Translation Policy in Hebrew Children's Literature: The Case of Astrid Lindgren

Basmat Even-Zohar
Open University, Tel Aviv

Everything in a literary text is created, invoked, and constructed by language. Therefore, any choice of the writer pertaining to the linguistic level[1] naturally will greatly affect all other textual levels, such as characters, plot, segmentation, or meaning. This does not mean that the linguistic level—comprising a variety of registers, dialects, slang, scales of decorum (e.g., "bookishness" or "literariness")—will necessarily occupy the central place in any textual hierarchy. Its status within a text, or rather within a certain model, is a descriptive question of literary repertoires. It does, however, play a central role in the process of translation, which exposes and lays bare the linguistic choices of the text—at least for the translators, because they must consciously identify "problems" in the text in order to supply "solutions" in their own product, the translation.

However, none of the choices made by the translator or, for that matter, the author, are manifestations of individual whims or inspiration, but are made within the (poly-)system in which they operate. Therefore, exploring points of contact between literatures, such as

1. The term "level" is used here to denote organized groups of elements within a text. They are always inter- and intraconnected open groups, i.e., groups in which the components of elements are in a state of constant fluctuation on more than one level at a time. Textual levels too are not autonomous and are constantly in interaction with each other, as are the elements within them.

translation, is bound to be a very good way of discovering prevalent norms within the target system, namely, those of a particular literature (see also Shavit 1981: 171).

1. Hebrew Literary Repertoire

In order to uncover the literary constraints of Hebrew translation within the system of children's literature, one must have a basic knowledge of the linguistic level used in Hebrew literature in general and in Hebrew children's literature in particular. Each of these literary systems can be examined as a polysystem in itself, but they are organized in a hierarchy whereby translated children's literature operates as a subsystem within the system of Hebrew children's literature, and the latter is again a subsystem of Hebrew literature. Whether a system is referred to as a "system," "subsystem," or "polysystem" is a function of the particular relations obtaining between it and other systems and of the relevant scientific point of view.

The linguistic level contains a repertoire of the various models of linguistic registers available to the writer—such as slang, the vernacular, standard language, or media language—within the literary repertoire. These different levels of language function in every active tongue, serving diverse social groups. They also function in diverse social situations, which do not necessarily overlap with social groups (see, e.g., Sapir 1949 [1921]; Sebeok 1960). Some of these levels, as well as other linguistic levels which have ceased to exist in the vernacular, are represented in the literary repertoire. This means that there is not necessarily an overlap between the options of a given linguistic repertoire and the options of the literary repertoire within the same language.

In modern Hebrew literature, both "adult" and children's literature, the reigning norm is one of elevated literary language: rich, elaborate, standardized, based upon historical scripts ranging from roughly 800 B.C. to the nineteenth century. This language is different from the Israeli spoken tongue on all levels, from vocabulary and syntax to accent and pronunciation. This literary written standard is still the unmarked norm.

This situation has its immediate roots in the fact that modern Hebrew language and literature emerged before Hebrew became a "native" spoken mother tongue. According to the educational Zionist ideology that formed literature as well as most other activities in the modern Hebrew culture in pre–Israeli Palestine, Hebrew was to be transformed into a natural spoken language and taught to immigrants and their offspring. This ideology was closely connected to an artificially induced veneration of old traditional Hebrew, and it gen-

erated: (a) "desk inventions"[2] of a vernacular, created to fill a literary gap in translations of "Realistic" literature into Hebrew; (b) avoiding direct speech in original Hebrew literature; (c) a tradition of ignoring modern Hebrew native vernacular, which also entailed considering it "incorrect" and "deviant" in comparison with old traditional Hebrew, perceived as the "rich" and "correct" *standard* (see Hrushovski 1983; Perry 1968).

However, this situation has been gradually changing since the 1960s, first in theater-plays and in poetry, then in belles lettres, and recently also in (original) children's literature. Although they are still considered "innovative" and still require literary justification, elements of the vernacular have been decidedly infiltrating literary texts (see Ben-Shahar 1983, 1989). These elements are inserted by means of three central techniques for representing "authentic speech" in Hebrew literature: (1) deviations from the norms of the standard by relatively partial punctuation; (2) "disorderly" free-speech word order; and (3) the use of words, grammatical constructions, and phrases which are recognized as typical of spoken Hebrew or slang.

The most prominent justification for using the vernacular may be found in dialogue, especially in "realistic" texts, because the literary norms require "authenticity" in the characters' speech. I will therefore concentrate specifically on norms of *dialogue* translation, since dialogue reveals the literary attitude toward the vernacular more conspicuously than any other part of the text.

2. Swedish Literary Repertoire and Astrid Lindgren

Swedish literature was also governed by the norms of high literary language, but these norms began to weaken in the Realist and Naturalist literature toward the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, especially in dialogue. During the most recent decades standard written Swedish, including literary Swedish, has come to be based upon the spoken language. The great social changes

---

2. "Desk inventions," as one can intuitively guess, occur when a writer invents forms of language at the *desk*, forms which bear no connection to any "real world" utterances in that language. The first dialogues in modern Hebrew literature were composed in Biblical Hebrew and, in many cases, paraphrased actual quotations from biblical conversations. The second stage brought a significant innovation, attributed to Mendele Mokher-Sfarim, "the Grandfather of Hebrew Literature": his Hebrew dialogue was based upon Yiddish speech and thus was perceived as "authentic." Both options were solutions to the problem of there being no native speakers of Hebrew at the time and, certainly, no natural conversation among them. The trouble was that, once the norm of "inventing" a spoken language for speakers of Hebrew became institutionalized, such inventions continued to be produced even after actual speech had become an optional resource.

undergone by Sweden in the course of this century—socialism and large-scale immigration—have brought about a heightened conscious-ness with regard to matters of education, equality, and language. The resultant *practical* need to acknowledge the vernacular in the Swedish culture at large has also paved the way for the vernacular to permeate *literature*.

Astrid Lindgren has won worldwide recognition as a prominent and respected writer, with more than a dozen prestigious national and international awards to her name and dozens of her books translated into many languages. Her first book was published in 1944, and in 1945 she won first prize in a contest organized by a prominent Swedish publishing house with the manuscript of the now world-famous *Pippi Longstocking*. Back then, her books provoked heated controversies be-tween those who criticized them as "counter-educative" and "out-rageous" and those who saw them as "fresh." In any case, Lindgren was considered revolutionary and innovative both in her characters and plots and in her use of language—which was described as having a "rough glib everyday-life tone" (Örvig 1977: 154). As appreciation and favorable recognition of her work have gradually grown, Astrid Lindgren has become a major source of influence in Swedish children's literature, as well as in other literatures. She has managed to introduce new literary and linguistic norms into Swedish children's literature and today represents the most powerful and effective norms of canon-ized, official children's literature (see, e.g., Örvig 1977). Moreover, the fact that her texts are highly language-conscious serves my purpose of discovering the way Hebrew children's literature deals with Lindgren's depiction of the vernacular especially well.

Needless to say, my point of view here is concerned with the tar-get system and target language. I am interested in uncovering the literary constraints of Hebrew translation within children's literature. Therefore, my purpose in discussing the status of Astrid Lindgren as a writer, or the status of her texts, within Swedish children's literature or in discussing her literary ideology within the source language is not normative or source-language oriented, but rather, target-language oriented: the comparison with the source system is a means of mea-suring the strength or weakness of norms within the target system, not simply a naive complaint about "bad translations."

3. The Translation Policy for Astrid Lindgren's Books

In the present state of research we know enough about children's lit-erature to expect its norms to be traditional and secondary due to the (again, expected) peripheral status of children's literature within the Hebrew literary polysystem. As Hebrew children's literature has

become a "full" and stable polysystem, at least since midcentury, the position of the translation subsystem has become peripheral within it, as is usual in such cases (cf. I. Even-Zohar 1990a). It should therefore not surprise us to note that, while the modern Hebrew vernacular has been gradually infiltrating the language of literature for adults, and even to some extent that of original children's literature, translated children's literature still perpetuates the traditional norms of the high literary standard (Shavit 1981).

As a result of Lindgren's explicit literary policy, the language of dialogue in her Swedish reflects an authentic current vernacular. Hebrew has also developed a natural spoken tongue in the course of its hundred-year modern history. Disregard for this factor in the translated texts is therefore a manifestation of literary norms rather than of linguistic shortcomings.

Hebrew translations display literary language in dialogue, which is standardized in many ways. However, this policy has been changing since the 1970s from a homogeneous and uncompromising literary language toward a partial simulation of the vernacular. The translation policy in Hebrew children's literature can be described in terms of "constraints" or in terms of "reconstructed instructions." Using the term "policy" implies that what lies at the core of this matter is not so much any individual constraint but rather a whole network, a system of constraints held together by a leading guideline. Since this policy is mostly implicit, one has to "reconstruct" it from textual products.

This reconstructed policy is best described as "instructions" because that term most aptly describes their actual status: there is an authoritarian element in them. They are, in a way, "forced" upon the translators by such agents or factors as editors, "company policy" of a publishing house, or "clients" who order the translations. But at the same time, such "instructions" are also "internalized" by the translators, that is, the translators share the *same* repertoire of instructions. Most translators do not have to be instructed or corrected.

These instructions function at various levels of consciousness: most of them are *not* explicit, so that they either produce texts automatically (that is, they determine the option to be chosen as a translational solution from the outset, making most other active options "invisible") or they surface in the form of corrections or remarks by the editor regarding specific local elements. For instance, there are two words for "nose" in Hebrew: the everyday "af" and the literary "khotem." It is common to find the former corrected to the latter. The editor, who usually carries out the "policy" prevalent in this system (on those rare occasions when the translator does not comply with the norm), may repeat such a "correction" throughout a text without once offering an

explicit generalization in the form of an "instruction," such as "always choose the *literary* option over the one *in use*," or "Hebrew as spoken is a priori suspect as distorted and wrong."

However, certain agents implementing the norms may be more explicit. Among them are two groups who hold a disproportionate amount of power in children's literature and consider themselves to be guardians of the Hebrew language: the "naqdanim" (vocalizers), who add the signs of Hebrew vocalization to words, and the proof-readers—the two groups who deal with spelling and punctuation. One of these "guardians" inadvertently furnished me with an example: the note he sent to my editor at Massada Publishing House, concerning the first proofs of my translation of Astrid Lindgren's book *The Children on Troublemaker Street*. And this is what he wrote (translation and emphasis mine):

1. The punctuation is *bad* [he used a worse word] and was *corrected* accordingly.
   There are [too] many sentences beginning with "and." The "and" stayed, but in many places, as much as possible, the full stop was changed into a comma or a semicolon.
2. There are several suggestions for word changes—marked in pencil.

This proofreader clearly sees his job as an editorial one, involving judgmental evaluation. In explanation of his notes: in (1) he refers first to a "shortage" of commas, full stops, and question and exclamation marks, and secondly, to the use of "and," which is used as a "void prag-matic connective" (vpc) in both Swedish and Hebrew. In the proper literary standard, it would not be used to open a sentence and would require a preceding comma within the sentence. Both "mistakes" are, of course, techniques of representing spontaneous speech in writing, the Hebrew here following the original Swedish (but using Hebrew counterparts).

Thus, translation policy in Hebrew children's literature appears to be actualized in the following reconstructed "instructions."

3.1 *Prefer the Literary Option to the Vernacular One*

This instruction is actually a more specific formulation of the overall tendency generally implicit in the instructions. I will therefore give only a brief historical sketch of a few major elements. Examples of this instruction may be found in abundance in all other examples. The major elements are (1) words and phrases, (2) literary word order versus free-speech word order, and (3) grammatical elements, of which I will discuss only one: negation in the present tense [*shlilat ha-benoni*].

Modern Hebrew vernacular has three grammatical tenses where

standard literary Hebrew has two: A tense that used to be more of a noun than a verb functions in modern spoken Hebrew as the present tense. Thus, "ani shomer" means either "I guard" (verb) or "I am a guard" (noun). According to historical grammatical rules, the negation of this tense should be done with "en": "*en* ani shomer" or "ani *eni/ en*eni shomer" [I am not guarding/a guard], unlike the past and future tenses, which are negated with "lo" [no]. However, modern Hebrew vernacular negates all three tenses with "lo": "ani lo shomer" [I don't guard/I am not a guard]. I have found "en" versus "lo" to be a good indication of the level of literariness in translations.

The Hebrew translators of *Pippi* (Lindgren 1956) and *Kalle* (Lindgren 1986) prefer the most literary options on all textual levels. The translators of *Emil* (Lindgren 1976) and *The Brothers Lionheart* (Lindgren 1984) try to give a more "colloquial" impression by using a less literary option in many cases, but they are not consistent: while they might use "efo" instead of "hekhan" [where], they will also use "kefi," not "kmo" [as, like], or "le-histayem" instead of "le-higamer" [to end], and they "correct" the word order, weed out VPCs, and use both the "en" and "lo" negations. In translating *The Children on Troublemaker Street* (Lindgren 1987), I was subjected to heavy pressure from at least two editors, as well as a vocalizer and a proofreader, to "standardize" the language. They systematically corrected the manuscripts and proofs, adding punctuation, erasing VPCs, "correcting" word order, replacing words and phrases with more literary ones, changing "lo" to "en," etc. For example, compare these variations on the opening sentence of *The Children on Troublemaker Street*—a story "told" by a five-year-old girl.

> Swedish: Min bror, han heter Jonas och jag, jag heter Maria och vår lilla syster heter Lotta [My brother, he is called Jonas and I, I am called Maria and our little sister is called Lotta].

> Hebrew (as published): Ha-ax sheli qorim lo Jonas va-ani qorim li Maria, ve-la-axot ha-qtana shelanu qorim Lotta [My brother they call him Jonas and I they call me Maria, and our little sister is called Lotta].

> An editor's version: Shem axi hu Jonas, li qorim Maria, ve-la-axotenu ha-qtana qorim Lotta [My brother's name is Jonas, my name is Maria and our little sister's name is Lotta].

3.2 *Avoid All Linguistic or Spelling "Mistakes"*

Swedish texts attempt to simulate the vernacular by violating spelling rules and by using slang words and conventional "mistakes" of speech. Spelling mistakes, in particular, are used to accentuate authentic pronunciation, as opposed to the written standard, in the few instances available in Swedish, a highly phonetic language. Examples from Astrid Lindgren's books include "dej," "dom," "va," "huve," "sån"

instead of "dig," "dem," "vad," "huvud," "sådan." Consider, for ex-
ample, the following passage from *The Brothers Lionheart* (Lindgren
1973: 95, 1984: 78).

> Swedish: "Ditt pund*huve,* varför har du inte fått ur *dej* det där lite förr," sa
> Kader. "En bror, hade vi honom, så kunde vi snart tvinga fram lejonhjärta
> ur hans gömställe. För var han än ligger och trycker, så skulle han säkert
> på hemliga vägar få veta att vi hade fångat hans bror" ["You blockhead,
> why didn't you let it out a bit earlier," said Kader. "A brother, if we had
> him, then we could quickly force Lionheart out of his hiding place. Because
> wherever he is hiding, he will surely in secret ways get word that we have
> captured his brother"].
> (Note: *huve, dej* are normally pronounced that way [English speakers should
> note that "j" is pronounced "y"], but should be written *huvud* and *dig.*)
> Hebrew: "Tipesh kamokha, lama lo amarta lanu qodem?" amar Kader.
> "Anaxnu yekholim le-hishtamesh ba-ax, im hu yihye be-yadenu, kde leha-
> khriax et lev-ari lacet me-ha-maxbo shelo. Mipne she-be-khol maqom she-
> bo hu mistater hu yeda, be-ezo derekh nisteret, she-tafasnu et axiv" ["You
> fool, why didn't you tell us before?" said Kader. "We could use the brother,
> if he would be in our hands, to force Lionheart out of his hideaway. Because
> wherever he hides he would know, in some mysterious way, that we have
> caught his brother"].
> (In conclusion: no spelling mistakes in Hebrew, standard and clearly or-
> dered literary language—as opposed to the not-so-orderly spontaneous
> speech imitation in Swedish.)

Hebrew original children's literature does not allow any *spelling* mis-
takes except in (rare cases of) "citations" of children's "writings" ("au-
thentic beginner-spelling"), despite the vast possibilities for literary
use that Hebrew provides in this department: modern Hebrew is in
a situation of di-glossia between literary pronunciation, an histori-
cal construct manifested in the standard spelling and vocalization,
and spoken pronunciation, different from the historical written stan-
dard in vowels, consonants, and accent (ultimate vs. penultimate). It
is possible to write down an authentic spoken discourse which is also
"correct" by literary standards, and read it aloud in two different, or
even opposite, ways: the non-authentic literary standard versus the
authentic vernacular.

Hebrew, then, can supply a much richer inventory in this respect
than Swedish can, but as long as children's books are printed with the
signs of vocalization, it is impossible to use it. There have been sev-
eral attempts to "update" the vocalization system, but so far without
success. Children's literature is especially resistant to the possibility
of such changes, since editors of children's literature believe that the
system is satisfactory and *should not* be changed.

To give one example of di-glossia: in spoken Hebrew the phrase

"and because" is pronounced "ve-biglal." However, according to Hebrew rules of grammar, it should be pronounced "u-viglal" because the word "ve" (and), which remains the same in modern spoken Hebrew, changes form according to the succeeding syllable, in historical grammar; the b/v change is also not the same in modern Hebrew (which tends to treat these mostly as two separate phonemes) versus historical literary Hebrew (where they are one phoneme, pronounced according to the vowel and accent environment).

Hebrew does, however, use the device of *linguistic* "mistakes," but mainly in *certain popular* uncanonized texts, which simulate modern Hebrew usage characteristic of a *higher* social stratum of educated adults in order to characterize a *lower* stratum of undereducated children[3]: Uncanonized popular texts (by Galila Ron-Feder, for example) which describe delinquent youths, or children from broken homes or rundown neighborhoods, also characterize such undereducated children by way of certain linguistic "deviations" from the literary standard that are traditionally viewed as "language mistakes." However, their "bad language" does not represent the actual language of such children in Israel, but rather, certain elements of the *educated vernacular* implanted in otherwise standard literary Hebrew. Due to the systemic norms, the children's represented language is considered a concession to Realism. In other words, the publisher is willing to let this "terrible language" pass for the sake of realistic characterization of poor, uneducated children. As a result, these elements could no longer be used to represent the speech of "normal" children: since the elements of the educated vernacular (the "highest," closest to the literary option) have been "occupied" to fulfill the function of the "lowest" speech, they are no longer available to represent the educated vernacular itself. This also blocks the way for any less-educated vernacular to enter children's literature, as long as the current norm prevails.

Still, some conventional "colloquialisms" can be found in translations dating from 1976 on. These are words and phrases which had already gained recognition as elements denoting authentic speech in adult Hebrew literature as far back as eighty years ago and which entered children's literature some sixty years ago: phrases like "betax" (sure), "bikhlal" (at all), or "hamon" (a lot). But they are embedded, more often than not, in an otherwise literary, sometimes even high literary, language, thus creating an awkward mixture. For example, in *The Brothers Lionheart* (Lindgren 1984: 46), we find the word "bikhlal" after the literary "u-mipne": "u-mipne she-hi bi-khlal lo mefaxedet" [and because she is not afraid at all]. (By the way, in the Swedish original [Lindgren 1973: 55], the phrase was not "at all" but "ett enda

dugg" [even a little bit]. So, "bi-khlal" was chosen over an even "lower" phrase.)

Another example of mixed language occurs in the following passage from the Swedish and Hebrew versions of *Kalle Blomkvist and Rasmus* (Lindgren 1953: 104, 1986: 97).

> Swedish: "Det är bättre att bara *en* vet det," sa Kalle. "Än är vi inte riktigt i säkerhet. Och så länge vi inte är det säger jag *ingenting*" ["It's better that only *one* knows it," said Kalle. "We are not yet truly safe. And as long as we aren't I'm not saying anything"].
>
> Hebrew: "Mutab she-raq exad yeda zot," amar Kalle. "Va-lo, enenu betuxim mamash. Ve-khol od enenu betuxim mamash, ani lo omar *shum-klum*" ["It is better that only one will know it," said Kalle. "Otherwise, we are not truly safe. And as long as we are not truly safe, I will not say anything"].
>
> (In conclusion: "Klum" alone is common vernacular for "nothing." In this case, the translator "softened" it by adding "shum" to it. Among other things, she also changed "I'm not saying anything" to the more literary "I will not say anything" and preferred the bookish "mutab" over "yoter tob.")

Quite common in a wide variety of Hebrew texts is another method of simulating natural speech while at the same time avoiding the violation of any unwritten literary law, namely, by alluding to vernacular phrases without literally using them. This is carried out through reshaping an existing vernacular phrase by applying certain rules of literariness, as in the case of "shum-klum." The result is always an invention, that is, something which does not exist in any real stratum of Hebrew. For example, in the passage from *The Brothers Lionheart* (Lindgren 1984), quoted earlier, there is no such thing as "tipesh kamokha," in the sense of "you blockhead." The correct existing phrase, which entered the literary repertoire at least fifty years ago, is "tipesh *she*kamokha," which is a "softer" version of "you fool." But even this phrase seemed too "low" to the language editor, so he corrected the authentic expression.

3.3 *Use Only "Correct" Standard Syntax*

It is a commonplace that everyday speech usually follows a rather free flow of words, more or less according to the chain of thought; such speech is also characterized by incomplete syntactical construction, repetition, the use of VPCs, etc. It is common practice to open a sentence by saying something, then to remember something important that should have been mentioned at the beginning of the sentence but wasn't, and to insert it elsewhere. It is also very common in free speech to insert qualifiers, such as "also," "but," and "though," at the end of the sentence instead of where they belong both logically and grammatically. In impromptu speech sentences are seldom grammatically formed (see Enkvist 1982; Van Dijk 1985); these (and other) known

features of the vernacular are simulated in Lindgren's Swedish. All Hebrew translations[4] have systematically "corrected" the syntax and restored the standard order. Again, the two examples elaborated above also attest to this, as noted even in the translation.

3.4 Omit Nonreferential Parts of Speech (Such as VPCs)

Natural speech contains quite a large repertoire of void pragmatic connectives: sounds, words, and phrases which serve to convey mood or attitude, to win time or to hold the speaker's place in conversation, etc. These elements (e.g., "well," "then," or "what") are either devoid of referential meaning in this context or have no such meaning at all (e.g., "oh"). The size of the repertoires of VPCs and the extent to which they are used or may potentially be used in speech varies from culture to culture. VPCs rarely constitute part of the official written standard. However, in some cultures they began permeating the language of fiction with the demands for nineteenth-century literary "Realism" (see I. Even-Zohar 1990b).

Swedish has a particularly rich repertoire of VPCs, which is used abundantly in speech as well as in literature and includes *o, oj, ju, jo, vad* [what]; *men* [but]; *jamen* [yes but]; *då* [then]; *ännu* [yet, still]; *nä, väl* [well]; *jasså, jaha, nog, så* [so]; *asch, usch, fy.* Astrid Lindgren uses this option extensively in dialogue, as in the following example from *Pippi Långstrump* (Lindgren 1945: 119–20): "*Nä*, men jag har *ju* födelsedag *vetja*, och *då* kan jag *väl* ge er födelsedagspresenter *också?*" (all emphasized words are complete or partial VPCs).

Hebrew has a rich and growing repertoire of VPCs, but these have no literary status or recognition. Hebrew VPCs have only very recently entered the repertoire of light entertainment (stand-up comedy), but this is only the first stage toward establishing a linguistic repertoire, including the literary one. Some examples of contemporary Hebrew VPCs are *lo* [no]; *ken* [yes]; *hare, loken* [no yes]; *kenlo* [yes no]; *a, e, ax, uf, ki* [because]; *kaze* [such]; *keilu* [as if]; *ve* [and]; *az* [then]; *tov* [good]; *nu.* All Hebrew translations omit VPCs to some extent: during the 1970s all of them were omitted; translations done in the mid-eighties used Hebrew VPCs which had already been canonized in Hebrew children's literature, but even then only where these items were either not entirely "void" or were not recognized as VPCs.[5] For example, consider

4. In this case it is important to comment that one of the translations I examined was my own, in which I opposed my editors' pressure to standardize my translation and instead simulated Hebrew free-speech word order.

5. In my own translation I have tried to provide Hebrew equivalents to all Swedish VPCs. The result has come pretty close to a linguist's recording of real-life conversation, but it encountered total objection by my editors. After long negotiations about each and every "and," "then," etc., roughly thirty to fifty percent had to be dropped.

this passage (again, vpcs emphasized) from the Swedish and Hebrew versions of *Emil in the Soup Tureen* (Lindgren 1963: 45, 1976: 41).

> Swedish: "Det blir dyrt *det här*," sa Emils pappa. "Men ska det vara kalas, *så* ska det! Inget knussel! Fast man kunde kanske göra köttbullarna *något mindre*" ["It will cost this," said Emil's Dad. "But if there's gonna be a party, there's gonna! No economy! Except one could maybe make the meatballs somewhat smaller"].

> Hebrew: "Ze yaale hamon kesef, kol ha-okhel ha-ze," amar aba shel Emil, "abal im yesh xagiga, mutab she-hi tihye amitit u-vli qimucim! Abal ulay yakholt laasot et qcicot ha-basar yoter qtanot" ["It will cost a lot of money, all this food," said Emil's Dad, "but if there is a party, it would better be real and without economizing! But maybe you could make the meatballs smaller"].

> (Note: "*det här*" becomes a legitimate "all this food"; "*något* mindre" [somewhat smaller] becomes merely "smaller"; elliptical exclamations become complete sentences—no vpc allowed.)

3.5 *Add Punctuation (Especially Question and Exclamation Marks)*
One of the methods used by Astrid Lindgren to simulate the vernacular is that of scant punctuation. She avoids question and exclamation marks almost entirely and limits herself almost exclusively to commas and full stops, which she uses sparingly. This practice has become rather conventional in modern Swedish children's literature, but it is very different from standard written and literary Swedish, which is as heavily punctuated as German (in fact, Swedish punctuation was actually formed according to the German model in this respect).

This "light-punctuation" technique is almost as prominent in Hebrew literature for adults (as in, for example, works by A. B. Yehoshua and Yaacov Shabtai), but it is still regarded as avant-garde and has not yet been adopted by the repertoire of children's literature. Hebrew translations added all punctuation marks freely, including marks that were wholly absent from the Swedish. Question and exclamation marks were added not only in question and exclamation phrases, but in other places as well. A typical example can be found in the translation of *Pippi Longstocking* (Lindgren 1950: 12, 1956: 13).

> Swedish: "Varför i all världen har du en häst på verandan," *frågade* Tommy ["Why in the world do you have a horse on the porch," asked Tommy].

> Hebrew: —Ribono shel olam, lama ha-sus po hu, ba-mirpeset? *Qara Tommy bi-tmiha* [—Dear God, why is the horse here, on the veranda? Exclaimed Tommy in amazement].

> (Note: not only was a comma replaced with a question mark, but a simple "asked" became a full cliché [see also Skott 1977, who shows that the same practice occurs in Russian translations of Lindgren].)

On the one hand, Hebrew literature definitely favors "exclamatory" phrasing, possibly after the Russian model. On the other hand, adding

punctuation is a universal of translation also found in translations from Hebrew to Swedish (Ben-Ari 1988: 96–103; B. Even-Zohar 1988).

3.6 *Add Standard Vocalization*

Standard vocalization is added, thus dictating a "correct" literary pro-nunciation, even for words and phrases from the repertoire of the ver-nacular, whose pronunciation is incompatible with the old standard. The Hebrew writing system mostly records consonants and, only spar-ingly, vowels. The vowels are supposed to follow known patterns. An additional vowel notation, standardized and canonized in the eleventh century, is still used today in poetry and in texts for children and new immigrants.

   This vocalization is a strong convention, preserving a tradition that does not always apply to modern Hebrew pronunciation. It is the most archaic feature of the written standard, yet it cannot be avoided in texts for children, who are meant to use the signs as reading aids. When used in the Hebrew translations of Astrid Lindgren's books, vocalization generally undermines *any attempt at authentic simulation of the Hebrew vernacular*. When the translation uses vernacular rather than literary words, but the reader is instructed to pronounce them differently, the result is a pure desk invention, as in this earlier ex-ample from *Emil in the Soup Tureen* (Lindgren 1973: 41): "Im yesh xagiga, mutav she-hi tihye amitit u-vli qimucim!" Here, two things "spoil" the authenticity of natural spoken language: the word "mutav" is bookish, and the literary "u-vli" should be pronounced "ve-bli." Note also "va-ani" in the opening sentence of *The Children on Troublemaker Street* (quoted above) instead of the vernacular "ve-ani" (see also the examples in section 3.2, above).

In conclusion, then, the characters in Astrid Lindgren's books, who speak quite an authentic Swedish vernacular in the original texts, converse in regularized standard Hebrew (even extremely literary Hebrew) in translation, on all levels—literary or standard phrases, words, spelling, punctuation, and vocalization (representing pronun-ciation). This policy, as shown above, is represented throughout the system, even by proofreaders and vocalization experts. These norms are thus vigorously carried out by a large body of decision makers, including editors, publishers, critics, and various other groups within the literary institution, who function as strong pressure groups, repre-senting a set of constraints the translators cannot ignore.

   These features of the Hebrew texts do in fact follow the rules of uni-versals of translation (see especially Ben-Ari 1988), but I would like to contend that they are *not* primarily generated by the translator as an individual, as part of the process of translation, but are rather a result of the prevailing norms in Hebrew children's literature.

Even though the attempt to simulate natural speech is a central fea-
ture of Lindgren's poetics, the translations' disregard for this attempt
is thus not due to a misunderstanding or a misreading of the text, nor
is it an arbitrary result of the process of translation, but stems first
and foremost from adherence to the governing literary norms. These
norms are dictated by the cultural, educational, and literary wish to
"teach" the child the "correct" and "rich" form of traditional literary
Hebrew.

By way of an epilogue, though, I would like to remark that these
norms currently appear to be in flux, and translated products oscil-
late between different levels of literariness and colloquialism. There
is a clash between the desire for "Realism," authenticity, and recog-
nition of the vernacular and the desire to educate, to create a rich
and varied language base for every child. There is an additional fric-
tion between the principle that children should read a language they
speak and understand, and the competing notion that they should
broaden and develop their linguistic horizons. But at the core of the
matter lies neither the one nor the other; the operative mechanism
here is the nature of the policy appropriated by children's literature
from the general system at large. And since the norms of the latter
penetrate children's literature continually, I shall risk predicting that
the course to be taken by children's literature definitely lies in the
direction of the modern tongue. Translated children's literature will
sooner or later follow suit.

References and Related Works

I. *General*

Ben-Ari, Nitsa
    1988 "Norms Underlying Translation of German Literature into English, French
       and Italian." M.A. thesis, Tel Aviv University.
Ben-Shahar, Rina
    1983 "Dialogue Style in the Hebrew Play, Both Original and Translated from
       English and French, 1948–1975" (2 vols.). Ph.D. diss., Tel Aviv University.
    1989 *"Alice in Wonderland*—Language and Style in Aharon Amir's Translation,"
       Maagale Qria 18: 75–90 [Hebrew].
Enkvist, Nils-Érik, ed.
    1982 *Impromptu Speech: A Symposium* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi).
Even-Zohar, Basmat
    1988 "Eqronot ha-tirgum li-shvedit shel ha-sefer Gerushim Meuxarim meet
       Abraham B. Yehoshua" (The Translation Principles of *Late Divorce* by Abra-
       ham B. Yehoshua into Swedish). Manuscript.
Even-Zohar, Itamar
    1990a "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem,"
       Poetics Today 11(1): 45–51.
    1990b "Void Pragmatic Connectives," *Poetics Today* 11(1): 219–45.
Hrushovski, Benjamin
    1983 "Deconstruction of Speech: Shalom Aleichem and the Semiotics of Jewish
       Folklore," in *Sholem Aleichem*, 195–212 [Hebrew].

Örvig, Mary, ed.
  1977 *En bok om Astrid Lindgren* (Rabén och Sjögren).
Perry, Menakhem
  1968 "Analogy and Its Role as a Structural Principle in the Novels of Mendele
    Moykher-Sforim," *Ha-Sifrut* 1(1): 65–100 [Hebrew, with English summary:
    viii–x].
Rokem, Freddie
  1982 *Scandinavian Literatures in Hebrew Translation, 1894–1980* (Tel Aviv: Tel
    Aviv University [English: 56–58]).
Sapir, Edward
  1949 [1921] *Language* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World).
Sebeok, T. S., ed.
  1960 *Style in Language* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
Shavit, Zohar
  1981 "Translation of Children's Literature as a Function of Its Position in the
    Literary Polysystem," *Poetics Today* 2(4): 171–79.
Skott, Staffan
  1977 "Karlson på taket i rysk översättning," in Örvig 1977: 84–132.
Van Dijk, Teun A., ed.
  1985 *Discourse and Literature* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins).

II. *Texts by Astrid Lindgren Translated into English and Hebrew*

Lindgren, Astrid
  1945 *Pippi Långstrump* (Rabén och Sjögren).
  1950 *Pippi Longstocking*, translated by Florence Lamborn (New York: Viking).
  1956 *Gilgi*, translated by Aviva Hayim [Viveka Heyman], edited by Ezra Ha-
    Menaxem (Tel Aviv: Newman).
  1953 *Kalle Blomkvist och Rasmus* (Rabén och Sjögren).
  1965 *Bill Bergson and the White Rose Rescue*, translated by Florence Lamborn (New
    York: Viking).
  1986 *Kalle Blomkvist ve-Rasmus*, translated by Mirjam Schusterman (Tel Aviv:
    Zmora-Bitan).
  1958 *Barnen på Bråkmakargatan* (Rabén och Sjögren).
  1964 *The Children on Troublemaker Street*, translated by Gerry Bothmer (New
    York: Macmillan).
  1987 *Ha-yeladim me-rexov ha-raashanim*, translated by Basmat Even-Zohar (Tel
    Aviv: Massada).
  1963 Emil i Lönneberga (Rabén och Sjögren).
  1970 *Emil in the Soup Tureen*, translated by Lilian Seaton (Leicester: Brock-
    hampton).
  1976 *Yeled u-shmo Emil*, translated by Tamar Salmon (Tel Aviv: Am Oved).
  1973 *Bröderna Lejonhjärta* (Rabén och Sjögren).
  1975 *The Brothers Lionheart*, translated by Joan Tate (New York: Viking).
  1984 *Ha-axim lev-ari*, translated by Hanna Karagiuz; language editor, Yossi
    Eshkol (Tel Aviv: Sifriat Poalim).