topics (e.g., Audiovisual translation, Conference interpreting, Journalism and translation, Language learning and translation, Quality in translation), which are discussed in alphabetical order in 500 to 6000 words per entry (based on the relevance of the topic in the field) by “specialists in the different subfields” (p. 2). In addition, the *HTS* is available in both a print edition and a slightly adapted online version, which offers hyperlinks to the Translation Studies Bibliography available at <http://www.benjamins.com/online/tsb/>. It is the piecemeal approach adopted in both the printed edition and the online version that makes it difficult to discuss every single contribution in a traditional book-review format. Consequently, the remainder of this book review will highlight the following three overarching themes of importance in the *HTS*: (1) broad readership and accessibility, (2) breadth of scope and (3) editing.

Broad readership and accessibility: as is visible in the introduction to the *HTS* (see quote above), the editors had in a mind a relatively broad readership ranging from students, researchers and lecturers in translation studies to practitioners, scholars and experts from other related fields. However, writing for such a broad readership often results in an unpleasant mismatch between information that is too general and information that is too specialised. In turn, this mismatch often results in a choppy reading experience, resulting in a distance between the author and the reader. To my surprise, the editors of the *HTS* have been extremely successful in ensuring that most of their specialists wrote their contributions using a relatively consistent writing approach. This writing approach consists of introductory information about specific translation-studies-related topics followed by selections of key concepts and developments related to the topics that are being written about. This writing approach has resulted in contributions that can be read and processed relatively easily by the intended readership. Some people will inevitably find specific contributions too simplistic and too introductory but because of the vast array of topics on offer in the *HTS*, there is undoubtedly something for everyone interested in getting to grips with essential concepts in the field of translation studies. The general idea behind the *HTS* is not to provide highly specialised readers with in-depth information and findings about specific research topics. Although such information is extremely important and useful, it would be misplaced in a book such as the *HTS*. Readers who are looking for such specialised information should turn to the multitude of highly specialised books in the field of translation studies. In addition to providing factual introductory information about key topics, most contributions in the *HTS* also provide the readers with reference lists and some contributions even provide lists with books for further reading.

Breadth of scope: the breadth of scope is a feature which makes the *HTS* tremendously useful to a vast array of readers (see above). However, it is also a feature which can lead readers to experience the contents of the *HTS* as fragmented. The approach adopted by the editors of the *HTS* is not the approach that you typically find in other books which are referred to as *handbooks*. Most handbooks adopt more thorough investigations of a smaller, unified set of topics, providing detailed insights into the selected topics. The editors of the *HTS* have consciously decided to broaden their investigation scope by accepting contributions on 74 topics. However, this does not mean that the 74 topics are 74 unrelated topics. There are clear links between certain topics (e.g., Conference interpreting–Consecutive interpreting–Interpreting studies–Media interpreting–Relay interpreting–Simultaneous interpreting) but the links are not always made explicit, which may be necessary for readers who are not at all familiar with the diversity found in translation studies.

Editing: editing a book is without a doubt a challenging task. Editing a book with no fewer than 74 contributions, most of which have been written by different authors, may appear to many as too tall an order for the best of editors. However, Gambier and van Doorslaer have done a remarkably good job. It is obvious that the collaboration between both editors required planning, strategy and precision. The fact that most of the contributions follow a relatively consistent writing approach is testimony to the synergy between the editors, on the one hand, and the contributors, on the other hand. However, there are quite a few language- and style-related inaccuracies, which the editors (and possibly proofreaders) did not manage to filter out. A few examples of such inaccuracies are (in alphabetical order) the following: *associated to* (instead of *associated with*), *bilingual* \diamond *bilingual*, *to practice* (AmE) \diamond *practising* (BrE) *professionals*, *compare to* (instead of *compare with*), *consists in* (instead of *consists of*), *don't* (instead of *do not*), *grammar-translation method* \diamond *grammar translation method*, *-ise* \diamond *-ize*, *non-verbal* \diamond *nonverbal*, order of some of the in-text references (neither chronological nor alphabetical), *programme* \diamond *program* (outside of IT contexts) and *South-Africa* (instead of *South Africa*). Luckily most of the inaccuracies do not lead the reader astray by creating intractable ambiguities or incomprehensible stretches of discourse. The editors may want to consider tackling such problems if they are considering an updated version of the book.

Overall, the *HTS* is a publication which successfully manages to introduce a wide range of topics which are currently being investigated in the field of translation studies to an extremely broad readership. The editors have done a wonderful job of combining the numerous contributions in the handbook in a relatively consistent way and of making the handbook available in a printed version and an online version, the latter of which they intend to keep updated. For any future editions of the printed version or for

any changes to the online version, the editors would do well to filter out any language- and style-related inaccuracies.

Jimmy Ureel, Department of Translators and Interpreters, Artesis University College Antwerp

Baer, B. J. (Ed.). (2011). *Contexts, subtexts and pretexts: Literary translation in Eastern Europe and Russia*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 332p.

This volume on *Literary translation in Eastern Europe and Russia* in the prestigious *Benjamins Translation Library* series is entirely dedicated to the *Other Europe*, as Eastern Europe is frequently referred to by scholars from Western Europe. I would have written *Central and Eastern Europe* as I usually do when mentioning the region, but the editor has good reason not to use the concept of *Central Europe*, as he explains in the *Introduction* (pp. 2–3), following the recommendations in the paper by Charles Sabatos (see below).

For some years now the classical viewpoint of Western translation studies scholars has shifted towards more *exotic* regions and cultures. As editor Baer correctly points out, non-Western translation traditions are becoming “increasingly visible in recent years as a reaction to hegemonic Western models of translation and the general Eurocentrism of contemporary translation studies” (p. 1). However, renouncing Eurocentrism in translation studies usually involves a turn towards Asian and African translation topics. Despite the impressive papers by, for instance, Russian, Czech and Slovak scholars (p. 5) in the theory of translation studies, the eastern part of Europe is largely neglected in most recent Western publications on the subject, which led to the big gap that this volume partly tries to fill.

The collection of translation studies-related articles *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts* is an attempt to cover most of the region of Eastern Europe. The majority of languages and cultures in the region (not only the Slavic languages that the area is too often associated with) are represented in the volume and only the Russian topics (8 papers) clearly outnumber the other themes which might, however, reflect fairly realistically the respective weight of these languages and cultures in contemporary translation studies. Besides Russian, only one Slavic culture is dealt with twice in the volume, for one of the great representatives of Czech literature is present as the metaphorical *alpha and omega* of the volume: Milan Kundera, an author with a more than moderate interest in translation, has the honour of opening and closing the volume. Other languages discussed

in the volume are Ukrainian, Romanian, Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Polish and Latvian.

The volume not only geographically covers most part of the Eastern European region, it also addresses a broad range of different translation-related topics, with papers on various aspects of translation. However, most of the papers look at translation from a cultural-studies angle, emphasizing the roles that politics and ideology have played and still play in the development of culture in Eastern Europe and Russia, especially during the twentieth century. Most of the papers deal with what André Lefevere (1992) calls “patronage outside the literary system” (p. 15), that is, political and ideological pressure. Geographical borders, linguistic colonialism and the consolidation of cultural identity are key concepts in nearly all of the articles in this volume.

As the title of the volume suggests, the papers are divided into three sections, the first of which, *Contexts*, deals with “the broad cultural and political contexts that helped shape the choice of texts for translation, the translation approach taken, and the reception of translated texts in the various cultures represented by Eastern Europe and Russia” (p. 10). This is the largest part of the volume with 7 papers on 5 different Eastern European languages. In the opening paper, a key question in Slavic studies is touched upon, that is, the existence, or rather the alleged non-existence, of a conceptual *Central Europe*. Charles Sabatos relates the history of Kundera’s essay on the “Tragedy of Central Europe” (1984), in which the author claimed the existence of a transnational Central European identity, based on “*small nations* rather than languages, including Austria but not Germany, and even [...] Slovenia and Croatia” (p. 25). However, Sabatos explains why he is not convinced by Kundera’s ideas.

Nation building and the development of national culture is the common theme in the next two papers as well. Vitaly Chernetsky addresses the problem of “shaping [...] modern Ukrainian culture” (p. 33) and investigates this process as a reaction to what he calls Ukraine’s *colonial* history. In Chernetsky’s view, literary translation should be considered a “conscious project of resistance” (p. 34) against the domination of Russian language and culture. Literary translations from languages other than Russian, frequently funded by Western institutions, mark, according to the author, a double process of globalization and strengthening of national identity in Ukraine. David L. Cooper, on the other hand, shows how the Russian nation had similar doubts about its own identity, albeit in another period, namely the beginning of the nineteenth century when Russia was in search of *narodnost*’ (national originality) and its own voice in world literature. Cooper illustrates the polemics about translations and the concept of originality in Russia through the work of author–translator Vasilij Žukovskij and a reaction from colleague writer Nikolai Gogol.

Translation and the nation’s cultural identity play an equally important role in Sean Cotter’s paper on the thinking of the Romanian

philosopher, essayist and poet Constantin Noica. Cotter deals with Noica's "international nationalism" (p. 80) and his ideas about Romania as "Europe's translator" (p. 80). Noica is convinced that translation activities benefit only "the translator, not the public that reads them" (p. 86) and therefore Romania should play its role of Europe's translator, wedged as it is between three large empires (Austro-Hungary, Russia and the Ottoman empire).

Susmita Sundaram brings the reader back to Russia with an article on Konstantin Bal'mont's translating activities. Bal'mont was one of the free spirits among the poets of Russia's Silver Age, who showed great interest in ancient and exotic cultures (the Mayas, India, Egypt) and considered himself a *cultural mediator* between Russia and various distant cultures. At a higher level, the writer saw Russia as a mediator between East and West (p. 113), providing the nation with a specific mission in the world. Sundaram extensively illustrates Bal'mont's Indophilia (p. 107) and his love of oriental motifs.

Sibelan Forrester investigates, in her paper, how Croatian and Serbian authors used translations of Russian avant-garde writers from the early twentieth century "in order to shape his or her own bibliography and literary personality" (p. 117). Forrester pays tribute to writer-translators Sever, Kiš, Vrkljan and Ugrešić, who continued to recommend Russian literature to their Croatian and Serbian audiences in a period (the 1970s and 1980s) when Russian (Soviet?) literature "appeared as stunted as the economy" (p. 119) and the number of literary translations from Russian rapidly dropped in favour of translations from English.

The last paper of the *Contexts* part deals with a more practical translation topic: the problem of translating "theoretical categories and social types for which there are no Slovenian counterparts" (p. 137), especially lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered literature and non-fiction. The author, Suzana Tratnik, is a translator of "seminal Western works of gay and lesbian fiction and queer theory" (p. 137) herself, and she recounts her own struggle to find translations for this special type of *realia* since much of the required terminology has not yet been developed in Slovenian.

The second part, *Subtexts*, has 5 papers in 3 different languages, dealing with "the various ways in which politics has mediated the theory and practice of translation in Eastern Europe and Russia" (p. 11). This part is dominated by *Russian* papers that afford insights into the position of translation against the background of politics, ideology and censorship in the former Soviet Union. For instance, Susanna Witt investigates the probably largest ever "coherent project of translation" (p. 149)—the history of literary translation in the Soviet Union, that, according to Witt, remains "still basically unwritten" (p. 167). She is convinced that a closer look at the Soviet translation project could even supply "new perspectives on such

key concepts, such as source language, target language, authenticity and translation agency” (p. 168).

The next two papers examine the ideas and translating practices of three well-known names in the Russian history of literary translation. Brian James Baer relates how two coryphaei of Russian literary translation, Roman Jakobson and Vladimir Nabokov, became theoretical opponents in the Cold War period. The polarization between these great thinkers became obvious in the context of a proposed joint translation project of the famous *Slovo o polku Igoreve* (The Lay of Igor’s Campaign), which Nabokov saw foremost as a pure work of art, while Jakobson apparently wanted to use the Russian origin of the anonymous text for patriotic political and ideological concerns. Yasha Klots, in his paper, illustrates how ideological censorship can also contribute to a poet’s artistic completion. In the case of Nobel Laureate Iosif Brodskij, for instance, “the process of reconciling [...] aesthetic predispositions to the ideological demands of the state-owned publishing industry” (p. 187) forced the poet to refine his own poetics. Translations from a broad range of languages gave Brodskij the opportunity to create a kind of *pure poetry*, independent of the source language in which the poetry had been written, and strengthened his idea about the poet being the instrument of an ultimate *Ur-language*, rather than the *Ur-language* being the instrument of the poet (pp. 200–201).

The effects of (communist) censorship on the practices of literary translation are the leitmotif running through the next two papers as well. László Scholz explains the reasons behind “the surprising uniformity of translations” (p. 205) of Latin American narrative texts into Hungarian in the postwar period. Scholz blames the practices of planned art for being “by nature old-fashioned” (p. 216) and therefore averse to the stylistic experiments of modernity. As Vitana Kostadinova points out in her paper on literary translations (or rather the absence of translations!) of Byron in Bulgaria, literary and historical contexts can have a great influence on translation practices. In describing the reasons for not translating Byron in three different periods of Bulgarian cultural history, she clearly illustrates why “the absence of translations in a given culture can speak as loudly as the translations themselves” (p. 219).

The third part of the volume, *Pretexs*, on “the secondary status traditionally attributed to translated texts” (p. 11) with a special focus on contemporary translation, is more heterogeneous than the previous ones. This section presents the reader with another 6 papers dealing with 4 different Eastern European cultures. The first two papers touch upon contemporary translation practices in Russia. Vlad Strukov focuses on the cultural authority of film translator *Goblin* and deals with questions of intellectual property in a globalized world. Strukov relates how Goblin gradually introduced new forms of film translation by first thoroughly domesticating discourse in his earlier works and transforming translation into parody later on in his work. Aleksei Semenenko discusses a more

traditional, even canonical, topic—the translation of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* into Russian. Semenenko investigates and compares no fewer than six twenty-first-century translations of *Hamlet* and concludes that all the translations, however different they might be, share some common, typically postmodern features (p. 261). All six translators tend to modernize the text and even “strive not to translate the text, but to give an original interpretation of individual passages” in order to write their “names in the history of *Hamlet*” (pp. 261–262).

The expectations of the postmodern reader are dealt with in Natalia Olshanskaya’s paper on the translations of Russian dystopias into English. By its nature, the dystopian narratives of Evgenij Zamjatin and Vladimir Vojnovič contain a more than average amount of *untranslatable* vocabulary, used to depict the dystopian worlds created by the authors. Olshanskaya investigates translators’ decisions and concludes that contemporary literary translators tend to “over-domesticate” the target texts “in part because of the inability of the general readership to relate to the dual nature of specifically Russian cultural references and the hidden implications of the Russian absurd” (p. 273). Allen J. Kuharski addresses another topic of *translatability* in his paper on “translating classical tragedy into Polish theater” (p. 277). Kuharski focuses on stage director Zadura’s recent attempts to revive “neglected Polish and foreign classics” (p. 277) by adapting the dramas of Racine and Kochanowski and performing them on the twenty-first-century stage in Poland. He illustrates Polish concerns about, on the one hand, the will to integrate culturally into a larger European tradition and, on the other hand, the fear of losing its own cultural identity.

An even stronger concern about cultural and linguistic identity is seen in Latvia, where first German and later Russian were the dominant languages and where nowadays “70% percent (sic) of the texts consumed by the average Latvian are translations”, mainly from English (p. 295). Gunta Ločmele and Andrejs Veisbergs observe in their paper a rapid “shift in norms and conventions” (p. 295) in Latvian, directly affected by English norms, not only at the levels of lexis and semantics, but also in grammatical constructions, spelling norms and even the phonetic system (p. 307), thus illustrating globalizing tendencies as a result of translation practices.

Milan Kundera not only opens this volume on literary translation in Eastern Europe and Russia, he is also the theme of the closing paper, written by Jan Rubeš, on the author’s “problematic relationship” with “the translation of his work” (p. 317). Hardly any writer shows more interest in literary translation than Kundera, who sees translation as his “entrée onto the world stage” (p. 317) but who is, at the same time, rather hesitant about the loss of control that the translation process contains. In the case of Kundera, Rubeš points out, the situation is even more complex because his early (Czech) novels have been translated into French, while the author himself is writing in French at the moment and “refuses to authorize the

Czech translation of his books written in French” (p. 322). The whole complexity of authorship and the status of translated texts could not be illustrated more strikingly than in this closing paper to volume 89 in *Benjamins Translation Library*.

Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts is a real must-have for all translation researchers working on that ‘Other Europe’, but for whom a lot of sources written in ‘minority languages’ remain unreadable, as well as for researchers in Slavic studies dealing with translation. So it seems all the more annoying to me that such an inspiring collection of papers has been rather carelessly compiled, for a lot of typographical and formal errors have made it into the final version of the text. Apparently, not all proper names in the papers have been checked, as I find Norvid instead of Norwid (pp. 198–199), Brian De Palmo instead of Brian De Palma (p. 238) and Norwegian instead of Norway (p. 320). Moreover, the editor apparently made no use of a style sheet either for bibliographical references, or for the transcription or transliteration of the Cyrillic alphabet. The different contributors to this volume all use their own system, which results in various inconsistencies in the bibliography. For instance, Marina Cvetaeva (I prefer the ISO R/9 system myself) is referred to twice in the bibliography, once as Cvetaeva (p. 324) and once as Tsvetaeva (p. 331) without any cross-references between the two. The same goes for Majakovskij and Mayakovsky (p. 328), while Černov is cited next to Chernyshchevsky (sic—this name does not contain a “shch”) on page 324. Even more confusing is the reference to a Meirkhol’hold (sic) on the same page, an obviously wrong transcription for Mejerhol’d (ISO R/9) or at least Meyerhold (in English transcription), to whom a reference is made in one of the papers (p. 165), without this name being added to the bibliography.

Despite these formal inconsistencies *Contexts, Subtexts and Pretexts* touches upon some essential and *hot* topics in literary translation in Eastern Europe and Russia and should be recommended to a broad public of translation scholars and students.

Reference

Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, rewriting and the manipulation of literary fame*. London: Routledge.

Piet Van Poucke, University College Ghent / Ghent University

Nord, C. (2011). *Funktionsgerechtigkeit und Loyalität. Die Übersetzung literarischer und religiöser Texte aus funktionaler Sicht*. Frank & Timme, Berlin 2011, 302p. (In der Reihe: TransÜD Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens.)

Dieser Band in der Reihe *TransÜD Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens* bündelt 17 Artikel, die Christiane Nord in den vergangenen 30 Jahren in verschiedenen wissenschaftlichen Zeitschriften und Büchern veröffentlicht hat. In diesen Beiträgen behandelt sie Themen zur Übersetzung literarischer und religiöser Texte aus dem Blickwinkel der funktionalistischen Translationstheorie.

Christiane Nord hat insbesondere mit ihrem Modell der funktionalen Textanalyse und Translation und ihrem reformerischen Einsatz für die Translationsdidaktik Namen gemacht. In zahlreichen Publikationen zur Ethik und Didaktik des Übersetzens und zur Notwendigkeit einer translationsorientierten Textanalyse entwickelt sie ihre Translationstheorie anhand von Beispielen aus der Praxis und prägt sie den Begriff der *Loyalität*, der die vagere Vorstellung der *Treue* innerhalb der Translationskritik ersetzen soll. Nord diskutiert und untersucht in ihren Beiträgen, ob die Kriterien der funktionalen Translation für die Übersetzung von literarischen und religiösen Texten gültig gemacht werden können.

Diese Diskussion ist innerhalb der Translationswissenschaft längst nicht abgeschlossen und bewegt sich auch oft im etwas dogmatisch angehauchten Gebiet der kreativen Handlung, die von funktionalen Aspekten und Zielsetzungen keineswegs gestört werden dürfe. Nord sucht in ihren Beiträgen eine Antwort auf die ewige Frage, ob nun "Kopf" oder "Bauch" die Translation lenken sollten. Klar ist, dass in der funktionalen Translationswissenschaft die Antwort zugunsten des Kopfes ausfällt.

Innerhalb der literarischen Translationskritik hat die funktionale Vorgehensweise jedoch zahlreiche Gegner. So nennt zum Beispiel der deutsche Literatur- und Translationswissenschaftler Rainer Kohlmayer die funktionale Translation "eine wissenschaftlich argumentierende Anleitung zur Herstellung von Trivialliteratur" (Kohlmayer, 1988, S.34). Nord bekämpft diese Art von Kritik mit einschlägigen Argumenten: „Diejenigen, die von [...] dem Ideal einer „treuen“ Abbildung des AT durch den ZT ausgehen, dürften sehr bald an die Grenzen der Übersetzbarkeit stoßen“ (Nord, 1989, S.101).

Nord sucht einen Ausweg aus der Sackgasse der literarischen Translationspraxis, indem sie eine Strategie entwickelt, die verschiedene Sichtweisen konsolidieren und insbesondere die Übersetzung literarischer und religiöser Texte aus einer Art der Regellosigkeit herausholen könnte.

Die funktionalistische Translationstheorie, die den Schwerpunkt von *Bedeutung* auf *Funktion* verlagert, soll den Translator als Experten, der eine

translatorische Handlung erbringt, sichtbar machen. Dieser handelt nach einem Entscheidungsprozess, der vom *Skopos*, von der *Funktion* oder *Absicht* des Textes - großenteils vom *Initiator* oder Auftraggeber der Übersetzung bestimmt - eingegeben wird.

Nord betont, dass alle Rahmenbedingungen (Auftrag/Medium/Sprachfunktion) genauestens beschrieben sein müssen, bevor mit der Translation begonnen werden kann. Die zweite Phase, nämlich die Analyse des Ausgangstextes, wird laut Nord an erster Stelle von textexternen Faktoren bestimmt: Ort und Zeit der Entstehung des Textes, Anteil des Autors, etc.). Erst dann sollte der Analyse textinterner Faktoren Aufmerksamkeit gewidmet werden. (Stil, Thematik, Inhalt, Struktur, kulturspezifische Elemente). Diese Analyse ist für Nord selbstverständlich translationsrelevant, aber auch auf den Skopos gerichtet: Änderungen können nur vorgenommen werden, wenn sie dem Ziel des Translats gerecht werden können. In der Phase der eigentlichen Translation steht wieder die Funktion des Textes an erster Stelle: Nicht der Ausgangstext bestimmt die gewählten Übersetzungsstrategien, sondern die Funktion, die das Translat in der empfangenden Kultur erfüllen soll.

Das Buch eröffnet mit einem Beitrag aus dem Jahr 1980, in dem anhand der kritischen Besprechung einer veröffentlichten Übersetzung der Kurzgeschichte *Don Payasito* der spanischen Schriftstellerin Ana Maria Matute ein Modell aufgestellt wird, das die Bedeutung der Textanalyse für die Qualität des Translats illustrieren soll. Es handelt sich hier um den ersten translationswissenschaftlichen Artikel Nord's, der noch stark vom Äquivalenz-Modell Katharina Reiß' geprägt ist, für Nord jedoch "den Ausgangspunkt meiner übersetzungswissenschaftlichen Entwicklung markiert. (Nord, 2011, S. 11)

Meines Erachtens hantiert Nord hier einen fragwürdigen Begriff des "Literarischen". Sie rechnet literarische Texte generell "nicht zur Kategorie der pragmatischen Texte" (Nord, 2011, 15), untersucht jedoch den Text anhand ihres Kommunikationsmodell, wobei Sender, Empfänger, Kode, Senderintention und Empfängererwartung feste Kategorien sind. Den vorliegenden Text definiert sie als literarischen Text, der "durch seinen Inhalt/Gehalt die Leser ansprechen, nachdenklich machen, ihnen anhand eines – fiktiven oder autobiographischen – Kindheitserlebnisses ein allgemein menschliches Problem bewusst machen" möchte (Nord, 2011, S. 16). Ferner würden literarische Texte von einem "Stilwillen" (Nord, 2011, S.16), der bewussten Handhabung bestimmter sprachlicher Ausdrucksweisen bestimmt und seien sie so Äußerung eines einzigartigen Sprachgebrauchs, der dazu diene, den Inhalt zu unterstützen. Die Bestimmung des Texttyps aufgrund dieser Kriterien führe "zwingend" (Nord, 2011, S. 16) zur Translationsmethode.

In einem zweiten Beitrag "Übersetzungshandwerk – Übersetzungskunst" (1988), setzt Nord ihren Versuch, den Begriff 'literarisch' zu definieren, fort: sie bringt ihn in ein Kommunikationsmodell

ein (Intention des Senders/Empfängers/Referenten/Code/Effekts) und stellt dieses Modell dann in einen Rahmen der interkulturellen Kommunikation und Translation. Schließlich beschreibt sie den daraus gewonnenen theoretischen Rahmen für die literarische Übersetzung. Das Fazit ist erstaunlich: Die Forderung nach Äquivalenz von Ausgangs- und Zieltext sei unvereinbar mit den Hypothesen der interkulturellen literarischen Kommunikation. Auf den ersten Blick sei die Übersetzung von literarischen Texten also eine unmögliche Handlung und werde von ihr eigentlich "die Quadratur des Kreises" verlangt. (Nord, 2011, S.60)

Den einzigen Ausweg aus dieser Sackgasse sieht Nord in der Formulierung einer klaren, wissenschaftlich untermauerten theoretischen Grundlage und Zielsetzung. Außerdem seien die Unterschiede zwischen literarischer und nicht-literarischer Kommunikation so gering, dass eine einzige theoretische Grundlage für beide Textsorten ausreiche. Um diese Argumentation zu unterstützen greift Nord auf die Skopostheorie von Reiß und Vermeer zurück. (Reiß/Vermeer, 1984, S.43)

In einem weiteren Beitrag behandelt sie den Diskussionspunkt, dass literarische Übersetzungen eine Kunst seien, die nichts mit Wissenschaft zu tun hätten. Nord setzt dem entgegen, dass gerade literarische Übersetzungen oft einen auffallenden Qualitätsmangel aufweisen und ihnen eher vom "Bauch" her als vom "Kopf" her begegnet wird. (Nord, 20011, S.65) Anhand einiger 'typischer' Translationsprobleme, die die Translationswissenschaft wohl lösen kann, versucht sie, eine theoretische Grundlage zu schaffen, die der literarischen Übersetzung dienlich sein kann. Diese Grundlage geht ihrerseits vom funktionalistischen Modell aus und berücksichtigt Faktoren aus der Translationswissenschaft, Rezeptionstheorie, Stiltheorie, Textanalyse, Soziologie und Phonologie.

In den nächsten Kapiteln werden Themen behandelt wie die Translation kulturspezifischer Unterschiede ("Alice im Niemandsland", S. 75-98); die Transkription paraverbalen Verhaltens ("Wer spricht wie und warum?" S. 99-115); der Mythos der treuen Übersetzung ("So treu wie möglich?" S. 117-143) und die Übersetzung von Anreden in literarischen Übersetzungen aus dem Spanischen ("Ja mein Herr – o nein, Señorito!" S. 145-165).

Der zweite Teil des Bandes ist der Übersetzung religiöser Texte aus funktionalistischer Sicht gewidmet und formuliert u.a. einen neuen "Skopos für alte Texte" (S. 169-185); das Verhältnis von Interpretation und Übersetzung: "Auslegung und Übersetzung" (S. 207-213) und ein Plädoyer, auch nach Luther die Bibel immer wieder neu zu übersetzen. Der Band schließt mit einem interessanten Kapitel über Translationskompetenz und Bibelübersetzung und Kreativität versus Methode.

Die Bündelung dieser eher erschienenen Beiträge weist eine gewisse Kohärenz auf, ohne allzu große Überschneidungen. Der Standpunkt Christiane Nords ist von Anfang an klar: Die Bedeutung der Übersetzungsmethode und der Analyse von sowohl Ausgangs- wie auch

Zieltext kann nicht überschätzt werden. Eine klare Betrachtungsweise der Funktion von Ausgangs- und Zieltext und die Ersetzung des Begriffs der 'getreuen Übersetzung' durch den Begriff 'Loyalität' müssen einfach bessere Übersetzungen hervorbringen.

Referenzen

- Kohlmayer, R (1988): Der Literaturübersetzer zwischen Original und Markt. Eine Kritik funktionalistischer Übersetzungstheorien. In: *Lebende Sprachen* 33/4, 145-156.
- Nord, Ch. (1989): Loyalität statt Treue. Vorschläge zu einer funktionalen Übersetzungstypologie. In: *Lebende Sprachen* 3. Langenscheid, 100-105.
- Nord, Ch. (2011). *Funktionsgerechtigkeit und Loyalität. Die Übersetzung literarischer und religiöser Texte aus funktionaler Sicht.*, Berlin: Frank & Timme (In der Reihe: TransÜD Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens.)
- Reiß, K./Vermeer, J. (1984),43 *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie.* Tübingen: Niemeyer

Patricia Linden, Department of Translators and Interpreters, Artesis University College Antwerp

Nord, C (2011). *Funktionsgerechtigkeit und Loyalität. Theorie, Methode und Didaktik des funktionalen Übersetzens.* Berlin: Frank & Timme. 331p. [TransÜD. Arbeiten zur Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens 32.]

In diesem Band hat Christiane Nord auf Vorschlag von Hartwig Kalverkämper eine Auswahl „alter“ d.h. eher veröffentlichter Aufsätze gesammelt. Sie bringt sie in drei Teilen unter und ordnet sie in jedem Teil chronologisch aufgrund ihrer Erstveröffentlichung. Nach einem I. Teil über die Theorie des funktionalen Übersetzens folgt im II. Teil („Methode des funktionalen Übersetzens“) die Anwendung des Funktionsbegriffs auf verschiedene Probleme und Aspekte des Übersetzens, z.B. auf die Einteilung von Zitatstypen, die Unterscheidung von Übersetzungseinheiten und Einheiten kommunikativen Handelns und die Einteilung von Metakommunikation. Der III. Teil ist der Didaktik des funktionalen Übersetzens gewidmet. Nicht alle Aufsätze sind eine wörtliche Reproduktion der früheren Veröffentlichung. Da sich der Band ausschließlich aus deutschsprachigen Beiträgen zusammensetzen sollte, sind einige der Aufsätze aus dem Englischen übersetzt worden. Außerdem erwähnt die Autorin in ihrem Vorwort auch, dass sie bestimmte Artikel

gekürzt hat und gelegentlich mit „C.N. 2010“ gekennzeichnete Anmerkungen hinzugefügt hat.

Das große Verdienst der Translationswissenschaftlerin und der Translatorin Christiane Nord besteht wohl darin, dass sie der „rücksichtslosen Funktionsorientierung“ ein „Korrektiv“ geboten (S. 103) und den Funktionalismus für die Praxis des Übersetzens und die Übersetzerausbildung brauchbar gemacht hat. Und gerade dieses Verdienst spiegelt sich auch in dieser Sammlung wider. Im I. Teil sind drei der sechs Beiträge explizit dem Begriff der *Loyalität* gewidmet, der für Nord das Korrektiv zur Funktionsgerechtigkeit darstellt. Loyalität bedeutet, dass es zum ethischen Verhalten des Translators gehört, alle Beteiligten im Interaktionsprozess - das sind der Sender und der Ausgangstext, der Auftraggeber und der Auftrag sowie die Rezipienten - „nach bestem Wissen und Gewissen“ (S. 105) zu berücksichtigen. Auf all diese Beteiligten im kommunikativen Interaktionsprozess, der die Translation ist, nimmt Nord auch Rücksicht in ihren Beiträgen zur Didaktik des Übersetzens: bei der Analyse des Übersetzungsauftrags, bei der Formulierung der Anforderungen an ein Übersetzungslehrbuch, bei der Klassifizierung von Übersetzungsfehlern und beim Vorschlagen neuer Arbeitsformen im Übersetzungsunterricht.

Eine solche Sammlung von eher veröffentlichten Beiträgen weist auch einige Nachteile auf. Die Autorin kündigt im Vorwort ausdrücklich an, dass sie „auf die Einbeziehung neuerer Publikationen“ (S.8) verzichtet, was dazu führt, dass zeitgebundene Themen nicht aktualisiert werden, wie z.B. mit den Vertextungskonventionen von Packungsbeilagen der Fall ist (S. 93-99 und S. 308-309) und dass die in einem Artikel aus dem Jahr 2003 versprochenen Erweiterungen in diesem 2011 erschienenen Band noch immer in Aussicht gestellt werden (S. 225). Daneben ist bei einer Sammlung autonomer Aufsätze Wiederholung kaum zu vermeiden. Es ist nicht verwunderlich, dass gerade die Textfunktionen als Schlüsselbegriffe des funktionsorientierten Übersetzens in mehreren Aufsätzen erläutert werden. Das Vier-Funktionen-Modell wird zweimal ausführlich dargestellt (S. 161-164 und S. 213-216) und die Textfunktionen stehen auch im Mittelpunkt, wenn Probleme bei der Übersetzung von Titeln, Zitaten oder Werbetexten behandelt werden.

Bedauernd ist, dass sich in diesen Band – vermutlich als Folge des Bearbeitungsprozesses - sehr viele Druckfehler eingeschlichen haben. Manche dieser Druckfehler sind möglicherweise dem Scannen des Manuskripts zuzuschreiben: z.B. „Hierarchier“ statt „Hierarchie“ (S. 35), „sodas“ statt „sodass“ (S.58), „la bruit“ statt „le bruit“ (S. 62). Andere Fehler tragen deutlich die Spuren von zwei Fassungen: z.B. „[...] auf die man *sich* beim Übersetzen [...] *zurückgreifen* kann“ (S. 29), „[...] *begrenzen* die Signale [...] das Spektrum [...] *ein*“ (S. 49). Einmal wird derselbe Inhalt in zwei aufeinander folgenden Absätzen einfach in anderer Formulierung wiederholt (S.172-173). Es mag auch an der Textbearbeitung

liegen, dass an zwei Stellen Inkongruenzen zwischen Fließtext und Abbildung entstehen. Gemeint sind: die Beschreibung der Abb. 7 (S. 94-96) und die Erläuterung der Abb. 1 (S. 162-163), in der auf "Wellenlinien" verwiesen wird, die es in der Abbildung nicht gibt.

Trotz der genannten Schwächen erfüllt dieser Band seine Zielsetzungen. Er dokumentiert die wesentlichen Aspekte von Christiane Nords wissenschaftlicher Arbeit, er stellt einen Überblick der funktionalistischen Ansätze und deren Anwendungsmöglichkeiten dar und enthält wichtige Hinweise für all diejenigen, die in der Übersetzer Ausbildung mit Translationsübungen beauftragt sind.

**Leona Van Vaerenbergh, Department of Translators and Interpreters,
Artesis University College Antwerp**