Introduction

Studying texts and contexts in translated children's literature

Jan Van Coillie & Jack McMartin

Be it explicit or implicit, all translators have some awareness of context when translating a text. Rodica Dimitriu calls context a key notion in translation studies and one that allows for "complex analyses of the translator's activities and decisions, of translation processes and, ultimately, of what accounts for the meaning(s) of a translated text" (Dimitriu 2005, 5). However, there is no settled conceptualization of context among translation studies scholars, nor of the relation between context and text. As a subject of academic research, translated children's literature provides fertile ground for examining this relation, precisely because its defining characteristics – the asymmetric relationship between the adult author/translator and the child reader; the heightened cultural, political and economic preoccupations that tend to accompany children's books as they cross linguistic borders; the multimodal interplay between image and text that must be renegotiated when a children's book is translated for a new audience – defy any straightforward conceptualization of context and its relation to text. In this introduction, we retrace three decades of scholarship at the intersection of translation studies and children's literature studies, using the text/context conceptual pairing as our frame. This overview is meant to foreground the studies collected in this volume, which build on the work discussed below. While each chapter has its own theoretical and empirical signature, all had their impetus at the "Translation Studies and Children's Literature: Current Topics and Future Perspectives" international conference held in Brussels and Antwerp in October 2017.[1]

In translation practice, context is often understood as referring to the text-internal, linguistic context surrounding a given textual feature: the words, sentences and ultimately the text as a whole in which the textual feature being

1 This conference was occasioned by the emeritus celebration of Jan Van Coillie. On behalf of the many colleagues, students and readers who have been inspired by his work, his co-author respectfully wishes to acknowledge a career well spent.

studied is situated. As early as the 1960s, Eugene A. Nida (1964) emphasized the importance of this particular understanding of context. He gives the example of the word 'run,' whose meaning only becomes clear within the syntactic context, in combination with other words. At the same time, Nida also emphasized the need to be attentive to the context *outside* the text. He calls on the translator to take into account the wider culture, previous translations and the commissioning client when interpreting a text's meaning (Nida 2001, 9). This concept of context was expanded in the 1980s within the pragmatics tradition of linguistics, which understands translation as a form of communication by which meaning is transmitted to and from participants. The interconnectedness and interdependency of text and context is even more central to discourse analysis, which uses the wider communication context to explain shifts in meaning in translations, with a particular emphasis on power relations. This focus is also at the explanatory heart of critical discourse analysis and linguistic criticism, which focus mostly on ideological concerns. Research in pragmatics and critical discourse analysis assume that syntactic and semantic choices reflect the values and beliefs of the author and the social group(s) to which s/he belongs.

Clearly influenced by these ideas, Juliane House defines translation as "recontextualization," which she characterizes as "taking a text out of its original frame and context and placing it within a new set of relationships and culturally conditioned expectations" (House 2006, 356). House makes a distinction between what she calls 'overt' and 'covert' translation:

> In overt translation the original's context is reactivated alongside the target context, such that two different discourse worlds are juxtaposed in the medium of the target language; covert translation concentrates exclusively on the target context, employing a cultural filter to take account of the new addressees' context-derived communicative norms. Covert translation is thus more directly affected by contextual and cultural differences. (*ibid.*)

As a linguist, House focuses on translation practice, in which a translator is constantly drawing connections between the contexts of the source and target cultures. In this sense, House approaches context as something static, invariable and relatively fixed in time. Mona Baker (2006) also studies context from a translation practice perspective. However, she emphasizes precisely the dynamic nature of context. She sees translation as a variable and interactive process of contextualization determined by a diverse set of contextual factors that affect the choices made by a translator.

While context as a heuristic concept slowly gained analytical robustness among scholars of translation, linguistics-inspired theories continued to

dominate the academic discourse throughout the 1970s. Emphasis remained squarely on translation practice and on the linguistic (text-internal) context of the translated text. It was not until the arrival of Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory in 1979 that translation studies scholars turned their attention to the text-external context, simultaneously shifting from a prescriptive to a descriptive mode, and from the source text to the target text. Even-Zohar's theory enabled the diachronic study of a literary system in its totality, including the position of translated literature and children's literature within it. He defines a polysystem as "a multiple system, a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap, using currently different options, yet functioning as a structured whole, whose members are interdependent" (Even-Zohar 1979, 290). Polysystem theory opened the way for research into the contexts and systems beyond texts, enabling analyses of how literary texts functioned in a complex whole of contexts and how literary texts were both influenced by and exerted influence upon these contexts. Working in the same tradition, Gideon Toury combined linguistic comparison of source and target texts with an analysis of the cultural context of the target text in order to explain translation shifts. Central to this method was the identification of the culturally and historically specific norms that determine dominant translation strategies in a given target culture. Toury defines norms as "the translation of general values or ideas shared by a group – as to what is conventionally right and wrong, adequate and inadequate – into performance instructions appropriate for and applicable to particular situations" (Toury 1999, 15). Since Toury, norms have become a key concept in the study of context and translation. His notions of 'adequate' translation (where the norms of the source culture prevail) and 'acceptable' translation (where the norms of the target culture prevail) continue to be tremendously influential.

Taking cues from linguistic-oriented studies, literature-oriented studies in translation appearing in the 1980s and 1990s tended to take a functionalist tack. One particularly dominant line of research was Skopos theory, developed by Katharina Reiss and Hans J. Vermeer (1984). They understood translation primarily as a purpose-driven language act and studied the role of the various participants (client, source and target publishers, receiver) involved in the commissioning and carrying out of a translation. For them, translation strategies were driven by a translation's purpose (as defined by the commissioning client). A particularly well-elaborated model using Skopos theory was that of Christiane Nord (1991), who combined a textual analysis of the translation with a treatment of the intended text functions (which are inseparable from the target culture) as well as an analysis of the context in which the translation under study came to be and the various people involved

(initiators or commissioners, authors, translators). For Nord, translations are located in what she calls 'linguacultures' (Nord 1997). Translation thus always constitutes an act of intercultural communication.

Indeed, in translation studies the term 'culture' has increasingly come to be used in relation to context. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (1990) announced a "cultural turn" in 1990, signaling a trend to situate source and target texts within the source and target 'culture.' Researchers in this tradition focus mainly on the study of literature in translation and explore the place of literary translations within a wider cultural context. They investigate the manner in which sociocultural factors like poetics, ideology, politics, power, ethics, colonization, and ethnic and gender identity influence translations and the role of translators as cultural intermediaries. Translations are seen "as a cultural political practice that might be strategic in bringing about social change" (Venuti 2012, 276). Lawrence Venuti's concepts of 'foreignization' and 'domestication' are particularly inspiring for this line of research. Foreignization usually refers to a translation method which takes the reader to the foreign text, preserving significant stylistic and cultural features of the source text, whereas domestication assimilates the text to target cultural and linguistic norms and values. Venuti rejects domestication as an "ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to the target-language cultural values" (Venuti 1995, 20) and advocates foreignization because it "challenges the dominant aesthetics" and signals "the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text" (Venuti 1995, 309).

Translation studies has also borrowed from neighboring disciplines to augment its understanding of context. Advocating for a fusion between translation studies and cultural studies, David Katan's *Translating Cultures* emphasizes the importance of cultural context in translation practice. For Katan, the translator must be aware of both text and context, which is to say both the words s/he is translating and the text's 'implied frames,' its ideological and culture-linked presuppositions. As he has it, "the context of culture is an important frame from within which we perceive, interpret and communicate" (Katan 2004, 167).

Perhaps the most conspicuous cross-disciplinary fusion since the 1990s has been with sociology. Sociological approaches understand translation as a form of 'social practice.' More so than with cultural studies, sociologists of translation place the analytical focus on people and their social behavior. This enlarges the conceptual boundaries of context to include the entire (professional and social-cultural) sphere in which translation takes place. Michaela Wolf (2010, 337) identifies a number of possible research domains at the nexus of translation studies and sociology: training institutions, working conditions, professional institutions and their social role, questions of ethics

in translation, (auto)biographies of translators, translation in the global book market and sociopolitical aspects of translation. Alongside examining culturally determined norms that help explain individual translation choices, sociologists of translation have also explored the various individuals (literary agents, publishers, editors, marketers, critics) and institutions (publishing houses, prizes, government agencies) that play a role in the production and circulation of translated texts.

Many translation studies researchers found inspiration in the work of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. His concepts of field, habitus and the various forms of capital have been fundamental to the development of a sociology of translation. Theo Hermans (1999) analyzes the manner in which agents take up positions of power in the literary field and the role of economic factors, publishers, marketers and book clubs in this process. André Lefevere (1998) works with Bourdieu's notion of 'cultural capital' to reveal translations as important vectors for the dissemination of cultural capital within and between cultures and human networks. Several researchers have applied Bourdieu's ideas to the study of translation flows in the world market for book translations and the production and distribution of translated books. This focus has shifted the attention even further away from the (translated) texts themselves and placed it squarely on the context of production and cross-border circulation. Michael Cronin (2003), for example, has studied how translators are influenced by global changes such as machine translation and the internet. Johan Heilbron (1999) analyzes translation flows between core and peripheral languages, while Gisèle Sapiro (2010) traces translation flows between the US and France, emphasizing the political, economic and social factors that shape the worldwide exchange of books.

Perhaps the most central concept shared among these sociological approaches to translation is power. Inherent in Bourdieu's notions of capital and field is the assumption that literary, symbolic and economic resources are not equally distributed among the people and institutions involved in the coming-into-being and circulation of translated texts. In fact, the fields in which these practices are carried out are defined by the opposition between the haves and the have-nots: some languages are more dominant than others; some publishers are perceived to be more prestigious than others; some roles in the translation process are more decisive for the creation, production and reception of translations than others. It is precisely the study of power relations that helped train scholars' analyses on the context(s) of translation (Fischer and Jensen 2012). This brings us to research on the *contexts of translation of children's literature*. Power takes on an additional guise here through the inherent power inequity between adult and child.

The first studies of children's literature in translation, which date from the 1960s, reflect an idealized belief typical for the immediate postwar era that a peaceful future could be guaranteed by the (proper upbringing of) the younger generation. Because translations transcend borders between cultures, translations were seen as a way to advance international understanding. This was the stated aim of a 1962 volume of essays on translated children's literature edited by Lisa Christina Persson. Among its contributors was the American librarian Virginia Haviland, who argued passionately that books from other countries were a significant enrichment for young readers in the US. Another contributor, the British editor and translator Monica Burnes, nominally endorsed the volume's cross-cultural ethos but also argued frankly that "children's books must be tailored to their new country" (Persson 1962, 78). This prompted the following response from Reinbert Tabbert:

> Rarely will target-language oriented scholars find a less disguised plea for the subjection of translations to conventions, in this case the shared belief, initiated by Rousseau, that children have to be protected against anything culturally unfamiliar or morally unbecoming. This leaves little room for vicarious experience of foreignness. (Tabbert 2002, 308)

The tone was set for a decade of debate for and against the domestication of translated children's literature.

A leading voice in this debate was Richard Bamberger (1963), who emphasized the importance of high-quality translations for the development of one's own national (in his case German) children's literature. Like Persson, he situated translated children's books in a discourse of international understanding:

> We can now rightly speak of a genuine world literature for children which can do much to further international understanding. Children all over the world are now growing up enjoying the same pleasures in reading, and cherishing similar ideals, aims and hopes. (Bamberger 1978, 21)

This perspective has a long tradition. The French comparatist Paul Hazard considered each translated children's book to be "a messenger that goes beyond mountains and rivers, beyond the seas, to the very ends of the world in search of new friendships" (Hazard and Mitchell 1944, 146).

Idealized notions of translated children's literature were not called into question until the end of the 1970s, with Göte Klingberg's prescriptive study which argued that a translated children's book should have the same 'degree of

adaptation' as the source text. By adaptations he meant the changes made on account of the child reader, which for him followed as a necessary result of the knowledge and experience gap between the adult author and the young reader. As it happens, the notion of context was central to Klingberg's argument. He introduced the term 'context adaptation' (1978, further developed in 1986 under the term 'cultural context adaptation'), which he considered a central difficulty in (the study of) translation:

> The problem of context adaptation is that on the one hand it is necessary in translations of children's books if one wants to retain the same degree of adaptation of the source text, but, that one of the aims of translating children's books must be to further the international outlook and the international understanding of the young readers. (Klingberg 1978, 86)

He rejected ubiquitous forms of context adaptation: modernization, purification, abridgements and 'localization,' or the transposing of the entire text into the culture of the target readership. Since Klingberg's study, the term 'cultural context adaptation' has appeared regularly in research on children's literature in translation. Cecilia Alvstad calls it "one of the most frequently quoted characteristics of children's literature in translation" (Alvstad 2010, 22).

The resulting stream of studies on the adaptation of culture-specific items in translated children's books gradually gained in scientific rigor, particularly thanks to polysystem theory and cultural studies (see *infra*). Zohar Shavit (1986) was among the first to apply polysystem theory to children's literature. She argues that manipulations and adaptations are often motivated by the ideology or the stylistic norms of the target culture and are typical for (translated) children's literature. In various studies, she examines the mediation between the pedagogic and literary system and the impact translation has on it, emphasizing the complex position of children's literature in this polysystem. According to Shavit, "children's literature, more than any other literary system, results from a conglomerate of relationships between several systems of culture" (Shavit 1994, 4). The insights of Gideon Toury also had a major impact on the study of children's literature in translation. Jeremy Munday (among others) popularized Toury's model in his study of the Spanish and Italian translations of J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone*, which appeared in his handbook *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications* (2001, 121-125). Echoing Toury's method, Munday places the target texts in their cultural context/system, compares segments of the source and target texts, and draws general conclusions about the translation strategies used and the norms upon which they are based.

Isabelle Desmidt (2006) offers an interesting addition to Toury: her model calls out norms specific to children's literature. Like Shavit, she underlines the complexity of the norms that shape the specific communication process involved in children's literature. She distinguishes between source text-related norms, literary aesthetic norms, business norms, didactic norms, pedagogical norms and technical norms. The first two categories correspond with Toury's basic initial norm, addressing adequacy and acceptability. Business norms relate to the context of editing, publishing and distribution. Didactic and pedagogic norms are linked to two functions unique to children's literature: that children's books must educate children (didactic norms) and that they must be adapted in such a way as to be understandable to children (pedagogic norms). Finally, technical norms determine (among other things) the layout, including the relationship between text and image characteristic of (translated) children's literature.

The influence of cultural studies is particularly apparent in research on translated fairy tales, a line of research that emerged in the 1990s and has since blossomed into a sub-discipline in its own right. One of the more remarkable studies to emerge out of this line is Cay Dollerup's book on the international reception of the Grimm tales, which is presented as an illustration of "aspects of translation as cross-cultural communication" (Dollerup 1999, ix). Karen Seago's work on the translations of *Sleeping Beauty* in the 1990s is another example of research that places cultural context at the center of the analysis. She examines not only the intentional changes in target texts made for "didactic and moral reasons" but also "the unconscious shifts in meaning as an expression of the social and political environment which has shaped the translation" (Seago 2006, 179). She finds that fairy tales actively contribute to "the articulation of domestic ideology" (*ibid*., 188) while at the same time exposing latent tensions in society. The title of a recent volume on one of the most widely translated fairy tales illustrates the centrality of cultural studies to this line of research: *Cinderella across Cultures*. The first section is titled "Contextualising Cinderella" and explores the circulation of the fairy tale "in numerous different contexts" (De La Rochère, Lathey and Wozniak 2016, 2).

In the 1980s and 1990s, researchers working within Skopos theory also turned their attention to children's literature in translation. Like the polysystem researchers, they zeroed in on the tendency among producers of translated children's books to change the text, often drastically. Katharina Reiss (1982) distinguishes three factors that lead to a divergent (adaptation-rich) translation: the imperfect linguistic competence of the young reader, his/her limited knowledge of the world, and taboos. Christiane Nord (1995) focuses on the specificity of translated children's books when she adds a fourth function, the phatic function, to Reiss's three (informative, expressive, and operative

or appellative). The phatic function refers to the relation between sender and receiver, for instance in forms of address like 'dear children.' Nord (2003) also studied the translation of names in children's books, one of the most researched types of cultural context adaptation.

Two influential studies on the translation of children's literature were published at the turn of the century, both of which placed context at the center of the analysis. The first is Emer O'Sullivan's (2000) impressive synthesis arguing for a comparative approach to the study of children's literature. She focuses particularly on the culturally specific status of children's literature, its international circulation, the influence of norms on the transfer of children's literature across linguistic and cultural boundaries, and the relation between word and image in translated children's books. As O'Sullivan writes in the introduction to the English-language edition: "Comparative Children's Literature, like mainstream comparative literature, must consider those phenomena that cross the borders of a particular literature in order to see them in their respective linguistic, cultural, social and literary contexts" (2005, 11). In another seminal book, *Translating for Children,* Riitta Oittinen (2000) places the child front and center as the primary reader of translated children's books. For her, adaptation and domestication are part and parcel of translation, particularly translations for children. She takes up a prescriptive position: "Translators of children's literature should reach out to the children of their own culture" (Oittinen 2000, 168). Drawing on insights from Mikhail Bakhtin and Christiane Nord, Oittinen furthermore considers translation to be a goal-oriented dialogue that the translator undertakes with the text, author and reader. This dialogical situation encompasses both text and context: "Throughout my book, I have understood the situation as involving not just the texts (in words and pictures) and their different creators and readers, but also the text's contexts, including the child images that mirror our cultures and societies" (*ibid*., 159). Oittinen's work inspired a new flurry of research on child images (the ideas adults have about children, how they are and how they should be) and the relation between text and image in translated children's literature.

In 2006, Gillian Lathey published a reader surveying research on translated children's literature up to that time. The titles of the book's main sections give an idea of its thematic range: "Narrative Communication and the Child Reader," "Translating the Visual" and "The Travels of Children's Books and Cross-Cultural Influences." The notion of (cultural) context is particularly central in this last section, where various authors address the "ideological differences between the contexts from which national children's literatures emerge, of which didacticism and censorship are just two aspects" (Lathey 2006, 7). In her more recent work, Lathey continues to emphasize the specific contexts in

which translated children's literature is produced and received. In *The Role of the Translator in Children's Literature*, she examines the 'voice' of the translator as expressed explicitly in forewords and implicitly in translation changes. She argues that "translators of children's literature are mediators not just of unfamiliar social and cultural contexts, but also of the values and expectations of childhood encoded in the source text" (Lathey 2010, 196). Lathey's *Translating Children's Literature* (2015) is practice-oriented and research-informed and pays special attention to the translation of culture-specific elements.

Since the 1990s, another buzzword in research on translated children's literature has been ideology. Gaby Thomson-Wohlgemuth (2009), for instance, studies the effects of ideology on the translation of children's books from English in the former German Democratic Republic (GDR). Grounding her research in André Lefevere's theories on patronage and rewriting, she focuses especially on extratextual factors, including an extensive treatment of the GDR's censorship apparatus. Ideology is also of central concern in studies on retranslations, when a book that has already been translated into a language is translated again at a later date. Myriam Du Nour (1995) shows how retranslations expose changing societal norms. In his study on the English retranslations of Jules Verne's *Tour du monde en quatre-vingt jours*, Kieran O'Driscoll (2011) seeks out what he calls "the web of causation" to explain translation shifts. He combines a comparative study of source and target texts with a thorough study of the context in which translators work and the personal and professional circumstances surrounding a translation. Inspired by Toury, he also considers the social and cultural norms that shape translation strategies. Virginie Douglas explores how the socioeconomic context and ideology shape the specific communication situation characteristic of (translated) children's literature:

> The fact that a children's book, translated or not, appears in a world of adults, and therefore that contextual factors cannot be ignored, explains why [researchers] place a strong emphasis on retranslation and the ways in which a particular retranslation is inscribed in the socio-economic sphere – elements that are at the core of the strongly ideological dimension of children's literature. (Douglas and Cabaret 2014, 327; our translation)[2]

2 In the French original: "Le fait qu'un livre pour la jeunesse, traduit ou non, voit le jour dans un monde d'adultes et que les facteurs contextuels ne peuvent donc pas être ignorés explique que les [chercheurs] insistent beaucoup sur ces instances extérieures, sur l'inscription de la démarche de retraduction dans la sphère socio-économique, éléments qui sont au cœur de la forte dimension idéologique de la littérature pour la jeunesse."

Ideology is also emphasized in studies on canon formation and the influence of translations and adaptations on the canonization process. Sylvie Geerts and Sara Van den Bossche make explicit the link between ideology and adaptation in translated children's literature: "This observation, that stories are adapted to correspond with a new context, points to the ideological implications of the process" (Geerts and Van den Bossche 2014, 5). They draw inspiration particularly from John Stephens' *Language and Ideology in Children's Fiction* (1992). Writing in 1998, Stephens and co-author Robyn McCallum showed how retellings lay bare dominant ideologies:

> Any particular retelling may purport to transmit elements of a culture's formative traditions and even its sustaining beliefs and assumptions, but what it always discloses is some aspect of the attitudes and ideologies pertaining at the cultural moment in which the translation is produced. (Stephens and McCallum 1998, ix)

Bettina Kümmerling-Meibauer and Anja Müller (2017) make clear how research on canon formation is determined by how researchers understand the relation between text and context. Some limit the analysis to the textual criteria that lead to a text's being included in the canon. For these researchers, adherence to standards of aesthetic quality is what determines whether a work makes its way into the canon. For others, market mechanisms and extratextual factors are decisive in determining which books are canonized. The latter group tends to focus on the sociocultural context and emphasizes the role of the canon in society (as a tool for nation-building, for instance). This line of research has become dominant in recent years and can be seen as part of the wider embrace of sociological approaches in translation studies: "Research into the canon thus not only pays attention to texts but to the entire literary field: production, market, publication, education, criticism, readership, etc." (Kümmerling-Meibauer and Müller 2017, 3). It is also important to note the link between canon formation and translation of children's literature: canonized works in the source culture stand a better chance of being translated, which increases their chances of entering the international canon, which in turn increases the prestige of the work in the source culture.

Researchers working within linguistics have also focused attention on ideology. In their comparative discourse analysis of translations of English children's books into Greek, German, Korean, Spanish and Arabic, Kaniklidou and House (2017) call out many examples of 'massive cultural filtering.' They find that translators as well as editors and publishers "openly manipulate original texts, thus changing the relationship that addressees can establish

with STs and source cultures" (*ibid*., 243). According to them, such manipulations can often be traced back to financial and marketing factors. Kaniklidou and House also call attention to the (ethical) responsibilities of adult actors vis-à-vis their dominant position in the power relation between adult and child: "Children cannot guard against shifts imposed on translated texts they read or listen to. They are only permitted to experience another culture through translated products" (*ibid*., 243), which are always already mediated by adults. Haidee Kruger draws a connection between cultural adaptations and "the asymmetrical power relationships involved in the production of children's literature" (Kruger 2011b, 122), by which adults determine what children can handle and what is valuable to them. Her study, based on original survey data from South African translators of children's literature, shows that translators' opinions also "provide insight into the ways in which ideology influences perceptions of translation in particular contexts" (*ibid*., 131).

Taken together, the perspectives on text and context distilled from the research discussed above reveal three main characteristics that typify translated children's literature: (1) the *asymmetric communication*, resulting from the differences in knowledge and experience between the adult translator (straddling source and target cultures with specific conceptions of the function of a given title and of its intended reader) and the child reader (often with limited preconceptions of the source culture); (2) the *dual audience*, which includes both children in their roles as readers and listeners, and adults in their roles as consumers, critics, mediators, marketers and readers (aloud); and (3) the *multimodal character* of children's literature, the translation of which requires consideration of the interplay between text and image. Let us now briefly elaborate each of these three characteristics.

The asymmetrical relationship affects not only the translator, but all adults involved in the production, distribution and reception of children's literature: authors, publishers, parents, teachers and so on.[3] As soon as adults attempt to bridge that asymmetry, they have adapted the text to the young audience in some way.

In the case of translated children's books, adaptations are often of a cultural sort, where translators remove or replace culture-specific elements because they judge them to be too difficult for, or simply unsuited to, their young target audience. In doing so, they (consciously or not) express a specific child image, which is informed by both their personal, situational context and the wider cultural context; that is, from both their own childhood and

3 For a more detailed conceptualization of the narrative communication process in translated children's literature see O'Sullivan (2003) and Kruger (2011a).

life experiences with children and the norms and values that their society or social group seeks to pass on to the younger generation.

The situational context of the translator is shaped by other participants involved in the production process as well: publishers, editors and marketing specialists. They too take part in the asymmetric relation of power with the youth audience and are often also responsible for adaptations. These adaptations are inevitably informed by book producers' ideas about what children – and adults – are able to appreciate. Publishers, editors and marketing staff thus allow their decisions to be led not only by their image of young readers but, consciously or not, also by that of the adult intermediaries that bring books to children: parents, teachers, librarians and the adult critics or prize juries that evaluate and publicize them. This 'dual audience' also forms an important part of the context of the translator and therefore also partially steers his/her translation strategies. Furthermore, when an adult reads a book to a child, this occurs in a very specific context whereby the auditive elements of the text also play a role in the communication process. The translator may take this aspect into account in his/her decision-making as well.

Finally, the interaction between text and context can also be colored (figuratively and literally) by the multimodal character of many children's books, where the 'text' consists of both words and images. This brings the illustrator and graphic designer into the situational context. Images are regularly adapted in the course of translation, or they may influence or even necessitate textual changes. Alternatively, illustrations may also depict culture-specific items, which make their adaptation in the written text redundant. Often due to commercial considerations, source text illustrations are also regularly changed out for new illustrations by an illustrator from the target culture.

All of this may give the impression of a lopsided relationship, where context tends to determine text. However, the opposite also occurs. One of the most interesting areas of research in the area of translated children's literature today is the study of texts that bring about changes in the context of the target culture in which they are translated. Translations can have an impact on the literature of the target culture (Ghesquiere 2006), and can help shape views, norms and values in the wider society (see Zohar Shavit's chapter in this volume, and Xu 2013). In the case of translated children's literature, this has most often been studied in relation to pedagogy. However, the power of translated children's literature to transform societies surely reaches far beyond the classroom – a promising direction for future interdisciplinary research.

Despite the range and diversity of the contributions compiled in this volume, all have one aim in common: to better understand the complex interaction between text and context. Each contributor has woven this thread

into the analysis in a different way – precisely the added value of a volume with such a broad methodological, historical, linguistic and geographic scope.

The text/context relationship is complex and co-implicated, and no single analytical framework can fully account for it. We can, however, glean two main analytical orientations in the contributions collected here and have organized this book accordingly. The first part, "**Context » Text**," entails a mode of analysis oriented towards understanding the national and linguistic spheres in which the production and reception of translated children's books take place: How is the marketplace for translated children's literature structured? What were the historical conditions under which this market developed? It also seeks to understand the practices of the people occupying these spheres: publishers, editors, translators, illustrators and others. What roles do these various agents take up in the communication process? What social factors explain how a children's book comes to be produced and received as it is? The answers proposed by our contributors highlight the complex and unequal relations that hold between the various contexts and people that shape the translation process. These relations are the result of historical developments over time and, while they are embedded in national and language-specific contexts, they are very often transnational in scope. This is no surprise, as translation necessarily involves interactions across multiple linguistic, economic and sociocultural contexts. Some agents enjoy dominance or influence in their respective contexts. Others are obliged to develop strategies to coexist alongside more powerful players in a game whose rules are weighted against them.

Part 1 opens with two contributions that examine translated children's books in the UK and Ireland. Both zero in on the selection processes and strategies of a number of small, independent publishers who have successfully introduced translated children's books, despite the market's notorious resistance to translations and the overwhelming dominance of conglomerate publishers. In "'Only English books': The mediation of translated children's literature in a resistant economy," **Gillian Lathey** traces this resistance back to anti-French sentiment at the beginning of the nineteenth century, when prominent voices protested "that torrent of infidelity and immorality (…) from the continent through the channel of French books" (Lathey quoting Trimmer 1803, 406). With few exceptions, the wariness towards books from 'the continent' has persisted to the present day. This, combined with the dominance of English-language children's literature internationally, has led to an oversaturation of the British market, leaving little room for translations. Indeed, only 2 percent of publications for children produced in the UK each year are translations. Lathey goes on to examine translation strategies. She qualifies Venuti's call to always maintain the foreignness of a

translated text, arguing instead for a more nuanced mix of domestication and foreignization – a "subtle linguistic and cultural negotiation" necessary for ensuring that "translations are read at all." She then surveys the publishing landscape in the UK, singling out the importance of small-scale publishers of translations, government and charitable organizations, and prizes like the biennial Marsh Award for Children's Literature in Translation. She closes with an expression of hope that these actors will continue their efforts to "maintain links with Europe and to overcome the echoing clarion call for 'only English books'" in post-Brexit UK.

That effort reverberates in **Emer O'Sullivan**'s contribution, "Two languages, two children's literatures: Translation in Ireland today." O'Sullivan traces dual traditions of children's literature in Ireland, each with its own specific history and set of conditions relating to translations. While Irish-language publications, including translations, have been heavily subsidized by the Irish state since Irish independence in 1922, those published in English by Irish publishers have had to compete on the open market with the publishing conglomerates on the neighboring island. Official measures making Irish compulsory in schools increased demand for Irish-language children books, further shifting the publishing landscape inward. Nonetheless, as with modern Hebrew, translated literature played an important role in reviving and fostering the Irish language. Today, a number of small, innovative independent Irish-language presses produce a steady stream of children's books for the small minority of children who are either Irish native speakers or attend an Irish-medium school. Among these books are a fair number of translations.

The source language from which these works are selected, however, can be a contentious issue indeed – and here is where Ireland's two traditions intersect. For decades, books from English were adamantly resisted by the Irish government and were not eligible for translation subsidies. The result: while some books were arriving into Irish from the USSR and former Eastern Bloc countries, virtually none were being translated from English. It was not until the turn of the century, when the Irish state changed its position on English in the wake of the Good Friday Agreement, that children's books from English began to be translated into Irish, the first popular title being *Harry Potter*. Many children's books from English quickly followed – to the extent that the Irish-language writers' association protested and petitioned (successfully) to limit incoming translations. Nonetheless, O'Sullivan credits the influx of translations from English with motivating young readers to read in Irish and raising the perceived status of the Irish language.

O'Sullivan concludes her chapter with a look at Irish children's literature in English. Until the 1980s, almost all English-language books for children

in Ireland (including those by Irish writers) were imported from the UK. Faced with such extreme intralingual power asymmetries, Irish publishers generally refrained from publishing books for children in English. After a boom in the mid-1990s, which saw seven Irish publishers regularly publish books for children in English, "the economics of publishers surviving in a small market" caught up (O'Sullivan quoting Coghlan 2004, 1099). Only two remained by 2007. However, the few Irish publishers working in English today continue to issue translations from various languages and express an openness to diverse titles from around the world. O'Sullivan attributes the survival of both Irish-language and English-language publishing for children in Ireland to two factors: the courage and creativity of passionate independent publishers, and generous state subsidies.

In "Cultural translation and the recruitment of translated texts to induce social change: The case of the *Haskalah*," **Zohar Shavit** challenges the common usage of the term 'cultural translation.' She argues for a narrow definition reserved for "cases where translations play an active role in the dynamics of a given society, for instance when translations function as agents of change and serve as a vehicle for presenting and exhibiting a desired social change." Shavit holds up the *Haskalah* movement (the Jewish Enlightenment movement), as one such case, showing how translated texts were intentionally used to disseminate bourgeois societal values and a modern habitus throughout German-speaking Jewish communities in late-eighteenth-century Europe. She focuses especially on translated texts intended to provide Jewish children and young adults with guidelines for everyday practices, such as how to interact with others and how to maintain proper personal hygiene. These seemingly mundane texts served a central aim of the *Haskalah* movement: to assure Jews' integration into non-Jewish bourgeois society, a development resisted by the insular, traditional Ashkenazi religious elite that dominated Jewish cultural life at the time. Following Toury and Even-Zohar, Shavit shows how translations of texts borrowed from other systems (in her case, educational texts inspired by German Philanthropinism) provided the raw materials for the importation of new cultural and social models, which were then molded to suit the needs and demands of the target system. She goes on to contemplate the effectiveness of this large-scale translation effort, concluding that the *Haskalah* translations "opened the door to the creation of a modern Jewish society."

Delia Guijarro Arribas examines contexts of transnational publishing in her chapter entitled "Associative practices and translations in children's book publishing: Co-editions in France and Spain." Drawing on insights from the sociology of translation, she concentrates on co-editions, an increasingly

common tool used by publishers of children's literature to reach readers beyond their borders. Arribas traces the history of co-editions (where a publisher secures rights buyers abroad prior to publishing a book and then prints multiple language-specific editions of that book simultaneously), situating them alongside other cooperative forms of publishing. She goes on to analyze the various strategic uses co-edition schemes offer children's book publishers. These depend on a publisher's position in the field: dominant publishers often use co-edition schemes as a means to 'conquer' new language markets, whereas dominated publishers use them as a way to make new book projects viable and to affiliate themselves with more prestigious counterparts in other languages. Furthermore, co-edition strategies are subject to the prestige possessed by each respective language, nation and publishing house involved in a given rights negotiation. Comparing the French and Spanish subfields, Arribas finds that French publishers who publish co-editions look outward, leveraging their historical dominance, stores of know-how and prestige while Spanish publishers look inward, using co-editions to capitalize on a multilingual publishing field that includes the co-official state languages of Spain's five autonomous communities. Several (Catalonia in particular) have developed flourishing publishing industries in post-Franco Spain. Nonetheless, they remain subordinated to Spanish-language publishers: publication timelines must be managed carefully to prevent the Spanish translation of any given title from swallowing up their version, a function of the fact that all those who read Catalan, Galician, Basque or Valencian also read Spanish. Arribas' contribution highlights the need to take into account national, linguistic and international contexts simultaneously when explaining cooperation among publishers.

Lia Miranda de Lima and **Germana Pereira** describe the gradual formation of Brazilian children's literature over the course of two centuries, linking periods of aesthetic innovation and stagnation with political developments in the country. Their chapter, "Translation and the formation of a Brazilian children's literature," takes inspiration from Even-Zohar's polysystem theory and a similar framework developed by the Brazilian scholar and critic Antonio Candido to trace the historical role of translations in the constitution of Brazil's national literary system. They sketch five periods that were pivotal to the formation of Brazilian children's literature: (1) the last decades of the eighteenth century, on either side of the proclamation of the Republic in 1889, during which localized adaptations of European classics for children were translated into Portuguese in the service of constituting a Brazilian national identity in the Romantic ilk; (2) the emergence of an innovative system of literary production for children starting in the 1930s pioneered

by the editor, translator and author Monteiro Lobato (1882–1948), who combined characters from European and North American fairy tales with Brazilian folklore figures; (3) children's authors' resistance to state-sponsored narratives of national progress, culminating in a regime change to democracy (1945-1964); (4) a period of political repression and censorship (1964–1979) following the military coup; and (5) a flourishing of politically engaged books for children following gradual re-democratization after 1979. This last period encapsulates the "Brazilian children's literature boom," which saw the revival of Lobato "as an instrument of political satire and liberation from the formal and thematic conventions of the previous decades."

Lima and Pereira also link influxes of incoming translations to expansions in Brazil's school system. They zoom in on the latest expansion, during the 1980s, which saw the Brazilian state become the main client of that country's publishers of books for children. They analyze the catalogue of Brazil's massive national school library program, which buys more than nineteen million books per year and serves twenty-two million primary and secondary school students. They found that the share of translations among the books purchased by the state for nurseries and kindergartens ranged between 18 and 35 percent of total books for the period 2008–2014, a sign that translations continue to play an important role in the ongoing development of Brazilian children's literature.

In "*Said*, *spoke*, *spluttered*, *spouted*: The role of text editors in stylistic shifts in translated children's literature," **Marija Zlatnar Moe** and **Tanja Žigon** turn their focus to the context of the editing process by examining the collaborative workflow between translator, text editor and book editor in the production of translated picture books. Drawing on original survey data from 235 Slovene translators, ninety-one text editors and twenty-six book editors, and a textual analysis of drafts, edited versions and published versions of a sample of Norwegian picture books in Slovene translation, they explore interpersonal power dynamics based on two indicators: (1) the relative ability of translators, text editors and book editors to make changes to the text after an initial translation has been drafted; and (2) the perceptions people in each of these roles have of their counterparts' authority to do so. Moe and Žigon show that, while the end result is always a compromise between all involved, in most cases the translator was seen by his/her collaborators as the 'author' of the target text and as such had significant power to influence the final version. Interestingly, translators tended to see themselves as overlooked agents in the translation process, despite others' perceptions of their authorial power. Moe and Žigon also found that text editors intervened more often in texts for children than in texts for adults. Text editors' changes neutralized

non-standard orthographic, syntactic, grammatical and stylistic features in the draft translation, a (sometimes problematic) function of not speaking the source language of the translated text they were revising. These changes were often reversed in later editing stages, with book editors tending to defer to the opinion of the translator, particularly if that person was trusted, experienced and willing to take the time to explain his/her reasons for intervening.

Jan Van Coillie closes Part 1 with a wide-ranging reflection on the power of translated children's literature to bring children into contact with other cultures and perspectives. In "Diversity can change the world: Children's literature, translation and images of childhood," he approaches the 'foreign' in translated children's literature from four perspectives: selection, reduction, visualization and digitization. He strikes a critical tone, going so far as to ask whether translation itself, the mode by which many books for children circulate today, hinders or helps diversity. Underwriting the contributions by Lathey and O'Sullivan, he laments that the flood of translated children books from English, facilitated by Anglo-American processes of globalization and commercialization, has stifled diversity in many language areas. Anglophone dominance has been particularly strongly felt in smaller language markets in Europe and markets with emerging children's literatures in Southeast Asia, where anywhere between 60 and 80 percent of all translated children's books are from English. Even when non-Anglophone source texts *are* selected for translation, they are often stripped of their foreign elements, making it much more difficult for young readers to glean a sense of the source culture. These omissions and reductions of the foreign reveal target producers' commercial motivations as well as their own child images, which are often informed by the (for Van Coillie unfounded) belief that young readers are unable to understand and cope with foreign elements (strange sounding names, unfamiliar foods), let alone taboo subjects like sexuality, nudity, violence, and death. Van Coillie extends this to the visual medium in translated children's books, noting that it is not uncommon for illustrations to be adapted or replaced to suit the target culture. Many dominant source publishers circumvent this by instructing illustrators to "avoid culture-specific markers as well as references to sex, violence and anything else that could cause offence." Such practices limit diversity by filtering out visualizations of the foreign.

Van Coillie finishes his chapter with a discussion of digital books for children, where selection, reduction and visualization dynamics converge in potentially innovative ways. Digital children's books enrich the reading experience with in-story games, hotspots for interacting with items and characters in the story, reading comprehension exercises, and read-aloud functionality. Digital children's books also have the added advantage of

being easily published in multilingual editions. This makes them not only a promising didactic tool for young readers and second-language learners but also an enriching potential site for encounters with the foreign. However, as with the print market, the market for digital children's books is currently dominated by English-only titles. Looking to the future, Van Coillie sees promise in digital children's books that combine multiple, high-quality translations/voice-over versions in many languages, each with localized supplemental content.

Many more examples of how a text's diversity is embraced or reduced upon entering a new context can be found in Part 2, "**Text » Context**." These contributions reflect a second, more well-established mode of studying translated children's literature oriented towards understanding the myriad ways individual translated texts or oeuvres are adapted to suit the context of a given target culture. Several contributions deal with retranslations, the study of which allows for a diachronic comparison of translation strategies across time and space. Retranslations invite investigations into the constraints imposed, explicitly or not, by (state) ideologies, pedagogic norms and dominant child images active in the target culture – all of which must be negotiated in one way or another by the translator. The translation strategies used and the various textual artefacts they render (shifts, omissions, subversions, changes in emphasis, reinterpretations) tell us something about the motivations of the translator and the cultural context in/for which s/he is translating.

In "The creative reinventions of nonsense and domesticating the implied child reader in Hungarian translations of *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*," **Anna Kérchy** explores six different Hungarian translations of Lewis Carroll's Victorian classic produced over the last century and a half. She begins with a reflection on the (un)translatability of literary nonsense, a genre unique for its dual address and crossover appeal: literary nonsense offers "a retreat from structures of authority" for children and a "return to a child-like state" for grown-ups. Kérchy then comments on the six translations, using Venuti's terminology to identify a progression in the Hungarian translation history of Alice from "domesticating translations bordering on creative adaptations [to] foreignizing translations intent on respecting criteria of fidelity to the source-text." Some domesticating choices had major ramifications for the story. For example, in the third Hungarian Alice (1935), which Kérchy calls "the most exciting take on Carroll's classic to date," the decision to use Hungarian playing cards instead of French ones necessitated replacing the Red Queen with "a schizoid king figure" since Hungarian decks do not contain a queen card.

Kérchy argues that dominant images of the child and childhood prevailing in the target culture at the time a translation is produced are likely to influence

the translation strategies used by the translator. This explains why most of the Hungarian translations transform Alice from an active, empowered co-creator of the narrative in Carroll's original to a passive, vulnerable listener in all but one (the latest, 2013) translation: until very recently, the dominant child image in Hungary infantilized the child reader.

Michał Borodo looks at another case of domesticating translation but suggests that, paradoxically, domestication can sometimes achieve a foreignizing effect. In "'Better watch it, mate' and 'Listen 'ere, lads': The cultural specificity of the English translation of Janusz Korczak's classic *Król Maciuś Pierwszy* [King Matt the First]," Borodo compares three English translations (two North American, one British) of this widely translated Polish classic for children. He pays special attention to the translation for British readers, created by Adam Czasak and published in London in 1990 with the title *Little King Matty*. In addition to the more obvious domesticating choices (adapting child protagonists' names and culture-specific items), the translator introduced an array of lexical items – 'lads,' 'mates,' 'mingy,' 'barmy,' 'to nick,' 'to take the mickey,' 'righto,' 'blimey' and 'flippin' 'eck' – associated with the British working class. This decision contrasts with the other two English translations, which use standard 'literary' English. Borodo concludes that Czasak's use of a marginal, non-standard discourse actually achieves the effect of a foreignizing translation in Venuti's terms, making for a more complex source–target dynamic. He credits Czasak with "breathing new life" into the Polish classic for children by giving it a "colloquial and distinctively British character."

Complementing the contribution by Lima and Pereira in Part 1, **Anna Olga Prudente de Oliveira** shows in "Brazilian rewritings of Perrault's short stories: Nineteenth- and twentieth-century versus twenty-first-century retellings and consequences for the moral message" how rewritings of Charles Perrault's *Tales of Mother Goose* contributed to the emergence of a Brazilian children's literature. She retraces three centuries of Perrault's tales in Brazil to show that whereas early rewritings challenged conventions in their time, newer rewritings tended to adhere to dominant ideological and aesthetic currents. The latter dictated that retranslations of canonical works should adhere closely to the original. Oliveira holds up the early omission and eventual reappearance of Perrault's morals (the witty codas in verse that followed each of Perrault's prose tales) to illustrate this progression. Informed by Descriptive Translation Studies and Lefevere's notions of rewriting and patronage, she shows how rewritings exerted a central role in establishing and maintaining Perrault's tales in the Brazilian children's literature canon. Monteiro Lobato reappears here as a central intermediary figure: his translations of eight tales

from *Mother Goose* (he excluded the morals), published in 1934, cemented a place for Perrault in the Brazilian literary system.

Two contributions explore the complex relationship between text and image in translated picture books. In "Translating crossover picture books: The Italian translations of *Bear Hunt* by Anthony Browne," **Annalisa Sezzi** considers the translation problems that arise from having to handle two semiotic systems (the verbal and the visual), two addressees (child and adult) and difficult, taboo themes (in this case, war). Her investigation focuses on the Italian translation (1990) and retranslation (1999) of *Bear Hunt* (1979), a story revolving around a little white bear being chased by hunters who draws himself out of problematic situations with a magic pencil. The case study shows how the two Italian translators adopted different solutions when tackling the relationship between visual and verbal, the read-aloud situation posed by the adult reading aloud, and the various layers of meaning in Browne's picture book. Sezzi finds inspiration in O'Sullivan's (2003) scheme on narrative communication for translation, using it to compare the implied child reader and the implied adult reading aloud in the source and target texts. She finds that both the Italian translation and the retranslation make light of the picture book's disquieting yet central theme of war, suggesting that the child image *and* the adult image informing both translators' strategies question both audiences' ability to cope.

Sara Van Meerbergen and **Charlotte Lindgren** focus on the depiction of movement in images and words in two spreads from a popular series of Swedish picture books, showing how globally disseminated images receive local meanings when translated. Their chapter, "Pettson and Findus go glocal: Recontextualization of images and multimodal analysis of simultaneous action in Dutch and French translations," combines insights from social semiotics and Descriptive Translation Studies to "see translation and the act of translating as motivated by and within its specific social and situational context, depending on the signs that are culturally available within this context." On this basis, they discuss the Dutch and French translations of a Pettson and Findus picture book, describing the conditions of each translation's coming into being (the production context) and analyzing their multimodal features (the text-internal context containing the visual and verbal depiction of characters and their actions). They focus specifically on simultaneous action, where a character is depicted multiple times on one spread in a succession of different actions. (In their examples, Grandpa Pettson is going about various chores in his garden.) They find that the Dutch translation tends to neutralize and reduce ongoing simultaneous actions, reformulating them into sequential actions performed one after another, which

requires less complex verb structures. In contrast, the French translation tends to use complex stylistic verb structures to depict simultaneous and ongoing action. Van Meerbergen and Lindgren relate these differing strategies to different translation norms in each production context. They also note the wider tendency in translations for children to avoid repetition and simplify difficult syntax. They conclude that the picture books about Pettson and Findus can be described as "'glocal' artifacts, where globally spread images receive different meanings due to local choices made in the translations."

Two final contributions examine the translation of violence in children's literature. **Marija Todorova** looks at the English translation (2011) and musical stage adaptation (2012) of Branko Ćopić's *Ježeva kućica* [Hedgehog's Home] (1949), one of the most enduring books for children from the former Yugoslavia. She opens her chapter, "Translating violence in children's picture books: A view from the former Yugoslavia," with a reflection on violence itself, parsing its various forms. She then goes on to explore how the violence foregrounded in the original book – direct violence caused by fighting in the Western Balkans during World War II – was recast in a different context to illustrate another form of violence: ecological violence to the natural environment. The musical stage adaptation, set in 1920s England, makes a similar move, combining references to ecological violence with references to class violence: whereas the Hedgehog is dressed to represent a British peasant, the bad animals of the forest are costumed as the upper class (with the Fox dressed in traditional foxhunting attire). Like Sezzi and Van Coillie, Todorova finds that direct mentions of war and death in the source text were either removed or rendered indirectly in the translation and stage adaptation "so that the dark forest is not so dark anymore." However, despite the fact that both target texts radically decontextualize the story from its geographical and historical context and fractalize its notion of violence, the story's recontextualization in a new time and place "arguably offers target readers a more complex and nuanced understanding of the issue of violence and its psychological and structural manifestations."

Valérie Alfvén examines another form of violence in the volume's final contribution: "Defying norms through unprovoked violence: The translation and reception of two Swedish young adult novels in France." She reconstructs the French careers of two Swedish young adult novels – *Spelar död* [Play Dead] (1999, translated into French in 2004) and *När tågen går förbi* [When the Trains Pass By] (2005, translated into French in 2007). Both books broach the sensitive topic of unprovoked violence perpetrated by young people on their peers. The translations sparked a 'moral panic' among French book producers that compelled the books' French editor, Thierry Manier, to explain

his editorial choices in the media. He and others defended the books on the grounds that young readers were intelligent enough to read "literary works (…) [and were] capable of knowing the difference between being a voyeur (…) and being a reader" (Alfvén quoting *Le Monde des livres* 2007). Others disagreed, admitting that there were "taboo topics" and that "not everything is publishable" even if its literary merits are uncontested (*ibid.*). Using Toury's notions of adequate and acceptable translation, Alfvén gives a textual analysis of the translators' strategies for rendering violence. Given a French context of "strong pedagogical norms and reticence about dark and difficult topics, the risk that the Swedish texts would undergo restrictions in the translation was high." To her surprise, Alfvén finds that the French translators chose to translate in an adequate manner, that is, close to Swedish norms. (This is not the case for the English translation of *När tågen går förbi*, which she also briefly examines.) She then looks at the social conditions of the books' entry into the French system, concluding that they owe their existence to the clout of the well-established translators and editors attached to each title. Alfvén argues that the books are innovative in Even-Zohar's sense of the term: they arrived in France "at a historical moment where old models and norms were no longer tenable, as illustrated by the moral panic that ensued." By offering a new model, the works "filled a vacuum in the French system and injected it with a new dynamic." Since the publication of these books, some French authors for children and adolescents have dared to write about unprovoked violence themselves, an early indication that the Swedish model has found a foothold in France and another example – among the many compiled in this volume – of how translations can unsettle and innovate.

Bibliography

Alvstad, Cecilia. 2010. "Children's Literature and Translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies Volume 1*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer, 22–27. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Baker, Mona. 2006. "Contextualization in Translator- and Interpreter-mediated Events." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, no. 3: 321–337.

Bamberger, Richard. 1963. *Übersetzung von Jugendbüchers*. Vienna: International Board on Books for Young People [Schriftenreihe des Buchklubs der Jugend], 17.

Bamberger, Richard. 1978. "Influence of Translation on Children's Literature." In *Children's Books in Translation: The Situation and the Problems*, edited by Göte Klingberg, Mary Ørvig and Stuart Amor, 19–27. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere, eds. 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. London/New York: Pinter.

Brownlie, Siobhan. 2006. "Narrative Theory and Retranslation Theory." *Across Languages and Cultures* 7, no. 2: 145–170.

Cronin, Michael. 2003. *Translation and Globalization*. London/New York: Routledge.

De La Rochère, Martine Hennard Dutheuil, Gillian Lathey and Monika Wozniak, eds. 2016. *Cinderella across Cultures: New Directions and Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Desmidt, Isabelle. 2006. "A Prototypical Approach within Descriptive Translation Studies? Colliding Norms in Translated Children's Literature." In *Children's Literature in Translation: Challenges and Strategies*, edited by Jan Van Coillie and Walter Verschueren, 123–139. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Dimitriu, Rodica. 2005. "The Many Contexts of Translation." *Linguaculture* 1: 5–23.

Dollerup, Cay. 1999. *Tales and Translation: The Grimm Tales from Pan-Germanic Narratives to Shared International Fairytales*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Douglas, Virginie and Florence Cabaret, eds. 2014. *La Retraduction en littérature de jeunesse / Retranslating Children's Literature*. Brussels: Peter Lang.

Du Nour, Miryam. 1995. "Retranslation of Children's Books as Evidence of Changes in Norms." *Target* 7, no. 2: 327–346.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1979. "Polysystem Theory." *Poetics Today* 1–2: 287–310.

Fischer, Beatrice and Matilde Nisbeth Jensen, eds. 2012. *Translation and the Reconfiguration of Power Relations: Revisiting Role and Context of Translation and Interpreting*. Graz: LIT Verlag.

Geerts, Sylvie and Sara Van den Bossche. 2014. *Never-ending Stories: Adaptation, Canonisation and Ideology in Children's Literature*. Ghent: Academia Press.

Ghesquiere, Rita. 2006. "Why Does Children's Literature Need Translations?" In *Children's Literature in Translation: Challenges and Strategies*, edited by Jan Van Coillie and Walter Verschueren, 19–33. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Hazard, Paul and Marguerite M. K. Mitchell. 1944. *Books, Children & Men*. Boston: The Horn Book.

Heilbron, Johan. 1999. "Towards a Sociology of Translation: Book Translations as a Cultural World-system." *European Journal of Social Theory* 2, no. 4: 429–444.

Hermans, Theo. 1999. *Translation in Systems*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

House, Juliane. 2006. "Text and Context in Translating." *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 338–358.

Kaniklidou, Themis and Juliane House. 2017. "Discourse and Ideology in Translated Children's Literature: A Comparative Study." *Perspectives* 26, no. 2: 232–245.

Katan, David. 2004. *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. 2nd edition. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Kruger, Haidee. 2011a. "Exploring a New Narratological Paradigm for the Analysis of Narrative Communication in Translated Children's Literature." *Meta* 56, no. 4: 812–832.

Kruger, Haidee. 2011b. "Postcolonial Polysystems: Perceptions of Norms in the Translation of Children's Literature in South Africa." *The Translator* 17, no. 1: 105–136.

Lathey, Gillian. 2006. *The Translation of Children's Literature: A Reader*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lathey, Gillian. 2010. *The Role of the Translator in Children's Literature*. London: Routledge.

Lathey, Gillian. 2015. *Translating Children's Literature*. New York/London: Routledge.

Lefevere, André. 1998. "Translation Practice(s) and the Circulation of Cultural Capital. Some Aeneids in English." In *Constructing Cultures*, edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, 25–40. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Munday, Jeremy. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London/New York: Routledge.

Nida, Eugene A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Nida, Eugene A. 2001. *Contexts in Translating*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nord, Christiane. 1995. "Text-functions in Translation: Titles and Headings as a Case in Point." *Target* 7, no. 2: 261–284.

Nord, Christiane. 2003. "Proper Names in Translations for Children: *Alice in Wonderland* as a Case in Point." *Meta* 48, no. 1–2: 182–196.

Nord, Christiane. 1991. *Text Analysis in Translation*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.

Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

O'Driscoll, Kieran. 2011. *Retranslation through the Centuries: Jules Verne in English*. Oxford/Bern: Peter Lang.

Oittinen, Riitta. 2000. *Translating for Children*. New York/London: Garland.

O'Sullivan, Emer. 2000. *Kinderliterarische Komparistik*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

O'Sullivan, Emer. 2003. "Narratology Meets Translation Studies, or, the Voice of the Translator in Children's Literature." *Meta* 48, no. 1–2: 197–207.

O'Sullivan, Emer. 2005. *Comparative Children's Literature*. London: Routledge.

Persson, Lisa-Christina, ed. 1962. *Translations of Children's Books*. Lund: Bibliotekstjänst.

Reiss, Katharina. 1982. "Zur Übersetzung von Kinder- und Jugendbüchern: Theorie und Praxis." *Lebendige Sprachen* 17: 7–13.

Reiss, Katharina and Hans J. Vermeer. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeier.

Sapiro, Gisèle. 2010. "Globalization and Cultural Diversity in the Book Market: The Case of Literary Translations in the US and in France." *Poetics* 38: 419–439.

Seago, Karen. 2006. "Nursery Politics: *Sleeping Beauty* or the Acculturation of a Tale." In *The Translation of Children's Literature: A Reader*, edited by Gillian Lathey, 175–189. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Shavit, Zohar. 1986. "Translation of Children's Literature." In *Poetics of Children's Literature*, 111–129, Athens/London: University of Georgia Press.

Shavit, Zohar. 1994. "Beyond the Restrictive Frameworks of the Past: Semiotics of Children's Literature – A New Perspective for the Study of the Field." In *Kinderliteratur im interkulturelle Prozess: Studien zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Literaturwissenshaft*, edited by Hans-Heino Ewers, Gertrud Lehnert and Emer O'Sullivan, 4–15. Stuttgart/Weimar: J. B. Metzler.

Stephens, John and David McCallum. 1998. *Retelling Stories, Framing Culture: Traditional Story and Metanarratives in Children's Literature*. New York/London: Garland.

Tabbert, Reinbert. 2002. "Approaches to the Translation of Children's Literature: A Review of Critical Studies Since 1960." *Target* 14, no. 2: 303–351.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Toury, Gideon. 1999. "A Handful of Paragraphs on 'Translation' and 'Norms'." In *Translation and Norms*, edited by Christina Schäffner, 10–32. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Venuti, Lawrence, 1995. *The Translor's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London/New York: Routledge.

Venuti, Lawrence, ed. 2012. *The Translation Studies Reader.* 3rd edition. London/New York: Routledge.

Wolf, Michaela. 2010. "Sociology of Translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies Volume 1*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 337–343. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Xu, Xu. 2013. "Translation, Hybridization, and Modernization: John Dewey and Children's Literature in Early Twentieth Century China." *Children's Literature in Education* 44, 222–237.