Gideon Toury

Hebrew tradition

Hebrew is a member of the north-western branch of the Semitic family of languages. It started as one of many Canaanite dialects, but its beginnings as a language in its own right can be identified with the adoption of that dialect by the Israelites who settled in the Land of Israel in *c.*1000 BC and who continued to use it during their periods of national independence (*c.*1000 BC-587 BC and 517 BC-AD 70). Outside those periods of national independence, spoken Hebrew was replaced, first by Aramaic and Greek, then - when the Jews were forced to leave their land - by the various languages amongst whose speakers they settled. At the same time, wherever Jewish identity was not lost, Hebrew continued to be used as the language of religious rites and retained the prestige that goes with its status as the 'Holy Tongue', this being a mixture of Hebrew and Aramaic. It also continued to be used in a limited range of written functions. All later uses of the language were thus closely related to Jewish life and culture. Contact with other languages resulted in constant changes to its original form, including some of its most fundamental traits, especially as more and more of the languages in question were non-Semitic.

Like the use of the language itself, translation into Hebrew is characterized by inherent discontinuity: its history is marked by a series of new beginnings, each one charting a set of new routes, to be followed for a limited period of time before being abandoned for yet another set. And since the centres of Jewish culture shifted continually, a new beginning normally coincided with a territorial shift. It is fair to say,

however, that this description applies first and foremost to Western traditions; our knowledge of translational behaviour in other parts of the Jewish Diaspora is still too scanty to support a reliable account of non-Western traditions.

Translation during antiquity

The Hebrew Bible includes clear references to translation, including liaison interpreting (e.g. Genesis 42: 23). Also, several passages reveal traces of actual translation (e.g. Ezra 1: 7-8 in Hebrew vs. Ezra 5: 14 or 6: 5 in Aramaic). On the evidence of, among other things, the interference of other, often easily identifiable languages and textual traditions, it seems reasonable to suggest that quite a number of passages in the Old Testament may have been translated from other sources. However, there is very little one can say about these passages as translations due to the absence of any concrete texts which might have been taken as their immediate sources.

There can be no doubt that some translation into Hebrew took place during the early phases of the post-biblical period. However, the actual texts that have come down to us are mainly confined to biblical verses quoted in Mishnaic texts and translated, as part of their interpretative treatment, into the new brand of Hebrew which was in use at the time (Bendavid 1967 and 1971). Later on, in the Land of Israel as well as in neighbouring countries where the Jews had settled (most notably Egypt), translation started to be carried out *from* Hebrew, mainly into Aramaic and Greek - first orally, then in writing. The main objective of this translational effort was to render the Scriptures accessible to the less learned so as to enable them to follow the services (See TORAH TRANSLATION). Mishnaic literature also contains many important observations on the

nature of translation and the proper ways in which it should be performed, as well as on the

(in principle inferior) status of translating, translators and translated texts in the Jewish culture of the time.

In the post-Mishnaic history of Jewish culture, where Hebrew was retained as a privileged language but other languages were used for most communicative purposes,there were two periods/territories wheretranslation into the Holy Tongue enjoyed a special status, both quantitatively and qualitatively; these were south-western Europe of the Middle Ages and certain parts of Central and Eastern Europe during the Enlightenment and Revival periods. In both cases, not only did translations account for a large percentage of all texts produced, but certain cultural and textual 'slots' were filled mainly, sometimes exclusively, by translations. In some instances, as in the case of the medieval *maqâmât* and modern fables, translating served as a means of experimenting with, and later introducing in original composition, text types which were hitherto unknown in Hebrew.

The Middle Ages

Following a long interval, translation into Hebrew resumed in medieval Europe and was in full swing by the end of the twelfth century. Most of the texts translated were now 'works of wisdom', i.e. scientific texts.

Many of the scholarly works first selected for translation were treatises in Arabic on Jewish law (*Halakha*) and ethics (*Musar*) written by Jews in Muslim Spain or North Africa. No need for translation had arisen

when the Jewish readers lived in areas where Arabic was a shared literary language. However, by the twelfth century, Jewish families had already moved to Christian territories, most notably in southern France and northern Italy, and their descendants were unable to read Arabic. Interest in the achievements of Jewish scholarship remained strong, and a pressing need to have the texts translated therefore emerged. Hebrew, which was in use as a privileged literary language, became the target language partly because Jews living in different places no longer shared any other means of communication. A recurrent pattern, even though not an exclusive one, was thus to have a treatise translated at the request of an interested patron, who merely required the prospective translator to be reasonably fluent in Arabic. There is no explicit mention of remuneration, but it stands to reason that at least some translators received some payment, either from the individual ‘commissioners’ or from the local congregation, in which the commissioners often occupied key positions. Among the most influential translations of Jewish ‘works of wisdom’ completed during this period are Bahya ibn Paquda's *Hovot ha-Levavot* (Duties of the Heart), Maimonides' *Moreh Nevukhim* (Guide of the Perplexed), and Judah Halevi's *Sefer ha-Kuzari*.

Interest in scholarship soon spread to non-Jewish books and themes, leading to numerous translations into Hebrew of works of philosophy, logic, grammar, astronomy, medicine, physics, and various other medieval sciences. Here, Arabic was often a mediating language only, especially in the case of Greek and Latin, including many of Aristotle's works. Other source languages were later added to the list. The most comprehensive presentation of Hebrew translations in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance period, as well as the role of

Jews as cultural mediators between East and West, is still Steinschneider (1893); most of the texts mentioned throughout this 1077-page volume are still buried in manuscripts.

Although the translation of medieval 'works of beauty' has had much less impact on the Jewish tradition, it was no doubt a lot more common than we have come to think, due to a long tradition of devoting scholarly attention to 'serious' texts only. True, 'literary' translation was considered inherently inferior, at best on the threshold of legitimacy, and Jews indulged in it with some reluctance - whether for personal diversion or in an attempt to fill empty slots in the literary sector of their culture. However, it seems reasonable to assume that many of the texts that did exist at the time simply failed to reach us. Not having been submitted to copying and recopying, like many of the scientific texts, very few of them existed in more than one copy to begin with, and even these copies were soon lost. The number of literary translations which were subsequently considered fit to be printed was even smaller. Finally, when Hebrew medieval texts became an object of scholarly interest within modern

Judaic studies, it was again first and foremost 'scientific' writings which were taken into consideration and (re)printed.

A significant exception to this rule was *Mahbarot Iti'el*, the Hebrew translation by Judah Al-Harizi of Al-Hariri's *maqâmât* in Arabic. Al-Harizi undertook the translation as a preparatory exercise for writing his own collection of *maqâmât*, entitled *Tahkemoni*. Probably as a result of the canonization of the maqâmât in Arabic literature, as well as Al-Harizi's own prestige, *Tahkemoni* came to be held in high esteem in Jewish culture. Other

literary translations which enjoyed considerable prestige and distribution include Abraham ibn Hasdai's *Ben ha-Melekh ve-ha-Nazir* (= *Barlaam and Josaphat*), *Kalila and Dimna*, *Mishle Sendebar* (a version of *The Seven Sages*) and the *Alexander Romance*. The marginalization of medieval literary translations in scholarly work, especially those which did not originate in the East, has lately begun to show signs of weakening, as witness the recent printing of a 1279 Hebrew translation of *King Artus* (Leviant 1969) and the reprinting of a 1541 translation of *Amadis de Gaula* (Malachi 1981).

Many medieval translations were preceded by lengthy introductions, which were overwhelmingly apologetic in tone. This may be explained in terms of the problematic image of translation in traditional Jewish culture, where there was long-standing resistance to translating the Hebrew Scriptures. Medieval Hebrew translators often felt obliged to ask the reader's forgiveness for indulging in the act of translating, especially if the translation was initiated by the translator himself. Many felt obliged to apologize for tackling the particular text they undertook to translate: in the case of ‘works of wisdom’, mainly because of their limited familiarity with the subject-matter, in the case of ‘works of beauty’, the apology reflected widespread apprehension regarding ‘idle talk’. Finally, apologies were sometimes offered for the kind of language used in the translation, whether out of choice or out of necessity. These translators may or may not have had genuine reasons for apologizing to their readership, but their over-indulgence in apologetics should be seen first and foremost as a convention of medieval Hebrew translation.

The introductions also offer important insights into prevailing views of the nature of translation and the proper ways of handling it

under the conditions of the time. Huge gaps existed between theoretical observations and normative pronouncements on the one hand and actual translational behaviour on the other, and the translators themselves were not totally blind to such discrepancies. In practice, many of the problems stemmed from the recurring need to translate from a rich language, which was well suited to the purpose it served, into a language with a rather small repertoire, an inevitable outcome of its having been so long confined to a limited range of uses, and ones that hardly concurred with the nature of the source texts. When the original at hand was written in Arabic, additional problems arose from the family resemblance between the source and target languages, which often led the translators astray.

Generally speaking, medieval translators had two different strategies to choose from, depending to a large extent on the prestige of the text submitted to translation. Translators of 'important' works - mostly scientific texts - usually chose to stay as close as possible to the Arabic wording, replacing small, relatively low-rank segments one at a time, and the resulting text consequently reflected the structure of the original. In an attempt to reduce the gap between the two lexical repertoires, new words were also coined, either through direct borrowing (with a measure of adjustment to the target language) or by way of loan-translation. The Hebrew texts thus abounded in interference at all levels, both deliberate, or at least controlled, and accidental. By contrast, when it came to literary and other less-privileged texts, the translators - sometimes the very same persons - stuck much closer to domestic models, especially those offered by the quasi-biblical language used in Hebrew medieval poetry. The two strategies can be seen most clearly in texts which are both

scholarly and literary in nature, for example *Sefer ha-Kuzari*. These were sometimes translated as if they were pure science and sometimes as if they were basically literature.

In retrospect, the strategy adopted by translators of scientific texts proved truly innovative. Originally a clear case of translationese, the

resulting structures and voc5bulary were gradually assimilated into the language at large. What came to be known as ‘Tibbonid Hebrew’, after the most influential family of medieval translators (see THE TIBBONIDS), crystallized as a variety in its own right: not just a legitimate variety, but one which was considered most appropriate for particular uses. By contrast, the way literary texts were translated had very little impact on Hebrew culture and next to none on the language.

Translation into Hebrew continued in Renaissance Europe too, now mainly in Italy, which became a new centre of multilingual Jewish culture. Interesting as each instance of translation made between the sixteenth and the eighteenth century may be, whether in terns of choice of genre, author, text, or even translation strategy (including variation in the language of translation and the varying modes and extent of ‘Judaizing’ the texts), translation was hardly noticed as a distinct cultural activity during that period. For instance, the inventory of private Jewish libraries in Italy at the close of the Renaissance (Baruchson 1993) shows that owners were keen to collect Hebrew texts but that very few of these were translations. Moreover, unlike the Middle Ages, Hebrew translation during this interim period seems to have lacked any distinct profile. It certainly lagged behind almost anything Jews did in Hebrew, which in itself was no

longer up to European standards anyway. Much of this was bound to change with the next beginning, which was intimately connected with the *Haskala*; the Hebrew Enlightenment movement aimed at bringing Jewish culture closer to the achievements of Central European cultures. The new beginning coincided with yet another territorial shift: the cultural centre moved first to Germany then further to the east. Finally, it also marked the end of interruptions in the evolution of the Hebrew tradition: from now on there would be an almost direct line of development in translation activity leading right up to the present.

The Enlightenment period

Haskala in the middle of the eighteenth century could see that there was virtually no chance of catching up with the civilized world without a major investment in translation. Translating was not only an obvious way of producing texts quickly and in quantity, which is one way of demonstrating the existence of the new culture, but it was also a convenient means of experimenting with anything that was thought worthy of treatment by virtue of its association with an existing culture of high prestige. However, right from the start a distressing tension revealed itself between these recognized needs and the inability of Hebrew to express everything that had been, let alone could have been, formulated in other cultures. It was ideology which was mobilized to alleviate the tension. The solution came from an ingenious reversal of medieval practices, which were still very much in force. Apologetics, which were based on exaggerating deficiencies of translation, were replaced by a conscious effort to highlight the power and versatility of the language, even if this involved using false arguments. As early as

1755-6, a claim was made in the first pre-periodical of the *Haskala* to the effect that whereas 'words of wisdom' were indeed untranslatable, Hebrew could hardly be rivalled when it came to the translation of 'words of beauty', which were soon to become the centre of attention. By constantly asserting the ability of Hebrew to do precisely that which held so many difficulties in store, a favourable climate was created right from the start, and this made it possible to pursue a highly ambitious programme and to achieve many of its goals. This ideological solution was supplemented by another congruent move of far-reaching consequences: linguistic acceptability was posited as a major requirement, to an extreme marginalization of any real wish to reconstruct the features of the source text. The priority thus assigned to complying with me norms of 'pure' Hebrew was to protect the emerging new culture from being submerged under the weight of a huge volume of imported texts.

The model within which a translator, like any writer, was obliged to manoeuvre was in fact much narrower than the sum total of Hebrew resources, because only the language documented in the Old Testament was made available for actual use. The decision to restrict

the language used to the most classical form of Hebrew was ideologically motivated again: it was part of the overall struggle against anything that smacked of the Jewish Orthodoxy of the time. Paradoxically enough, this extreme archaization, which was to govern acceptability during the early *Haskala* period, had an important innovative effect on Hebrew, as the kind of language now made compulsory had for a long time been out of use. The Bible was now regarded both as a source of matrices, to

be filled with new linguistic material, and as a reservoir of actualized forms, to be used as fixed expressions. Long and complex linguistic items came to be regarded as most appropriate *per se*. They were, in a sense, target-language segments in search of source-language items to replace. Long word-chains were often formed by concatenating a series of phrases taken out of their original contexts, and this preferred mode of usage obviously narrowed down the translators' options even further, which might explain the high level of uniformity in the texts produced throughout this period. Very often, texts wer e not identified as translations; at any rate, it was common practice to assign a translated text first and foremost to its translator. The range of activities, strategies and texts associated with translation was thus both broad and highly diffuse, especially as many compositions which did not draw directly on individual foreign texts were still based on imported models.

Given that Hebrew Enlightenment made its début in Germany, it was naturally the local culture which was called upon to act as a supplier of texts and models, especially since mastery of German was another ideal of the *Haskala* itself. However, rather than turning to the model-culture in its contemporary state, the new cultural paradigm usually played it safe by using earlier forms of German as a reference point, selecting items and models which had once attained some canonization. Many of the texts and authors selected for translation had indeed occupied a position near the epicentre of the living German system, but most of them had since been relegated to a more peripheral position or were considered significant from a historical perspective only. For a period of time, inclusion in a German anthology, the kind of source which rarely

reflects current tastes, seems to have been an important criterion for selecting a text for translation, especially since many *Haskala* persons initially came into contact with the German texts through such collections. This time lag explains why no poem of Schiller and Goethe, for example, was translated until the first quarter of the nineteenth century. Both poets later became extremely popular in Hebrew circles and remained so for at least a century, often obstructing the translation of contemporary writers and texts and hence perpetuating time lag and stagnation.

During the first decades of the *Haskala*, translation was largely restricted to short texts or fragments of longer ones, not only because short texts are inherently easier to handle, but also because they are particularly suitable for periodicals and readers, which is where all first translations and many of the subsequent ones were in fact published. This is partly why it took a long time for novels and dramatic texts, and even novellas and short(er) stories, to be selected for translation.

Quite a number of the texts which were translated from German were themselves translations from other languages. Thus, the emerging new Hebrew culture did come into contact with other cultures as well, if only through the mediation of German. The mediating culture naturally adapted the foreign texts and models to its own needs. A culture which gives priority to linguistic acceptability in terms of its own norms and pays little attention to the features of the source text is unlikely to question the adequacy of a mediating text and, indeed, for a very long time proponents of the Hebrew *Haskala* hardly stopped to ponder this point. The overall tolerance for indirect translation - again, quite a while after the German model-culture had come to regard it as no longer appropriate - was reflected in a pro-

liferation of second-hand translations, starting with the very first modern translation into Hebrew, a fragment of Edward Young's *The Complaint, or Night Thoughts on Life, Death and Immortality* undertaken in all likelihood by Moses Mendelssohn (Gilon 1979). Thus, even someone like Mendelssohn, who could have just as easily translated from the English original, adopted the approach favoured by the

proponents of the emerging new literature when operating on its behalf, which was quite different from his own behaviour when he operated as a representative of the German culture (Toury 1988). During the first decades, most indirect translations were of English and French origin, so that many ideas of the French Revolution, for instance, only reached the Hebrew reader in a mediated and mitigated form. Those few translations of non-German texts which were not mediated via German were seldom accepted as an integral part of the new paradigm, partly, at least, because they looked like relics of an earlier historical phase rather than forerunners of a new era.

An interesting example of many of the points made so far is offered by Shakespeare's fate in Hebrew (Almagor 1975): by the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Hebrew cultural milieu had come to regard the Bard, with whom it was acquainted mainly via German, as a major figure of world literature. However, this appreciation in reality amounted to nothing more than paying lip-service to Shakespeare's importance in an attempt to emulate ‘modern’ cultures, and for a long time Shakespeare's position *vis-à-vis* Hebrew literature itself remained marginal. It was not until 1816 that the first known excerpt of a Shakespearean text was published. Before 1874, when the first play (*Othello*) was trans-

lated in its entirety, and from the original, only monologues and other short passages from his tragedies were translated, and every single one is likely to have been mediated. These fragments were normally presented and accepted as instances of poetry. At the same time, no sonnet - the Shakespearean short poem par excellence - was translated until 1916, most probably because Hebrew had had an uninterrupted sonnet tradition of its own and did not need to experiment in this area (Toury 1995: Chapter 6). Most nineteenth-century translations of Shakespeare were made by minor, if not totally obscure figures, and none of them won any fame through these translations. In fact, the translations were mostly published in marginal periodicals, so that the great majority of the few fragments that did appear in print went virtually unnoticed.

No single translation undertaken during the Enlightenment period stands out as instrumental in the evolution of Hebrew culture. However, translation as a mode of generating texts, as well as the cumulative weight of translated products - texts and models alike, had as enormous impact on its course. The most outstanding domain in this respect is no doubt children's literature, the like of which Hebrew had never had and which was modelled almost exclusively on the German example (Shavit 1986, 1992). In spite of the relative brevity of close contact between the two cultures, traces of German influence can still be seen in some areas of Hebrew culture and language to this day.

The Revival period

During the nineteenth century, the cultural centre gradually moved further east, first within the German cultural domain itself and then out of it and into the Slavic region. Subse-

quent generations witnessed frequent changes of attitude and behaviour, but no need was now felt for a brand new beginning. Evolution was now proceeding more evenly and translational norms came closer and closer to those which operated in other Western cultures.

The gradual shift eastwards inevitably brought Hebrew writers into contact with ever new cultures. These contacts had two complementary effects: with the new systems in the background, new gaps were being identified and, at the same time, various options for filling them also presented themselves. Nor were the gaps now confined to the realm of text-type, theme and composition as they had been before. Rather, they manifested themselves on the language plane as well. In view of the new tasks it had to perform, the current form of Hebrew could no longer be regarded as adequate, not even by way of ideologically motivated wishful thinking. It soon became clear that many institutionalized modes of behaviour, including those imported from German a few decades back, could not fulfil the new purposes and had to be replaced. Starting in the 1820s, Russian had gradually become the closest available system, and it was this culture which would now present Hebrew with most of its new challenges and provide most of the options for meeting them. Russian also became the main source of texts

for translation, both original and mediated. Indirect translation was still common, and at least one important literary complex, Scandinavian writing of the end of the century, was imported into Hebrew almost exclusively in a mediated form (Rokem 1982).

The behaviour of Hebrew in relation to Russian during this period, which has come to be known in Hebrew historiography as the

Revival period, involved much more than a simple recognition of the latter's availability. One could say that Hebrew behaved as if the Russian system were part of it, and a dominant part at that. Especially since the 1860s, when the dependency patterns had already been established (Even-Zohar 1990), the new paradigm which took shape gradually replaced the previous one based on German and was to dominate Hebrew culture for many generations, even after the centre had moved out of Russia again. On the face of it, Hebrew purism was still strongly advocated, though no longer on the basis of the Bible alone. However, the underlying model which was applied to both original writing and translation, regardless of source language, was in fact highly Russified. This contributed much to the process of enriching and diversifying the available repertoire. Among other things, it made it possible for the first time to create a kind of simulated spoken language in prose fiction; this became necessary in view of the new kinds of literature which were now being translated, and despite the fact that Hebrew itself had hardly started to be used as a spoken language again. Extending the range of options available to the writer and translator, often one and the same person, made it possible to narrow down the concept of translation and increase the relative weight of dependence on the source text. The borderline between originals and non-originals thus became much clearer, and translations no longer pretended to be original writings, as they did during the German period; if anything, it was now original texts which were largely based on translational models. Interference in the translation of individual texts as well as in the composition of non-translated ones thus played an important role in the very revival of the language.

All these trends were further reinforced by the close contact which now developed between Hebrew and Yiddish, another language used by Jews but regarded throughout the Enlightenment as corrupt German, to be abandoned in favour of Hebrew and pure German. Yiddish, especially in its Eastern variety, was now rapidly becoming a literary language in its own right and was also increasingly being modelled on the Russian example. For a long period, Hebrew and Yiddish behaved as if they were two complementary components of the same culture, a canonized and a non-canonized system, respectively. Later on, Yiddish texts began to be translated into Hebrew, often by the authors themselves, not in order to increase their readership (the potential reader of Hebrew in Eastern Europe could normally read Yiddish anyway), but in a deliberate attempt to enhance their cultural prestige. This process also helped to fill many lacunae which were still felt in the Hebrew system and further reinforced its overall Russification, first and foremost in the literary domain.

Israel

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, with the rise of Zionism and the first waves of Jewish immigration to Palestine, the centre of Hebrew culture started to move back to the ancient homeland. The immigrants had been brought up in the Russified tradition, and the writers and translators among them carried on their activities in the new environment. Consequently, many of the old habits were perpetuated, especially as most of the readership was still in Europe. In the difficult years of World War One, literary translation in particular became an important means of supporting the Jewish intelligentsia, and many elaborate projects were put forward by various

institutions for that purpose. Most of these projects were never realized in full, but their activities nevertheless led to a boom in translation production (Shavit and Shavit 1977).

At the beginning of the twentieth century, a secondary cultural centre was established in the United States by a similar group of immigrants from Eastern Europe. The main importance of this short-lived centre is that it subsequently provided a small number of writers and translators who were well-versed in English and its literature. Many of them

later moved to Palestine, by which time the local scene was ready to absorb them as the language of the British mandate over Palestine (1917-48) had become current in the country. English soon became the main source language in translation, but English texts were still translated in the old fashion, as if they were written in Russian. In the 1930s and 1940s, a struggle for domination ensued between the old Russified models and some new options associated with Anglo-American practices; it was finally settled in favour of the latter.

To be sure, the supremacy of the Palestinian centre was not established until the destruction of Jewish culture (in both Hebrew and Yiddish) had taken place in the Soviet Union and some six million Jews had been murdered by the Nazis. These events resulted in Hebrew culture becoming practically mono-territorial again. By this stage, Hebrew had developed a number of spoken varieties on its way to self-sufficiency. But written Hebrew continued to resist these varieties for quite a while. Translation took even longer to accept the new varieties of Hebrew, and it is only recently that the rich gamut of linguistic options which exist in practice began to be used in Hebrew translations (Ben-Shahar 1994). The emergence of

translational norms which involve drawing on all varieties of Hebrew has increasingly made it possible to approximate to the verbal formulation of the source text, and there is even a substantial subculture now which prefers foreignizing to domesticating translations (see STRATEGIES OF TRANSLATION).

With the end of the century drawing in, translation seems to be undergoing a process of cultural marginalization: while most Hebrew texts are still products of translation, there are clear signs that original compositions are beginning to be preferred by the reading public.

Translator training and the organization of the profession

It is still the norm for an Israeli translator not to have had any specific training for the job, and many still practice translation as a sideline. This is particularly true of literary translators, most of whom are not even writers any more. A plea for more professionalism has often been made, but without much effect.

The first university to offer a fully fledged programme in translation and interpreting was Bar-Ilan University in Ramat-Gan. For decades, other institutes of higher learning went on offering at most a handful of courses in translation theory and/or workshops in practical translation within a variety of departments, and it is only recently that a couple of new programmes have been launched.

Until 1980, Israeli translators had no professional organization to represent them. In fact, translators were largely against the idea of being ‘organized’, and quite a number of attempts to establish an independent association therefore failed. For a long time, the interests of translators were partly taken care of by the Hebrew Writers Association, even

though translators would not normally have been accepted as members. The new Israeli Translators Association, established in 1980, has been affiliated to FIT since 1987.

Various awards are offered to encourage translation into Hebrew. The most prestigious is the Tschernihovski Prize, established in 1942. This prize, named after one of the most prolific literary translators into Hebrew, Shaul TSCHERNIHOVSKI, is awarded for two categories: literary and scientific translation. Israel also has an institute which promotes the translation of Hebrew literature into other languages.

Translation studies in Israel

Until the 1950s, there was very little work done in translation studies in Israel, except for some research on old translations of the Scriptures and on medieval translation practices. Unlike their counterparts in most Western cultures, translators and critics did not produce much writing on translation either, and very few of the articles that did get published had any real impact. Not a single book on modern translation was published until 1977, except for a concise monograph on the intriguing figure of Yitshak (Eduard) SALKINSOHN (Cohen 1942).

Pioneering theoretical research was undertaken in the 1950s by the linguist Chaim Rabin, but since translation failed to acquire any academic status, very few scholars followed suit. The turning point occurred in the 1970s, when a series of high quality doctoral

dissertations were completed: Itamar Even-Zohar (1971), Menachem Dagut (1971; 1978), and Gideon Toury (1976; 1977). Toury's approach has inspired a number of doctoral dissertations and MA theses, mostly descrip-

tive studies on aspects of literary translation into Hebrew. Interesting work in translation theory was also done by Yishai Tobin, Shoshana Blum-Kulka and Elda Weizman, mostly in English. Unlike the situation in many other countries, very little scholarly work has come out of the programmes for training translators and interpreters.

In 1973, Tel Aviv University established a Chair of Translation Theory where research and publications continue to be coordinated; these include TRANSST (the International Newsletter of Translation Studies, since 1987) and *Target* (since 1989). Both are co-edited by Gideon Toury (Tel Aviv) and José Lambert (Leuven, Belgium).

Further reading

Halkin 1971; Shavit and Shavit 1977; Toury 1977, 1995.

Biographies

SALKINSOHN, Yitshak (Eduard) (1820-83). Salkinsohn was born in Russia and, after spending some time in Germany, moved to London, where he converted to Christianity. He then became a pastor in Scotland and finally served as a missionary in central Europe, mainly Vienna. He translated Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1871) and Shakespeare's *Othello* (1874) and *Romeo and Juliet* (1878). His continental background, combined with his mastery of English, made him an ideal mediator between English literature and the Hebrew literary centre of the time. However, his missionary activities prevented his translations from being fully accepted. His unfinished translation of the New Testament was published posthumously.

SHLONSKY, Avraham (1900-73). Born in the Ukraine and emigrated to Palestine in

1921. A poet in his own right, Shlonsky was also one of the most prolific translators ever into Hebrew. He translated mainly from Russian (including many indirect translations), Yiddish and French. A key figure in the Hebrew Modernist movement, he also introduced significant changes in translational norms which were picked up by a growing number of translators. His translations include Gogol's *Revizor* (*The Inspector General*; 1935) and *Marriage* (1945), Sholokhov's *Virgin Soil Upturned* (1935-6) and *And Quietly Flows the Don* (1953-9), Pushkin's *Yevgeny Onegin* (1937ff.), Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1946) and *King Lear* (1955), and De Coster's *Tyl Ulenspiegl* (1949).

The TIBBONIDS. A family which produced several generations of highly influential medieval translators into Hebrew. From the first generation, **Judah ibn Tibbon** (*c*.1120-90) has come to be regarded in Jewish historiography as the 'father of all translators'. Among his major translations are Bahya ibn Paquda's *Duties of the Heart*, Judah Halevi's *Sefer ha-Kuzari* and Sa^{c}adia's *Beliefs and Opinions* His will to his son **Shmuel ibn Tibbon** (*c*.1160-1230) constitutes an important theoretical document on translation. The most important translation by Shmuel himself is Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*. The introduction to this translation is not only unusually comprehensive, it is also one of the most important treatises on translation in the Middle Ages. Other well-known members of the family include **Moses ibn Tibbon** (1240-83) and **Jacob ben Machir ibn Tibbon** (*c*.1236-*c*.1312).

TSCHERNIHOVSKI, Shaul (1875-1943). A physician and Hebrew poet, Tschernihovski was born on the border between the Crimea and Ukraine and emigrated to Palestine in 1931. His mastery of a large number of lan-

guages served as a basis for a highly varied and rich translation output. This included, for example, Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (1930ff.), Longfellow's *Song of Hiawatha* (1913) and *Evangeline* (1923), Anacreon's poems (1920), Sophocles' *Oedipus the King*

(1929) and the Russian epic *The Song of Igor's Campaign* (1939).

Toury, Gideon 1998. "Hebrew [Translation] Tradition".
in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*,
ed. Mona Baker, assisted by Kirsten Malmkjaer.
London and New York: Routledge, pp. 439-448.

Source : http://www.tau.ac.il/~toury/works/index.html