

BOOK REVIEWS

- 218** CAWS, MARY ANN. *Surprised in Translation*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2006. Pp. ix+145.

Tim Conley, Brock University

“Surprise” is, etymologically, an instance of borrowing from the French, the language which Mary Ann Caws has been passing through and back for many years now as an accomplished translator and anthologist. The root meaning of “surprise” is “to overtake,” and anyone who has made any significant effort at translation can appreciate Caws’s use of this word in connection with that practice that seems like a schizophrenic struggle for identity and mastery. It is to just such people that *Surprised in Translation* will mean and give most: those of us who perversely enjoy screwing up our brows, trying to come up with a passable French term for the English “lump” (Caws punningly refers to “the truly massive importance” of this word: one failed option for her is *massif*, which “loses the tangible point” [67]) or debating between the clunky “woman of mine” and the too-liberal “my love” for “ma femme” (129).

This is a disarmingly slender and elegant book, a meditation more than a rigorous argument or critique, a loose-legged amble rather than a march. If it seems unwilling to foray into the wilder thickets of theoretical considerations of translation as such, it is also pleasantly free of jargon. It belongs, I think, on the same shelf with Gregory Rabassa’s *If This Be Treason* (2005), and though it is not quite a memoir in the way that Rabassa’s book is, *Surprised in Translation* does provide a similar, yet somewhat indirect overview of a translator’s career. Caws’s touchstone writers (Mallarmé, André Breton, René Char) are here even if, given her long association with the surrealists, the party itself does seem curiously under-represented, only brought into focus

as an afterthought, in the book's last six pages. (A shame, it seems to me: a full-length study could be done on surrealism and translation.) The challenges in translating and those in the translations of Virginia Woolf, Ezra Pound, and Yves Bonnefoy are brought out for careful inspection, author with tuning fork at the ready.

Caws praises "imagination" in translators and translations, a quality all too typically and all too often supposed unnecessary or even dangerous by those who would characterize translators as servile, to be neither seen nor heard. Given her playful introduction about parrots and recent insights into animal perception, it is a little strange that Caws makes no mention of Nabokov, who asked

What is translation? On a platter
A poet's pale and glaring head,
A parrot's screech, a monkey's chatter,
And profanation of the dead.

Nabokov would probably disapprove of almost every translation act in Caws's book (her own and others) for their "smoothness." The most vehement proponent of what we might label "crunchy" translation, Nabokov calls for a nearly deafening sounding of cultural and linguistic difference, full of dissonance, awkwardness, and as many explanatory notes as possible. Such a position is so extreme as to appear, at first blush, irrational, but when Caws writes, "I want to make a claim for the truest translation as *recognition*" (118), she reveals the temptation against which Nabokov firmly sets himself: the temptation to domesticate the foreign, to negate difference in favour of "recognition."

Recognition is, by Althusserian lights, a very charged word, and it seems the very antithesis of *surprise*. In the midst of a very fine analysis of Mallarmé's approach to Tennyson (which includes engrossing discussion of differences of lighting in "Mariana" and of the funereal turn of "le rayon de soleil gisait" from "sunbeam lay" [43]), Caws draws from Michael Rifaterre's 1983 essay, "On the Prose Poem's Formal Features," and makes this general suggestion:

What is triggered by whatever anomaly the reader may sense as a block to understanding in the text is a recognition of some intertext, something read or seen before or after the study of the text and found in the reader's mind. A syllepsis, or a word interpretable in two senses, often gives the clue to this intertext and to the interdependence of the two texts: present and remembered. (38)

"Recognition" here means an identification of that which cannot be identified, a sounding of the alarm at an encounter with the unknown, the other. The claim that I can only "understand" the other if I can identify an analog in my own experience and memory is far from easy to prove and has disturbing ethical implications besides.

Besides this correlation of "recognition" and "truest translation," Caws here and there conversationally drops suggestions as to how she conceives of translation, usually when she compares translations. (One of the odd delights of this book is Caws's compulsion to revise and improve her earlier translations. In some ways this

irresistible gesture says more about her thinking about translation than her critical narrative does, and it conveys in part the spontaneity felt in the process more than any recounting can.) Take the problem of translating *Orlando* into French, for example. Caws openly prefers Charles Mauron's 1974 version to the more recent one by Catherine Pappo-Musard, for, while the latter is "competent but undistinguished," the former conveys "Provençal joy" (74) and displays "a conscious and consciously understood exaggeration" (75). "Consciously understood" by whom? For Caws, the distinguished translator must be a fairly quiet inventor, not afraid to embellish or even omit. An interesting example is found in the translation of Woolf's Austen-like sentence, "Here she took up her lodging and began instantly to look about her for what she had come in search of—that is to say, life and a lover." Caws approves of Mauron's splitting this into two sentences, replacing the em-dash with a colon, and altogether excluding "that is to say" on the understanding that Woolf's wit "resides in the irony of the confidence of our hero/ine," while Pappo-Musard's use of "c'est-à-dire" is judged not to "wear its irony so crucially upon its sleeve" (75). There is also irony in the pedantry of Woolf's phrasing, and one of the trickier negotiations in translation lies in just these sorts of rhetorical throat-clearings and throwaways. Elsewhere in the book, Caws smartly remarks on "how impossible it generally is to render with any conviction an 'Oh! Oh!' or 'O! O!'" (98), a not uncommon crossroads for someone translating from French to English. It is the same kind of culturally ingrained rhetorical puzzle that awaits the English-to-French translator in mannered phrases like "that is to say" and "as it were."

220

"Mauron makes the very best of a difficult situation," Caws appraises, "and that is surely the best ways to judge any translation" (77). Also: "Mauron knows how to have fun and how to share it. This is, I submit, one of the goals of such a translation" (77). Well, it's hard to be against fun, and one cannot decently gainsay what others in difficult situations do...but it must be admitted that these are pretty loose terms. When Caws gives a nod to this or that translator's decision as "perfect," it is not always clear why it is so (perfect for what?). Her appreciation for the "delight in thinking" (73) vibrant in such writers Woolf and Ponge, while estimable and easily shared, might also function as a nascent prejudice, a kind of expectation that can impose a style or manner (see Moncrieff's Proust). There are different kinds of thinking, after all, and different ways to delight in them. The "delight in thinking" that drives Bach is in some ways comparable to that fuelling Cecil Taylor, but if Taylor were to announce that his next project will be to tackle *The Well-Tempered Clavier*, some fans (of Bach and of Taylor) might very well have some reasonable apprehensions, and others palpable enthusiasm.

Literalism is for Caws a "major sin against writing that flows" (you can practically hear the numerous revolutions of subterranean Nabokov) (80). Caws enjoys the restraint of Pound's handling of Rimbaud—perhaps I should say Pound's restraining of Rimbaud—because, as she puts it in the master's style, "for those who cling to exactitude, this ain't exact" (86). It is hard to argue with that, even if one wanted to.

What, I wonder, does Caws make of the more experimental avenues of modernist translation, such as the homophonic *Catullus* of Louis and Celia Zukofsky? My guess is that the lack of “flow” would be grounds for rejection but, again, given Caws’s experience with avant-garde works and disjunctive manifestos, perhaps she would allow abruptness to trump “flow” in some instances.

“Surprise” is poised as a kind of antidote to literalism, but questions protrude like thorns: To what extent is literalism *per se* even possible? *Who* is supposed to be surprised (a question very like that mentioned above of who is to consciously understand exaggeration)? What of the text that is unsurprising by design? When Caws writes that “many of Beckett’s translations are competent, but unsurprising and uneventful” (94), I see neither an awareness of the irony in the statement (complaining that Beckett is “unsurprising and uneventful” is like worrying that Paris Hilton might be a bit on the shallow side) nor the truth of it. Her first example of this mere competency is Beckett’s work on Éluard’s poems—work done when the writer was in his mid-twenties, it ought to be noted—and she cites as a “culmination” his admirable rendering of Apollinaire’s “Zone,” with its brutal ending: “Soleil cou coupé” becomes “Sun corseless head,” a line that in Caws’s view “leaps from the page to strike the same harsh blow that the beheading itself does” (99). Even if, in deference to Caws’s chosen concentration on verse, we overlook the sometimes startling differences found between Beckett’s self-translated plays and novels, we still may ask: what of his role in the translations of *Finnegans Wake* (always surprising and events in themselves), his uncharacteristic contributions to Octavio Paz’s *Anthology of Mexican Poetry*?

221

As “free” a translator as Caws would be judged by Nabokov’s strident standards, she does observe definite prohibitions, however arbitrary they seem. Most cardinal of these is Thou Shalt Not Mess Around with “the essential—which is to say, *conceptual*—shape of the poem, inward as that might be” (20). Of course, simply identifying this curiously extralinguistic and singular “essence” of the work, which Walter Benjamin recognized as that which is to be carried across, might well be itself the most slippery business in translation.

LICHTENSTEIN, SABINE (ED.) *Music’s Obedient Daughter*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014. Pp. 507.

David Menzies, McGill University

An astonishing range and breadth of essays are presented in this text, skillfully curated by Sabine Lichtenstein. The essays contained within hold thought-provoking examinations of the timeless relationship between text and music.

Unique to these seventeen essays is a refreshing emphasis on the treatment of music and text on an equal footing—they all treat opera from a literary perspec-

tive, that is, from a basis on the libretto. The essays demonstrate how many of the greatest works of opera came from this understanding. We are reminded of somewhat tempestuous artistic relationships—beginning with Striggio and Monteverdi, to Mozart and Varesco, to Puccini and Illica and Giacosa. Some composers, such as Pfitzner and Wagner, chose to avoid this struggle and simply wrote their own libretti.

The collection begins with Eddie Vetter's "The Power of Music: Striggio and Montverdi's *L'Orfeo*", presenting the source of the libretto and the treatment of this by both composer and librettist.

Jacques Boogaart's "Octavia Reincarnated: Busenello's and Monteverdi's *L'incoronazione di Poppea*" explains how Monteverdi and Busenello manage the persona of Ottavia, providing an account of the first opera based on an historical character (9).

222 Tim Carter's "In the Operatic Workshop: The Case of Varesco's and Mozart's *Idomeneo*" investigates various mutations of the sources for the text, and presents an outline of librettist and composer collaboration.

Caryl Clark's "The Librettist's Dilemma in London: Badini's and Haydn's *Orfeo ed Euridice*" reflects on the "conditions of possibility" portrayed in Badini's libretto created for Haydn's operatic debut in London (107).

Irmlind Capelle's "*Hans Sachs*—The Relation of Lortzing's Opera to Deinhardtein's Drama" demonstrates the challenges Lortzing faced by introducing new elements within the drama, while attending to the original drama.

Heather Hadlock's "Classical Parody and Burlesque in *Orphée aux Enfers* by Crémieux, Halévy and Offenbach" discusses modern French operetta and the origins of the libretto from the demi-monde of Paris.

John Neubauer's "Burning the Heretics and Saving Don Carlos: Méry's, Du Locle's and Verdi's *Don Carlos*" presents the various sources of the libretto, from Saint-Réal to Schiller and examines how a writer may choose to deviate from historical sources in the advancement of drama (192).

Katherine Syer's "Tracing Wotan's Incendiary Past: The Evolution of Storms and Fire in Wagner's *Der Ring des Nibelungen*" considers the numerous changes that Wagner made to his libretto for the opera, highlighting the "process of reassignment and it's far-reaching impact on the dramaturgy and the music of the *Ring*" (218).

Vincent Giroud's "Manon at the Opera: From Prévost's *Manon Lescaut* to Auber's *Manon Lescaut* and Massenet's *Manon*" provides a study of the various incarnations of the Manon character throughout opera, drawn from Abbé Prévost's original tale.

Kasper van Kooten's "Reflections on the Genesis and Dramaturgy of Illica's, Giacosa's and Puccini's *Madama Butterfly*" focuses on Puccini's divergent views from Illica's and Giacosa's libretto.

Helga Hushahn's "The End of a Line: Strauss' and Hofmannsthal's *Elektra*" presents a complex relationship between a composer and a librettist, one that resulted in one of the most intriguing operas of the twentieth century.

Sabine Lichtenstein does double duty as editor and contributor in her stimulating

essay “Hans Pfitzner’s *Palestrina, Eine Musikalische Legende*”, discussing the “stillness, mysticism and music” contained within this work (326).

Loes Dommering-Van Rongen’s contribution in “The Musical Personality of Don Quixote: Manuel De Falla’s *El Retablo de Maese Pedro*” introduces the genre of puppet opera and the textual influences commencing with the original Cervantes source.

Michal Grover-Friedlander’s essay “Transformations of the Killing of a Boy: Weill’s and Brecht’s *Der Jasager*” examines the various mutations of the libretto, originating from a Japanese tale, and outlines the transformations this story takes over time.

Ruth HaCohen’s “A Theological Midrash in Search of Operatic Action: *Moses and Aron* by Arnold Schoenberg” presents a work that revolves around family conflict and the clash between “theology and poetics” (406).

C.C. Barfoot’s “The Making of a Victim: From Crabbe’s *The Borough* to Slater’s and Britten’s *Peter Grimes*” deftly explains the genesis of this masterpiece of the twentieth century, from libretto to score.

Claudia di Luzio’s “Opera on Opera: Luciano Berio’s *Opera*” introduces us to an unconventional “meta-opera” focusing on Berio’s new look at text and music through the juxtaposition of different sources.

223

Lichtenstein’s collection of essays accomplishes the hope of what the book could become: “a contribution to our increasing insight into the special function of a libretto and into the troublesome task of the librettist” (9).

McMASTER, JULIET, ET AL. (EDS.). *Crossing Canada, 1907: The Diary of Hope Hook*. Sydney: Juvenilia P, 2011. Pp. xx+49.

Kathryn Carter, Wilfrid Laurier University, Brantford

Diary writing emphasizes its movement through time. By necessity, diary writing meanders through a narrative with an uncertain plot line, iterated in daily snapshots. Diarists don’t know how the story is going to turn out. This is the great quirk and the great hook of diary writing: it can give diaries a sense of momentum. Diary writers are often compelled by the possibility of discovery. However, that sense of movement, of travel, of discovery—whether it be in time or in space—can sometimes seem disconnected from later readers who have the fact of the finished text before them. One of the difficulties about reading diaries then, according to Philippe Lejeune, is that readers are cut off from the original momentum which now seems “complete and immobile.” Lejeune describes the process of reading 19th-century diaries by young girls, for example, and laments that he was “the only one moving in relation to them by discovering them” (321). Editing diaries also often serves to deaden the effect of discovering and reading a manuscript.

When Juliet McMaster and co-editors considered the travel diary of young Hope

Hook, written in the early twentieth century, they faced a set of challenges: could readers join diarists in a mutual process of discovery? How should they edit and present manuscript diaries so that their kinetic movement through time and space is recreated on the published page? Is it possible? Is it even more important to retain the sense of movement and discovery in a travel diary? What McMaster and her co-editors managed to achieve in this slim and handsome volume is worth noting for future diary editors hoping to restore the sense of discovery that can animate diary writing and reading.

224 Juliet McMaster, professor emeritus at the University of Alberta best known for her work on eighteenth-century writers, actually remembers Hope at the end of her life, in her seventies, living on Vancouver Island (xi). When Hope Hook writes her diary, she is fifteen years old and at the start of a life that will take her through two world wars and a depression before ending in 1979 when she is eighty-seven. Her young age at the time of writing is significant. For one thing, Hope's diary refutes the notion that late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century diaries by young girls "are a recreational activity, like stitching or playing the piano: meek, sickly sentimental, and boring" (Lejeune 133). Certainly, Hope keeps her diary as a recreation and a past time, but her intelligence shimmers on each page: she is interested in life, curious about a great number of things, a great relater of anecdotes. Her young age is significant for another reason too. As Perry Nodelman explains in an editorial for the journal *Canadian Children's Literature*, too often we examine writing by adults about children and all too rarely examine the kinds of literature "actually written by young people" (12). The publisher of this text, Juvenilia Press, represents a rare outlet where the writings of children and young adults can find publication.

The Hook family archives, the source of this diary, have been the source of other treasures. For example, McMaster published in 2006 the diary of Rosalie Hook, the artist wife of the renowned painter James Clarke Hook. Hope Hook is Rosalie's granddaughter, and Juliet McMaster herself is the daughter of Hope's cousin. The connection between the two women is helpfully illustrated in family trees included in both published works, and Hope's birth is mentioned in her grandmother's later Silverbeck diaries in a simple entry reading "August 25, Born Hope Hook—" (179). The diary now published as *Crossing Canada* is written in 1907 when fifteen-year-old Hope undertakes a voyage from the south of England to western Canada, traversing the prairie by train and making it as far as Vancouver Island. McMaster is the first to note that neither the diary of the grandmother nor of fourteen-year-old Hope Hook and her travels across Canada would have been preserved had her grandfather not been a well-known artist. Family connections and the family archive add much to the story here. Considering how rich Hope's published diary is because of these additional connections and archives, McMaster is right to refuse an apology: "Although family members are often considered suspect as editors or biographers, I am proud to avow my relationship because it is only for that reason that I have access to Hope Hook's diary and (through the generosity of her descendants) permission to publish

it and to dig among other archives of family history” (xi). Unapologetically then, McMaster adds to the text.

The more you try to “explain” the events in a diary, the less interesting they become because immediacy is one of the chief charms of the format. As a result, diary editors struggle between explaining too little and too much. McMaster and co-editors seem to have some answers. I first noticed the editorial lightness of hand that made Rosalie Hook’s diary an enjoyable read. In Hope Hook’s published diary, the editors array visuals to accompany the text on nearly every page. There are reprinted examples of the work by Hope’s father, Allan J. Hook, and her grandfather James; there is a facsimile of a page from Hope’s diary; there are beautifully rendered drawings of bugs from the diary of Duncan Hook (1910); there are reproductions of postcards available at the time, along with art produced more recently by Hope’s grandson Sam Jackson, along with maps and plates from illustrated books of the time. These visual additions not only help to “explain” the content of the travel diary, but they cause the eye to wander. They interrupt the linear reading experience so that the process begins to seem more like sifting through an archive or contemplating a scrapbook.

225

Readers are also offered a variety of textual additions. These range from descriptions of the places Hope visits (like Revelstoke and Lake Shuswap), to descriptions of the flora and fauna encountered, to explanations of the cast of characters (like Uncle Bry). The way these are arranged on the page make the “footnotes” into a running side bar that retain as much visual space on the page as the diary itself. Again this causes the reader’s eye to wander, encouraging a kind of reading that is a visual exploration. Another perspective on Hope’s travels is added by Rudyard Kipling, in a letter discovered by biographer Peter Alexander and excerpted at the beginning of the diary. Kipling, coincidentally aboard a ship at sea only one month after Hook set sail, tells of wireless radio messages going back and forth between his vessel and the *Tunisian* which had so recently carried Hope and her family. In total, these examples of intertextuality, along with the additional documents, family narratives, and visuals that surround and penetrate the text contribute to a published text that keeps its sense of momentum and discovery.

The editors of this diary have been able to coax an intimate portrait of Hope Hook from the slender volume she left of her teenage travels. McMaster and her co-editors should be lauded for finding an editorial pathway that is at once instructive, illuminating, and engaging. Hope Hook’s manuscript has been transformed into a handsome and charming testament of what can be done with a young girl’s diary.

WORKS CITED

- Lejeune, Philippe. *On Diary*. Eds. Jeremy D. Popkin and Julie Rak. Trans. Katherine Durnin. Manoa: Biographical Research Centre, U of Hawai’i, Manoa, 2009. Print.

Nodelman, Perry. "Editorial: Toy and Dress Porn." *Canadian Children's Literature* 32.2 (Fall 2006): 1-13. Print.

SPARGO, R. CLIFTON, AND ROBERT M. EHRENREICH (EDS.). *After Representation?: The Holocaust, Literature, and Culture*. New Brunswick, NJ, and London: Rutgers UP, 2010.

Sarah Shewchuk, University of Alberta

226 *After Representation?*, which deals with many familiar areas of Holocaust Studies, including memory, trauma, and the limitations of language, was inspired by a 2001 Symposium on Literature and the Holocaust organized by the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies (ix, x). Edited by Clifton S. Spargo, an Associate Professor of English at Marquette University, and Robert M. Ehrenreich, the Director of University Programs at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, the book is a collection of eleven essays in which the authors explore how the aforementioned ideas contribute to the "contemporary state of the field" (x). As Spargo notes in the Introduction, "On the Cultural Continuities of Literary Representation," in each of the text's three sections, the authors "examine how writers—whether they write as witnesses to the Holocaust or at an imaginative distance from it—articulate the shadowy borderline between fact and fiction, between event and expression, between the condition of bare life endured in atrocity and the hope of a meaningful existence" (3-4). As such, when read together, the articles in these sections draw attention to the ways in which historical representation is "culturally mediated" and to the complex relationship between writing, history, and ethics (7).

The first section of *After Representation*, "Is the Holocaust Still to be Written?" consists of four articles, "The Holocaust, History Writing, and the Role of Fiction" by Geoffrey Hartman, "Nostalgia and the Holocaust" by Sara R. Horowitz, "Death in Language: From Mado's Mourning to the Act of Writing" by Petra Schweitzer, and "Oskar Rosenfeld and Historiographic Realism (including Sex, Shit, and Status)" by Berel Lang. In each of these essays, Spargo notes that the authors examine the "competing imperatives operative in Holocaust writing—the pull between a language of radical discontinuity (e.g., the trauma as persistent interruption) and a language that supposes the necessity of continuity (drawing upon tradition, nostalgic memory, and the resources of communal identity)" (x-xi). Hartmann evaluates many of the tensions implicit in the relationship between fiction and history, and the role of writing within this construct, while Horowitz focuses on Eva Hoffmann's *Lost in Translation: Life in a New Language* and the work of Marianne Hirsch and Leo Spitzer in order to introduce the layers of nostalgia in post-Holocaust family relationships, identity con-

struction, and the search for home (33, 36, 41, 47, 45, 53, 50, 52). Within the context of trauma theory, Schweitzer examines Charlotte Delbo's treatment of the story of Mado, an inmate who perished in Auschwitz-Birkenau, and, drawing on the work of Hayden White, Lang explores Rosenfeld's "ghetto writing," and assesses the limitations of realism by examining what Rosenfeld included and excluded from his text (59, 75, 76, 83). By examining how Holocaust writing operates in different cultural contexts and time periods, these four authors explore the ways in which writing has been used to record, reconstruct, and re-imagine the past, while drawing attention to the ambiguities of language, the constraints of genres, and the silences imposed by trauma and the passage of time.

Section two, "A Question for Aesthetics?" contains three articles, "Nazi Aesthetics in Historical Context" by James E. Young, "Writing Ruins: The Anachronistic Aesthetics of André Schwarz-Bart" by Michael Rothberg, and "'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem': The Poetry of Forgetful Memory in Israel and Palestine" by Michael Bernard-Donals. In these essays, the authors assess "how important the medium of textual witness or imaginative documentation is to what it conveys" (xi). Young explores the relationship between power and visual representation through his examination of various forums for Nazi aesthetics, from political rallies to *The Triumph of the Will*, and, in his comparative examination of Schwarz-Bart's *A Woman Named Solitude* and *The Last of the Just*, Rothberg explores "the commonalities and divergences of Holocaust and postcolonial literature" (97, 94, 91, 99). Finally, Bernard-Donals compares Yehuda Amichai's *Open Closed Open* and Mahmoud Darwish's *Memory of Forgetfulness* in order to examine the experience of exile and loss in Israeli and Palestinian contexts (121, 122). In this section, the juxtaposition of the visual aesthetics in Nazi Germany and Adolf Hitler's artistic aspirations, Schwarz-Bart's representation of the Holocaust and postcolonial history after losing his family in the Holocaust, and the relationship between Amichai, who left Germany for Palestine in 1935, and Darwish, who was born in Palestine and left for Lebanon in 1948, reveals the connection between life experiences and aesthetic choices (96, 99, 121, 122). By examining the relationship between form and content in the visual arts, the novel, and poetry, and the role of aesthetics during and after the war, the authors of these essays consider how existing Holocaust scholarship can be applied to the study of different media in different cultural contexts.

The third section, "How Does Culture Influence Memory?" is made up of four articles, "The Holocaust and the Economy of Memory, from Bellow to Morrison (The Technique of Figurative Allegory)" by R. Clifton Spargo, "'And in the Distance You Hear Music, a Band Playing': Reflections on Chaos and Order in Literature and Testimony" by Sidney Bolkosky, "Reading *Heart of Darkness* after the Holocaust" by Robert Eaglestone, and "Theorizing the Perpetrator in Bernhard Schlink's *The Reader* and Martin Amis's *Time's Arrow*" by Erin McGlothlin. Here, the authors explore how "techniques of memory or popular cultural representations of the Holocaust alter or shape how we remember of the events that culturally constitute it" (xi). Spargo

examines issues of memory in Saul Bellow's *The Victim* and Toni Morrison's *Beloved* in order to evaluate modes of approaching historical "injustice" through a comparative lens, Bolkosky focuses on elements of fragmentation and disorder in Holocaust testimony and literature, drawing predominantly on a case study of the testimony of Abe P, Eaglestone uses *Heart of Darkness* and Conrad's own experience in the Congo to evaluate the complexities of reading after Holocaust and of using the theoretical paradigms that have been developed in Holocaust Studies in order to examine the representation of other genocides, and, in the final article in the collection, McGlothlin addresses what she identifies as the traditional lack of scholarship on perpetrator narratives by providing a comparative analysis of the representation of perpetrators in *The Reader* and *Time's Arrow* (140, 179, 190, 191, 213, 214). By situating Holocaust scholarship within the context of other atrocities and genocides, and within the context of perpetrator narratives, these four authors assess the ways in which the Holocaust is understood in different national contexts, at different points in time, and from different perspectives (xi).

228

After Representation? is an interesting collection both in terms of the individual questions the authors raise and the ways in which they address the history of Holocaust scholarship and future directions for the field. The articles in this collection are well chosen and benefit from being read in conjunction with each other. While they vary significantly in style and length, the comparisons that the authors undertake, and the thematic continuities between the three sections, particularly discourses of remembering, writing, and reading after the Holocaust, issues of colonial and postcoloniality, and themes of perpetrator aesthetics and experiences, enable the reader to reflect upon the ways in which foundational ideas can be applied in new contexts, while drawing attention to the limitations of these applications. Building on key issues in Holocaust Studies, the eleven authors whose work is included in *After Representation?* explore new ways of addressing familiar questions and challenge the reader to undertake new ways of thinking about the past.

LADOUCEUR, LOUISE. *Dramatic License: Translating Theatre from One Official Language to the Other in Canada*. Trans. Richard Lebeau. Edmonton: U of Alberta P, 2013. Pp. xx+279.

Moira Day, University of Saskatchewan

What drives the need to translate in a colonial culture like Canada? In this English translation of her 2005 award-winning book on Francophone-Anglophone theatre translation in Canada, Ladouceur quotes D. J. Jones in suggesting that translation addresses an identity problem shared by anglophones and francophones alike: "how to live and write...when your existence first in the eyes of others, finally in your own,

is an illusion.” We translate “so that we may exist, so that our particular identity may be recognized and reinforced in each other’s eyes (4).” Little wonder then, as indicated by Ladouceur, that the rapid proliferation of literary and theatrical translation in Canada corresponded to the rapid rise of nationalism and an indigenous professional theatre in both Québec and English Canada after World War II. In contrast to the entire period before 1960, which saw only fifty-one literary translations total, mostly of novels and poetry, the fifteen years between 1960 and 1975, saw 458 covering all genres including drama (2-3).

Nonetheless, Ladouceur warns, the popular view of translation as a bridge between solitudes needs to be interrogated rigorously, especially when one of the two communities perceives itself as perpetually under siege. The same bridges that allow for cultural and economic trade, expansion and cross-pollination can also be conduits for invasion, appropriation and contamination. “As a source of power and resistance,” Ladouceur writes, “translation informs what it represents as much as it is informed by the circumstances in which it takes place” (206). As such, it is an enormously dynamic and ever-shifting site of “struggle between the languages and cultures that it brings into contact” (206).

229

Ladouceur develops her thesis on a number of fronts. While the first two chapters provide a valuable overview of Canadian and Québec literature and drama in translation from the 1890s through to the 1990s, the real meat of the study lies in its central three chapters: *Translating for the Stage*, *The French Repertoire Translated Into English*, and *The English Repertoire Translated into French*.

One particularly appreciates Ladouceur’s erudite but accessible chapter on the enormously complex dynamics of translation in general, and theatrical translation in particular. To the extent that national expressions of culture are embedded in orality and physicality as well as language, theatre is enormously powerful because of its immediacy, and its ability to work across an enormously complex sign and communication system in a very intense and compact way in live performance. But its very strengths also tend to make theatrical translation more volatile, unpredictable and ephemeral than much literary translation. As Ladouceur indicates, only a fragment of the translations done for theatre production ever become published texts.

Ladouceur then applies these principles to French plays translated into English. While the breadth of work and playwrights covered is impressive, Ladouceur understandably focuses much of her analysis on Michel Tremblay, offering some intriguing insights into his “universal” appeal to an English-Canada then hungry to establish its own canon of national playwrights. She suggests that the tendency of the published texts to undersell the translator’s role in the process actually encouraged anglophone audiences to assume that the translations simply held up the mirror of Nature to the original texts, and that the latter succeeded (or failed) for much the same reasons they had with francophone audiences. Through her careful analysis of the original *Les Belles Soeurs* and two English translations, Ladouceur argues that to the contrary, anglophone critics and audiences, often failing to understand the

extent to which the texts had been mediated in translation, frequently missed not only the complex political dimensions of the original language, but the extent to which they were experiencing a more eccentric, exoticized Québec than Tremblay's original. The difficulties of steering between faithfulness to the text and accessibility to the target audience is even more poignantly demonstrated in the case of feminist playwright Jovette Marchessault. On one hand, male translators were sometimes accused of insensitivity to the nuances of her consciously feminist use of language. Yet paradoxically, translations that tried to remain true to the poetry of the original text often failed in production, especially when disastrously paired with naturalistic English-Canadian acting. (Anglophone audiences and critics, assured that this was a faithful translation of the original, often left convinced that Québec playwrights were naturally more verbose, rhetorical, and cryptic than their anglophone counterparts.)

230 The other side of that, Ladouceur notes in her next chapter, was Québec's tendency to dismiss much of the early English-Canadian canon—with rare exceptions like John Herbert's *Fortune and Men's Eyes*, and George Ryga's *Ecstasy of Rita Joe*—as boringly naturalistic and derivative of better English and American plays. However, as Ladouceur suggests, Québec, with its sharper awareness of being a colonized nation within a colonized nation, was generally more cautious about what bridges it built, and what fare it was willing to allow into its territory. Later playwrights like David Freeman, Brad Fraser, Judith Thompson, Norm Foster, and George F. Walker—whose Toronto's East End has been compared to Tremblay's the Main—may have fared better. But even here, Ladouceur suggests, especially in the 1980s and 90s, the line between translation and adaptation could become very thin. If English translations tended to keep the scripts' original Québec setting in a somewhat exoticized form, French translations tended to translate not just the language of the play but its entire milieu into an anagram of Québec local culture, or alternatively, a neutral zone, vague enough for the action to happen anywhere including Montréal.

With the passing of the "nationalist" era in both English and French Canada, Ladouceur notes, translations became less "Gallicized" on the English side and less transposed into Québécois on the French side. Plays tended to be chosen and translated more for their striking theatricality than their social, political, or economic relevance to the manifest destiny of English-Canadian or Québec nationhood. In discussing groups that bypass language altogether in favor of imagistic and physical theatre, Ladouceur discusses Carbone 14, but makes surprisingly little mention of the (by now) better known Cirque du Soleil and Robert Lepage. But that may be an indication of just how much has changed again in the eight years since the book was published.

The fact that one wishes Ladouceur had been able to expand further is the greatest testament to the job she actually has done here in exploring her initial paradox: that of two cultures compelled to see each other in order to better see themselves—and yet, through the medium of translation, always fated to view the other "through a mirror but darkly" rather than face to face.

FESTIĆ, FATIMA. *The Body of the Postmodernist Narrator: Between Violence and Artistry*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009. Pp. vi+225.

Leena Kurvet-Käosaar, University of Tartu and Estonian Literary Museum

This is a curiously timely work, despite (or perhaps because of) being written more than a decade ago, in 1998, originally in Bosnian-Croatian and much later translated into English by the author herself. Referred to as “a small document-testimony to the last decade of the 20th century,” it offers, via an in-depth analysis of postmodern narrating, a novel look at postmodernism. Widely enough used (and misused and abused) paradigm or concept that may or may not have by now exhausted itself, postmodernism gains a different voice and weight in Fatima Festic’s consideration. Starting from Habermas’ claim about Holocaust as the marker of the end of modernism, Festic’s definition of postmodernism ties this concept to violence, murder and destruction, to “dark forces of desire and the repercussions of their externalization in the reality of life” (1). Based on the insights of psychoanalysis from Freud to Lacan to Žižek along with interpretations by Kristeva and Felman, *The Body of the Postmodernist Narrator* seeks to highlight the physio-biological element behind the self-referential impasse of (postmodern) literature via a tracing of the circulation of desires into narrative exchange, desires that can be seen as the products of the “drive to acquire knowledge” (3).

231

The novels to which interpretation, defined in *The Body of the Postmodernist Narrator* as a site for finding and elaborating opposition to “Lyotard’s...irreducible difference” between “one’s fiction and the piles of corpses” (196), is offered here—Christa Wolf’s *Cassandra* (1984), John Maxwell Coetzee’s *Foe* (1986), Salman Rushdie’s *Shame* (1987) and D. M. Thomas’s *The White Hotel* (1981)—are all canonical postmodernist novels. At the same time, they also occupy a variety of different borderlines that make them, in a sense, also marginal in postmodernism though not marginal for postmodernism. In her analysis of the novels, Festic employs a number of different theoretical foci (an emphasis on the interrelationship of visibility, consciousness and narration, the symbolic and representation and the referent and reference) that are all self-consciously and elaborately, indeed minutely, laid out for the reader. The basis of selection of the novels and, even more importantly, the frameworks of interpretation of Festic make her work an important statement not only on postmodernism but also on the state of comparative literature. At the same time, it also prompts the question of whether and in which manner the tendencies identified in the four novels are present in the world literature (a term that has recently regained popularity in the field of comparative literature) of the new millennium and if such presence would point toward continuity of (certain characteristics) of postmodernism or if the tendencies themselves may go, in fact, beyond the paradigm

of postmodernism.

A few years after *The Body of the Postmodernist Narrator* was completed, Gayatri Spivak's well-known statement on the situation of comparative literature, *Death of a Discipline* (2003), was published. It emphasized not only the need to recognize the state of crisis of the discipline but also envisioned new routes for it to take, routes that would yield a "responsible comparativism" that, when practiced thoroughly and with utter dedication may "come close to the irreducible work of translation...from body to ethical semiosis, that incessant shuttle that is a 'life'" (Spivak 12-13). What is practiced in *The Body of the Postmodernist Narrator* is, similarly, a "responsible comparativism" that, via investigating "the split inherent in subject, agent and author" seeks to bring back to (postmodern) literature "the dimension of maturing and of (accepting) difference that today equals life itself" (Festić 4-5).

In different manner, each of the novels that form the interpretational nexus of Festić's book deals with the question of history, violence, and trauma. The analysis of **232** *Cassandra* foregrounds a re-writing of the myth of the Trojan War and the process of finding the alternative of living between killing and dying; the analysis of *Foe* posits the emergence of "the insular story of Susan Barton" (121) against male-centered colonial narrations and the coming to the fore, via Friday, of "the stream of life" (124) as ultimately the only functioning mode of communication. The analysis of *Shame* explores the "unwritten, unhistorical core of history" and its relation to the imprint of religion, law, state and body" (128) and the analysis of *The White Hotel* focuses on issues of techniques of representation and "the historical phantasm of the Holocaust" (161). Taken together, different foci of interpretation reveal both the violent core of postmodernist art and the postmodern condition and, ultimately, ways of overcoming it by establishing the "lost relation between the I and the other" via a complex process of the repetition of "trauma of the other through one's own" that, if it is to be able to work against the grain of the apocalyptic perspective of literature, entails "a change in consciousness in our repetition of the event" (195).

At times when debates over the nature and implications of trauma studies continuously occupy an important position in critical theory, this insightful perspective on trauma, echoing of words written in Festić's native Bosnian-Croatian more than ten years ago and of the destruction and desperation of war greatly responsible for the author's "nomadic life-style" that took her to nine universities "in five countries and three continents" (189) constitutes a powerful ethically balanced stance. The author's own very real background of trauma the reader can only glimpse via a dedicatory note to an unknown dead girl in the foreword and in the epilogue via the "topography of war" (189) that the author sketches on the sand of a beach in California as a preparation for a lecture she was going to write. One the one hand, it is this discreetness (it seems inappropriate to even highlight it) and, on the other, the utter minute dedication to interpretation that call into being the space of betweenness on multiple levels that constitutes a possibility, elaborated in *The Body of the Postmodernist Narrator* with painful convincingness, of hope.

PEACOCK, STEVEN (ED.). *Stieg Larsson's Millennium Trilogy: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Nordic Noir on Page and Screen*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. Pp. xi+172.

Annemette Hejlsted, University of Iceland

The Swedish author Stieg Larsson's *Millennium Trilogy* was, with no comparison, the most successful Scandinavian piece of crime fiction of the first decade of the twenty-first century. The trilogy, which includes *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* (*Män som hatar kvinnor*) from 2005, *The Girl Who Played with Fire* (*Flickan som lekte med elden*) from 2006, and *The Girl Who Kicked the Hornets' Nest* (*Luftslottet som sprängdes*) from 2007, was adapted into film and TV-series by Niels Arden Oplev and Daniel Alfredsson a few years after the first book's release, and in 2008 the first book was translated into English.

Steven Peacock's book deals with the trilogy in its written, filmed, and televised versions. The book is an anthology made as an outcome of a symposium on Stieg Larsson's *Millennium Trilogy* at the University of Hertfordshire in 2011. The symposium entitled 'Dragons, Fire, Hornets' was interdisciplinary, and made an encounter between various fields such as criminology, sociology, gender studies, journalism, and new media studies, for example (3). From the readers point of view the books presents a wide range of completely different views on the phenomenon of Stieg Larsson's *Millennium Trilogy*. Going through the book from the beginning to the end, the reader initially is offered an introduction by the editor, which is opened by a bravura description and analysis of the title sequence of David Fincher's film *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* from 2011. After the thrilling prelude follows more traditional statements about the background, focus, and structure of the book. At this point, I miss some general considerations on methodology in the interdisciplinary studies performed in the book. This lack makes it difficult to comprehend why the fictionality of the location Hedeby (in the Swedish version) and Hedestadt (in the US version) in *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* is stressed in Sarah Niblock's analysis of "Journalism and Compassion"; meanwhile, Sarah E.H. Moore, in her study of the courtroom proceedings in *The Girl Who Kicked the Hornets' Nest*, concludes that the novel shows something about the real world by writing: "Reading *The Girl Who Kicked the Hornets' Nest* reveals how important it is for a defendant to be able to provide a full account of her life-experience" (145).

The articles following the introduction draw a multi-faceted picture of Stieg Larsson's *Millennium Trilogy* and place it in the most important contexts. Some of the articles make valuable close reading points. For example, Heather O'Donoghue shows, through a brilliant analysis of the genre in the trilogy, how the work transforms itself from detective story into a thriller that turns into an espionage novel. Sarah Casey Benyahia investigates the significance and functions of cyberspace in the Swedish film trilogy, and Sarah Niblock cross-examines the male protagonist

in the light of his profession as journalist and the female protagonist as researcher. Other articles make overviews, for example, of the Scandinavian and Swedish crime fiction and place the *Millennium Trilogy* in that context (Barry Forshaw), and the global, commercial destiny of Larsson's work (Steven Peacock).

The book is closed by two "Interview Transcripts" of, respectively, the producers Yellow Bird Productions (Mikael Wallén and Erik Hultkvist) on the distribution of the Wallander (film and TV-series) and Larsson products, and the Swedish crime writer Johan Theorin on Scandinavian crime fiction. The two interviews seem to be important sources for the knowledge of both the distribution of Scandinavian crime fiction and Scandinavian crime fiction. From my point of view, the interviews are completely superfluous. The interviewees have too great of interests in the picture that is made of Scandinavian crime fiction to be trustworthy sources. Also, the index is superfluous. Due to the fact that a lot of important persons mentioned in the book are missing, it is close to completely useless.

234 Steven Peacock's book on the phenomenon of Larsson has, I think, much to provide for the reader. The book contains many thrilling analytical points. Some of the points of view from which the phenomenon of Larsson is studied are more than just interesting; they are enlightening. Furthermore, the book communicates many facts about the phenomenon of Larsson and places Larsson's fiction and its different adaptations into other media into traditional as well as renewing contexts, such as Scandinavian crime fiction and courtroom proceedings.

Though Peacock's book is inspiring in many ways, there are some points that make me annoyed. Although the Danish TV-series *Forbrydelsen* (*The Killing*) is analysed in one of the articles and other Danish works of crime fiction are mentioned, the book as a whole makes Scandinavian crime fiction identical with Swedish crime fiction. Also, Norwegian and Danish novelists take part in Scandinavian crime fiction; as well, Denmark and Norway take part in the Scandinavian model of welfare. In extension, one could question why the Scandinavian context of feminist crime fiction is missing. The controversies about the relevance and quality of feminist crime were on stage when Stieg Larsson wrote his trilogy. The influence seems obvious when analysing the main female character, Lisbeth Salander.

In conclusion, I can recommend Steven Peacock's book on Stieg Larsson's *Millennium Trilogy* under the reservation that the book is weak when methodologies are in question. Despite the weaknesses, the book deserves to be read for its innovative points of view from which the phenomenon of Stieg Larsson is studied.