

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 15.09.20

Dette dokumentets nettadresse (URL) er:

<https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/cm4all/uproc.php/0/nyoversettelse.pdf>

Nyoversettelse

(_oversettelsespraksis) Også kalt gjenoversettelse. Å oversette en tekst som allerede er oversatt (vanligvis av en annen oversetter mange år tidligere) til det samme språket som det nå oversettes til på nytt. Noen ganger er en tidligere oversettelse ikke av hele verket, mens nyoversettelsen omfatter hele teksten.

Oversetteren går til en tekst på nytt og tar i sin nye oversettelse hensyn til nye lingvistiske, litterære og estetiske normer, og til målgruppens forventninger og behov (Belle 2007). Nyoversettelser er nødvendig for å reaktualisere eller reaktivere tekster, og for å ta hensyn til at lesernes behov, smak og kunnskaper har endret seg – “man må nyoversette fordi oversettelser eldes” (Antoine Berman gjengitt fra Belle 2007).

“En oversettelse er *også* en tolkning. At det forholder seg slik blir især klart når vi tar for oss de mange oversettelser av klassiske tekster som er blitt til gjennom tidene. De nyoversettes gjerne minst én gang i hver generasjon, og avspeiler sin tid både når det gjelder filologisk tradisjon og det jeg vil kalle ideologisk betinget holdning til originalen.” (Herbert Svenkerud i *Aftenposten* 28. februar 1985)

Gjennom nyoversettelse blir teksten “pluralisert”, og nyoversettelsen signaliserer at teksten rommer et uavgrenset meningspotensiale (Julia Peslier i <http://www.fabula.org/acta/document6026.php>; lesedato 25.10.16). “Translating is a way of questioning a work, and the more translations we have of it, the more answers we will get from it. In fact, a work stands as a classic as long as it does not stop offering answers” (Juan Gabriel López Guix sitert fra <http://nt2.uqam.ca/en/dossiers-thematiques/enjeux-de-traduction>; lesedato 05.04.19).

“[R]etranslation is a complex, multifaceted process of transmission, substitution and duplication which is played out, over time, against the shifting background of a literary system.” (Sharon Deane i <https://journals.openedition.org/flaubert/1538>; lesedato 12.02.20)

“As every generation retranslates the classics, out of a vital compulsion for immediacy and precise echo, so every generation uses language to build its own

resonant past. At moments of historical stress, mythologies of the ‘true past’ follow on each other at such speed that entirely different perspectives coexist and blur at the edges. There is, today, a 1914-19 figura for those in their seventies; to a man of forty, 1914 is the vague forerunner of realities which only gather meaning in the crises of the late 1930s; to the ‘bomb-generation’, history is an experience that dates to 1945; what lies before is an allegory of antique illusions.” (George Steiner i boka *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, 1975; sitert fra https://archive.org/stream/SteinerGeorge_201504/; lesedato 03.11.16)

I motsetning til den opprinnelige, originale teksten, som ikke trenger noen justeringer eller modifiseringer, vil en oversettelse alltid bli stilt spørsmål ved, kunne forbedres, gjøres mer aktuell osv. (Jean-Paul Manganaro i <http://www.lesgrandsdebats.fr/Debats/La-retraduction-des-classiques-est-elle-necessaire/Enfoncer-le-clou-460>; lesedato 04.01.17). Oversetterarbeidet inkluderer å ta hensyn til originalens indre sammenheng, stil, musikalitet, påvirkning fra andre forfattere m.m., og er derfor et arbeid som alltid kan gjøres bedre (Olivier Mannoni i <http://www.lesgrandsdebats.fr/Debats/La-retraduction-des-classiques-est-elle-necessaire/Freud-ecrivain-451>; lesedato 08.11.16). Ingen oversettelse er den ferdige, perfekte versjonen.

Romanen *Forbrytelse og straff* “kan utmerket godt leses både i Ivar Digernes’ utgave fra 1937 og i Jan Brodals fra 1990, da den ble nyoversatt i forbindelse med Solums utgave av Dostojevskijs samlede verker i 29 bind på norsk.” (Fredrik Wandrup i *Dagbladet* 26. november 2016 s. 52)

En nyoversettelse fungerer som oversetterens nylesning av verket – en ny oppfatning, forståelse, tolkning av verket (Yves Gambier i <https://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/1994/v39/n3/002799ar.pdf>; lesedato 06.12.16). Den nye forståelsen kan f.eks. skyldes at den kulturen som den oversatte teksten tilhører, har blitt mer og mer kjent.

Den nye oversetteren kan ignorere tidligere oversettelser, utfylle dem, fornye dem, omforme dem, og til og med stjele formuleringer fra dem. Noen oversettere unnlater å lese tidligere oversettelser av verket for ikke å bli influert av dem (Julia Peslier i <http://www.fabula.org/acta/document6026.php>; lesedato 25.10.16) og slik bevare sin autonomi. Det kan for oversetteren være et ærbødig forhold til tidligere oversettelser eller en implisitt rivalisering.

En nyoversettelse kan bli satt igang fordi en tidligere utgave av en bok var en sekundær-oversettelse, f.eks. en novelle på urdu oversatt til norsk fra en engelsk oversettelse av urdu-teksten (Yves Gambier i <https://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/1994/v39/n3/002799ar.pdf>; lesedato 06.12.16). Nyoversettelsen til norsk er derimot direkte fra urdu.

En nyoversettelse kan fungere som et slags salgargument for et nytt produkt, i motsetning til å revidere den allerede eksisterende oversettelsen (Yves Gambier i <https://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/1994/v39/n3/002799ar.pdf>; lesedato 06.12.16). Både økonomiske, litterære og ideologiske faktorer spiller inn på hvilke tekster som nyoversettes og hvordan oversettelsen gjennomføres.

Det er en tendens at oversettelser som tar mye hensyn til målgruppen, dvs. tilpasser oversettelsen til mottakernes språk på et bestemt tidspunkt, eldes raskere enn oversettelser som holder seg tett til originalteksten (Yves Gambier i <https://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/1994/v39/n3/002799ar.pdf>; lesedato 06.12.16). Hvis en tekst skal oversettes fra spansk til norsk i 2017, og bruker gjengse uttrykksmåter typisk for Norge i 2017 (f.eks. slang), vil oversettelsen eldes raskere enn om den bruker et mer “tidsløst” språk.

Noen oversettere av verk på vers/rim velger rimmønstre som etter noen år virker stive og gammeldagse (Belle 2007). Det er ikke alltid mulig å overføre et bestemt rimmønster fra ett språk til et annet, og oversetteren må derfor velge hvordan kildens rimmønstre og rytme skal komme til uttrykk i den oversatte versjonen. Valg tatt underveis i oversettelsesarbeidet kan føre til et resultat som eldes raskt.

Hvis en tidligere oversettelse har vært en forkortet utgave av verket, f.eks. en delvis sensurert utgave, vil nyoversettelsen langt på vei fungere som en første oversettelse av verket (Yves Gambier i <https://www.erudit.org/revue/meta/1994/v39/n3/002799ar.pdf>; lesedato 06.12.16). Den første oversetteren kan ha vært underlagt rammebetingelser (f.eks. sterkt tidspress for å få ferdig oversettelsen) som den neste oversetteren ikke er.

“In the context of literary translation studies, a translation can be challenged at any time, which may lead to its retranslation. According to “Retranslation Hypothesis”, first translations tend to be more target-oriented than subsequent, more recent translations. Retranslations, the hypothesis claims, get closer to the source text, resulting in a more accomplished target text [target text = den teksten som utgjør oversettelsen]. [...] The “Retranslation Hypothesis” has been presented in an article by French scholar Berman (1990: p. 1), talking basically about literary retranslation. He claims that translation is an “incomplete” act and that it can only evolve through later translations. Completion to Berman refers to the success of a translation in getting closer to the source text (ST) and in representing the encounter between the translator and the language of the original (1990). He believes that all translations are marked with an inherent “failure” that is at its peak in its first translation (1990: p. 5). He further believes that subsequent translations pay more attention to the letter and style of the ST and keep a cultural distance between the translation and its source, emphasizing the otherness of the original (1990). [...] Robinson (1999: p. 1) states, “standard assumption about retranslation is that it is undertaken when an existing translation, comes to be widely perceived as outdated.” Based on this idealized model of translation, the original is

considered “timeless,” while translation is for its own time only (1999: p. 2). Later he takes a critical stance on this ideal model and regards it rather simplistic, since literary classics in opposition to the claim of “Retranslation Hypothesis” may be retranslated for a whole host of reasons, only some of which are related to the passage of time (1999). [...] Robinson (1999) speaks of three models of retranslations as temporal supplementarity, quantitative supplementarity, and qualitative supplementarity, which refer to updating and modernization of previous translations, getting more of the original’s semantics, style, and beauty, respectively.” (Dastjerdi og Mohammadi 2013)

“Implied in “Retranslation Hypothesis” is the paradigm of idealism, namely the further we get away from the time the ST was created and the more it is retranslated, the better translation will be achieved (Vándor, 2009). In other words, the more we translate the better results we get and eventually we get access to an ideal translation, i.e., a translation that its goal is to achieve “perfect identity with the original” (Goethe cited in Schulte & Biguenet, 1992). [...] If a ST appears to be foreign or alien in the target culture, a more domesticated comprehensive version of translation is often expected and later translations seem to benefit from increased familiarity with the source culture. [...] Generally, Berman (1990) takes three main reasons in to account for rendering a new translation of the already translated texts. He primarily speaks of historical, interpretive, and recaption-oriented grounds as specific justifications for the act of retranslation. He puts emphasis on the issue of aging translations with the passage of time, and eternal “young” ST as a major motivation for rendering new translations. By contrast, Brownlie (2006) points out that changing social contexts and the evolution of translation norms are major factors leading to retranslate a previously translated text. Pym also gives some explanation on the reasons for retranslation act “ranging from different pedagogical functions of texts to rivalry in the possession of the knowledge contained in the document to be translated” (1998: pp. 82-83). Other reasons for retranslations, as Kujamäki (2001) claims, are ideological and political factors that give rise to a need for retranslation of canonical literary texts in particular. Retranslations may also be published in order to reassert the power and authority of certain social institutions such as academic, feminist, and religious establishments (Venuti, 2003). Retranslations commissioned with the awareness of the predecessor translations, Venuti maintains, “justify themselves by establishing their differences from one or more previous versions” and that this difference emerges from retranslation strategies leading to competing interpretations formed on the assumption of unacceptability of previous versions” (2003: pp. 25-26).” (Dastjerdi og Mohammadi 2013)

“Retranslators may also set out to displace the prevailing translation norms in a given culture (2003). Paloposki and Koskinen (2004) argue that the possible reason behind the act of retranslation is that if a ST appears to be foreign or alien in the target culture, a more domesticated comprehensive version of translation is often expected and later translations seem to benefit from increased familiarity with the

source culture. Therefore, acquainting with the culture of ST is seen as another reason for retranslation act. The role of publishing houses which are attracted by prestige, cost effectiveness, and guaranteed sales associated with the publication of literary classics is also another reason to retranslate or recycle existing translations (Milton, 2001; Koskinen & Paloposki, 2003; Venuti, 2003).” (Dastjerdi og Mohammadi 2013)

“Five main arguments have been put forward to justify retranslation. Retranslation, thus, is acceptable if 1) The existing translation is unsatisfactory (in terms of errors of comprehension, changes in perception and target language norms over years); 2) A new edition of ST is published and becomes a standard reference; 3) The existing TT [= target text] is considered outdated from stylistic point of view; 4) Retranslation has a special function to fill in the target language (e.g. synchronic retranslations for British and American market [nyoversettelser som gjennomføres samtidig]); 5) A different interpretation of ST is plausible (Vanderschelden, 2000: pp. 5-6). Retranslations [...] can also contribute to the revival of interests in a forgotten literary text, and publishers use them as a positive literary device (2000). [...] “Retranslation Hypothesis” is formulated more explicitly in an evaluation by Gambier (1994: p. 414) “... first translation always tends to be more assimilating, tends to reduce the otherness in the name of cultural and editorial requirements... The translation, in this perspective would mark a *return* to the source text” [...]. First translations, therefore, are assumed to feature cuts and challenges that are motivated by a concern for higher levels of readability (1994). [...] the retranslation as much-needed supplement that captures more of the original’s timeliness (temporal supplementarity), semantics and/or syntax (quantitative supplementarity), or spark, genius, élan, or je ne sais quoi (qualitative supplementarity)”. By qualitative supplementarity, he means getting more of the original’s style and beauty.” (Dastjerdi og Mohammadi 2013)

Anthony Pym “regards ‘passive retranslation’ as a corollary of diachronic normative changes in the target system. But he further adopts a synchronic perspective, highlighting the phenomenon of ‘active retranslation’: whereas passive retranslation gives rise, over time, to retranslations which ‘have relatively little disturbing influence on each other’ (1998: 82), active retranslation presupposes that ‘retranslations sharing virtually the same cultural location or generation must respond to something else’ (ibid.). And that something else is often characterized by challenge or rivalry. The examples of active retranslations which Pym outlines are: (i) different versions of a ST for different readers; (ii) a commissioned retranslation to correct linguistic errors in a previous version; (iii) a retranslation designed to counteract restricted access.” (Deane 2011 s. 12)

Ifølge den amerikanske oversetteren Lawrence Venuti “any new retranslation has the potential to rival any of its predecessors, regardless of the time span which might separate them. Indeed, Venuti sees challenge as contingent on a temporal gap insofar as retranslations ‘deliberately mark the passage of time by aiming to

distinguish themselves from a previous version through differences in discursive strategies and interpretations' (2003: 35). Whereas Pym's passive retranslation and the updating of linguistic norms go hand in hand, Venuti highlights alterations to the discursive texture of a retranslation as indicative of a deliberate act of differentiation. Likewise, reinterpretation is no longer simply a consequence of outmoded readings, but becomes motivated by competition. In this context, diachronic movement activates rather than passivates retranslation. Moreover, Venuti also recognizes that the challenge of interpretation has implications beyond the text itself. This is particularly true of retranslations that 'are designed deliberately to form particular identities and to have particular institutional effects' (2003: 26), e.g. retranslations within religious or academic institutions that 'define and inculcate' (ibid.) the desired interpretation of a canonical text. In this instance, the active force of a retranslation is inherent in its ability to 'maintain and strengthen the authority of a social institution by reaffirming the institutionalized interpretation of a canonical text', or alternatively, to 'challenge that interpretation' (ibid.) in the interests of change or innovation." (Deane 2011 s. 14)

Det er ikke tilfeldig at den romerske dikteren Vergils epos *Aeneiden* fra 1. århundre f.Kr. ble nyoversatt flere ganger til engelsk i 1640- og 1650-årene (helt eller delvis oversatt). Eposet handler om Romas grunnleggelse. Mot midten av 1600-tallet var det borgerkrig i Storbritannia, blant annet på grunn av kong Charles 1. sin politikk, og et epos som handler om grunnleggelsen av en stat var dermed relevant. Den politiske situasjonen ga eposet fornyet aktualitet (Belle 2007). En oversetter av 4. bok i *Aeneiden* skrev i 1658: "This fourth Book (...) has been translated into all Languages, and in our days at least ten times by severall Pens, into English. It is freely left to the Reader, which he will preferre" (siteret fra Belle 2007). Disse oversettelsene henter ofte til hendelser i samtidens Storbritannia. Dessuten ble ulike språklige strategier utprøvd. For eksempel skrev en av oversetterne i 1632, den protestantiske (presbyterianske) John Vicars, at han ville unngå latinske språkornamenter og skrive "homespun English greycoat plain" (siteret fra Belle 2007). Protestantiske britiske oversettere prøvde generelt å holde seg tettere opp til originalteksten enn oversettere som tilhørte hoffmiljøet med dets tendens til å bruke "belles infidèles" (i dette tilfellet en elegant stil som ikke samsvarer med originalens stil). Det var en ideologisk og estetisk kløft mellom disse to gruppene av oversettere, som blant annet viste seg i hvem de dediserte sine verk til og hvem de tenkte seg som målgrupper for oversettelsene (Belle 2007). Oversetterne måtte ta taktiske, og noen ganger politiske hensyn: Oversetteren John Ogilby "was aware that Cromwell (...) might cast an eye over the work" (Belle 2007).

I et verk om *Aeneiden* sammenligner tyskeren Werner Suerbaum 10 ulike tyske oversettelser av to verselinjer i eposet. Den eldste tyskspråklige oversettelsen av *Aeneiden* som han forholdet seg til, er fra 1742 og den yngste fra 1972 (Suerbaum 1981 s. 132-133).

“Testing her theory against five British (re)translations of Zola’s *Nana*, Brownlie demonstrates how retranslation is a mesh, not simply of socio-cultural and historical elements, but also of idiosyncratic input. The case study first reveals how retranslation can be used to map changing ideologies within Britain. In particular, the crudeness and sensuality inherent in Zola’s writing ‘were not acceptable to the British Victorian middle class ideology of moral uprightness and ‘delicacy’ ’ (2006: 157), an ideology which then manifests itself in the first translation of 1884 in self-censorship, i.e. in omission and substitution. Similarly, Brownlie sees ‘a clear overlap between social ideologies and literary norms, in that what is acceptable in literary texts is affected by social mores’ (ibid.: 161). Again, the notion of delicacy serves as a basis for normative comparison, and Brownlie outlines how ‘the expression of sensuality changed gradually over time’ (ibid.), progressing towards the explicit pole. Turning her attention to linguistic norms, the example of the 19th century term ‘gay women’, meaning women of ill repute, is used in order to support the argument that retranslations respond to updating since ‘the later translators were obliged to use contemporary language in order to avoid miscomprehension’ (ibid: 162). [...] Brownlie’s case study is another example of how contextual influences may shape retranslation, but it also highlights the fundamental issue of heterogeneity in that translators may exercise a choice which controverts the normative behaviour of the time.” (Deane 2011 s. 22-23)

“Eight different retranslations into German of [Aleksis] Kivi’s Finnish work, *Seitsemän veljestä* [1870; oversatt til norsk med tittelen *De syv brødre*], are examined by Kujamäki. The translation profiles are established along the cline of faithful and free, and are then discussed in conjunction with those ‘statements of ideological and poetic constraints and expectations or individual translator’s ideologies that might shed light on translators’ decisions’ (2001: 47). Of particular note are the first three (re)translations which appear in 1921, 1935 and 1942. Kujamäki finds that, despite having been completed, the publication of the initial, ‘faithful’ translation into German was forestalled by over fifty years due to the fact that the ST [source text] was ‘simply far too removed from the poetic ideal of the period’ (ibid.: 54) which was prevalent in Germany. However, its appearance was finally motivated by a key political event, namely Finland’s independence from Russia. The translation henceforth becomes integrated into a particular agenda: ‘the translator was deemed to operate first and foremost in the interest of the culture *from* which he was translating’ (ibid.: 55), i.e. to contribute towards the establishment and promotion of Finnish national identity. On one hand, this example demonstrates that the reasons for translation may be located in the source culture; on the other, the lack of demand from Germany attests to the power asserted by the target culture to accept or reject a particular translation attempt. Nevertheless, the following two retranslations of 1935 and 1942 are inextricably tied to the target system and to the agendas of the National Socialist party. The heavily abridged version of 1935 effectively appropriated the work as a ‘valuable poetic model’ (ibid.: 57) for the rebuilding of German national identity in line with the supposed racial and cultural supremacy of the Nordic people. Then with the

growing alliance between Germany and Finland comes the opportunity for a retranslation in 1942 which is ‘more open to foreign cultural-specific elements’ (ibid.: 60), i.e. one in which Finnish identity becomes less an archetype of Nordic culture, and more ‘interesting’ (ibid.) in its own right. Overall, these three examples clearly evidence the very real intersection between translation and the prevailing ideas, be they ideological, poetological or otherwise, in both the source and target cultures.” (Deane 2011 s. 21-22)

“I 2008 bestemte forlaget Penguin Classics at Ibsens tolv samfunnsdramaer måtte oversettes på nytt. [...] Oversetterne vil gjenskape rollefigurenes særegne språk for å formidle Ibsens ofte subtile humor i større grad.” (*Morgenbladet* 20. desember 2013–2. januar 2014 s. 50)

“Albert Camus’ epokedefinerende roman *Den fremmede* (1942) utkom første gang på norsk i 1946, og på nytt i en språkrevidert utgave i 2006. Nå foreligger historien om Meursault og drapet han ikke engang forstår selv, i en splitter ny oversettelse signert professor emeritus Karin Holter.” (*Morgenbladet* 24.–30. juli 2015 s. 42)

“For hvorfor har noen norske forlag valgt å oversette viktige verker på nytt, selv om de ble oversatt til et absolutt lesbart og ofte høyt kritikerrost norsk i 1930 eller så sent som på 1960-tallet? Det skyldes ikke at norsk språk har forandret seg så kraftig, selv om det naturligvis har endret seg noe. Nei, ikke bare var oversettelsene tidligere friere i forhold til originalteksten, men de var også ganske ofte sensurert, av så vel forlaget som oversetteren. Det er oppdaget utelatelser av vanskelige eller såkalt umoralske ord og passasjer, og man har avslørt lettferdig omgang med faguttrykk og mangelfulle kunnskaper hos oversetteren. Dette er ikke vanlig i dag når et seriøst forlag gir ut oversettelser. Min gode kollega Per Qvale oversatte for et par år siden Thomas Manns kjente roman *Trolldomsfjellet*, som i en tidligere oversettelse het *Trollfjellet*. Til sin store overraskelse fant han at omtrent en tredjedel av teksten ikke var med i den tidligere oversettelsen. Det gjaldt særlig avsnitt av politisk eller anarkistisk karakter, men også avsnitt som berørte homofili.” (Ellinor Kolstad i *Språknytt* nr. 2 i 2006 s. 19)

Den amerikanske forfatteren Norman Mailers dokumentarroman *The Armies of the Night* (1968) ble utgitt på norsk både i 1969 og 2011. “Bør verk som dette oversettes på ny? Boka er tross alt utgitt på norsk tidligere, i Leo Strøms norske språkdrakt fra 1969. Stadig oftere velger forlagene å lage nye oversettelser av klassikere. Eksemplene er mange fra seinere år: Herman Melville, Joseph Conrad, Honoré de Balzac, Gustave Flaubert, Alfred Döblin, Leo Tolstoj, Fjodor Dostojevskij, Charles Dickens, Stendhal, J. D. Salinger, Ralph Ellison, Thomas Mann, Ernest Hemingway, F. Scott Fitzgerald, for å nevne noen. Iblant kan de opprinnelige utgavene ha en slags nostalgisk og gammelmodig sjarm. I andre tilfeller er de preget både av feil, unnlatelser og misforståelser. I dette tilfellet er en ny oversettelse høyst betimelig. Riktignok nøyde Font seg med å utgi en bearbejdet og revidert utgave av Leo Strøms oversettelse av “De nakne og de døde” fra 1950,

men den var tross alt en mer konvensjonell roman med et streitere språk. Det ville vært til dels absurd å utgi 1969-utgaven av "Nattens armeer". Allerede på første side finner vi Mailers "universalsubstantiv, -verb og ukvemsord". Leo Strøm gjengir dette som "Kjøss meg." I den nye utgaven er ikke det opprinnelige uttrykket oversatt i det hele tatt, men gjengitt på engelsk: "Fuck you." I 1969 ville det vært problematisk, i 2012 er "fuck you" et vanlig uttrykk blant nordmenn fra ungdomsskolealderen og framover. [...] Strøm har ikke nødvendigvis gjort en dårlig jobb anno 1969. Men språket er utdatert og inneholder slangkoder som 43 år seinere er meningsløse. Slik er det nå engang med språk." (Fredrik Wandrup i *Dagbladet* 23. januar 2012 s. 40-41)

"Når det gjelder [James Fenimore] Coopers indianerbøker er dette bøker som er kommet ut i "ørten" utgaver, ofte sterkt forkortet. Jeg skjønner ærlig talt ikke hva slags interesse disse skulle ha for dagens barn og unge. Skulle også tro at de har en del holdninger til urbefolkning som er temmelig passé i våre dager. Andre eksempler på unødvendige nyoversettelser er Lille Lord Fauntleroy og Onkel Toms hytte, som begge ble oversatt på nytt i 2012, begge på Transit forlag. Hvis noen (f. eks. i forbindelse med forskning) skulle ha interesse av disse titlene kan de leses på originalspråket. Samtidig kommer det ut mye bra samtidslitteratur for barn og ungdom som heller fortjener oversetterstøtte." (e-post av barne- og ungdomsbibliotekar Eli Frisvold på e-postlista biblioteknorge, 18.05.15)

Journalisten Will Crutchfield skrev i *The New York Times* i 1992 at det finnes minst 12 engelske oversettelser av den tyske lyrikeren Rainer Maria Rilkes sonetter.

Den franske forfatteren Gustave Flauberts roman *Madame Bovary* (1857) har blitt oversatt til engelsk (ikke medregnet amerikanske oversettelser) "in full, seven times, over a period which spans from the end of the nineteenth century to present day [2011] [...] the appearance of the initial British version in 1886, translated by Eleanor Marx-Aveling, daughter of Karl Marx [...] Penguin responds to this revision by upping the ante, and in 1992 they replace their oft reprinted Russell version with an entirely new translation by Geoffrey Wall. This too is framed by a comprehensive introduction, albeit pitched at a more general level, and by a considerable number of notes. However, where it moves away from the OUP edition [Oxford University Press] is in its engagement with and acknowledgement of earlier translations: "Translating afresh the already translated classic, the translator is drawn into dialogue with his or her precursors. Though I was working on different principles, and though I have found that I eventually disagreed with some of their most cherished efforts, I have profited from the posthumous conversation of three previous translators of *Madame Bovary*: Eleanor Marx, Alan Russell and Gerard Hopkins." This reflection on the act of retranslation is telling in many ways: firstly "afresh" has connotations of progress, of betterment [...] this is the only occasion on which there is explicit recognition of the fact that the translator has in fact drawn on the work of others, thereby emphasizing the arteries

of influence which may be posited between extant versions.” (Sharon Deane i <https://flaubert.revues.org/1538>; lesedato 04.05.16)

“In his article, “Retranslating *Madame Bovary*”, [Geoffrey] Wall elaborates further on this conversation, explaining that “[w]henver I got stuck I would turn to them [...] I discovered a happy plurality of voices available to me”. However, such influence is only given limited reign, and as with the above note, a chord of dissent is struck: “for all their virtues, neither Hopkins nor Russell were to be trusted”, while Marx-Aveling’s translation “falls down at those moments where Flaubert has invested, imaginatively, in his subject-matter”. [...] However, a certain degree of collusion in the perpetuation of the idea that translations need to be updated or renewed can be surmised in light of the activities of both OUP and Penguin. With the introduction of each fresh challenge comes the opportunity to occupy a position of greater prestige or authority; by defining the terms of the game, these publishers ensure the potential for future moments of rupture, and with it, the chance to dominate.” (Sharon Deane i <https://flaubert.revues.org/1538>; lesedato 04.05.16)

“As Alan Hodge, editor of the Hamish Hamilton edition, remarks, “*Madame Bovary* is a book which can be read many times: as with a medieval tapestry, each glance reveals some illuminating collocation of scene and story not seen before”. Therefore, the sheer scale of potential alone can be regarded as a catalyst for retranslation; each new translation casts the world of the original in a different light, and it is this inconsistency in perspective that allows the versions to exist side by side. Individually, we are presented with a glimpse into the complex universe of Flaubert’s masterpiece; collectively, that vista expands and grows more intricate. [...] taking the source text as the invariable point of departure, retranslations can be compared to rough drafts since they too are a series of re-workings and metamorphoses wherein various motivations and strategies can be pinpointed, and are also unfixed in the sense that the opportunity for new versions or interpretations never ceases. The fluid mutability of the rough draft then allows for a comparable viewpoint on to the unfolding process of creation, rather than on the end result; this outlook can certainly be extended to a given corpus of retranslations, with each text representing a different and comparative stage in a translational process of creation. [...] Rather than entities which chronologically restore the linguistic or the cultural specificity of the original, they [dvs. nyoversettelsene] are individual and different worlds, albeit rotating around the same axis, but worlds which nevertheless have wavering depictions of the meanings, the style, the structure of the source text, and which often bear the mark of the conditions in which they were born.” (Sharon Deane i <https://flaubert.revues.org/1538>; lesedato 04.05.16)

I *Madame Bovary* lyder en setning i kapittel 3 slik på fransk: “Il n’y voyait plus, il entendait des voix autour de lui, il se sentait devenir fou.” Denne setningen har bl.a. blitt oversatt slik:

“He couldn’t see where he was going, he heard voices round him. He felt as if he were going mad.” (L. May, p. 337)

“His eyes blurred, he began to hear voices, he felt himself going mad.” (A. Russell, p. 346)

“He couldn’t see, he was hearing voices, he thought he was going mad.” (G. Wall, p. 274)

“He could see nothing and he heard voices around him; he felt himself going mad.” (L. Bair, p. 290)

“He could no longer see anything, thought he heard voices all round him, and felt that he was going mad.” (G. Hopkins, p. 326)

“He couldn’t see, he heard voices, he thought he was losing his mind.” (F. Stegmüller, p. 394) (Chevalier og Delport 2010)

Nye innsikter kan oppstå gjennom å sammenligne flere oversettelser av samme verk: “The comparative analysis of active retranslations, however, tends to locate causes far closer to the translator, especially in the entourage of patrons, publishers, readers and intercultural politics (...) The study of active retranslations would thus seem to be better positioned to yield insights into the nature and workings of translation itself, into its own special range of disturbances, without blindly surrendering causality to target-culture norms.” (Anthony Pym sitert fra Belle 2007).

“Det blir slutt på å ledes inn i fristelse, men helvete består. I den nye bibeloversettelsen blir Fader vår til Vår far, legeme blir kropp, og brødre blir søsken. [...] Bibelselskapet har de siste hundre årene oversatt eller revidert bibeltekster når det har gått mellom 15 og 30 år, og lanserte i går en ny versjon av Det nye testamentet. Hver nyoversettelse er blitt møtt med skepsis fra kirkegjengere og prester som har et sterkt personlig forhold til den bibelteksten de selv har lært. Men etter en tid blir den nye bibeloversettelsen brukt i de aller fleste menigheter. Det skjedde også da Det nye testamentet ble revidert forrige gang, i 1978, ifølge prosjektleder Hans-Olav Mørk i Bibelselskapet.” (Tone Hertzberg i *Avis 1* 17. november 2005 s. 9)

Alle artiklene og litteraturlista til hele leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>