

*Translation and Literature* 19 (2010)

emerging novel'. A lack of clarity when it comes to generic classification does not help: given the repeated assertion that the period saw a shift from prose fiction to 'the novel', it is strange to find a text like John Shebbeare's *Letters on the English Nation* (1755) cheerfully categorized as a novel. There is, nevertheless, much of value in *The Spread of Novels*. We get a detailed portrait of the business and practice of translation during the eighteenth century, and McMurrin capably demonstrates the refusal of individual novels to stay within national borders. For all its shortcomings, this is a useful contribution.

HENRY POWER

*University of Exeter*

DOI: 10.3366/E0968136110000993

*Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*. Edited by Eiléan Ní Chuilleanáin, Cormac Ó Cuilleánáin, and David Parris. Pp. 256. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009. Hb. £45.

*Modes of Censorship and Translation: National Contexts and Diverse Media*. Edited by Francesca Billiani. Pp. 328. Manchester: St Jerome, 2007. Pb. £22.50.

*Translation under State Control: Books for Young People in the German Democratic Republic*. By Gaby Thomson-Wohlgemuth. Pp. 260. New York and London: Routledge, 2009. Hb. £80.

It seems anyone standing between writer and reader can be called a censor. The publisher binning unsolicited manuscripts, the editor fine-tuning his protégé's debut, the translator choosing the word 'azure' instead of 'cobalt' – all are in danger of being lumped in together with *bona fide* censors cutting unflattering references to king, party, or deity. But – at least with respect to preventive censorship – translations are not in the same position as originals. When an original is censored before publication, only the author's manuscript shows what the finished work would otherwise have been like. When a translation is censored, the original, finished work is nearly always somewhere out there, inviting a comparison that will reveal the censor's influence when many a regime would prefer to deny that censorship even exists. The various drafts that come before the final, published version of an untranslated work can also be studied, but the vast majority of readers accept the final version as the definitive authority. Usually only specialists look further. With a translation the authoritative text is not at the end of the chain of production, after the publisher's indifference has been overcome, the

*Reviews*

editor flattered, and the censor evaded—it is at the beginning of the process. For all that translators (‘re-writers’) and translation scholars may protest, it is the source text, already bent into and out of shape by forces at work in a different regime, that translations will be measured against.

If a translation is published and is found wanting, accusations can ensue. And unlike censors in totalitarian regimes, the translator’s name generally goes on the record. Nor can translators, like censors in democracies, call on the dignity of their office. A translator caught toning down the bad language in a play cannot, like a Lord Chamberlain, hide behind a public remit. We might expect, then, that studies of censorship and translation will differ from studies of censorship and original literature, but, as can be seen in the works reviewed here, this is not always the case.

*Translation and Censorship* is divided into four sections—‘Theory’, ‘Classical and Renaissance’, ‘Censoring Regimes’, and ‘Sensitivities’—with the emphasis mostly on European languages and cultures. Among the issues which arise are self-censorship and the relationship between censorship and editing. Some articles read like straightforward historical accounts of censorship in a given time and place and as applied to a given text or texts, the fact that the texts in question are translations being almost incidental. The collection is well organized; there is a good index, and the overall quality of the book’s production is high. The editors’ introduction discusses Strachey’s English translation of Freud in terms of censorship, and here problems arise: if Strachey can be called a censor because he used ‘pseudo-scientific Greek vocabulary’ instead of Freud’s ‘warm and vivid style’, then any translator might be labelled a censor, and this collection should be renamed ‘Translation and Translation’. Indeed, Elisabeth Gibbels’ contribution is called bluntly ‘Translators, the Tacit Censors’.

Maria Tymoczko was the keynote speaker at the conference from which these articles are drawn, and her paper, on censorship and self-censorship, follows the introduction. This is a good opening, mixing history, theory, and practice. She points out that there is no clear distinction between external and internal constraints. The question of self-censorship in anticipation of external censorship is to recur repeatedly in the three books under review here: a common feature of external censorship seems to be vagueness about what is permissible (see, for example, Gómez Castro’s case study in this volume of Durrell’s *Justine* in Francoist Spain).

After Piotr Kuhiwczak’s swift account of seventy-five years or so of state censorship in the USSR and the Eastern Bloc, the articles

*Translation and Literature* 19 (2010)

narrow their focus. Elisabeth Gibbels compares four German versions of Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Gibbels seems more at home when doing close textual analysis, but one suspects that the unfortunate translators of Wollstonecraft simply did not read the original as closely as she did. Whether they censored Wollstonecraft or simply did not understand her in the way Gibbels does is debatable. Gibbels writes: 'By becoming more colloquial, Wollstonecraft is addressing women.' Possibly so, but it seems a little harsh to present a translator as a sexist and a censor because she fails to agree, and produces a more formal version instead.

Apuleius and Catullus, the latter something of a favourite in Translation Studies, are taken on by Carol O'Sullivan in her article, which ranges over the 450 years or so of English translations to date. She shows how translators sometimes took refuge in French or Latin for parts too scandalous for plain speaking. Like Gibbels and other authors under review here, she draws attention to the role of paratexts in the control of meaning, but her essay is more forgiving of translators than is Gibbels'. It is followed by Ní Chuilleanáin and Deirdre Serjeantson's contribution, 'The Petrarch they tried to ban', a sixteenth-century journey across Latin, Italian, French, and English that reads almost like a detective novel. The erudition is at times overwhelming (praise be to the indexer!) but it is a fascinating study of cultural and linguistic transfer against a background of Protestant and Catholic conflict and intrigue. Next, Jane Dunnett's study of inter-war Italy adds some archival back-up to her 2002 article 'Foreign Literature in Fascist Italy: Circulation and Censorship' (*TTR* 15.2), parts of which it follows very closely indeed, without saying so (although a footnote does mention the earlier publication).

Aoife Gallagher reads Pasternak's translation of *Hamlet* as an act of indirect communication—not, as she says is often maintained, a straightforward 'escape' from censorship. Pasternak presents Hamlet as a 'simple, flawless hero', subverting the conventions of socialist realism. Gallagher's article has the virtue of showing the difference between censorship's effect on originals and on translations. Censorship is understood quite broadly in the first two contributions in the section labelled 'Sensitivities': Filipe Alves Machado's study of three Portuguese *Don Quixote* translations published under varying political circumstances between 1875 and 1978, and Gerri Kimber's article on Katherine Mansfield. For example, the French edition of Mansfield's *Letters* (1931) was an abridged (censored?) version of the two-volume English edition of 1928, which her husband had also censored (edited?). These and the following two essays show how useful studies

*Reviews*

of translations can be as a means to understanding cultural values and social mores past and present. Nikolowski-Bogomoloff shows how much more robust the British version of Astrid Lindgren's *Madicken* is than the American one, while Cormac Ó Cuilleanáin's contribution under the title '... comme des nègres: whitewashed in translation' takes us into the territory of varying attitudes to racism and sexism. It gives the intriguing example of a play which was re-written (actually re-written, that is, not in the all-encompassing Lefeverian sense that all translation is re-writing) to ensure that foreign (US) audiences got the 'right' message. I cannot help but think that the audience got the right message in the first place – that they understood the play better than the playwright. The author is long dead; must she now be resurrected by translators? Ó Cuilleanáin is too gentlemanly to pass judgement in the way that I just have, and instead offers a thoughtful and wide-ranging piece that acknowledges the unexamined biases inherent in – yes – 'gentlemanly, domesticated' translators. The collection ends with Sarah Smyth's cautionary tale of 'Razom nas bagato' ('Together we are many') by Ukrainian pop group Greenjolly. A big hit at the time of the Orange Revolution in 2004, it was a big disappointment in the following year's Eurovision song contest. Its lyrics changed according to circumstances and language, eventually ending in 'the censorship of sound bites and amnesia which no amount of translation can combat'.

In this, and in the next collection under review here, there are some worthwhile, detailed individual studies, but some of the items lack real depth, offering only illustrations of well-known facts, and not tackling the practices of translation under censorship. We learn, for instance, that such and such a foreign book was interfered with by the censor, but the conclusion to be drawn is simply that censorship existed. Also, scholars of totalitarian regimes need to remember that it was not just the Pasternaks and the Solzhenitsyns who were subject to censorship. So were their critics and reviewers; so were their censors; so were literary historians; and so, in some cases, were historians of censorship (Abellán's study of censorship in Francoist Spain came out in 1980, five years after Franco's death, but censorship did not end there until at least 1983). All but the most dogmatic party hacks were looking over their shoulders, and no one's words can be taken at face value. Even critics from outside totalitarian states could not speak freely (or should not have) about censored writers for fear of jeopardizing their careers, even their lives. A proper sensitivity to this is not always displayed in the work reviewed here.

When a translator thanks two people for helping in the translation of a single sentence it is time to wonder if the sentence was worth

*Translation and Literature* 19 (2010)

translating in the first place. Francesca Billiani finds herself in this unhappy situation in the introduction to *Modes of Censorship and Translation*. The culprit is Pierre Bourdieu, with his ‘habitus’, ‘fields’, and ‘structuring structured structures’ (*sic*). As in *Translation and Censorship*, there are problems with definitions, though they are more serious here: Billiani writes that, for this volume, censorship ‘describes the multiple cultural and linguistic locations at which censorship meets translation’.

Most of the contributors to this volume either ignore Bourdieu (and Foucault and Bhabha) completely or simply pay a little harmless lip service. An exception would be Katja Krebs, whose article on stage censorship in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Britain (mostly of German plays) ends by saying that translation is ‘a ‘meeting ground’ which is located not so much in an in-between space, a neither-here-nor-there, but rather in a space which defies binary oppositions and manages to bridge and shift the apparent borders between visibility and invisibility, the dissenting and the compliant, the permissive and repressive’.

Giorgio Fabre, Jacqueline Hurlley, and Gaby Thomson-Wohlgemuth take us through modern dictatorships (Italian, Spanish, and East German) with the emphasis firmly on historical facts and archival research. As in *Translation and Censorship*, the fact that the material in question was originally written in a foreign language sometimes seems incidental: there is not much comparison of source and target texts in the four chapters following the introduction. Perhaps taking advantage of the broad definition of censorship, Gonda Van Steen goes a step further: her article on versions of Aeschylus’ *Persians*, lines 402–5, is really a study of the adaptation and manipulation over the years of the exhortation to the Greeks, on stage and in song. Is every new interpretation of a play to be understood as censorship? Surely the more censorious act would be depriving actors and directors of the right to their own interpretations. Nonetheless, this is an interesting historical survey of political manipulation, although it suffers from the same problem as Gibbels’ article in *Translation and Censorship*. Whether a given reading of Aeschylus is ‘censored’ or not depends on the beholder’s understanding of Aeschylus: perhaps the Greek colonels were right and *Persians* really *is* triumphalist.

‘As becomes clear to any historian of translation, each age recreates the ancient world in its own image’, writes J. Michael Walton in this same volume. Walton’s study of Greek drama and the Lord Chamberlain’s censorship in Britain is one of the best individual contributions under review here. It is an entertaining tour through

*Reviews*

the pages of lewd Greek classics, but also a thought-provoking study of changing social mores. (As in *Translation and Censorship*, quite a few items found in this volume serve as social history documents.) Not only that, but Walton gets to grips with translation as both a tool of censorship and a means to evade it, where many other essays simply note that censors forced changes in translations. He writes, for example, 'What Frere does here is follow sufficiently closely on the original for someone who does read Greek to recognize the euphemisms.' Related to this is the central point of Matthew Reynolds' 'Semi-censorship in Dryden and Browning', another strong contribution, which shows how cunning translation choices can tip the reader off to the presence of censorship: 'They let us know that something is being kept from us – and, by letting us know, prompt us to guess what it is.' These nods and winks sometimes lead readers to assume the original was more explosive than in fact it was – straining to find contraband where there is none appears to be a common reaction to censorship in general.

Walton and Reynolds share with Siobhan Brownlie an approach which compares source and target texts. Brownlie's subject is Zola's *Nana* in five British translations. This is painstaking work, presented clearly and precisely here. As in several other contributions, we see that the authorities generally only trusted the rich and well-educated with uncensored materials. It was the lower classes who had to be 'protected' from dangerous ideas. The better-off could be trusted not to rock the boat. (Few scholars in Translation Studies stop to wonder from which group a professionalized caste of translators would come, Cormac Ó Cuilleaináin, above, being an honourable exception.)

The last three chapters deal with film and radio. Chloë Stephenson's 'Seeing Red' is a history of Soviet film in fascist Italy, and has little enough to say about translation proper. Mussolini was a film buff (and a translator) but very anti-Soviet: *Battleship Potemkin* lasted all of fifteen minutes in its censored, 'Italian' form, and Soviet films were often rendered incomprehensible by the censor's work. Matthew Philpotts in his chapter on Günter Eich stretches the boundaries of translation to include radio adaptation. He points to the difficulty in determining whether a writer has capitulated to censorial authorities: Eich chose safe, censor-friendly subjects in the 1930s, but perhaps he would have done so even if Hitler had not come to power. The collection finishes with Jeroen Vandaele's case study of the fate of three Billy Wilder films in Francoist Spain. He studies the films themselves, censors' reports, and also press reactions – which in a totalitarian state were at least in theory also supposed to act as a means of control. This survey of

*Translation and Literature* 19 (2010)

changing attitudes, as reflected in press and censors' reviews, provides a useful insight into modern Spanish social history.

Billiani's is a substantial and well-produced book, with a helpful index. A couple of contributors make reference to writers (Kershaw and Perlmann) who do not appear in their bibliographies – an unfortunate, but minor, slip.

Based on archival research into East German censors' reports and the introductions and afterwords added to translations of books for children and young people, *Translation under State Control* outlines the history of what seems to have been a strongly internalized censorship regime: according to the files, only one young people's book translated from English did not pass the censor. The book starts with a history of the German Democratic Republic's literature policies before examining the extremely complicated dual power structures in the censoring regime (although the system rarely mentioned censorship or censors, preferring euphemisms such as 'assessment', 'procedure to obtain print permits', and 'political experts'). The influence of socialist realist aesthetics on translations is examined, as are the constraints of paper supplies, central planning, foreign currency exchange, and copyrights. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 deal respectively with the censors' files, case studies, and afterwords and introductions. These last were often added to children's books, ostensibly to guide children to the right conclusions about what they were reading, but often serving to keep the censors happy, since children were not thought likely to actually read them. The book is at its best and most interesting in dealing with archival evidence and these paratexts. There is little or no comparison of source and target texts.

The title of the book is somewhat misleading, since it only treats translations from English. Also, it only deals in detail with the period from 1961 to 1989. There is only passing mention of books translated from other languages; opportunities are lost here, for example to compare quotas from countries on either side of the Iron Curtain. Michael Westdickenberg, in his *Die 'Diktatur des anständigen Buches'* (2004), looks at this, but does not distinguish between adults' fiction and fiction for young people. Thomson-Wohlgemuth's introduction relies too much on official pronouncements about the importance of children's literature. Similar pronouncements were made stressing women's rights too, yet Herman Weber, in *Geschichte der DDR*, concludes that despite 'political theses' the GDR remained a man's society. In his study of East German book censorship in the 1960s, Westdickenberg refers to a list of twentieth-century Western authors approved because of their 'progressiveness'. Were there any children's

*Reviews*

authors on this list? An answer to that question would go some way to convincing readers that professed commitment to children's and young people's literature was more than just empty words, but the list is not mentioned in *Translation under State Control*. The author does show more scepticism when it comes to censors' reports (and in the conclusion rejects official claims that children were taken seriously). She attempts to read between the lines, and acknowledges that assessors' reports were influenced by the need to play up any desirable socialist values that might be found in the books.

Over-reliance on officially approved sources in the introduction might be deemed a tactical error, but I have other reservations about the book. To begin with, the graphs in Chapter 2 showing young people's books translated from English according to genre published from 1961 to 1989 are unclear. The vertical axes are unlabelled, and we only learn the overall number of books for young people in the period some 150 pages later (it was 405). Thomson-Wohlgemuth writes: 'the very small figure of 'other' is made up by poetry productions . . . and two books by church publishers'. But this figure for 'other', 4.2%, is greater than that for girls' books, science fiction, and animal stories combined, and only slightly lower than that for crime and detective stories (4.4%). Surely, then, poetry was worth a category to itself? The print-runs and numbers of fresh editions are not given. One of the two non-poetry books in the 'other' category was a children's bible. It would be interesting to know how many children's bibles the communist authorities printed, and why. Did they, for instance, outnumber copies of *The Hobbit*?

The possibility that a critic may have been 'covering' for an author by not calling attention to dangerous content is sometimes overlooked, as in the following case. In Werner Schmoll's 1962 book *Mit siebzehn ist man noch kein Held* (*At Seventeen one is no longer a Hero*) there is a conflict between the class-bound father and the progressive son, Hannes. Thomson-Wohlgemuth writes that Nadeshda Ludwig 'called Hannes' conflict truly socialist, because it demonstrated that it arose from an ideological difference and not from a generation problem'. Ludwig may have thought it was a good old generation gap story, but chose to play up the tradition-*vs*-progress angle in order not to kill off Schmoll's chances of publishing another book. This also points to a disadvantage of not engaging with the books themselves: it would be easier to interpret Ludwig's comment if we knew more about Schmoll's book.

Thomson-Wohlgemuth has a tendency to hammer home her points and over-explain. The endnotes contain, for instance, explanations



*Translation and Literature* 19 (2010)

of My Lai and Chartism—quoted from the Internet at that. And do readers really need to be told that in East Germany ‘there was a distinct move towards a socialist society’? Or that ‘the price to be attained [for books] on the domestic market could not be neglected, as it was also a tool for accruing earnings’? Her introduction to a discussion of the file on one book opens with the words, ‘This collection of short stories was published by Neues Leben for young adolescents in 1984 and therefore constitutes an example of an anthology for young adults’. What is said is more important than how it is said, and I would not devote space to the problem of verbiage if I did not think it was the cause of some embarrassing slip-ups. On the last page we read that ‘Choice of books occurred in alignment with Party ideology and no other subjective view was permitted.’ Fair enough, even if it is the umpteenth time we have read this widely known and thoroughly understood fact of totalitarian life; but the next sentence is: ‘Thus, publishers’ decisions were rooted in what they believed was ‘socially acceptable to the Party’, since the Party represented the society.’ That the Party represented society is highly questionable, as Thomson-Wohlgemuth herself notes elsewhere. Also on the last page: ‘Whichever stance is taken on the meaning of censorship, it has been shown that the wider social context has a direct effect on the literary production of a society.’ This apparently innocuous, if not banal, statement is also open to question: in East Germany the wider social context had much *less* influence on literature than in open, pluralist societies, precisely because of censorship and the narrow dictates of enforced socialist realism.

The index is inadequate, and—a blow to translators’ fight for recognition—the names of the translators of the books which form the basis of the study are not given. Parts of the author’s previously published article ‘On the Other Side of the Wall: Book Production, Censorship and Translation in East Germany’, in *Modes of Censorship and Translation*, appear verbatim in the book with no attribution (e.g. p. 77).

A pattern emerges in the items reviewed here: the more oppressive the regime, the less likely there is to be a detailed comparison of source and target text. In one case where there is a comparison (Gómez Castro’s article), the TT (produced outside the censoring regime) is found to be faithful and uncensored, merely banned for many years. In the case of censorship in democracies, all or almost all the contributors involved do refer to the ST. This may be suggestive of a tendency for democracies to prune risky translations while dictatorships prohibit them altogether—a possible avenue for further research. Perhaps dictatorial regimes will in general prefer outright suppression to

*Reviews*

doctored translations. Giorgio Fabre mentions the problem of ‘adverse reaction abroad’ if cuts are noticed, but perhaps more decisively, an all-out ban, though it may sound more drastic, can sometimes be justified more easily: there are other, better books to translate; there is a paper shortage, a foreign currency shortage; there is an indigenous culture to be fostered; the book is not *banned* as such, it is just not being published right now . . .

Bassnett and Lefevere come out against comparisons of ST and TT in their *Translation, History and Culture* (1990) on the grounds that the *tertium comparationis* inevitably either sneaks in or is implicit. I would not rule comparisons out, but they were right to be wary. If the final authority is neither the source nor the target text, but rather the critic’s reading of the source text, then all variant readings – all other translations – will be deemed censorship.

ROBERT LOOBY

*Catholic University of Lublin*

DOI: 10.3366/E0968136110001007

*Six Lithuanian Poets*. Edited by Eugenijus Ališanka, translated by Eugenijus Ališanka, Kerry Shawn Keys, Medeinė Tribinevičius, Laima Vincė, and Jonas Zdanys. Pp. 159. Todmorden: Arc Publications, 2008. Pb. £10.99.

*Six Polish Poets*. Edited by Jacek Dehnel, translated by Ewa Chruściel, Bill Johnston, Karen Kovacik, Antonia Lloyd-Jones, Mira Rosenthal, George Szirtes, and Elżbieta Wójcik-Leese. Pp. 170. Todmorden: Arc Publications, 2009. Pb. £10.99.

*Vítězslav Nezval: Prague with Fingers of Rain*. Translated by Ewald Osers. Pp. 62. Tarsset: Bloodaxe, 2009. Pb. £8.95.

*Six Lithuanian Poets* and *Six Polish Poets* are the fourth and fifth books in a series called ‘New Voices from Europe and beyond’, following volumes devoted to Basque, Slovenian, and Czech poetry. Some funding comes from the EU’s ‘Literature Across Frontiers’ project; the series is designed to supply the oxygen of translation and readership to the languages and poets featured, and to open windows onto poetic scenes and developments across the new Europe. Despite the ‘beyond’ of the title, then, the series focuses so far on European poetry, and largely on countries of the former eastern bloc which entered the EU in 2004. These volumes attempt to address a paradox in their recent international reception. Until 1989, interest in the literatures