

*Brave New World:*  
**The Correlation of Social Order and the Process of  
Literary Translation**

by Maria Reinhard

A thesis  
presented to the University of Waterloo  
in fulfilment of the  
thesis requirement for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
in  
German

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2008

© Maria Reinhard 2008

### **Author's Declaration**

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis. This is a true copy of the thesis, including any required final revisions, as accepted by my examiners.

I understand that my thesis may be made electronically available to the public.

## Abstract

This comparative analysis of four different German-language versions of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) shows the correlation between political and socio-cultural circumstances, as well as ideological differences, and translations of the novel.

The first German translation was created by Herberth E. Herlitschka in 1932, entitled *Welt – Wohin?* Two further versions of it were released in 1950 and 1981. In 1978, the East German publisher Das Neue Berlin published a new translation created by Eva Walch, entitled *Schöne neue Welt*. My thesis focuses on the first translations by both Herlitschka and Walch, but takes into account the others as well.

The methodological basis is Heidemarie Salevsky's tripartite model. With its focus on author and work, commissioning institution and translator, it was developed as a tool to determine the factors influencing the process of literary translation. Within this framework, the translations are contextualized within the cultural and political circumstances of the Weimar and German Democratic Republics, including an historical overview of the two main publishers, Insel and Das Neue Berlin. With reference to letters between Herlitschka and his publisher Anton Kippenberg at the Insel Verlag, secured from the Goethe und Schiller Archiv (Stiftung Weimarer Klassik), titles and subtitles as paratextual elements of the Herlitschka versions are examined. An overview of Lawrence Venuti's and Hans Vermeer's approaches to the notions of domesticating and foreignizing provides further theoretical tools to assess the translations. Venuti rejects the technique of domesticating translation as, in his opinion, it constitutes an act of violence against the source language, which is contrast with Vermeer's perspective, according to which the alternatives are equivalent. In Vermeer's opinion, both the

domesticating as well as the foreignizing translation do not destroy the source culture. Another fundamental theoretical principle is Otto Kade's claim that the affiliation of a translator to a certain social system and identification with a certain ideology are evident in his or her work.

The thesis includes a study of the afterwords in the East German versions, which display an intent to create distance between the society of the novel and that of the translator. These paratexts function as a tool for censorship and at the same time as a means to circumvent it. Chapters 1-4 and 16 is selected for intensive analysis. It becomes obvious that the different socio-political situations influence the outcome of the translations. One of the most striking differences between them, Herlitschka's translocation of the original setting, is identified as a parodistic device. An analysis of the themes of gender, race and sexuality further answers what kinds of factors influenced the process of literary translation, what kinds of modifications appear and what causes them. Herlitschka's work displays a tendency to intensify traces of misogyny and racism, and to tone down descriptions of sexuality, phenomena which could not be found in Walch's text.

The conclusion links to Margaret Atwood's introduction to the most recent Canadian edition of *Brave New World* and identifies the examination of the two key German translations of the novel as an extension of her argument, pointing to the novel's relevance for contemporary times, transcending geographical and linguistic borders to include readers in all modern societies and cultures.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to Prof. David John for his encouragement and support throughout the sometimes daunting writing process. I would not have made it without you!

I also warmly thank my readers, Prof. Alice Kuzniar and Prof. Paul Malone for taking the time to read my thesis and for providing valuable comments.

I include in my thanks everyone else who made this thesis possible.

## **Table of Contents**

<b>I. Introduction and Methodology .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Methodology .....	4
<b>II. Theoretical Background.....</b>	<b>6</b>
1. Salevksy’s Model: Factors Influencing the Process of Literary Translation .....	6
2. Foreignizing and Domesticating Translation .....	8
<b>III. Analysis according to Salevsky’s Model .....</b>	<b>13</b>
1. Author and Work .....	13
1.1 Aldous Huxley .....	13
1.2. <i>Brave New World</i> : Critical Reception .....	16
2. Commissioning Institution .....	19
2.1 The Book and Publishing Industry in the Weimar Republic .....	19
2.2 The Insel Verlag .....	24
2.3 The Book and Publishing Industry in the German Democratic Republic .....	26
2.4 Das Neue Berlin Verlag .....	29
3. The Translators .....	29
3.1 Herberth Herlitschka .....	29
3.2 Eva Walch .....	30
4. Comparative Analysis .....	31
4.1 Paratextual Elements .....	31
4.1.1 The Afterwords in the Two East German Texts .....	33
4.1.2 Title and Subtitle .....	40

5. Selection of Excerpts .....	49
6. Cultural Transplantation .....	50
6.1 Original Setting .....	50
6.2 Cultural Transplantation of Proper Names .....	54
7. Analysis of Chapters 1-4, 16 .....	56
7. 1 Chapter One .....	58
7. 2 Chapter Two .....	65
7. 3 Chapter Three .....	69
7. 4 Chapter Four .....	72
7. 5 Chapter Sixteen .....	75
8. Special Aspects: Gender, Race and Sexuality .....	78
8.1 Gender .....	78
8.2 Race .....	81
8.3 Sexuality .....	84
<b>IV. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>92</b>

## 1. Introduction and Methodology

### 1. Introduction

The most recent Canadian edition of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) appeared in 2007. In her introductory essay to the volume, Margaret Atwood called it one of two "visionary books"--the other is George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949)--naming it either a utopia describing a perfect world, or "its opposite, a dystopia" (vii), a society in which the conditions of life are dreadful. The notion of "utopia" defines a concept of an ideal society, and the literary utopia is consequently the threshold between fictionality and political-philosophical discourse (Bode 42). The list of literary ancestors of Huxley's "utopian fantasy", as he calls his own work in his essay "Utopias, positive and negative" [1], starts with Plato's *Republic*, followed by Thomas More's *Utopia* (1516), Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726/1735) and H.G. Wells's *The Time Machine* (1895), and Atwood lists many more, including Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888) and William Morris's *News from Nowhere* (1890, viii). Conceiving an ideal society and thus presenting a critical view of the present society (Bode 44), many of these utopias, including Swift's, More's and Wells's, border on satire. With their view that human society is perfectible, many others, including Bellamy's and Morris's, resemble, in Atwood's opinion, "idealizing romances" (viii). With reference to the Communist Regime in Russia and the Nazi takeover in Germany, both of which Atwood says are based on utopian vision, she identifies World War One as the end of the "idealistic-romantic utopian dream in literature" (viii). Despite their differences, *Brave New World*, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and other works, utopian and dystopian, deal with a similar set of themes: how and where people live, what they eat and wear, what their

view on sexuality and child-rearing is, how the economy functions and who has the power (Atwood ix). Atwood identifies sexuality as one of the main themes in utopian and dystopian novels and, with recourse to conservative values prevalent when Huxley wrote his book, she points to the fact that many of his visions must have been startling to the original audience (x). But as Atwood points out, such social features are now commonplace. Hence her argument is that *Brave New World* is even more valid today than in 1932.

Despite *Brave New World's* popularity over seventy years after its first publication and its reputation as “one of the most influential books of the twentieth century” (Izzo 1), very little critical literature is available about the novel’s German language versions. The first German translation of *Brave New World* was created and published by Herberth E. Herlitschka for the Insel Verlag in 1932 with the title *Welt – wohin?*, shortly after the publication of the original text. His translation was republished as *Wackere neue Welt* in the Steinberg Verlag in 1950. The title was changed to *Schöne neue Welt* in 1953 and published by Fischer in Frankfurt am Main. In 1981, the same publisher released a revised version of this translation. In 1978, the East German publisher Das Neue Berlin released a new translation created by Eva Walch, also entitled *Schöne neue Welt*. A reprint of this version was published in 1988 by Reclam in Leipzig. Herlitschka’s revised version of 1981 is the only one still in print.

Most comparative analyses of translations of literary works focus on differences and discrepancies between the source and the target texts. My study is a comparative analysis the German versions of Huxley’s novel, created by two translators, and focuses on ideological differences implicitly present in the German-language versions.

The fact that the novel has been translated by two different translators is itself a compelling reason for their comparison; that these stem from eras of very different political, social and cultural circumstances makes such a comparison particularly enticing since the original text is itself so politically and socially focused.

These translations were created for different groups, each within a single language community. Otto Kade, an internationally distinguished and influential scholar in the field of translation studies, differentiates in this context between language communities and communication communities (“Kommunikationsgemeinschaften”, 107). He writes:

Wenn [...] ideologierelevante Faktoren im Spiele sind und in der Sprachmittlung gesetzmäßig Parteilichkeit wirkt, dann muß zwischen Verlauf und Ergebnis von Sprachmittlungsprozessen und Gesellschaftsordnung ebenfalls ein gesetzmäßiger Zusammenhang bestehen. In einer Übersetzung müßte demzufolge auch reflektiert sein, ob sie unter sozialistischen oder kapitalistischen gesellschaftlichen Bedingungen entstanden ist. (52)

My research question is: To what extent do cultural and socio-political circumstances determine the nature and outcome of the renditions of Huxley’s *Brave New World* translated into German? Whereas it seems obvious that the East German version had to be in accordance with Marxist-Leninist ideals, it would be naïve to assume that Herlitschka’s work did not unconsciously adhere to some ideology as well, which in turn influenced the process of translation.

Through detailed examination of selected excerpts from the texts, with a focus on those passages that deal with themes such as society, economy and science, my study

intends to provide answers to the following questions: (a) What kind of factors influenced the process of literary translation, as evident in the text and paratext? (b) What kind of modifications appear in the translated versions? (c) What caused these modifications?

## 2. Methodology

The methodological basis of my analysis is Heidemarie Salevsky's tripartite model of factors influencing the process of literary translation. My analysis of the translators' work will start with an overview of the background of the translations, looking at the translators themselves and the production history of their renditions of the text. I will contextualize the cultural and political circumstances of the Weimar and German Democratic Republics, including an historical overview of the two main publishers, Insel and Das Neue Berlin. The Steinberg and Fischer publishing houses will be ignored as I do not have enough space to include a more detailed discussion of the changes that occur in their editions. Then, I will examine the translated versions of Huxley's work. With reference to letters between Herlitschka and his publisher Anton Kippenberg at the Insel Verlag, I will first analyze the title(s) and subtitle(s) as paratextual elements of the Herlitschka versions. The correspondence between Herlitschka and Kippenberg (letters, postcards, and telegrams) provides interesting insight to the *Titelfindungsprozess*. I secured these documents from the Stiftung Weimarer Klassik. They contain relevant background information about the production history of the translation and Herlitschka's other translation work for Insel. Of particular interest are his commentaries about finding a title for the translated text and his decision to translocate the original setting from London to Berlin, which is one of the most

striking differences between the two translators' versions. I will then analyze the afterwords of the East German editions, written by Klaus Hühne and Bernhard Scheller. As paratexts to the work, the afterwords function as mediators between the publisher and the reader and are therefore means of exerting control. My method of comparison was to obtain a copy of each German-language edition (H1, H2, H3 and W)<sup>1</sup> and compare them page-for-page with the original (BNW)<sup>2</sup>. On the basis of this, I chose chapters 1 to 4 (the introduction to the brave new world) and 16 (the discussion between the World Controller Mustapha Mond, John the Savage and Helmholtz Watson) to be analyzed in detail. In addition I examine numerous segments from the point of view of the themes of gender, race and sexuality.

---

<sup>1</sup> H1: Herlitschka. 1932 ; H2: Herlitschka 1951 ; H3: Herlitschka 1981 ; W: Walch 1978.

<sup>2</sup> The basis of my analysis are the original 1932 as well as the 1946 editions.

## II. Theoretical Background

Heidemarie Salevsky's tripartite model of translation assessment presents factors that influence the process of literary translation. These serve as the framework of my thesis. I also apply the ideas of five other scholars, Friedrich Schleiermacher, Lawrence Venuti, Eugene Nida, Jan de Waard, and Hans Vermeer, whose theories on the phenomena of domesticating and foreignizing translation guide my assessment of the translated texts.

### 1. Salevsky's Model: Factors Influencing the Process of Literary Translation

Heidemarie Salevsky's tripartite model was developed to provide a tool or point of departure to assess the factors influencing the process of literary translation (449-51). I chose her approach as the foundation of my analysis because of its systematic simplicity on the one hand and its practical value, i.e. its applicability, on the other.

The model focuses on the author and work, the commissioning institution of the translation and translation assignment, and the translator, taking into consideration his or her personality and working environment (Ort-Zeit-Bedingungsgefüge, 451).

Acknowledging the need to examine independent phenomena, for example the influence of historical translation research and individual translation strategies and techniques, Salevsky considers the original text and the translation and, most notably, the process of text production in between those two constants. To study this process and its product she deems it necessary to examine the characteristics of the literary text, the people involved, as well as their decisions and options within the framework of their

assignment and within their social realities, including the precepts given to them by their societies (449). She identifies the following factors and sub-factors as relevant:

### **Author and Work**

Are translations of this author available in the target culture? Is the author known in the target culture? What are the stylistic characteristics of the work? Are there any difficulties in terms of reception and translation at a given time for given recipients in a given context?

### **Commissioning Institution of the Translation and Translation Assignment**

Here, Salevsky includes: the prestige of the commissioning publisher, its publishing profile, characteristics of the assignment in a given context, guidelines and precepts for the translator, editing/adaptation requests, and the deadline for the submission.

### **Translator and Process of Translation**

Salevsky includes these aspects: competence in terms of literary translation; experience in terms of literary translation; age, gender, education, life experience; relationship with author and work; appreciation/comprehension of the work; the translator's working conditions (the correlation of time and place, space time correlation; specific background knowledge [historical, cultural, linguistic]; norms, conventions, rules, idiosyncrasies); support from the publisher, advisor, editor; availability of existing translations of the same work; translation strategy; individual decisions (how is the relationship between explicit, implicit and associative meaning and information presented in accordance with time, function, context and their culture-specific and language-specific effects, 449-50).

As the scope of these is too great for my study, I will concentrate on these factors: the different political systems in which the translations were created, the correlation and interrelation of author and work, the commissioner and assignment, and the translator and translation (Salevsky 452-57).

## II.2 Foreignizing and Domesticating Translation

In his book *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (1995/2008), the American translation theorist and practicing translator Lawrence Venuti coined the term “invisibility” to “describe the translator’s situation and activity in contemporary British and American cultures” (1).<sup>3</sup> It refers to what he regards as two mutually determining phenomena. On the one hand there is the “illusionist effect of discourse” emanating from the manipulating, or even violating, effect of translation on the source language; and on the other the practice of both reading and assessing translations. Venuti argues that publishers and readers accept a translation only when it reads fluently and seems transparent, when any “linguistic or stylistic peculiarities” are absent (1). He describes the illusion of transparency created by a fluent translation strategy as the “translator’s effort to ensure easy readability by adhering to current usage, maintaining continuous syntax, and fixing a precise meaning.” The translator’s objective, he continues, is to give the appearance that the translation reflects both the foreign writer’s personality and the intended or essential meaning of the foreign text (1). He further asserts that the effect of transparency hides the conditions under which the translation was created, a claim with which I partially agree. In my view the fact that the translator

---

<sup>3</sup> Venuti’s focus is on the anglophone countries but the phenomenon occurs in other cultures as well.

chooses to adopt a translation technique that aims at so-called transparency reveals much about him or her and the conditions that influenced his or her decisions. Thus the translator remains “visible”, which contradicts Venuti’s assertion that a domesticating translation technique condemns the translator to “invisibility” and therefore anonymity.

Describing the act of translation as an act of violence, Venuti defines translation as a process by which the chain of signifiers in the original text is replaced by a chain of signifiers in the target language (13). Here, he draws on ideas by Derrida, who notes that since meaning is an effect of relations and differences among signifiers along a potentially endless chain, it is always differential and deferred, never present as an original unity (Derrida 11). Hence, both the original text and the translated version are deemed derivative, since they both contain linguistic and cultural materials that neither the writer nor the translator has generated (13). From this observation, Venuti deduces that the original foreign-language text consists of many different semantic possibilities, which are fixed only provisionally in its translation, based on “varying cultural assumptions and interpretative choices, in specific social situations, in different historical periods” (13). Therefore, a translation cannot be judged on the basis of semantic equivalence and one-to-one correspondence (13). Venuti notes that the notions of “fidelity”, “freedom” and even “linguistic error”, as historically determined categories, are subject to variance. In this context, he points to the “violence of translation” as inherent in the reconstitution of the foreign text in accordance with the preexisting values, beliefs, and representations of the translating language and culture (14). Despite the fact that translation is the forcible replacement of the linguistic and cultural content of the original work with a manipulated version of the text, which is understood by the target

language audience, it is impossible to remove the source's idiosyncrasies entirely; rather, they are subjected to a "reduction and exclusion of possibilities" (14). A translation can never be an unconditional communication of an original text; it always has to be an interpretation.

German philosopher and theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher argues that the translator has only two options in terms of the degree and nature of violence in the translation:

Entweder der Uebersetzer läßt den Schriftsteller möglichst in Ruhe, und bewegt den Leser ihm entgegen; oder er läßt den Leser möglichst in Ruhe und bewegt den Schriftsteller ihm entgegen. (47)<sup>4</sup>

In other words, the translator has the choice between a domesticating translation, a translation that "leaves the reader in peace", i.e. an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values, and a foreignizing translation that "leaves the author in peace", one which places an ethnodeviant pressure on the target culture (Venuti 15).<sup>5</sup> Venuti suggests that since foreignizing translation seeks to control ethnocentric violence in translation, it should be a translator's strategy of choice today, and advocates foreignization as a strategic means to counter ethnocentrism, racism and cultural narcissism (15).

As an advocate for the opposite, the domesticating translation, we can turn to the American Bible translator Eugene Nida who first presented his concept of dynamic or functional equivalence in his book *Toward a Science of Translation* (1964). According to Nida, "a translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression,

---

<sup>4</sup> I have retained the original orthography of all quoted material.

<sup>5</sup> Schleiermacher's favoured choice is the domesticating translation.

and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behaviour relevant within the context of his own culture” (159). This statement signals the importance of a strategy of fluency, and fluency presupposes domestication (Venuti 16). “The translator”, states Nida, “must be a person who can draw aside the curtains of linguistic and cultural differences so that people may see clearly the relevance of the original message.” Nida and Jan de Waard, both Bible translators, state that the translator must aim at identification with the purpose and intent of the original text both on an intellectual and an emotional level, but cannot, at the same time, forget the needs of the target readers (de Waard and Nida 14). This means that the translator must have a thorough understanding of both the source text intent as well as the target text needs.

Unlike Venuti, who rejects any attempt to translate with the domesticating strategy, the German translation studies theorist Hans Vermeer takes up a neutral position in terms of domesticating vs. foreignizing practices. In German, the terms are “verfremdendes” and “angleichendes Übersetzen” (170). From Vermeer’s perspective as an advocate of the functionalist approach<sup>6</sup>, the alternatives are equivalent and have a lot in common. In his opinion, both the domesticating (angleichende) as well as the foreignizing (verfremdende) translation do not destroy the source culture, which stands in sharp contrast to Venuti, who speaks of the violence of the domesticating translation strategy. In the case of an assimilating translation, Vermeer argues, the original culture is transformed and assimilated into the target culture. The act of assimilation is intricate and must be creative and exerted with care. In fact, the translator must be an artist and

---

<sup>6</sup> Functionalist theorists approach translation as an action carried out by a person who has a specific communicative goal, referred to as *skopos*. For an overview on this and other translation theories refer to Edwin Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001).

congenial with the source text author. In the case of foreignization, the target culture is unlocked to absorb the source culture. In exposing the target culture to the source culture's influence, the translator exercises creativity both within and outside the target culture's norms (171).

### III. Analysis according to Salevsky's Model

#### 1. Author and Work

##### 1.1 Aldous Huxley

Aldous Huxley, who was born on July 6<sup>th</sup>, 1894 at Laleham in Goldalming, Surrey as the third of four children of Leonard and Julia Arnold Huxley, is praised by Gavin Keulks in his article in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of British Literature Online* as “one of the most productive and versatile writers in history, publishing a breathtaking number of books over a five-decade period.” Horst Höhne, in his afterword to the Das Neue Berlin edition, agrees with Keulks in terms of Huxley's literary force when he accredits him as a brilliant critic of the late bourgeoisie who was known as one of the most outstanding English writers of his time (254). His paternal grandfather, Thomas Henry Huxley, was a biologist and colleague of James Darwin, and his maternal grandfather, Thomas Arnold, was headmaster at Rugby School and had considerable influence on nineteenth-century education. Huxley's father, Leonard Huxley, was an assistant master at the famous Charterhouse public school for boys; he gave up teaching, however, to become editor of *Cornhill Magazine*, a long-running and successful literary periodical (*The Literary Encyclopedia Online*). Huxley's mother, Julia Arnold Huxley, who was a grand-niece of the famous poet and literary critic Matthew Arnold, was the founder of Prior's Field school for girls. Huxley was admitted to Hillside Preparatory School at the age of nine. Afterwards, he first attended Eton and finally matriculated to Balliol College, Oxford University (*Encyclopædia Britannica Online*). Despite his appreciation for Huxley as a writer, Höhne describes the author's family background with a slightly critical undertone, and characterizes him as “Sproß” of distinguished scientists

and littérateurs who could enjoy the education of the British upper classes. Joe Nordgren typifies Huxley's family as intellectually diverse.

In November 1908, Huxley's mother, to whom he was particularly devoted, died of cancer. During his time at Eton, he suffered from the eye disease keratitis, which rendered him partially blind for several months (*Encyclopædia Britannica Online*). In the summer of 1913, after his vision had improved enough to be able to read with difficulty, he registered at Oxford. In August 1914, Huxley's older brother Trevenen committed suicide. In 1915 Huxley was introduced to Philip and Lady Ottoline Morrell, whose Elizabethan manor had evolved into what Nordgren describes with admiration as a "fashionable yet casual gathering place for many English writers and artists", an assessment which Höhne, as a critic of the "bourgeois" social order, alludes to in his comments on "Natur, Herkunft und Bildungsweg", simply calling Huxley well-endowed (254). It was during his visits with the Morrells that Huxley met D. H. Lawrence, T. S. Eliot, Bertrand Russell, Lytton Strachey, Katherine Mansfield, and Virginia Woolf. His other important encounter at the Morrell home was with a Belgian refugee named Maria Nys, with whom he fell in love and whom he married in July 1919. It was soon after this that he began to write prolifically: the satiric novels *Crome Yellow* (1921), *Antic Hay* (1923), *Those Barren Leaves* (1925), and *Point Counter Point* (1928); and "notable minor works" (Nordgren) followed: *Two or Three Graces* (1926), *Proper Studies* (1927), *Do What You Will* (1929), *Brief Candles* (1929), and *Vulgarity in Literature: Digressions from a Theme* (1930).

Driven by a need to be socially active, as Hannelore Ploog writes in her dissertation on *Brave New World* at the then East German Humboldt Universität, Huxley,

along with André Gide and Heinrich Mann, accepted responsibility for the anti-fascist literary periodical *Die Sammlung*, published by Klaus Mann (9). Despite acknowledging Huxley's achievements, such as his address at the First International Congress of Writers in 1935, his participation in the pacifist movement and speeches on "various problems", Ploog expresses regret about Huxley's failure to assume a decisive position in "critical situations", such as the Spanish Civil War, the Soviet Union and the "counter-revolutionary" Soviet putsch in Hungary in 1956 (9). Her mention of Huxley's pacifist ambition, which is surprisingly not touched upon by Nordgren and Keulks, is countered by Höhne's observation that many members of the bourgeoisie of Huxley's generation, who had grown up in a world that seemed to offer unlimited stimulation of the human spirit, individual freedom and harmony, saw World War I as the termination of social sanity and ethics (254). It is interesting to observe that Huxley himself explores the theme of "sanity" in his foreword to the 1946 English edition of *Brave New World*, and after yet another World War comes to the conclusion that sanity, as offered to John the Savage, is an illusion (xviii). This is interesting not only because of the similarity to Höhne's choice of words but also since Huxley's afterword was withheld from the readers of the East German edition. In 1958, a collection of essays written for *Newsday* was published as *Brave New World Revisited*, in which Huxley expressed his concerns about issues such as overpopulation, eugenics, technology and propaganda-- another text that was notably not translated and included in the East German translation. Huxley died on 22 November 1963. Because of his literary prominence generally, and foremost as the author of *Brave New World*, few would disagree with Höhne, who concludes that he holds a "bleibenden Platz in der Weltgeschichte" (269).

## 1.2 Brave New World: Critical Reception

The earliest testimonies of critical reception of *Brave New World* in Germany date back to the year 1937, notably after the ban of the novel by the Nazis. Wilhelm Poschmann's dissertation *Das kritische Weltbild bei Aldous Huxley* (1937) explores Huxley's religious, political and social world view, focusing on the novelist's position on issues such as "Der Jude als Feind menschlicher Kultur" (39) and his "Ablehnung des Demokratismus, Kommunismus und Bolschewismus" (42). Despite (or perhaps due to) his indirect absorption of Huxley's ideas into current National Socialist ideology, no reference is made to the ban of the novel in Germany. In the same year, Rainald Hoops published his essay "Die Weltanschauung Aldous Huxleys". Referring to several of Huxley's novels and essays, Hoops examines, similar to Poschmann, the author's ideas "zu verschiedensten Fragen des Lebens" (74), touches upon Huxley's present but yet too weak rejection of "modern art" such as expressionism (77), which conveniently happens to be "entartete Kunst", and, accuses him, unlike Poschmann, of sympathizing with communism (90). Calling *Brave New World* a satiric work, Hoops sees the novel as possibly the most interesting of Huxley's works (84). In Hoops's opinion, however, Huxley does not succeed as a true satirist because one expects "von einem Satiriker [...], daß der seinen eigenen Standpunkt zu erkennen gibt", which Huxley fails to do (89). As opposed to Hannelore Ploog in her East German dissertation (7), or Horst Höhne in his afterword to the East German version of *Brave New World* (254), both of whom link the society described in the novel to the "bourgeois" society and capitalism, Hoops claims that "diese mechanisch-materialistische Welt die Welt des Kommunismus ist (89)."

Christoph Bode's monograph *Aldous Huxley: Brave New World* (1985) is a very comprehensive introduction to Huxley's novel and includes biographical information on the author, an overview of the critical reception of the work, an exhaustive "Werkanalyse", and even a few notes on Herlitschka's German translation, criticizing the translator's "interpretatorische Vorentscheidungen" (145). Unfortunately, no reference is made to Eva Walch's translation.

The Aldous Huxley Society, based in Münster/Westfalen, is a centre of current research on Huxley and holds an annual Huxley conference, the most recent of which produced a volume of essays edited by David Izzo. The society's web site cites "two chief purposes: to promote the academic study of the works of Aldous Huxley, in particular critical editions, commentaries and interpretations, and to make a wider public acquainted with the thought and writings of the author". In his introduction to the volume, Izzo identifies the society's mission to appreciate Huxley's "impact on our world" and to "spread the gospel of Huxley [...] so that he will not be forgotten" (1). Because its intent is not exclusively literary, but rather to examine social, political, economic, psychological, scientific and philosophical themes, Izzo writes in his introduction that *Brave New World* is "perhaps the most influential novel of the 20<sup>th</sup> century" (1). The volume includes a collection of essays with the intent to update *Brave New World's* "significance for the 21<sup>st</sup> century", and I agree with Izzo that the world and the society presented in the novel are perhaps more comparable to our current world than those of 1932 (6). To explore what Izzo means by his remark, it is necessary to examine Huxley's foreword to the second edition of 1946, wherein he identifies six distinct themes represented in his novel that are "not more than two or three generations away",

i.e. alarmingly close to Izzo's "current world": 1. the advancement of science involving human beings (i.e. cloning) (xii); 2. "hypnopaedia" as a technique of suggestion and manipulation of human beings (xvii); 3. a science of human differences (i.e. the caste system supported by biochemical measures); 4. drugs to substitute for alcohol and other narcotics to ensure happiness (xviii); 5. a "foolproof" system of eugenics aimed at the standardization of the "human product" (xviii); 6. sexual promiscuity (xviii). The sixth point is of special relevance for my thesis as my analysis will show how aspects relating to sexuality and promiscuity have been significantly tamed in Herltischka's version. The decrease in individuality is a theme discussed by Angela Holzer in her analysis of Huxley's influence on Adorno (117). Adorno rejects Hegel's assumption that history is "the progress of the consciousness" and claims that no progress toward freedom can be stated (11). The reasons for this are outlined by Holzer as follows: progress in terms of freedom is not possible due to the density of the "net of society", and the related concentration of economy and administration, which degrades human beings to "functions" (Adorno 11). Adorno further states that in the consumer society the individual has been stripped of all "personal liberty" to become an "appendix to the machinery" (12).

Many essays in the volume on *Brave New World* were written by authors associated with the Huxley Society. Jerome Meckier, for example, analyzes the phenomenon of "names and naming" (155), Tanja Nusser discusses the issue of gene manipulation (71), and David King Dunaway's theme is the issue of human cloning (165). Of eminent relevance for my analysis of the translations is the fascinating theme of gender issues, which is touched upon by David Leon Higdon in his article "The

Provocations of Lenina in Huxley's *Brave New World*" and by Cristie L. March in her essay *A Dystopic Vision of Gender in Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. March argues that while genders appear to be equal in *Brave New World's* social order in terms of employment, choice in sexual partners and participation in leisure activities, the novel reinforces "traditional gender norms" by directing the reader to be disgusted by Lenina's promiscuity ([53]). According to March, Lenina is the novel's model of dystopian society's womanhood, as evidenced in her unquestioned willingness to participate in prescribed leisure activities and promiscuity. Her character traits are antagonistic to those of Linda, who stands for the negative impact that social structures have on females (54).

## 2. Commissioning Institution

### 2.1 The Book and Publishing Industry in the Weimar Republic

The translations I analyze were created in eras of different political, social and cultural circumstances. To understand the factors that influenced them, it is essential to explore the historical background of the book and publishing industry of the Weimar and the German Democratic Republics (Ferguson 58).

Between 1918 and 1933, the Weimar Republic was shaken by political and economic crises, as well as an extreme polarization and political ideologization of large parts of the population. At the same time, intellectual life was characterized by a confusing variety of heterogeneous and competing art movements, political and cultural trends. The history of the book and publishing sector during those fourteen years is similarly complex (Wittmann 301). After analyzing the 1920's sales and corporate

statistics, Wittmann concludes that the book sector was undergoing a crisis, as the industry was affected to an unusually high degree by the inflation problem and the resulting decrease in purchasing power (301). In addition to a decrease in population and therefore a smaller market, the public sector had started to decrease expenses, which resulted in libraries having to cancel journal and serial subscriptions, seriously affecting scientific publishers. Not only the economic struggle, but “auch die kulturelle Hektik trug zur Unsicherheit bei”, Wittmann writes. The trade journal *Börsenblatt* notes in this context that “[...] der Buchhandel, dessen volkswirtschaftlicher Zweck es ist, [...] geistige Werte in marktgängige Werte zu verwandeln und zu verbreiten, ist gezwungen, sich dem andauernden schnellen Wechsel der Anschauungen immer wieder anzupassen” (341). The severe economic situation, however, did not produce an increase in solidarity in the book trade, but rather a sharper focus on particularistic interests and the establishment of competing groups, such as the “Buchhändlergilde”, the “Deutsche Verlegerverein”, and the “Sortimenter-Verein” (Wittmann 303). The following years saw the development of media giants such as the Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, the medical, scientific and technical publisher Julius Springer, and Ullstein. Noteworthy is the establishment of various book clubs with great commercial success, but strongly opposed by the Börsenverein, while many authors were pleased with the advantages these book clubs brought them. Alfred Döblin assessed these “literarische Konsumgemeinschaften” as follows:

Sie sind keine Avantgarde im Literarischen wie unsere Privatverlage, sie sind aber eine Avantgarde im Kulturpolitischen [...]. Sie geben [dem Autor] einen festen kulturfähigen Leserstamm und machen ihn unabhängig von einer Zufallsreklame

oder von einem Konjunkturerfolg. Sie gewähren auch dem Autor einen großen ideellen Vorteil [...]. Es folgt für ihn daraus auch eine Bindung [an die Lesermassen], die produktionssteigernd ist, geistig produktionssteigernd. Ganz besonders ist das der Fall bei ideell gebundenen Buchgemeinschaften, bei den weltanschaulich und politisch gebundenen Buchgemeinschaften. (375)

Wittmann deduces from this statement a writer's desire to be part of a community and an aversion to the anonymity of the readership, even for the price of ideological particularization, polarization and radicalization (307). Between 1927 and 1929, the term "book crisis" emerged, in Germany and abroad, a phenomenon for which Herbert Göpfert holds the global economic depression accountable (33). However, despite a decrease in the title production on the German book market, output figures were, overall, still very high (35). Large-scale advertising--lamented by publishers such as Samuel Fischer as the "Americanization of the book market" (40)--was the answer to the perceived crisis. Novelty events were planned to rescue the threatened book market, such as the "Tag des Buches", celebrated since 1929 on March 22 on the anniversary of Goethe's death, "Jugend und Buch" (since 1930), "Frau und Buch" (1931), and "Volk und Buch" (1933; Wittmann 308). The foundation of so-called "Weltanschauungsverlage" was a response to the intellectual and ideological dismemberment of the Weimar society (309), as reflected in what Elizabeth Harvey characterizes in her article on culture and society in Weimar Germany as a period of upheaval and transformation (58). Harvey focuses on the rise of the reformist and revolutionary left, the development of democratic values, economic and technological modernization, as well the provision of an environment in which aesthetic experimentation and left-wing art thrived as never before (60). Harvey's

emphasis on art movements sympathetic to the left is very interesting when compared to comments by authors such as Höhne and Ploog, who interpret the circumstances in which Huxley wrote *Brave New World* according to their own ideological stance.

The Malik Verlag and the Langen Müller Verlag are examples of ‘left-wing’ and ‘right-wing’ publishers. The Malik Verlag, founded in 1916, was an object of suspicion to the censorship authority from the beginning. The company, owned by Wieland Herzfelde, a deserter in World War I, represented ‘proletarian’ writers such as Johannes R. Becher and Georg Lukács as well as free-spirited authors like Oskar Maria Graf und Franz Jung. Financial success was gained through the publication of translated writings by the American social critic and author Upton Sinclair, along with the progressive artistic and graphic designs of Helmut Herzfelde, which became a signature feature of satiric-progressive fiction and journalism (Wittmann 312). However, in 1933, the company was forced to go into exile in Prague. In 1944, Herzfelde, or John Heartfield, as he later preferred to call himself, founded the Aurora Verlag in New York (together with Bertolt Brecht, Alfred Döblin, Lion Feuchtwanger and others), a publishing company that was later transformed into the East Berlin Aufbau Verlag, as noted by Hans Baier in his brochure *Verlagswesen und Buchhandel in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik* (18).

The right-wing Langen-Müller Verlag grew from a merger between the renowned literary publishing companies Albert Langen and Georg Müller, which were bought in 1927 and 1931 respectively by the Deutsch-Nationalen Handlungsgehilfen-Verband.

The longing for ideological orientation during the Weimar years was accompanied by social declassification (Wittmann 315) or the proletarianization of large parts of the so-called middle class, caused by revolution and economic crises. This

affected writers who criticized the publishing companies for their meagre royalty payments, which the publishers in turn justified by increased paper and printing costs (316). Another reason why writers turned against the publishing companies was because publishers primarily regarded the written work as a product, merchandise to be sold, whereas writers, despite their economic need, viewed the book as an “in ein materielles Gewand gekleidetes Werk” (Raabe 20). This confrontation between authors and publishers represents one of the major literary differences between the Weimar and the German Democratic Republics in the circumstances of book production. Eva Walch commented on the phenomenon in one of her e-mails to me (23 Aug., 2008). The antagonism of product versus work of art will be discussed in Chapter III.4.1.2, “Title and Subtitle”.

In response to the writers’ discontent with their situation, the Schutzverband Deutscher Schriftsteller was founded. One of the main objectives of this association was to fight censorship. Despite declaring “eine Zensur findet nicht statt” in the Weimar constitution, censorship did continue, but within broadened boundaries (Harvey 60). Harvey’s identification of the limitations to the freedom of arts and scholarship is further characterized by Wittmann as measurements against the “Schmutz- und Schundliteratur“. He concludes: “Damit war die Hintertür für provinzielle Sittenschnüffelei weit geöffnet, verbunden mit allgemeiner Polemik gegen das ‘verjudete’ und ‘verniggerte’ Sündenbabel Berlin” (320). This statement is important for understanding Herlitschka’s approach to translation, which I discuss in Chapter III.8.2 “Race”.

The “book crisis” was thus replaced by something dubbed as “Kulturreaktion” (Wittmann 321). Efforts to guide the readership (“Leserlenkung”), dating back to the

Wilhelminian era, were reinforced, “quer durch alle weltanschaulichen Lager” (Wittmann 324). The book crisis quickly turned into a general cultural crisis. The decreasing sales figures in the book industry were just a symptom of general disorientation and helplessness against rapidly progressing modernization and rationalization on the one hand, and idealization and irrationalization on the other (Wittmann 325). Given the importance of his prophecies, which were fulfilled on January 30, 1933 when the National Socialists assumed power in Germany, I would like to cite from Carl von Ossietzky’s *Weltbühne*-essay “Ketzereien zum Büchertag” of 1929:

[...] und man ahnt hinter alledem die Götterdämmerung, das Heraufkommen eines neuen Barbarentums, das schrecklich aufräumen wird unter den Werten, an denen wir heute noch hängen. Dem fettgewordenen Geist steht eine harte Abmagerungskur bevor, aber er wird daran nicht sterben, sondern jung und sehnig wieder aufstehen. Heute noch wird die Ablaßglocke geläutet und für den Buchbetrieb die liebe Caritas auf die Beine gebracht [...] Aber an einem anderen Tag, der vielleicht noch sehr fern liegt, wird es keine mildtätige Lösung mehr geben. Dann wird es heißen, das zu stoßen, was doch fallen will. (445)

## 2.2 The Insel Verlag

In 1899, three German authors, Rudolf Alexander Schröder, Alfred Walter Heymel, and Otto Julius Bierbaum decided to launch a new literary-artistic journal with the title *Die Insel*, “die in Deutschland Epoche machen sollte”, as the proud statement on the publisher’s web site reads today. The journal ceased publication in 1901. In the same year, Alfred Walter Heymel founded his own publishing company in Leipzig, entrusting

Rudolf von Poellnitz with its management. At Rudolf Alexander Schröder's suggestion, the Art Nouveau artist Peter Behrens created the publisher's logo: a sailboat with bulging sails. Despite the sublime intention behind the choice of this symbol of both artistic freedom and progress, this publishing house was first and foremost a company whose purpose was financial profit.

*Dir* (1899) von Heinrich Vogeler and Robert Walser's *Fritz Kochers Aufsätze* (1904) are among the house's first published books. In 1906, Anton Kippenberg, who was later responsible for the publication of the first German version of *Brave New World*, took over. His insightful correspondence with Herberth Herlitschka, who had been working for Insel as the translator of numerous other Huxley works, is available and will be examined in Chapter III.4.1.2 "Title and Subtitle."

In 1912, at Stefan Zweig's suggestion, Kippenberg founded the book series Insel-Bücherei. Its remarkable concept and design, particularly the colourful cover paper, were unique. The first book in the series was Rilke's *Die Weise von Liebe und Tod des Cornets Christoph Rilke* (1912). In 1929, Insel published Huxley's novel *Those Barren Leaves* (1925) as *Parallelen der Liebe* (1929), followed by *Point Counter Point* (1928, *Kontrapunkt des Lebens*, 1930), *Two or Three Graces* (1926, *Zwei oder drei Grazien*, 1931), *Brief Candles* (1930, *Nach dem Feuerwerk*, 1931), just to name a few, and of course *Brave New World* (*Welt – wohin*, 1932), all of which were translated by Herlitschka.

During the 30s and 40s (today vaguely dubbed "schwierige Zeiten" on the company's website), the Insel Verlag became "Stein des Anstoßes für die Machthaber". Numerous Insel-Bücherei titles were "unerwünscht", books by Jewish authors like Stefan

Zweig, and Huxley's works were banned. In December 1943, the Insel building was destroyed in an air raid. The subsequent division of Germany in 1948 also entailed the division of the publishing company. Anton Kippenberg founded a branch in Wiesbaden, while the head office initially remained in Leipzig. In 1950, Kippenberg died, three years after the death of his wife and colleague, Katharina. Remarkably, the Leipzig publishing company was never nationalized. In 1991, the Wiesbaden and Leipzig branches united.

### 2.3 The Book and Publishing Industry in the German Democratic Republic

Without knowledge of the book and publishing scene in East Germany, Eva Walch's translation cannot be assessed. The chapter "Kultur und Kunst" of the *Handbuch Deutsche Demokratische Republik* (1984) begins as follows:

Mit der Befreiung vom Faschismus erhielt das deutsche Volk 1945 die historische Chance, eine wahrhaft demokratische, eine freie, im Volk verwurzelte und dem Volk verbundene Kultur aufzubauen. Im Osten Deutschlands, auf dem Gebiet der heutigen DDR, ist diese Chance konsequent wahrgenommen worden. (566)

The *Handbuch* portrays the GDR as a progressive and culturally sophisticated nation, a nation of book publishers and readers, with a book and publishing industry whose objective is to satisfy the variety of reading needs of the population (581). These statements are accompanied by a list of reading statistics proving that, despite increasing TV consumption, a large part of the population were active readers: "Die DDR ist ein Leseland (581)."

Six years earlier, the booklet *Das Buch in der DDR* (1978) published by the Börsenverein der deutschen Buchhändler in Leipzig on the occasion of the Leipzig Book

Fair, provides further interesting perspectives on the East German book world. Portraying the GDR as a “Land des Buches” (1), emphasis is placed on its impressive literary culture, with praise for the library, museum and archive system. The booklet concludes with an outlook on the future of the book: “Überschaut man die vielfältige, differenzierte Arbeit für das Buch, die in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik geleistet wird, so wird die Funktion des Buches deutlich, die ihm in der sozialistischen Gesellschaft zukommt (74).” Of particular interest is the chapter “DDR-Bücher in aller Welt” which touches upon international aspects of the East German book market in the context of international book fairs (66-68), and “Zusammenarbeit im Buchschaffen sozialistischer Länder” which emphasizes cooperation between publishers in the GDR and the Soviet Union, including the exchange of translated literature (76). Remarkably, translations from languages other than Russian and especially of books from non-socialist countries are not mentioned at all.

After World War II, the construction of the book and publishing industry resumed in the Soviet Occupation Zone (Sowjetische Besatzungszone) under the control of the Soviet Military Administration (SMAD; Rumland 7). Since literature plays a major role in the education of the individual according to Socialist ideology, the revival of the publishing industry was accelerated, and texts and school books, as well as the books of authors who were banned by the Nazi regime and classic works of the labour movement, were among the first publications (7). In response to claims of a sophisticated literary culture, Wittmann notes that the East German book market was essentially a “Verwaltung des Mangels” (362). The vast demand for fiction and non-fiction books could not and was not supposed to be satisfied. Half of the publications with a relatively high number of

copies were out-of-stock immediately after publication. Alongside the founding of new publishers, including the Aufbau Verlag, the Verlag Neuer Weg as a medium of the communist party (KPD), and the SWA-Verlag, as publisher of Soviet literature, the expropriation of renowned publishing companies began, and they were transformed into “volkseigene Betriebe” (360). Since the beginning of Stalinist socialism in the GDR, the Republic did not ignore the possibilities of censorship either (Wittmann 362). On an institutional level, censorship was exerted by the “Amt für Literatur und Verlagswesen”, which was in charge of the internal examination of every publication and the promotion of Soviet literature after 1951. Furthermore, publishing programs were controlled and either approved or purged. An additional method of censorship, subtler and already tried and true during the Nazi period, was the allocation of paper supplies. The number of copies of published books was not determined by market needs, but was exclusively controlled by ideological standards (363). Since 1951, annual publishing conferences were held with the intention to align the publishing industry with the party ideology. In 1954, the Ministerium für Kultur was established. Its department, the “Hauptverwaltung des Verlagswesens”, was commissioned to control and lead the cultural, political, and economic orientation of the entire book industry and manage the “volkseigene” publishing companies (Rumland 9).

## 2.4 Das Neue Berlin Verlag

Das Neue Berlin was founded in 1946 in East Berlin (Beier 118). The Karlsruhe Virtual Catalog<sup>7</sup> shows that despite the allusion in the house's name to a political orientation, publications included literature such as crime fiction, adventure novels and science fiction. *Brave New World* thus fit perfectly.

Their current publication programme with titles on German history and politics points towards a clear political orientation. A history of Das Neue Berlin, accessible today on their website, says in this context: "In den 90ern schärfte er [the publisher] das Profil, um unterscheidbar zu werden. Das war auch insofern nötig, weil wegen der politischen Zeitläufte nunmehr jede Sache in der Bundeshauptstadt das Etikett verpaßt bekam: das neue Berlin! Wir waren das schon lange." The company was re-founded in 2005 under the old name and is now part of the Eulenspiegel Verlagsgruppe, which includes others such as Edition Ost, Eulenspiegel, Neues Leben, Ohreule and Rotbuch.

## 3. The Translators

### 3.1 Herberth Herlitschka

In *Die englische Literatur in Deutschland von 1895 bis 1934* (1937), Anselm Schlösser lists the "rühmigsten Übersetzer" of English literature during this time period. Herberth E. Herlitschka is ranked fourth in terms of quantity of translations (147), and is hence identified as an experienced translator. A KVK search yields numerous catalogue records recognizing Herlitschka as the translator of authors such as Aldous Huxley, Thornton Wilder and William Butler Yeats, many of whose works were published by

---

<sup>7</sup> The Karlsruhe Virtual Catalog (KVK) is a meta-search interface which provides access to library and book trade catalogs on the internet.

Insel, indicating a long working relationship. Huxley himself had a rather negative image of Herlitschka. In a letter to his literary agent Ralph Pinker in 1933, he wrote:

Various German writers are here--practically all the exiles, from Thomas Mann downwards!--and I have been told by more than one of them that the translation of *Brave New World* was very bad. This seems to be a pity. Particularly as I am tied to Herlitschka. Is there any means of escaping and finding someone who will do the job better? (285)

Christoph Bode, by contrast generally praises Herlitschka's achievement as a seasoned translator (144), and Michael Berndt calls his work "stilistisch an sich gut" (7).

### 3.2 Eva Walch

Eva Walch is the translator of the East German version of *Brave New World*, published in 1978. She, too, is experienced, with translations of about 60 dramatic works from English and French. She studied Anglistik and Romanistik at the Humboldt-Universität in Berlin and received her doctorate in 1978 with a dissertation on Shakespeare translation in the GDR. Between 1962 and 1988, Walch was lecturer at the Humboldt-Universität followed by assignments as dramaturg and opera dramaturg in Berlin, Vienna and Salzburg. She is currently responsible for the dramaturgy of Wagner's *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg* at the Bayrische Staatsoper and does not work as a translator. *Brave New World* was the only novel she translated.

## 4. Comparative Analysis

### 4.1 Paratextual Elements

Since the following section deals extensively with paratextual aspects such as title and subtitle in the original and translated versions of the texts and the afterwords of the the GDR editions (Ferguson 75), I take a closer look first at the concept of paratexts. The term was introduced by the French scholar Gérard Genette, who defines paratexts as “the verbal or other productions, such as an author’s name, a title, a preface, illustrations”, that surround and extend the text in order to present it, even though it is not always certain whether these “verbal or other productions” are to be regarded as part of the actual text or not (1). For Genette, it is the paratext that “enables text to become a book and to be offered as such to its readers” (1). According to this definition, the function of a paratext is as a mediator between text and reader, and author and reader respectively. A paratext, therefore, is not a neutral device but a tool to influence the reader. In this context, Genette differentiates between authorial paratextual elements, which are written by the author and characterized by an authorial intention and therefore accompanied by an assumption of responsibility (5), and allographic paratextual elements, which are characterized by a shift of responsibility from the author (and the publisher!) to a third party, for example to the writer of an afterword (9). I discuss the implications of delegating responsibility from the publisher to the writer of an afterword in Chapter 4.1.1, “The Afterwords in the Two East German Editions”. According to Genette, there are also incidents of shared responsibility, e.g. interviews with the author. The addressees of paratexts also vary in accordance with the type of paratextual device (9). The title, for instance, is directed at a general audience, whereas the afterword or preface addresses

only the actual reader of the book. Genette further categorizes paratexts as epitexts and peritexts. Peritexts are those paratextual elements which occur outside the book, for example interviews, conversations, letters or diaries; but epitexts appear within the text, for example as prefaces or titles. Also important in the context of my analysis is Genette's additional category of temporal location (5), which is subdivided into prior paratexts and original paratexts with the date of the text's first appearance as a reference point. Prior paratexts are, as the term suggests, paratextual elements that appear prior to publication, such as announcements or prospectuses; original paratexts appear at the same time as the text itself (e.g. title and afterwords). Genette developed a catalogue of questions that investigate features of the paratexts (4). Defining a paratextual element includes determining its location (where?), the date of its appearance and possibly disappearance (when?); its mode of existence, verbal or otherwise (how?); the nature of its communicative situation (to whom, from whom?); and finally the function of the paratext (to do what?).

As Richard Macksey notes in his foreword to the English edition of Genette's book, Genette omitted the aspect of translation as a paratext (xx). The relation between text and paratext is, according to Genette, not only transitional, i.e. characterized by a movement from one position (the author) to another (the reader); it is also transactional (2). To determine the function of a translation within the boundaries of Genette's framework, it is important to consider the dynamic relationship between the original version and the translated text.

Despite obvious paratextual elements, I find it difficult to characterize the nature of the relationship between paratexts and translation, as translation fulfills the conditions

set for both text and paratext. One can examine the paratexts that accompany the translation, for instance its titles and afterword, but it is also possible to regard the translated text as a paratext itself (Ferguson 77). In the following chapter I examine the paratexts (epitexts) that accompany the translations of *Brave New World*, specifically its afterwords and titles (Ferguson 75).

#### 4.1.1 The Afterwords in the Two East German Texts

The afterwords of the two GDR editions are examples of allographic paratextual elements, which are characterized by the delegation of responsibility from, in this case, the publisher, to a third party, the writers of the afterwords. In the case of the first East German edition published in 1978 by Das neue Berlin, the novel's text is accompanied by an afterword written by Horst Höhne, who was at the time of the publication of his essay Professor of English Literature at the University of Rostock. Höhne provides an overview of Huxley's life, his works, and themes, and an interpretation of *Brave New World* itself.

The afterword starts with a brief introduction to the publication history of *Brave New World* and a sketch of its themes. Höhne writes that the novel, widely considered the most important anti-utopian text of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, owes its success, on the one hand, to the "scheinbar wissenschaftliche Präzision, mit der das Leben in der Zukunftsgesellschaft als komplexe Erscheinung sinnfällig gestaltet wird", and on the other to the "Motive, Themen und Menschenbildvorstellungen, die aus dem Werk Shakespeares in die Handlung verwoben werden" (251). By placing the work within the context of early bourgeois literature, Höhne assumes the position of an outside observer

and distances himself and the work's readership from both the work and its interpretation. Not only does this comment imply a rejection of this literature and the ideology associated with it, it is also an attempt to direct the reader's approach to *Brave New World*. According to Höhne, the reader, who sympathizes with the Savage, is influenced to hate the world portrayed in the novel. Huxley, however, neither settles for "Schwarzmalerei" nor does he present a positive hero (252). He rather contrasts the "auf zivilisatorischem Höchststand, durch perfekte Klassenmanipulation in äußerlichem Glück lebende Gesellschaft" with a depiction of "Natur und Mensch in primitiver Häßlichkeit, in Schmutz und brutaler Triebhaftigkeit". (252) Höhne refers to the caste system in *Brave New World* as a society based on class manipulation. With this reference, Höhne positions his own reading within Marxist ideology and guides the reader to interpret the work from this point of view. After elaborating on the influence of Shakespeare's work on Huxley's utopian novel, Höhne analyzes in detail the society portrayed in it. With "stability" being one of the world state's slogans, he identifies individuality and lack of spousal commitment as two of the major threats to the stability of the state (253). "Die Maxime 'Jeder gehört jedem' wird mit den neuartigen menschlichen Beziehungen begründet, die durch künstliche Befruchtung und fabrikmäßige 'Aufzucht' der Kinder als Ergebnis eines zweifelhaften wissenschaftlichen Fortschritts gegeben wird" (253). Against the backdrop of his ideological stance, Höhne's evaluation of scientific progress as "zweifelhaft" can be seen as another backhanded side-swipe against bourgeois, i.e. Western society. He continues:

Die Geschichte des Bürgertums, so argumentiert der Weltenlenker im Roman-- damit unverkennbar bürgerliche Theorien zur Zeit Huxley reflektierend--, hat

erwiesen, daß Individualliebe und -ehe nicht funktionieren, daß Gatten-, Kinder- und Elternliebe entweder geheuchelt oder in ihr Gegenteil, in Haß, verwandelt werden. (253)

Here, Höhne is imitating deliberately, or perhaps unconsciously, Marx's famous line in the Communist Manifesto: "Die Geschichte aller bisherigen Gesellschaft ist die Geschichte von Klassenkämpfen [...] (47)." Putting Marx's words into the World Controller's mouth can be seen as a masterstroke of manipulation. In Höhne's interpretation, it is Mustapha Mond who deconstructs bourgeois society, which is doomed to fail due to its fragile foundation. Also notable is his use of the negative verb "heucheln" in connection with the society he describes, which reveals his negative view of Western culture by suggesting it is fake, and, again, his intention to influence the reader to assume a certain position. Whereas these intentions are merely implied rather than expressed openly, his critique of the consumer society as portrayed in *Brave New World* is more direct: "Es drängt sich auf, in Huxley's "idealer" Konsumgesellschaft ein Abbild von Tendenzen der heutigen bürgerlichen Gesellschaft zu sehen, wie sie den Massen durch die Ideologen des Imperialismus, durch Werbung und Massenmedien vorgegaukelt werden" (254). Here, he draws a parallel between the society in *Brave New World* and bourgeois society. The sentence can be read as an attack on Western (and more precisely on West German) society on a moral level. He accuses the "imperialist ideologists" of manipulating society through advertising, propaganda and the mass media. Through his rejection of Western (German) promotion of consumerism and media culture, he again implies that socialist society is superior. Writing in 1978, nearly 46 years after the novel's first publication, Höhne concludes that Huxley's portrait of a

future world is “der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft von heute ähnlicher denn je” (254). There follows a presentation of the main biographical data of Huxley’s life and an overview and appreciation of his writing. From this, Höhne identifies the quest for a moral force that could enable the peaceful and harmonic existence of human beings in a society determined by scientific and technical progress, mass production and consumer manipulation “ohne die bedrückende Macht von Religion, Ideologie und Polizei” as one of the major themes in Huxley’s work (255). The development of Huxley’s way of thinking can be tracked throughout his novels, Höhne observes further, since the themes and plots of his novels always incorporate a discussion of philosophical and moral issues. Therefore “wirken sie wie ein Kommentar des Weges der spätbürgerlichen Moral- und Gesellschaftsphilosophie unseres Jahrhunderts” (255). Categorizing Huxley as an advocate of late-bourgeois moral and social philosophy, Höhne again creates distance between the society of the novel and Western society on the one hand, and socialist society on the other. With particular reference to Huxley’s first book *Crome Yellow* (1921), Höhne comments on the emergence of satirical elements in Huxley’s work. He praises Huxley’s second novel *Point Counter Point* (1928) as his “literarisch höchststehendes” work, “geistig und stilistisch anspruchsvoll, wenn auch romantisch und weltanschaulich gleichermaßen eklektisch” (256). However, he notes that despite Huxley’s rejection of fascism as a governmental system, he “läßt [...] von der brutalen Vitalität eine Attraktion ausgehen, die innerhalb des Romangeschehens Menschen in ihren Bann zieht, welche infolge ihre bürgerlichen Leere ein verständliche Sehnsucht nach vollem, reichen Lebensgenuß haben” (256). Höhne’s contempt for bourgeois society becomes linguistically obvious through his choice of words when he talks about

“bourgeois vacuity”, contrasting it with a “desire for full and rich enjoyment of life”, which is, as suggested in the quoted text, not viable in the bourgeois society. Here, Höhne also suggests the causal relationship between bourgeois society and fascism, the latter emanating from the former. He mentions Huxley’s “verhängnisvolle [...] Nähe [zu] primitivistische[n] Irrlehren, die eine vermeintliche ursprüngliche Lebenskraft außerhalb der bürgerlichen Zivilisation fetischisierten und damit zu präfaschistischen Ideen von der notwendigen Herrschaft einer Elite von kraft- und willensbetonten ‘Tatmenschen’ kamen” (256). This comment again puts both Huxley and Western society into the company of fascism. Further, Höhne gives an elaborate account of the development of “bürgerliche Intelligenz” which is “solchen [faschistischen] Ideen gegenüber besonders anfällig” (256), thus hinting again at the alleged cause-and-effect relationship between bourgeois society and fascism. In the next paragraph, Höhne gives an elaborate account of the development of capitalism and its “zeitweiliger Stabilisierung in hemmungslosem Taumel” (256-57). Key phrases used to describe this development are “menschen- und kulturvernichtende Wirkungen (257), “totale menschliche Verarmung” (257), and “imperialistisches Profitstreben” (257), just to name a few. This stands in contrast to the implied superiority of socialist society which has overcome these difficulties, and constitutes a deliberate attempt to manipulate the reader’s approach to both the author the work.

For readers who, after reading Höhne’s interpretation, are still unsure as to where to place the novel (and in a very obvious attempt to appease the censorship board), the publisher provides a jacket blurb which states explicitly that the foundations of society portrayed in the novel are the “Grundlagen der modernen bürgerlichen Gesellschaft”.

An interesting account of both the reception of *Brave New World* and the censorship practices in East Germany is contained in Bernhard Scheller's essay "Gesichter und Gesichte des Aldous Huxley" published as the afterword to Eva Walch's translation in the Reclam edition (221). Appearing ten years after the first East German edition, Scheller's text is considerably less ideologized and subtler in its tone and criticism. The afterword begins with an overview of Huxley's life and work, stressing the great variety found in his work with regard to both genres and themes. After highlighting key events in the novelist's life, such as World War I, his mother's death and the almost blinding eye disease, Scheller attends to Huxley's world view, and notes that Huxley had adopted a "'zynische Schutzhaut' gegen Konsumzwänge, Technokratie, 'Vermassung'" (222). It is interesting to note that he uses quotation marks, especially in the context of "Vermassung", which may point to a reluctant use of these terms. His subtle rejection of Marxist-Leninist ideals becomes more obvious when he connects the hatred of books as foreseen by Huxley in *Brave New World* with the book burning in "Nazideutschland" (223). The fact that he uses the term "Nazi-" instead of "faschistisch", as Höhne does throughout his text, is remarkable. The identification of National Socialism and fascism is disputed in historical and sociological research. In Marxist-Leninist theory, however, it is subsumed "unter de[m] als Oberbegriff verstandenen Faschismus" (Schlosser 31). According to the Marxist-Leninist theory of history, fascism is a symptom of the final crisis of capitalism and is closely linked to imperialism and capitalism's last stage (Schlosser 32). Sabina Schröter writes in this context that the socio-economically diluted notion of fascism neglects the core and critical aspect of Nazism as a whole, i.e. anti-Semitism, racism, the "Herrenmenschendünkel" and the "Blut-und-Boden-Mythos"

(190). Viewing fascism as the symptom for the final crisis of capitalism, Schröter writes that the Marxist-Leninist construction of history preferred the almost imperceptible “international fascism” to incorporate the concept of an enemy and of a threat, since the phenomenon of racism did not fit into the Marxist-Leninist world view and was inconceivable as an historical force (191). In my view, Scheller’s decision against using the term fascism is a deliberate rejection of the Marxist-Leninist theory of history.

Another topic in Scheller’s essay is Huxley’s choice of names. He notes that the cluster of famous names apostrophizes with “positivist arbitrariness” many historical characters such as Napoleon or Mussolini, and attributes the fact that even Marx and Lenin have to serve in what he calls an “abstruse panorama of characters” bears witness to Huxley’s undialectic world view. To prove his claim, Scheller quotes Brecht, who, calling Huxley a “Dreiste[n] verschwommenster Sorte”, focuses his Huxley critique on the novelist’s reservation against an improvement of the materialistic conditions of the working classes, which results, in Huxley’s alleged position, in a decrease of the cultural needs of the people: “je mehr eisboxen, desto weniger huxley” (510). This citation hints at the Weimar authors’ dilemma between creating art and earning an income. Further issues addressed by Scheller which are of interest to researchers on both sides of the iron curtain are drug abuse and the role of Shakespeare’s work in *Brave New World*, both of which I discuss later. Scheller also considers other major works by Huxley, most of which were translated by Herlitschka and first published with the Insel Verlag. According to my research in the Online Catalogue of the German National Libraries, none of these works was published in the GDR. Concluding his essay, Scheller writes: “Aldous Huxley hat nicht geschwiegen. Er hat seine Wahrheit gesagt, die nicht objektiv

und nicht absolut sein konnte und wollte” (234). As noted earlier, his essay is generally neutral in its criticism, especially when compared to Höhne’s essay.

Quite similar to the choice of the subtitle of the East German version, the afterwords demonstrate the manipulative potential of paratexts (Ferguson 101), and in terms of Genette’s quest for the function of paratexts, the afterwords fulfil two almost contradictory purposes. On the one hand, they can be regarded as an indirect form of censorship, as they were obviously intended to provide guidance and a means to control the reader’s reception (Ferguson 100); on the other, they seem to provide the publisher with a tool to publish a text that could be controversial in a certain context, and make it available to their readership. Furthermore, despite admittedly being a compromise, by adding an explanatory afterword (Ferguson100), the East German publisher exerts a certain power over the censor board by circumventing their power to ban the book.

#### 4.1.2 Title and Subtitle

Categorizing titles and subtitles as epitexts, i.e. paratextual elements which occur within the text, Genette observes that the “titular situation of communication” consists of at least a message (the title itself), a sender, and an addressee (73). The title’s sender is not necessarily the actual producer, i.e. the work’s author (73). In the case of the original title, however, it can be safely assumed that Huxley is the actual creator. Huxley rarely commented on his titles, as Christa Jahnsen writes in her article “Titelprobleme in der anglistischen Literatur- und Übersetzungswissenschaft”. Jahnsen suggests that the reason for this is Huxley’s pragmatic attitude towards them. “One can’t go far wrong with the Bard”, he wrote to his American publisher Cass Canfield in 1947 (581), referring to the

fact that the title *Brave New World* is based on a quote from Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1610 or 1611). In the case of the original version of *Brave New World*, there are therefore two senders: Shakespeare, who created the original line, and Huxley, who uses Shakespeare's creation to entitle his own work. The function of this kind of title, apart from evoking the theme, is to give the reader the satisfaction of recognizing the quote's intertextuality and to help him or her define the literary context. Huxley's use of this quote, an exclamation of "the innocent Miranda", who does not know that the creatures she is praising are mostly "scoundrels"<sup>8</sup>, intensifies the irony, as the future world Huxley describes is "nearer to nightmare than to heaven on earth" (Watts 21).

The presence of quotations and their cultural significance causes problems for the translator, making the translating difficult, if not impossible. In this context, Jansohn mentions the French title of *Brave New World*, which replaced the Shakespeare quote with a quote from Voltaire's *Candide ou l'optimisme* (1758), "Le Meilleure des mondes". (351). Jansohn lists the technique of replacing a literary quote from the source text with a literary quote from the target culture as a strategy to treat the intertextual reference in the target language (351). As opposed to Genette, who regards mediation between sender and addressee as the main function of paratexts including literary titles, Jansohn identifies four main functions of a literary title: 1. to inform, 2. to contrast with other titles or to create a connection with other titles, 3. to categorize, and 4. to attract potential readers (340). In this context, translating titles into another language means that it is not sufficient to render the title literally if the target language system permits it; neither is it

---

<sup>8</sup> The complete quote reads: "O wonder! / How many goodly creatures are there here! / How beauteous mankind is! O brave new world, / That has such people in it" (Act V, scene 1).

sufficient to translate the title non-literally in the case of target language structures that do not permit a literal rendering. A translator of titles would do better to consider pragmatic factors and the socio-culturally conditioned knowledge about the world of the target text recipient. The purpose of the original title should be fulfilled in the target culture and the intended effect of the original title should be suggestive. As a consequence, in the translation of a title, not only do linguistic and cultural issues need to be considered, but also aspects from within the field of literary criticism (Jansohn 340).

Three of the strategies Jansohn recommends are discussed in the correspondence between Herlitschka and his publisher. I am in possession of photocopies of letters and postcards from and to Herlitschka and his publisher, the Insel Verlag, which I obtained from the Goethe-Schiller-Archiv in Weimar. Jansohn points out that the translation of the words “brave new world” seems to have posed a problem to both the translator and the publisher since a German version of it already existed in the Schlegel/Tieck Shakespeare translation as “Wackere neue Welt” (351). In his letter of May 5th 1932 to Herlitschka, Insel publisher Anton Kippenberg expressed his curiosity with respect to the translator’s title suggestions for the German version. Herlitschka responded on May 30<sup>th</sup> 1932 with the following suggestions: 1. *Wackere neue Welt*, 2. *Fortschritt wohin?*, 3. *Welt am laufenden Band*<sup>9</sup> and 4. *Herrlich weit gebracht*, indicating a preference for the last. Herlitschka’s favourite title suggestion does not recreate the literary allusion the original evokes; it rather imitates the pattern found in Huxley’s titles, identified by Herlitschka as the use of partial verses.

---

<sup>9</sup> Five years later a fantasy book with this title was actually published: Karl Ludwig Kossak-Raytenau. *Die Welt am laufenden Band*. (Wien: Höger, 1937).

The translation technique behind Herlitschka's reasoning seems to be of a compensatory nature in its attempt to reproduce Huxley's pattern of using partial verses. He realizes that the existing German-language version of the verse from Shakespeare's *The Tempest* does not have the same effect and level of recognition and familiarity as the English version. Instead, the difficulty the translator faces here is comparable to the problem of the translation of idioms, where the translator is required to find the pragmatic equivalent. Mary Snell-Hornby writes in this context that a text cannot be considered a "static specimen of language" (an idea still dominant in practical translation classes); it is rather the verbalized expression of an author's intention as understood by the translator as reader, who then recreates this whole for another readership in another culture (2). In other words, a given text has to make sense to a given readership (Baker 217). Herlitschka strives to capture and reproduce the overall effect the titles in Huxley's work have on his readers, both in the source and the target culture and to recreate part of the effect the original work had on its readership (Rothe 19). Kippenberg, in his response, however, rejected the proposals without giving reasons. On July 15, 1932 he contacted Herlitschka again, stating that *Herrliche neue Welt* has to be the German title version (Jansohn 352). Unsatisfied with this interim solution, on July 20, 1932, Herlitschka replied as follows:

Verzeihen Sie, aber ich bin ganz entschieden gegen „Herrliche neue Welt“. Es setzt uns wieder dem Vorwurf einer ungenauen Uebertragung aus, denn weiter als bis zum letzten Wort des Titels vergleichen die Rezensenten bekanntlich Uebertragungen nicht mit dem Original. Wenn wir uns schon möglichst an den Originaltitel anschliessen wollen, der übrigens im Text wiederholt als Zitat

vorkommt, muss es wie bei Schlegel-Tieck „Wackere neue Welt“ heißen, was aber immer noch die hier sehr gefährliche Missdeutung auf Amerika nahe legt. Ich bin selber von „Welt am laufenden Band“ abgekommen, weil es an einen Arbeiterroman denken lässt, und bitte Sie nun dringend, bei „Wohin, Welt?“, es ist das Treffendste und Einprägsamste. Und jedenfalls wäre der Untertitel „Ein Roman der Zukunft“ zu setzen.

Herlitschka, with his recommendation of staying as close as possible to the original title and his reference to a German version of the Shakespeare quotation, alludes to the strategies of literal translation and substitution as suggested by Jansohn (351). Publisher Kippenberg, on July 28 1932, decided against the substitution technique, claiming the established German version “Wackere neue Welt” lacks the dual meaning inherent to the original version. He wrote:

So bleibe “Wohin, Welt?”, zu dem meine Frau den ausgezeichneten Vorschlag macht, die beiden Wörter umzustellen und zu sagen: “Welt – Wohin?” Das klingt sehr suggestiv und zugleich dichterisch.

Calling this title proposal suggestive, Kippenberg shows his intention of creating a title that appeals and caters to the readers’ (i.e. buyers’) needs (Jansohn 352).<sup>10</sup>

Thus, the first edition was published as *Welt – Wohin?* Not only is the intertextual reference inherent to the original title not recreated in this German version; but also a shift from Huxley and Shakespeare respectively as senders of the title message has taken place (in Genette’s terms, 73-74), to the translator or the publisher, who had the

---

<sup>10</sup> Throughout the 1932 text, the Schlegel/Tieck version “Wackere neue Welt” is used (Jansohn 353). Starting with the 1950 edition, however, the citation is translated as “Schöne neue Welt”.

final word. The consequence of this phenomenon is that Genette's original definition of paratext as a means of mediation between author and reader strictly speaking no longer applies. I would even go as far to claim that the translated text, in this case the title, gathers a momentum of its own, which is no longer controlled by the original sender. According to Genette, it is allographic. The example demonstrates the manipulative potential of paratexts. Publisher Kippenberg wrote further in this context, "Meine Reisenden berichten, dass der Titel "Welt – wohin?" beim Sortiment außerordentlich gut anspricht. Wenn er auch den Inhalt nicht ganz deckt, so ist der Titel doch wohl verhältnismäßig der beste" (Sept. 9, 1932), in other words, sales figures were more important than faithfulness to the original work.

The title was changed several times in the following years. In 1950, the Swiss Steinberg Verlag published Herlitschka's translation under the title *Wackere neue Welt* with recourse to the Schlegel/Tieck quotation. The publisher's motivation behind this title change is not known. However, it constitutes another shift in terms of responsibility. Through the literal translation, which is at the same time the established German version of the Shakespeare quotation, the intertextual reference of the original English title as well as the authorial responsibility (as opposed to the allographic nature of the first title translation) are re-established. Although I could not obtain background information on this title change<sup>11</sup>, it can be assumed (with reference to the *Titelfindungsprozess* tracked above), that the title change was the publisher's decision, likely in consultation with Herlitschka. Hence, the responsibility as sender, in Genette's terms, is delegated back to the author, Huxley, (and Shakespeare), and, in the form of a secondary responsibility,

---

<sup>11</sup> The publisher is defunct. I attempted to contact the Schweizer Buchhändler- und Verlegerverband by email on July 26, 2008, to obtain further information.

which emanates from the phenomenon of the translation, to the first translators of Shakespeare's line. As opposed to the publisher Kippenberg, who consciously chose a "suggestive" title, the obviously too suggestive, and therefore manipulative, nature of the title *Welt – wohin?*, which takes the form of a question, was evidently rejected by the publisher at Steinberg. Three years later, in 1953, the work was published by Fischer as *Schöne neue Welt*, which is, according to Jansohn, the only authorized version (353).

The East German edition of 1978 is entitled *Schöne neue Welt*. Taking a different approach than Herlitschka, Eva Walch strove to render the German title as close to the original as possible and instead of taking detours that might be more suggestive, she was able to recreate the intertextuality inherent in the original. In terms of her title choice, Walch wrote in one of her e-mails to me:

Der Titel stand für mich schnell fest. Er sollte (dafür bin ich, wenn irgend möglich, grundsätzlich) der Originaltitel sein, also hier die Übersetzung des englischen Zitats aus dem Sturm. Dabei ergab sich lediglich die Frage, wie das *brave* zu übersetzen sei. Ich habe mich für die Schlegel-Übersetzung entschieden, die klassisch ist und einen schönen ironischen Nebenton hat. (Aug. 23, 2008)

Evidently, Walch's approach to the translation is source-text oriented in her effort to retain the character of the original title by choosing the equivalent English quote from the *Tempest*. By selecting the Schlegel version of the Shakespeare quotation, she creates an ironic undertone that is less invasive and violent towards the original work than the first Herlitschka title *Welt – wohin*, which was, first and foremost, intended to appeal to potential buyers of the book. Walch was not subject to the same market pressures. The presence or absence, respectively, of a market economy and the associated existence or

lack of pressure to produce high sales figures can be identified as one of the most significant influences on the outcome of any translator's creations. The impact of economic factors is apparent in Walch's description of the conditions under which she was able to create hers. Her statement "Wir arbeiteten nicht vordergründig für den Markt" (Aug. 23, 2008) describes one of the key differences between the circumstances under which the two translators worked, not only in terms of the *Titelfindungsprozess* but also for the translation as a whole. As Kippenberg noted, the title has to be "suggestive", in other words, encourage the potential reader to buy the book. The East German book market, guided by Marxist-Leninist principles, was very different from the capitalist one of the Weimar Republic. According to Walch, the book was sold "fast nur unter dem Ladentisch", due to the low numbers of copies published (she mentions 10,000, Aug. 23, 2008). She was therefore, unlike Herlitschka, under no pressure to force up sales numbers. The function of Walch's title is thus, according to Genette's functional categories (74), the identification of the work and, in the case of the subtitle, the designation of the work's subject matter, i.e. an attempt on the part of the publisher to secure permission to publish the book. Therefore, both Herlitschka's title and Walch's subtitle are used in a manipulative manner, originating in Herlitschka's case in an economic need and in Walch's a political necessity.

Walch recalled the extraordinarily fortunate situation for translators in the GDR and notes that the publisher's editing was not prescriptive. Independent of the pressure to achieve high sales figures, translators in the GDR worked under circumstances that enabled them to produce "sehr gute, seriöse, genaue, werktreue Übersetzungen" (Walch, Aug. 23, 2008). The faithfulness to the original work, as demanded by East German

scholar Otto Kade and prescribed by socialist principles described earlier (52), is evident in Walch's treatment of the original setting as well as other aspects of her translation. In this, the two translators' approaches diverged.

In combination with the main title, the subtitle is of primary importance to the reader's understanding of the text. The subtitle of the original English version refers to the work's literary genre and simply reads "A novel", whereas all of Herlitschka's titles are supplemented by the phrase "Ein Roman der Zukunft", which not only generically characterizes the work but also alludes to its futuristic setting. "Utopischer Roman" is the subtitle chosen by Walch, and similar to Herlitschka's, her version also guides the reader beyond the author's own direction. Walch notes in this context that Das Neue Berlin was a publisher with "sehr kleinen Auflagen, spezialisiert auf Kriminal-, Abenteuer- und Zukunftsromane, auch Science Fiction und so genannte Utopische Literatur. Unter diesem Label durfte er dann auch *Brave New World* herausbringen" (Aug. 23, 2008). The *Brockhaus Enzyklopädie* defines the adjective "utopisch" as "nur in der Vorstellung, Phantasie möglich, phantastisch, wirklichkeitsfremd" (Bd. 23: 19). Publishers were required to apply for permission for each publication with the Ministry of Culture. The promised afterword and the labeling of the work as "unrealistic" was used to clarify the situation and to ensure that the conditions described in the book could not be related to the conditions in the country in which it appeared (Aug. 23, 2008).

### III.5 Selection of Excerpts

For further comparative analysis of the translations, I have selected chapters 1 to 4 (the introductory chapters to the brave new world) and 16 (one of the key scenes of the novel, the discussion between the World Controller Mustapha Mond, John the Savage and Helmholtz Watson). In addition to these entire chapters, I examine particular aspects that are significant for my research question: cultural transplantation (including setting and proper names) and the topics of gender, race and sexuality.

The textual basis for my analysis are the 1932 and 1946 editions of the novel published by Chatto & Windus and Harper & Row respectively<sup>12</sup>. The German editions I am working with are *Welt – wohin: ein Roman der Zukunft* (Leipzig: Insel, 1932), i.e. the first German version translated by Herberth E. Herlitschka; *Wackere neue Welt: ein Roman der Zukunft* (Zürich: Steinberg, 1950), i.e. the second German edition translated and slightly revised by Herberth E. Herlitschka; *Schöne neue Welt: ein Roman der Zukunft* (1981)<sup>13</sup>, a licensed edition of the revised edition of Herlitschka's translation; and *Schöne neue Welt: utopischer Roman* (Berlin: Das Neue Berlin, 1978), published by Das Neue Berlin and translated by Eva Walch.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> The page references are from the 1946 edition because of its greater accessibility.

<sup>13</sup> Since Herlitschka (1893-1970) was already dead when this edition was printed, the question arises as to whether he authorized changes to his original version in later editions. While there is no explicit evidence, I assume that Herlitschka can be considered to have authorized the first edition of his translation (1932), but no changes in title or wording of the later two.

<sup>14</sup> I also consulted the afterword of the Reclam edition (1988) of this version.

### III.6 Cultural Transplantation

#### 6.1 Original Setting

As noted, the most striking difference between the German versions is the translocation of the original setting from London to Berlin in all editions authored by Herlitschka. By contrast, the East German translation does not employ this strategy.

The correspondence between Herlitschka and his publisher Kippenberg offers some interesting background on this decision. On July 20<sup>th</sup> 1932, shortly before the completion of his work, Herlitschka wrote to Kippenberg:

[...] weil ich nun, da das ganze Manuskript dem Verlag vorliegt, Ihnen die Frage stellen möchte, die mir selbst schon lange Kopfzerbrechen macht, nämlich ob man dieses Buch nicht aus dem englischen Milieu weg in ein allgemeineres, deutsch gefärbtes transponieren sollte. [...] Ich bin unbedingt für diese Transposition, da es sich ja hier nicht um Schilderungen typisch englischer Verhältnisse und Gesellschaft handelt.

A week later, Kippenberg replied: “Meine Frau und ich sind durchaus für die Transposition in ein allgemeineres deutschgefärbtes Milieu. Dadurch wird das Buch für die deutschen Leser sehr gewinnen.” (July 28, 1932)

This decision was a serious interference with the original work and not well received by critics. Christoph Bode, while acknowledging Herlitschka’s achievement, criticizes the decision to transplant the setting, as well as the adaption of original names and their denotation according to German conventions (144). Acknowledging the “ungewöhnlichen Schwierigkeiten des Projekts”, Bode concludes that Herlitschka’s adaptive translation does not falsify the author’s intent, but rather contains avoidable

weaknesses that call for revision (146). The question arising in this context is, of course, what the function of Herlitschka's cultural and geographical transplantation is, to which the publisher readily agreed. Reading through Herlitschka's and Kippenberg's commentaries on this issue, one cannot fail to sense the disapproval by both men of what Herlitschka calls the "englische Milieu" (July 20, 1932). This term, embedded in the phrase "aus dem englischen Milieu weg in ein allgemeineres, deutsch gefärbtes", seems to imply a negative view of the English setting. I surmise that the decision to translocate people and places to a German environment was an attempt to accommodate the German readership which was deemed either overchallenged or unwilling to deal with possibly unfamiliar places and names. In my analysis of selected chapters and in particular of chapter 16 (Chapter III.7.5), in which I expose parodistic devices, I suggest Herlitschka's intent to mock German conditions as another motive for this translocation. This occurrence can be best explained by a phenomenon now termed "domesticating" translation. Herlitschka's strategy can be ascribed to the domesticating method, which is, according to Venuti, characterized by an attempt to render a text in the target language that is void of any unexpected phenomena and which reads as fluently as possible, i.e. the translator remains "invisible" and the reader is not supposed to 'notice' that the text is not an original but a translation ([1]). As Herlitschka's geographical transplantation literally moves the text towards the reader, Schleiermacher's metaphor of "leaving the reader in peace and moving the author towards him" (47) is an even more precise illustration of the situation. Venuti's appraisal of foreignization as a means to place ethnodeviant pressure on the foreign text (15) can be applied in reverse to Herlitschka's method. With the year of origin of the first German version in mind, months before the Nazi takeover in

Germany, one cannot help but conceive the idea that if a translator uses foreignization to restrain ethnocentricism, racism and cultural narcissism, domesticating translation can be used and abused--consciously or unconsciously--to promote exactly these phenomena. Latent racism can indeed be traced in the first German version, as I show in Chapter III.8 “Special Aspects: Gender, Race and Sexuality”.

For the East German publisher, Das Neue Berlin, the transplantation was, in fact, a bone of contention and a key reason to commission a retranslation. I contacted the publisher and received a *Verlagsgutachten* by Michael Berndt, reader at Das Neue Berlin at the time, which concludes with the sentence:

Es ist notwendig, neu übersetzen zu lassen, die stilistisch an sich gute Übersetzung Herlitschka's [...] ist wegen der Verlegung des Schauplatzes und ähnlicher Unmöglichkeiten, die das Anliegen des Autors teilweise verfälschen, nicht tragbar. (7)

Walch's translation does not employ this strategy. The location and proper names remain the same as in the source text. In terms of the concepts of foreignizing or domesticating translation, she also strives for readability and fluency, the main characteristics of domesticating translation (Venuti 1). In the context of comparing her text and Herlitschka's, however, her version must be categorized as a foreignizing approach, as it is a conscious reversal of Herlitschka's decision to transplant the original setting. Furthermore, Venuti's concept of foreignization implies, to some degree, the alienation of the reader from the text to enforce critical reading. Alienation is not only achieved by means of an explanatory afterword to ensure 'correct' reading and the reference to the 'unrealistic' nature of the work; the retention of the original *foreign*

setting also contributes to this effect. In an email, Walch commented on Herlitschka's technique and wrote: "Ich selbst wäre nie auf die Idee gekommen, Zeit, Ort und Namen anderes als im Original wiederzugeben. Das war für mich eine rein künstlerische Entscheidung, die mit den Verlagsüberlegungen nichts zu tun hatte" (Aug. 23, 2008). It is interesting to note that she does not attribute her decision to demands by the publisher, citing only artistic reasons. She further mentions that she had access to the Herlitschka version; it was, however, of little interest to her as his approach was very different from hers:

Ich arbeite prinzipiell nicht mit vorhandenen Übersetzungen, weil ich mir damit die Möglichkeit nehme, aus meiner eigenen Zeit heraus neu--wirklich *neu* zu übersetzen. Nur so, streng auf die eigenen Ressourcen gestellt, kann man hoffen, einen eigenen durchgehenden Stil zu finden. (Aug. 23, 2008)

Walch's decision to retain the original setting should also be viewed in the light of the political consequences the translation engendered. The translator wrote in this context: "Der Verlag bewarb sein Vorgehen [beim Ministerium für Kultur], indem er eine neue originalgetreue Übersetzung in Aussicht stellte [...] Die Handlung sollte, wie im Original, in England (also weit weg!) spielen" (Aug. 23, 2008). The decision to retranslate Huxley's novel and adhere to the "far away" original setting to gain permission to publish the book, has to be evaluated in connection with what I said about the subtitle and the afterwords: the geographical distance of the foreign setting functions as a means to eliminate any possibility of relating the depicted society to circumstances in the GDR. The conscious alienation from the Herlitschka translation with its cultural transplantation also serves as a dissociation from the society of *Brave New World*. There

is, further, a more practical or technical reason why a retranslation with the original setting was deemed necessary. Despite being unacceptable, according to Berndt's judgment (7), as all of Berlin was GDR territory, it could be construed as a failure of the socialist state.

## 6.2 Cultural Transplantation of Proper Names

Since names and naming play an important role in *Brave New World*--Jerome Meckier even entitles the work an onomastic satire (185)--some attention should be given to the treatment of proper names in the German language versions. According to Meckier, who quotes the unnamed narrator, "two thousand million inhabitants of the world state have only ten thousand names between them." Each name is therefore shared by two thousand "brave new worlders", yet readers meet fewer than fifty characters whose names matter (185). Walch does not experience problems in this domain: she simply adopts the original names. Herlitschka, though, cannot resist the temptation to Germanize even proper names, a technique that is directly linked to the translocation of the setting from England to Germany, but in this context less dubious. The logic applied to the naming of characters, and especially the re-naming in the revised versions of Herlitschka's text, cannot always be reconstructed. Most of the namings in the Herlitschka versions appear random. Some interesting background information concerning the re-naming of two major characters, Mustapha Mond and John the Savage, in the second Herlitschka version, might shed some light on the motive for these changes. Mustapha Mond, the World Controller, is introduced to the German readership in the 1932 version as Mustafa Rathenau but renamed as Mustafa Mannesmann in the version

of 1950. The first name choice most probably alludes to the Weimar Republic politician Walther Rathenau, who was, according to the *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*, “despite [his] diplomatic success, which was hailed by many Germans, increasingly reviled. To the extreme right he represented the German postwar system, which they hated.” The extreme nationalists’ hatred of him was intensified by his being Jewish. Rathenau was assassinated on the way to his office by right-wing fanatics. Perhaps eager to avoid any kind of controversy and to create a ‘neutral’ translation, the name change from Rathenau to Mannesmann was carried out. The other curious name change occurred in the case of another main character, John the Savage. Whereas the 1932 German edition presents John as Josef, Herlitschka changed his name to Michel, evoking the image of a passive and spiritless “deutscher Michel” in the German reader, which certainly is not intended by the author. The motivation for this further name change, and whether this association was intended by Herlitschka or his editor, can only be surmised. The change may be seen as another attempt to render a text void of any negative associations, in this case Josef with Stalin or Goebbels.

A different kind of name change occurs in the case of the Hatchery employee Henry Foster. Unlike other characters in the novel, he is not named after a famous scientist or politician. The transitive verb “to foster” is defined by the Canadian Oxford Dictionary as “promote the growth or development of. encourage or harbour (a feeling)”, and translates into German as “1. jemanden aufziehen; 2. ein Kind in Pflege nehmen.” (*Cambridge Klett Comprehensive German Dictionary*). The name is, therefore, descriptive and derives from the person’s job function. Herlitschka’s rendering of the name as “Päppler”, derived from the verb “aufpäppeln”, is logical and imaginative as it

not only covers the range of meaning of the original name, but in its imitation of German name formation it can almost be seen as a parody of the original. The fact that Henry Foster's name is more than a name is missed perhaps by some readers of the English version, and Herlitschka's translation brings to mind that Foster is rather a 'job title' than just a proper name. Since the name "Foster" stands out in Huxley's naming pattern, Herlitschka's felicitous name adaptation is justified. Walch treats the character's name as a regular proper name, and according to her pattern of adopting names unchanged into her text, she chooses to let the German reader recognize its denotation.

### III.7 Analysis of Chapters 1-4, 16

In the following five parts I will analyze chapters 1 to 4 and 16 by first summarizing the content and then analyzing how each translator deals with the source text. I will determine what types of modifications appear in the translated versions and explore what caused them.

Huxley's novel opens in the year 632 after Ford, i.e. the year of birth of the American tycoon Henry Ford (1863-1947), who is Huxley's designation for God in the novel. It presents a society that began after civilization had been destroyed by a series of world wars. The new human society, governed by a group of ten "World Controllers", has a scientifically engineered caste system from Alphas to Epsilons based on the motto "Community, Identity, Stability", ideals which are enforced through conditioning the masses and making them believe they are happy. The novel begins with a guided tour of a group of students, future employees, through the Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre. They are shown the artificial creation of human beings, the

biological foundation of the state motto. The fertilized eggs of the three lowest classes are subject to the “Bokanowsky Process” which enables the cultivation of eight to ninety-six genetically identical multiples. The tour proceeds to the Neo-Pavlovian Conditioning Rooms where infants are conditioned, according to their caste membership, through electrical shocks and hypnopaedia. The tour concludes in the playground where children are encouraged to engage in sexual play to develop into promiscuous adults who are incapable of strong feelings for any single individual and are, therefore, happy. The following chapters depict adult life, including work and leisure activities with promiscuity and drug consumption. Individuals who are not fully adjusted to the life style are exiled to islands. The few “reservations”, in which indigenous people live without the amenities of the progressive new society and still practice viviparity and family life, can only be accessed by very few selected people. Bernard Marx, member of the Alpha caste and outsider both physically and emotionally, and Lenina Crowne, Beta-minus employee at the Hatchery with the rebellious tendency to go out with the same man more than once, receives permission to visit such a reservation in New Mexico. There they meet Linda, a woman from the new world who became lost in the reservation many years earlier and gave birth to a son, John. Bernard and Lenina take them both back to London. After his mother’s death from a drug overdose, John becomes an object of curiosity and amusement for the brave new worlders, while Bernard enjoys the attention he suddenly receives as John’s “caretaker”. John refuses to adapt to the new life style, refuses to take soma, the prescribed mood-elevating drug, and is disgusted by Lenina’s sexual behaviour. He rebels and attempts to start a riot among the lower castes, for which Bernard and his friend Helmholtz are held responsible. They are taken to Mustapha

Mond, one of the ten world controllers, who sends them into exile to the Falkland Islands. When prevented from joining his friends, John flees into solitude and finally hangs himself.

## 7.1 Chapter One

The first chapter introduces one of the three methods the new society employs to guarantee social control and stability: artificial human reproduction as the biological basis of society. The reader witnesses a student tour through the “Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Centre” guided by its director, who explains the basics of standardized, bio-chemical mass production of human beings using the Bokanowsky Process, a technique to clone fertilized ovula, and the Podsnap’s Technique, a method to accelerate the maturation of the ovula, both of which are fictitious.

The chapter starts with a nearly verbless sketch of the scenery leading the reader “bereits meisterhaft, weil subtil, in die gewünschte Richtung” (Bode 57). One of the first sentences reads as follows:

Cold for all the summer beyond the panes, for all the tropical heat of the room itself, a harsh thin light glared through the windows, hungrily seeking some draped lay figure, some pallid shape of academic goose-flesh, but finding only the glass and nickel and bleakly shining porcelain of a laboratory. Wintryness responded to wintryness. (BNW 1)

Through the prominent placement of the adjective “cold” at the beginning of the sentence, the author creates a cruel contrast between the physical warmth outside and inside the room and the emotional frigidity of the described sterility. Especially the

repeated use of the concessive clause “for all ...” emphasizes the hostile atmosphere. The first significant divergence between the original and the translated versions occurs in the rendering of this sentence. Both artistic devices employed by the author are ignored by Herlitschka, who writes:

Durch die Fenster fiel verdünntes Licht, eiskalt und hart trotz dem Sommer vor den Scheiben draußen und der tropischen Hitze des Raumes selbst [...]. (H1, H2, H3)

Walch, on the other hand, successfully recreates the original atmosphere of coldness, sterility and lifelessness characteristic of the feeling projected throughout the entire book. She succeeds in capturing the initial feeling the reader experiences by imitating the syntactical structure of the sentence:

Kalt--trotz des Sommers hinter den Scheiben, trotz der tropischen Hitze im Raum selbst--drang ein hartes dünnes Licht durch die Fenster [...]. (W: 5)

Also noteworthy is Walch’s use of the genitive case while Herlitschka resorts to the dative. The former further accentuates the distance between the reader and the scenery created by the author. The next sentence of the original--Wintryness responded to wintryness--(BNW 1) is handled quite differently as well. Herlitschka’s first version reads as “Winterstimmung von außen begegnete Winter im Innern” (H1: 5), which is obviously an error, as the season described is decidedly summer, and basically counters the author’s intention of contrasting physical conditions with emotional experience. The translator corrects his mistake with a prosaic “Hier war alles winterlich” (H2: 23), which is, likely for artistic reasons, replaced by the phrase “Kälte stieß auf Kälte” in the revised version (H3: 19), a translation which re-captures the syntactic structure of the original

with its alliterative emphasis. Walch resorts in this case to a freer approach and translates: “Frostig, alles war frostig” (W: 5). The repetition of the noun “wintryness” in combination with its powerful personification is therefore not entirely replicated. Another passage contributing to the image of deadly sterility is the following: “The overalls of the workers were white, their hands gloved with a pale corpse-coloured rubber. The light was frozen, dead, a ghost” (BNW 1). The passivity and lack of individuality of the people, a leitmotif throughout the novel, is reflected in the structure of the first sentence: the workers are reduced to a complement status, while the subject of the sentences is their overalls. Both translators recognize this phenomenon and replicate it in their German texts. For no obvious reason, however, the revised edition of the Herlitschka version modifies his original translation (“Die Arbeiter trugen weiße Kittel”, H3: 19), turning the workers into the subject of the sentence and therefore significantly altering the original impression. The second part of this section is translated as follows:

Das Licht war gefroren, tot, gespenstisch. (H1: 5, H2: 23)

Das Licht war kalt, tot, gespenstisch. (H3: 19)

Das Licht war gefroren, tot, ein Gespenst. (W: 5)

Both Herlitschka and Walch succeed in replicating the category mistake of “frozen light” which appears as semantically strange and unexpected and engenders the effect of this entire paragraph. The collocation “kaltes Licht”, on the other hand, as used in the revised version (H3) obliterates the author’s intent entirely. A similar loss occurs as the noun “ghost” is rendered as an adjective (“gespenstisch” in H1, H2, H3). Walch, by contrast, recreates the inherent threat and momentum the phenomenon ‘light’ has initiated. The term “gespenstisches Licht” is a collocation in German and therefore does not capture the

eeriness and surreal effect of the original. In the same context, the translators' approach to another passage describing human behaviour is remarkable. The original reads:

Bent over their instruments, three hundred Fertilizers were plunged, as the Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning entered the room, in the scarcely breathing silence, the absent-minded, soliloquizing hum or whistle, of absorbed concentration. (BNW 2)

Despite their apparent activity, here again, the people are reduced to passivity. Through the capitalization of the occupational title "Fertilizer", the group of workers becomes an entity, and the individual is condemned to anonymity. This subtle, but powerful effect is difficult to recreate in German due to German spelling conventions requiring the capitalization of nouns. However, by personifying the term "silence" in stark contrast to the de-personification of the human workers, at least the sensation of helplessness of the individual human being is preserved, as Walch does effectively:

Da saßen, als der Direktor für Brutstätten und Konditionierung den Raum betrat, dreihundert Befruchter über ihre Instrumente gebeugt, waren versunken in der kaum atmenden Stille, im gedankenverlorenen vor sich hin Summen oder Pfeifen selbstvergessener Konzentration. (W: 6)

Herlitschka, however, misses the opportunity to save part of the original tone by ignoring the personification and by breaking up the complex rhythm of the English original. His text reads as follows:

Dreihundert Befruchter standen über ihre Instrumente gebeugt, als der Brut- und Normdirektor den Saal betrat. Kaum ein Atemzug unterbrach die Stille, kaum ein

gedankenverlorenes Vor-sich-hin-Summen oder Pfeifen störte die allgemeine angespannte Vertieftheit. (H1: 6/7, H2: 23, H3: 19)

Walch's translation is a skilful rendition of the original mood, which is, on many occasions, not achieved by Herlitschka, and is evidence of her fidelity to the source text. She read the source text more closely and successfully recreated the original atmosphere projected throughout the entire book. Herlitschka, on the other hand, fails to save the original tone by ignoring stylistic means such as personification, and by breaking up the complex rhythm of the source.

The first few lines of chapter one introduce the reader to the world state's motto "Community, Identity, Stability", which summarizes the new society's key goals and is engraved on a shield at the Hatchery's entry (BNW 1). These virtues are achieved and maintained through a variety of means, both on a biological level, for example in the process of artificial reproduction, and on a more subtle, emotional level, by promoting a life style based on drug consumption and immediate sexual gratification. The two translators' approach to the motto displays a major divergence that is also characteristic of their overall strategy. Herlitschka chooses the terms "Gemeinsamkeit, Einheitlichkeit, Beständigkeit" (H1: 5, H2: 23, H3: 19), and he is undoubtedly guided by the "Freiheit, Gleichheit, Brüderlichkeit" motto of the French Revolution "Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité". Walch, on the other hand, renders the motto as: "Kommunität, Identität, Stabilität" (W: 5). To understand her decision to choose these words rather than words of entirely German origin as Herlitschka does, it is useful to know that the former East Germany commonly adopted for its official terminology words that can be characterized as internationalisms. "Internationalisms" are lexemes "die in mehreren Sprachen in jeweils

mehr oder weniger abgewandelter lautlicher, grammatischer und orthographischer Gestalt vorhanden sind” (Schlosser 24). Many such internationalisms entered the German language through Russian, as Sabina Schroeter writes (108). Examples in the East German official terminology and language are terms such as “Aktiv”, “Kollektiv”, “Pionier” and “Rekonstruktion” (110). Walch’s treatment of the world state motto is reminiscent of this practice. In one of her e-mails she wrote that she approached her translation with a critical attitude towards conditions in her own country, and that one way of capturing this attitude on a linguistic level was to recreate what she called “Bürokratensprache” (Aug. 23, 2008). The translation of the state motto using the internationalisms “Kommunität”, “Identität” and “Stabilität” not only mimics official practice in the GDR, but also recaptures the fact that the society described in the novel is part of a ‘world state’. Herlitschka’s translation of the state motto should be seen in the context of the entire cultural transplantation, i.e. the translocation of the original setting to Berlin, which will be discussed in Chapter III.6.1 “Original Setting”. Walch’s tendency to use international loan words and her conscious intention to imitate the official language of the GDR, and Herlitschka’s preference for an *Urdeutsche* terminology can be traced throughout the entire text.

There are more examples, for instance the noun “conditioning”, as in “Director of Hatcheries and Conditioning” (BNW: 2), was translated by Herlitschka as “Brut- und Normdirektor” (H1: 5) and “Brut- und Normdirektor” (H2: 23, H3: 19, 20), whereas Walch writes: “Direktor für Brutstätten und Konditionierung” (W: 5). The phrase “major instruments of social stability” (BNW 6), describing the Bokanowsky Process to produce human clones, is translated by Walch as “Hauptinstrument sozialer Stabilität”

(W: 9), while Herlitschka chooses the expression “Hauptstützen menschlicher Beständigkeit” (H1: 11, H2: 27). The 1981 revision of his translation modifies his rendition to “Hauptstützen für eine stabile Gesellschaft” (H3: 22), incorporating the internationalism of the noun “stability” as the adjective “stabil”, while ignoring the semantic distinction between “instrument” and “Stütze”. Walch’s version fulfils two objectives. Not only does she follow her goal to remain true to the original, she also captures the meaning of the phrase, which Herlitschka fails to do, as “Stütze”, support, is quite different from “instrument”, tool. The expression “Social Predestination Room” (BNW 11) is another example of Walch’s technique. She translates “Raum für soziale Prädestination” (W: 12), while Herlitschka translates as: “Vorbereitungssaal” (H1: 14), “Abteilung für soziale Vorbereitung” (H2: 30) and “Abteilung für soziale Bestimmung” (H3: 24).

Walch’s handling of Huxley’s composite nouns, such as “Bokanowsky Process” (BNW 4), “Infant Nurseries” (BNW 20) or “trumpet mouths” (BNW 27) is an example of her conscious manipulation of the text. She writes in an e-mail: “[...] die Substantivkomposita in einem Wort zu schreiben (ein Einfall, der sich als sehr ergiebig erwies), sollte das Bürokratische, Verordnete, absichtlich schwer Überschaubare der Sprache verdeutlichen, und dabei habe ich schon an die Bürokratensprache im eigenen Land gedacht” (Aug. 23 2008). Her renderings of such terms consequently read as follows: “Bokanowskyverfahren” (W: 8), “Kleinkinderpflegestätte” (W: 20) and “Trompetenschalltrichter” (W: 27).

A very modern approach to the term “Organ Store” (BNW 9) arises in Walch’s version. She translates the expression, probably without batting an eyelid, as

“Organbank” (W: 11). Herlitschka, on the other hand, unfamiliar with the notion, had to invent his own expression. His original version reads: “Lebensorgane-Depot” (H1: 13), followed by a revised “Organ-Magazin” (H2: 29, H2: 25). Even his 1981 version was not able to employ the term that matched current German usage. Walch’s translation is remarkably current.

In terms of the kind of modifications the translated text displays and the factors that caused them, again individual style plays an important role, but this individual style implies a certain attitude, as demonstrated in Walch’s treatment of composite nouns deliberately imitating the official language of her country. The organ store example points to the simple fact that Walch’s translation was created forty-five years after the first German edition, a period of time during which the language had undergone change and both terminology and technology had evolved--a fact neglected in Herlitschka’s 1981 version, which sometimes fails to adjust to current usage. Another account of a simple case of terminology change owing to technical progress is present in the translators’ handling of the term “television”, which is awkwardly rendered by Herlitschka as “Fernguckkasten” in his first two versions (H1: 104, H2: 99), and updated in the 1981 version as “Fernsehapparat” (H3: 86). In 1978 Walch experiences no difficulties in translating the term as “Fernsehen” (W: 83).

## 7.2 Chapter Two

In chapter two the reader continues to accompany the group of students on their visit to the Hatchery and becomes acquainted with the second means to establish social stability: the individual’s subordination to the needs of consumer society. The reader

witnesses infant conditioning according to caste membership. Lower-caste Gamma, Delta and Epsilon children are trained through exposure to electrical shocks to dislike books and flowers, as reading and a love for nature, at least at their social level, does not increase consumption. In other words, conditioning is a means to adjust behaviour to economic policy. In addition to economic conditioning, social conditioning, called Elementary Class Consciousness, is taught through hypnopaedia, which aims to make people satisfied with their own social destination and prejudice against members of other castes. Through the combination of authorial narrative technique, the director's address, and his dialogue with the students, the reader gains insight into the structure of this new society. The two German translators display a variety of approaches to the presentation of these social structures.

An interesting deviation from the original text in both translators' work is their translation of the term "Elementary Class Consciousness" (BNW 30), one of the subjects taught through hypnopaedia. The use of the term "class" is unusual in that it appears only twice throughout the entire novel. The common term to refer to social categories in the novel is "caste", and there is no explanation why the Huxley exchanges "caste" with "class" here, and the critical literature on *Brave New World* seems to have neglected this phenomenon completely. In his original German version, Herlitschka translates "class consciousness" as "Klassenbewußtsein" (H1: 36). His rendering, which I would consider correct, reads "Kastenbewußtsein" in the 1950 and 1981 versions (H2: 45, H3: 38). The change can probably be explained by a decision for consistency. Walch's translation contains the same mistranslation (W: 28). In this context, I asked Eva Walch whether she thought that political and ideological circumstances had any impact on her decision. She

responded that she was fully aware that her work was a contribution to a critical view of the GDR, owing to the fact that she was involved in the publication of a book that could be viewed as subversive. During the process of translation, however, she claimed that ideological and political aspects had no direct and conscious influence. She admitted, though, that translation is always guided by a certain attitude and an “innere[s] *kritische[s]* Verhältnis zu den gesellschaftlichen Verhältnissen, das teilt sich *subliminally* mit [...]“ (23 Aug. 2008). I think her avoidance, probably on a subconscious level, of the term “Klassenbewusstsein”, which would be the closest equivalent to the English term and therefore the best translation, is related to this comment. According to the *Oxford Dictionary of Sociology Online*, class consciousness is defined as the “the transition from a ‘class in itself’ (a category of people having a common relation to the means of production) to a ‘class for itself’ (a stratum organized in active pursuit of its own interests)” resulting in the development of revolutionary class consciousness among workers. The class consciousness lessons taught through hypnopedia to children of the brave new world are aimed at acceptance and satisfaction with the “class” to which they belong on the basis of biochemical predestination, instead of, according to the Marxist reading of the term, stimulating awareness of the economic injustice they suffer due to their class. Class consciousness is positively connotated as it eventually leads to revolution. Walch’s hesitation to use the term could, therefore, be attributed to the idea she has subconsciously opted for what it means.

The word “class” also appears in connection with the director’s report on the conditioning of the “lower classes” to hate nature and books: “It was decided to abolish the love of nature, at any rate among the lower classes [...]” (BNW 25). Herlitschka’s

versions read as follows: “Man hatte daher beschlossen, die Liebe zur Natur abzuschaffen, wenigstens unter den niederen Kasten [...]” (H1: 30, H2: 41, H3: 35). Walch, however, translates: “Man beschloß, die Liebe zur Natur abzuschaffen, wenigstens bei den unteren Klassen [...]“ (W: 24). The fact that Walch uses the term “Klassen” to translate “classes”, that is, translates the original text faithfully this time, can probably be contextualized with her treatment of the term “class consciousness”. The manipulation of the “lower classes” described in the cited excerpt aligns with the idea of the suppression of the lower classes. The term “niedere Klassen” could consequently be adopted unproblematically. As in most cases covered in this analysis, the translators made their decisions on an instinctive or subliminal (as Walch describes it) level and this is another excellent example that social and political circumstances do affect a translation. Since Walch writes that the editing performed by the publishers in East Germany was “genau, aber nicht vorschreibend” (23 Aug., 2008), it is assumed that the terminology used in her text can be attributed to her own decisions. In Herlitschka’s case, who did translate with the word “Klassenbewußtsein” in the first place but was subsequently corrected, the divergence can be attributed to an attempt to correct an alleged printer’s error.<sup>15</sup> This inaccuracy, however, does result in some inexplicable and interesting deviation from the source, as described above, which presents a difficulty in determining what actually influenced Herlitschka’s treatment of the term.

---

<sup>15</sup> I contacted the S. Fischer Verlag for information on the revision, i.e. who and why the text was revised, but was told that the information is not available.

### 7. 3 Chapter Three

In this chapter, one of the main characters, Mustapha Mond, makes his first appearance. Mond, one of the ten World Controllers, teaches the students the World State's version of history, i.e. the world as it was before the introduction of "universal conditioning techniques", and discusses issues relating to social and family life, the development of hypnopaedia, and sexuality. The reader is introduced to the one of the famous state slogans, "History is bunk", identified by Mond as "that beautiful and inspired saying of Our Ford's" (BNW: 38).

Sie kennen wohl alle den erhabenen und erleuchteten Ausspruchs Fords des Herrn: Geschichte ist Mumpitz. (H1: 44, H2: 52)

Sie alle kennen wohl den schönen und wahren Ausspruch Fords des Herrn: Geschichte ist Mumpitz. (H3: 44)

Sie erinnern sich alle, nehme ich an, des schönen und geistvollen Ausspruch Unseres Ford: Geschichte ist Mist. (W: 34)

The most obvious difference here is the two translators' choice of a German word for the term "bunk". The *Cambridge-Klett Comprehensive German Dictionary* suggests the phrase "völliger Blödsinn", Herlitschka renders it as "Mumpitz", characterized by *Cambridge-Klett* as "veraltend" and as "umgangssprachlich" by *Duden*, and Walch selects the more common term "Mist". While this reflects merely the chronology of the translations, or perhaps simply personal preference, the more interesting discrepancy lies in the rendering of the term "Our Ford". Herlitschka's version echoes the German phrase "Gott der Herr", replacing "Gott" with "Ford", thus directly alluding to the fact that the car manufacturer Ford has God-like status in the new society. Walch's allusion to Ford's

position is established by replicating the source text's syntax, and thus retaining the phonological adjacency between the English term "Lord" and the name "Ford". Her approach to translating this passage constitutes a subtler and possibly not immediately detectable reference to the depiction of Ford as God. Her version does not read as strongly as the original text, which leaves the reader in no doubt about the purport of the phrase and its significance. The factor that affected her seemingly cautious approach to the treatment of this religious issue might be explained by the strained relationship between church and state in the GDR, with the church being an "alleged remnant of bourgeois society" (Fullbrook 208). In contrast to Walch, Herlitschka's translation of this example guides the reader in a certain direction.

A passage later, Herlitschka delivers an example of reader patronization when the narrator describes the World Controller's hand gesture which "brushed away [...] Passion; [...] Requiem [and] Symphony" (BNW: 39). The translator feels the need to clarify these terms for the German reader, translating them as "Matthäuspassion [...]; Mozarts Requiem and [...] die Neunte" (H1: 45, H2: 52, H3: 44). Although this seems annoying at first glance--as if he deems his readers too slow to understand the reference without additional explanation--this approach should be seen in connection with his (and the publisher's) attempt to make the novel more accessible to the German reader. This is discussed further in Chapter III.6.1, "Original Setting", and is an example of Herlitschka's domesticating approach to the text. Walch, who does not offer extra information to her readers, simply translates as "Passion; [...] Requiem; [and] Sinfonie" (W: 34).

A further discrepancy between the translators' work occurs in the passage in which one of the new media is discussed. Whereas the term "feelies" (BNW: 39), referring to theatres showing films that transfer "tactual" experiences to the viewer, are translated by both as "Fühlkino" (H1: 45, H2: 52, H3: 44, W: 34), the term "tactual effects", with which the Assistant Predestinator describes the experience is rendered as "Fühleffekt" by Herlitschka (H1: 45, H2: 52, H3: 44) and as "taktile Wirkung" by Walch (W: 34). Both translators display consistency in their own approaches here. Herlitschka, with his general tendency to avoid words of foreign origin<sup>16</sup> and employ German terms, translates the adjective "tactile" as "Fühl-", by which he creates an analogy to his translation "Fühlkino". Walch, however, retains the "foreignness" of the word and writes "taktil", a term rather uncommon in everyday German. Her preference for the foreign term reflects her attempt to mimic East German official language. Similarly, Walch's translation of the term "Assistant Predestinator" shows a slight inconsistency in Walch's approach to a phenomenon to which she refers as "Bürokratensprache". She has a tendency to spell compound nouns as one word as opposed to using hyphenation, which would render the word more legible. Her approach is intended to achieve the exact opposite of legibility; she strives to mock the inscrutable official language of the GDR. In this example, however, she fails to do so when she translates "Assistant Predestinator" as "Stellvertretender Prädestinator" instead of "Prädestinationsstellvertreter" (W: 34). Interestingly, Herlitschka's version reads "Prädestinationsstellvertreter" (H1: 45, H2: 52) and "Prädestinationsassistent" in the (H3: 44), employing both of Walch's strategies: the use of internationalisms (even more so in the revised version of 1981) and the

---

<sup>16</sup> I consider the term "Effekt" as well established in the German language despite its Latin origin.

unhyphenated spelling of compound nouns. It is unclear why Walch's failure to follow her own approach coincides with Herlitschka's unusual adoption of what was to be her technique.

#### 7.4 Chapter Four

This chapter continues to prepare the reader for the main plot with a presentation of Bernard's and Lenina's vacation plans to the native reservation in New Mexico. Another protagonist, Helmholtz Watson, is also introduced, who, just as his close friend Bernard, is an outsider in the society.

At the beginning of the chapter, Herlitschka delivers an example which proves Kade correct when he asserts that the affiliation of a translator to a certain social system and his or her identification with a certain ideology is expressed in the translation (54). The first line in the fourth chapter reads: "The lift was crowded with men" (BNW: 68), which is translated by Herlitschka as follows: "Der Aufzug war gedrängt voll von Beamten" (H1: 70, H2: 73), subsequently revised to "Der Aufzug war gedrängt voll von Alphas" (H3: 63). While Herlitschka's interpretation of "men" as "civil servants", with its connotation of the typical German "Beamter" is amusing, his choice of words complies with his adopted strategy of domesticating his translation by "leaving the reader in peace" and "moving the text towards him" (Schleiermacher 47). This text excerpt also serves as an example to disprove Venuti's claim that domesticating translation with its "transparency" hides the conditions under which the translation was created. Herlitschka's term reveals that the translation was created in a social system that recognizes a *Beamtenstand*, as opposed to the GDR. As we would expect, Walch

translates “men” as “Männer”, and proves again to be more faithful to the source (W: 55).

Despite the fact that there is no reference to the existence of a *Beamtenstand* throughout the novel, Herlitschka’s term of choice here is not entirely unjustified. The German reader associates the term *Beamter* with characteristics such as obedience and pedantry, qualities that are not altogether out of place to describe the hatchery employees. However, while this occurrence of domestication was tolerated in the 1950 edition, it was finally eliminated in the revised version of 1981, resulting in yet another deviance from the source by translating “men” as “Alphas”, thus shifting the emphasis and neglecting the fact that all the lift users are men. Unfortunately, the elimination of the term “Beamte” from the 1981 version also counters Herlitschka’s potential intention to mock German bureaucracy, which is a possible reason to explain his decision to translocate the original setting to Germany. Walch’s translation is, again, faithful to the source. Huxley’s “men” are ordinary “Männer” in her version, leaving all associations to the reader.

A situation that often poses a problem for translators from English to German is the treatment of the personal pronoun “you”, and the two German translators display different approaches to this issue. Lenina addresses Bernard as follows: “Bernard! [...] I was looking for you” (BNW: 68), which Herlitschka renders as “Sigmund! [...] Ich habe Sie schon gesucht” (H1: 70, H2: 73, H3: 63), whereas Walch’s text reads “Bernard! [...] Ich hab dich gesucht” (W: 55). While Herlitschka chooses the formal “Sie” as the form of address between two people who obviously know each other on an intimate level, Walch opts for the familiar “du” and displays a more current usage. This is another instance of a

change in language use and the influencing factors here are convention and current practice.

A simple case of misinterpretation of the source text is present in the following excerpt, which refers to Bernard's insecurity due to his physical inadequacies. "[H]is self-consciousness was acute and distressing" (BNW 76) is rendered in Herlitschka's first version as "Sein Selbstbewußtsein war qualvoll scharf ausgeprägt" (H1: 79), which is not only incorrect but also contradictory to the context. The mistranslation of the noun "self-consciousness" as "Selbstbewußtsein" was obviously noticed and consequently changed in the sentence "Seine Fähigkeit zur Selbsterkenntnis war qualvoll scharf ausgeprägt" (H2: 79, H3: 68), yet the revised version failed to recognize the actual German equivalence of the English term. Walch, by contrast, has no problem identifying "Befangenheit" as the corresponding German term: "Seine Befangenheit war heftig und quälend" (W: 62).

More significant is the divergence between the German versions in the following excerpt describing the friendship between Bernard and Helmholtz. Whereas the original reads, "What the two men shared was the knowledge that they were individuals" (BNW 80), Herlitschka's interpretation is as follows: "Beiden gemeinsam war das Bewußtsein, daß sie Einzelfälle waren" (H1: 82, H2 82, H3: 70). While his choice of terms seems at first to be attributable to his strategy of domesticating translation in favouring the German term instead of the noun "Individuum", which is of Latin origin, his translation, maintained throughout all three versions, changes the perspective of the narrator, who approaches Bernard's and Helmholtz's emotions from their own perspective. An *Individuum* or *Einzelwesen* is someone who stands out and embraces his or her

distinctiveness; an *Einzelfall*, on the other hand, is perceived as odd by society. The positive associations one has with the term *individual* are not replicated in Herlitschka's version and manipulate the reader's perception of the two characters, shifting it into a direction not intended by Huxley. If the translator wanted to adhere to his domesticating approach, he could have resorted to the German term "Einzelwesen" which includes both the denotation of the original expression and the effect associated with it. Walch, according to her preference to opt for the term of foreign origin, writes "Individuum" ("Was die beiden Männer verband, war das Wissen, daß sie Individuen waren", W: 64), and by doing so she adheres to both the foreignizing translation strategy and the requirement to remain faithful to the source, as imposed on her by her publisher and implied in the Marxist-Leninist approach. The influencing factor in Herlitschka's case, however, and whether his choice was conscious or due to misinterpretation, cannot be determined. Whatever the case, Kade's accusation that the "bourgeois" translation was subject to "Fehlleistungen" holds true for this example in Herlitschka's work (52).

### 7.5 Chapter Sixteen

In the aftermath of the riot John tries to incite, he, Bernard and Helmholtz are taken to World Controller Mustapha Mond. In a lecture-like discussion, Mond justifies society's sacrifice of individuality and freedom to ensure stability and happiness. Helmholtz and Bernard are finally exiled to the Falkland Islands.

A linguistically interesting divergence between the two translators' approaches occurs at the chapter's beginning. In the English version, Helmholtz rejoices over the fact that their appointment with Mustapha Mond resembles a "caffeine-solution party"

more than a trial (BNW 260). Herlitschka renders Huxley's humorous transposition of the 20<sup>th</sup> century's coffee party into a futuristic "caffeine-solution party" by rendering the term as "Koffeinkränzchen" (H1: 260). His felicitous word choice, which makes use of the German fixed (and equally humorous) expression, alluding to the artificial quality many of the brave new pleasures display, is somewhat spoiled by the subsequent change into "Koffeinersatzkränzchen" (H2: 218, H3: 189), which is not only unnecessarily convoluted, but also exhibits a misinterpretation of the term "solution" as "Ersatz-" rather than "Lösungs-". The cause for this change, as in some of the previous cases, is not readily apparent. Walch's version, in accordance with her source-text oriented approach and her faithfulness to the original, imitates the composition of the English original and translates the term as "Koffeinlösungsparty" which is both semantically and linguistically correct, but does not succeed in replicating the ironic undertone of the original. Also notable is her readiness to employ an anglicism by retaining the noun "party", which correlates with her foreignizing technique. This text excerpt is an example of the domesticating translation being successful and preferable to the foreignizing method. Herlitschka's linguistically freer interpretation works very well and supports Vermeer's stance, who, as an advocate of the functionalist approach, argues that neither the domesticating nor the foreignizing translation strategy destroys the source culture.

Speaking about the disadvantages of reduced working hours, Mustapha Mond mentions that the "Inventions Office is stuffed with plans for labour-saving processes" (BNW 269). Analogous to Herlitschka's use of the German term "Beamter", he translates the "Inventions Office" as "Erfindungsamt" (H1: 269, H2: 224, H3: 195). As in the previous example, his transposition of the brave new administrative institutions to

German conditions can be seen as a parody or mockery of German bureaucracy. This is similar to Walch's technique of using convoluted German compound nouns to mock the official language of the GDR. Most probably, Herlitschka's motivation is a similar one and can be seen as a parody of domestic administrative structures. Walch's translation of "Inventions Office" is "Erfindungsbüro" (W: 215), which in turn reflects her general practice of using terms of foreign origin. Her term "Erfindungsbüro" is reminiscent of the political Russian loan word "Politbüro" and could therefore be another attempt to mimic the official language of her country.

A remarkably current translation occurs in the rendering of the phrase "The controllers had the island of Cyprus cleared of all its existing inhabitants" (BNW 267). Herlitschka's versions read: "Die Aufsichtsräte ließen die Insel Zypern von allen Einwohnern säubern" (H1: 267, H2: 223, H3: 194). His word choice "säubern" is as vague as the original English phrasing, and thus displays faithfulness to the source text. What makes his word choice for modern readers especially forceful, is that it is also the German verb used to describe the term "ethnic cleansing". Walch translates the section as follows: "Die Überwacher ließen Zypern von allen dort lebenden Einwohnern räumen" (W: 214). Like Herlitschka's, her translation copies the indeterminateness of Huxley's text, yet avoids the connotations the term has acquired in the last decades.

Reminiscent of parody or even mockery is Herlitschka's approach to the phrase "Price we have to pay for stability" (BNW 264), which he translates as "Spesenrechnung der Beständigkeit" (H1: 270, H2: 225). His playfully ironic "Spesenrechnung" (again alluding to the German *Beamtentum*) was regrettably changed to "Konto der Beständigkeit" in the revised version of 1981 (H3: 195). Walch, faithful as always,

translates almost literally as “Kosten der Stabilität” (W: 216). The factor that influenced her decision is again individual style combined with her general approach to translation.

### III.8 Special Aspects: Gender, Race and Sexuality

In this segment I analyze selected aspects to reveal accentual shifts present in Herlitschka’s text. Otto Kade, from his Marxist-Leninist viewpoint, criticizes such *Akzentverschiebungen* in texts translated in non-socialist societies as “grobe Entstellungen des Originals” (52), adopting a similar position to that of his American colleague Lawrence Venuti, who speaks of translations as acts of violence (13). I explore this with examples from the thematic areas gender, race and sexuality.

#### 8.1 Gender

Despite the fact that genders appear equal within the social order of *Brave New World*, since both men and women work at the same jobs, have equal choice in sexual partners, and participate in the same leisure pursuits, Huxley was occasionally accused of displaying some level of misogyny in the novel. David Higdon even claims that Huxley’s misogyny is everywhere in his novels written before 1931, and that it “become[s] as serious narrative issue and a thematic problem in *Brave New World*” (79). Milton Birnbaum observes that women in *Brave New World* “are seen chiefly in relationship to males” and only “occupy satellite position[s]” (61), and Deanna Madden claims that the men in *Brave New World* “have a spiritual dimension that the women lack” (292). While Milton sees a potential threat in Lenina’s behaviour (she consistently does not wear her caste’s colours, for example, 83), in Christie March’s contrasting

opinion, Lenina represents the “brave new womanhood” of Huxley’s world (54). According to March, Lenina’s apparent superficiality facilitates Huxley’s warnings about the impact of mass consumerism and sexual liberty; “she acts out the familiar ‘dumb blonde’ stereotype” (54).

The German versions translated by Herlitschka take up the latent misogyny and display a level of sexism that is not present in the source text to the same extent. Some of the examples I analyze in this section coincide with evidence of racism as well, which I discuss in Chapter III.8.2.

One of the most striking examples of misogyny, which prevails to a much higher degree in Herlitschka than in the original text, is Herlitschka’s rendition of the term “woman”. Several examples of this can be found in chapter seven, which deals with Bernard and Lenina’s visit to the Indian Reservation where they witness family life and rituals that are unknown in their own society. Here are some examples:

The spectacle of two young women giving the breast to their babies, made her blush [...] (BNW 130)

Beim Anblick zweier junger Weiber, die ihren Säuglingen die Brust gaben, errötete sie [...] (H1: 133, H2: 121)

Beim Anblick zweier junger Frauen, die ihren Säuglingen die Brust gaben, errötete sie [...] (H3: 105)

Der Anblick zweier junger Frauen, die ihren Kindern die Brust gaben, ließ sie erröten [...] (W: 106)

Men, women, children, all the crowd ran after them (BNW 135)

Die ganze Menge, Männer, Weiber, und Kinder liefen ihnen nach [...] (H1: 139, H2: 125)

Die Männer, Frauen und Kinder, alle liefen ihnen nach (H3: 108)

Männer, Frauen, Kinder, die ganze Menge rannte hinterher. (W: 110)

While *Duden* does not explain “Weib” at all, both the *Cambridge Klett Comprehensive German Dictionary* and the *Etymologische Wörterbuch des Deutschen* identify it as “pejorative”, which reveals a derogative attitude on the part of the translator. The fact that the term “Weib” was replaced by the expression “Frau” in the revised version of 1981 (but not in the 1950 edition, which underwent minor revisions as well), shows that the use of the pejorative term “Weib” to speak of a woman, despite its etymological neutrality<sup>17</sup>, is no longer acceptable, especially as the original text uses the neutral expression “woman” with reference to a female human being. Walch had no problem translating those text excerpts; she uses the German word “Frau” which is as neutral as the original and the only acceptable German translation.

However, there is an example where Herlitschka’s translation of “woman” as “Weib” has some justification. When Mustapha Mond, the World Controller, illustrates family life as it used to be, the original text reads “[...] a periodically teeming woman [...]” (BNW: 41). Herlitschka’s versions are: “[...] ein periodisch brütendes Weib [...]” (H1: 47), “[...] ein periodisch trächtiges Weib [...]” (H2: 54), “[...] ein in regelmäßigen Abständen trächtiges Weib [...]” (H3: 46). Despite the divergence in word choice, his translation captures very well the author’s intention of creating an image of an animal-

---

<sup>17</sup> The *Deutsches Wörterbuch* by Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm only refers to “Weib” as a person of female gender.

like human family. Walch's "ständig schwangere Frau" seems almost too tame in the context despite the fact that at first glance, on a formal level, it is closer to the original.

The translators' decisions discussed in these examples can be ascribed to personal choice or preference. A look at the status of women in the societies in which the German versions originated also offers possible explanations. The equivalency of men and women is entrenched in Article 20 of the Constitution of the German Democratic Republic, which says: "Mann und Frau sind gleichberechtigt und haben die gleiche Rechtsstellung in allen Bereichen des gesellschaftlichen, staatlichen und persönlichen Lebens" (*Verfassung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, Art. 20: 24). The constitution of the Weimar Republic included the equality of men and women, but the reality was different, a fact that might have been the underlying factor in Herlitschka's attitude towards women. The family law of the German Civil Code, the BGB, declared, for example, the submission of a wife to her husband (§1354). To accept employment, for example, required her husband's legal consent (§1358). Both the social realities and, perhaps, the translators' own genders influenced their decisions.

## 8.2 Race

Huxley's novel exhibits underlying racism. Examples of implied racism are the Hatchery employee Foster's comment on the genetic response of the "negro ovary" as being different from "European material" (BNW 8), or the fact that future tropical workers are bred and raised in London instead of employing local people (BNW 18). This is reminiscent of colonial practice and justification to oppress nations considered inferior, and the "unflattering depiction of the 'Savage Reservation' and the characters in

it” (Toy Miller 145), is, to say the least, strongly biased. More explicit racism surfaces in the term “Epsilon-Plus negro porter” (BNW 118). Despite the fact that inferior, low-caste workers are available for menial jobs, the author could not resist the cliché of the “negro porter”.

Racism can probably be taken as a matter of fact in the period of the novel’s creation. It is, however, conspicuous that Herlitschka adds a racial dimension to the narrator’s reference to the ethnic diversity of the children who are to be conditioned. The phrase “[...] not exclusively pink and Aryan, but also luminously Chinese, also Mexican [...]” (BNW 20) is translated by Herlitschka as: “[...] aber nicht nur lauter rosig arischer, sondern auch mattgelb mongolischer und mexikanischer [...]” (H1: 26, H2: 38, H3: 3), while Walch accurately reproduces the phrase as: “[...] die in diesem hellen Licht nicht nur rosa und arisch aussahen, sondern auch leuchtend chinesisches, auch mexikanisch [...]” (W: 20). Both colour and ethnic adjectives are derived from the German physiologist and comparative anatomist’s Johann Friedrich Blumenbach’s classification of human races (*Encyclopædia Britannica Online*). Instead of using the German term “chinesisches”, Herlitschka chooses to determine the appropriate race category, including its convenient colour coding, ironically, not unlike the colours prescribed for the members of the five castes. While his original translation and failure to correct his error in later versions is perhaps not at all surprising, the editor of the revised edition should have noticed and adjusted this embarrassing faux-pas, which is also a mistranslation. Walch translates ideologically neutrally and chooses the equivalent term “chinesisches”.

Another incident of ‘added racism’, i.e. racism that is not present in this form in the source text, can be observed in Herlitschka’s translation of the passage “Naked from

throat to navel (BNW 127)” which he rendered in German as “[...] nackt vom Hals bis zum Nabel” (H1: 130; H2: 118; H3: 103), as did Walch (W: 118). Although the presence of racism in this passage is not immediately obvious, it becomes clear in connection with Herlitschka’s translation of “naked” in the following one. The description of naked children playing in the garden (BNW 33) is at first rendered by Herlitschka as “[...] Knaben und Mädchen tollten mit schrillum Geschrei kleiderlos in der warmen Junisonne” (H1: 39), but “kleiderlos” is subsequently changed to the more obvious “nackt” (H2: 48, H3: 48). The fact, however, that he reserves physical nakedness for the indigenous people of the novel, while the presumably white children are described as “kleiderlos” is telling. This attitude can be explained by Stuart Hall’s definition of inferential racism, by which he means “those apparently naturalized representations of events and situations relating to race, whether ‘factual’ or ‘fictional’, which have racist premises and propositions inscribed in them as a set of unquestioned assumptions.” These assumptions, Hall continues, enable racist statements to be formulated without ever bringing to awareness the racist predicates on which they are based (399). While Herlitschka’s racism might not be conscious, ideological discourse does not depend on conscious intentions (Hall 400). Michael Berndt, reader at Das Neue Berlin, and therefore presumably Walch’s reader and editor, put Huxley’s condemnation of the class system on the same level as a rejection of racism when he wrote: “1932 geschrieben, verurteilt Huxley damals schon entschieden die faschistische Rassen- und Kastentheorie, die er für schlechthin barbarisch hält” (4). Racism is identified here as a fascist phenomenon. It is therefore not surprising that Walch’s work does not display tendencies of “extra-racism.” On both cited occasions she renders the term as “nackt”, and delivers,

therefore, a neutral translation. In the case of the aforementioned “Epsilon-plus negro porter”, she even tones down the linguistic aspect of inferential racism and translates “schwarzer Epsilon-plus-Dienstmann” (W: 96).

Herlitschka’s tendency to intensify latent racism present in the original text must be seen in the context of a prevailing attitude in the society in which the translation was engendered. Wittmann’s remarks on censorship during the Weimar Republic, conjoined with polemics against the “‘verjudete’ und ‘verniggerte’ Sündenbabel Berlin”, are important when it comes to understanding Herlitschka’s decisions (320).

### 8.3 Sexuality

As Gavin Miller notes, *Brave New World* depicts a “world state” in which “sexual expression is essential to the functioning of a nonviolent totalitarian system” (17). Sexuality is characterized by promiscuity. It is even inappropriate to go out with the same partner twice, and everyone who wants to maintain their good reputation has as many lovers as possible. The immediate gratification of sexual desire, taught through hypnopedic manipulation as “Elementary Sex”, ensures social stability and a minimum of social conflict. Huxley himself wrote in his foreword to the 1946 edition that “as political and economic freedom diminishes, sexual freedom tends compensatingly to increase” (xix). Walch has no difficulties translating the term as “Grundlagen des Geschlechtsverkehrs” (W: 28), but Herlitschka seems to struggle with his moral values when doing so. He renders the term as: “Grundbegriffe der Geschlechtsmoral” (H1: 36), “Elementarkunde des Geschlechtslebens” (H2: 45) and “Grundbegriffe des Geschlechtslebens” (H3: 38). According to the Weimarer Reichsverfassung, there was

no censorship: “Eine Zensur findet nicht statt” (Wittmann 320). However, decisions made by translators do function as a form of a censorship. To translate “sex” as “Geschlechtsmoral”, or, as a concession, “Geschlechtsleben” in 1950 and even in 1981, is simply incorrect and dilutes the author’s intent.

A similar attempt to tame the author’s explicit language was undertaken in the following case. The phrase “Old men copulate” (BNW 66) was rendered by Herlitschka “[...] Greise erfreuen sich ihrer Geschlechtskraft [...]” (H1: 68), “[...] die alten Männer erfreuen sich ihrer Geschlechtskraft [...]” (H2: 71), and “[...] die alten Leute erfreuen sich ihrer sexuellen Triebe [...]” (H3: 61). The Walch version reads: “[...] die alten Leute kopulieren [...]” (W: 54). Herlitschka’s euphemistic rendering again violates the author’s intent, which was to depict a society characterized by sexual freedom with an implied warning against this sexual liberty (March 54). Herlitschka’s effort to ‘cleanse’ the original language has, again, to be understood in the context in which he lived. There are numerous other examples in his text of toned-down language when dealing with sexual content. Surprisingly, much of this ‘Verklemmtheit’ prevailed in the 1981 version, but in a different form.

Sexuality in children is an especially sensitive issue in *Brave New World*. The following excerpts deal with this theme:

“toddler’s love-life”, and “older children were amusing themselves with [...] erotic play” (BNW 175).

“Hosenmätzchens Liebesleben”, and “wie machen’s die Großen?” (H1: 177, H2: 153/154)

“‘Hosenmätzchens Liebesleben’ and [Kleinkinder vergnügten sich] mit sexuellen Spielen” (H3: 133).

“Liebesleben des Kleinkindes”, and “Darüber befand sich ein Spielzimmer, wo sich [...] ältere Kinder mit [...] erotischen Spielen vergnügten” (W 141/142).

The treatment of the terms “toddler’s love-life” and “erotic play” is revealing (BNW 175). Herlitschka’s first rendering of the last as “wie machen es die Großen” is imaginative and does capture the sarcastic undertone of the original (H1: 177, H2: 153/154). As in previous similar cases, however, he appears to be subtly conducting a moral cleansing of the original. His witty and slightly ironic approach is, in my opinion, preferable to the 1981 version (“sexuelle Spiele”) which translates “erotic” as “sexuell”. Sexuality as a biological phenomenon is, apparently, more acceptable in children than eroticism, which focuses on sexual desire and sensuality. Herlitschka’s original version, by contrast, is broader and leaves the reader room for imagination. Regardless of his felicitous rendering, the term can easily be translated literally into German, which is Walch’s choice when she translates that the children amuse themselves with “erotischen Spielen” (W 141/142). Her translation saves the original expression on a lexical, syntactic and also semantic level and it is therefore more faithful to the source.

Although this might be viewed as far-fetched when compared to other translation choices made throughout the text, the treatment of the word “ovary,” which is used several times in the first chapter, falls into the same category (BNW 4, 7, 8). Despite his tendency to “Germanize” words of foreign origins, Herlitschka, as if hesitant to use the offensive German term in a work of literature, resorts to the German medical term

“Ovar” (H1: 7, 11, 12; H2: 24, 27, 28; H3: 20, 23, 24), while Walch uses the much more common term “Eierstock” (W: 7, 10, 11).

Herlitschka’s treatment of scenes dealing with sexuality is a striking example of “provinzielle Sittenschnüffelei“ (Wittmann 320), and can be ascribed to the socio-cultural circumstances under which he wrote. By contrast, Walch’s translation exhibits no trace of implied censorship in the form of “moral cleansing”. She also remains faithful to the original.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

My original research question aimed to show the correlation between political and socio-cultural circumstances, as well as ideological differences in translations of Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* into German. My fundamental theoretical principles were Otto Kade's claims that the affiliation of a translator to a certain social system and identification with a certain ideology are evident in his or her work. The examples I discussed in my analysis show that the milieu and circumstances under which the translations of Herberth Herlitschka and Eva Walch were created did, in fact, influence the results.

My analysis of the themes of gender, race and sexuality were particularly fruitful in answering what kinds of factors influenced the process of literary translation, what kinds of modifications appear and what caused these modifications. Many of the themes, such as family values and sexuality, touched upon by Huxley must have had a shocking effect on the original audience, as Margaret Atwood has observed (x), which offers an explanation for Herlitschka's approach. He obviously struggled with his moral values when he translated scenes dealing with sexuality, and especially sexuality in children. I referred to many examples from Herlitschka's text in which such episodes are significantly toned down and euphemistically rendered. Despite the fact that some of these were altered in subsequent versions, the Herlitschka editions do not match the precision of Huxley's original and failed to recreate the author's intent. He was doubtlessly influenced by prevailing moral values as well as social and legal restraints of the Weimar Republic, in which he lived. By contrast, Eva Walch, translating in the German Democratic Republic in the late 1970s, was obviously less startled by Huxley's

depiction of liberal sex, translating faithfully and almost literally, thus succeeding in recreating author's original intention.

My analysis of the translators' handling of traces of misogyny and racism in the novel sheds further light on the factors that influence a translation. The latent misogynist and racist attitude in Huxley's text is intensified in Herlitschka's translations. This phenomenon becomes obvious in his treatment of the English noun "women", which, on several occasions, is translated as the pejorative "Weib", which must be seen in connection with his inclination to intensify the racist connotations in the original. Examples are his translation of "luminously Chinese" as "mattgelb mongolisch" and his insistence on referring to indigenous women as "Weiber" rather than "Frauen", which, in turn, is closely connected to his misogynistic practice of translating "woman" as "Frau". I did not discover any of these phenomena in Walch's version, which points to the fact that she adhered to the demands of faithfulness set by Marxist-Leninist translation practice, opposing Kade's criticism of accent shifts prevalent in translations created in non-socialist societies.

In terms of the different economic systems in which the translations were created, my analysis of the titles and subtitles showed the influence of the translator's circumstances as well. By analyzing the *Titelfindungsprozess*, we could understand that the first Herlitschka version was created with a market in mind and with the objective to sell the product. Walch, on the other hand, writing in a socialist climate and not working in a competitive market economy, could focus her creativity entirely on the artistic aspects of her work and create a title that captured the original's intertextuality. She claimed that she was not guided by political influences and enjoyed freedom in her

choices as a translator without interference from her editors, but this claim is not entirely convincing. She was aware of the fact that she was translating a major work of world literature and that the conditions described in the novel could possibly be related to those in her own country. In several instances she consciously chose to mimic the *Bürokratensprache* of the GDR, and a similar practice can be observed in Herlitschka's text when he consciously, or perhaps unconsciously, imitated and even mocked current German conditions.

Herlitschka's translocation of the original setting, his decision to move the scene from London to Berlin, was likely a parodistic device. It was also an indicator of his tendency toward domesticating the translation, as opposed to Walch's penchant for foreignizing it.

The East German afterwords to Huxley's work are paratexts which function as mediators between the publisher and the reader and also yield information about the translations, particularly the factors that influenced the work of Eva Walch. Both afterwords display an intent to create distance between the society of the novel and that of the translator. They also function as a tool for censorship (Ferguson 100), and at the same time as a means to circumvent it.

By establishing a connection between Huxley's novel, her reader, and the contemporary Canadian reader in general, Margaret Atwood creates yet another paratextual element. The mediating effect of her writing is intensified by her direct address to us: "How does [Huxley's *Brave New World*] stand up, seventy-five years later, [...] how close have we come [...] to the society of vapid consumers, idle pleasure-seekers, inner-space trippers and programmed conformists that it presents?" (xiii) The

first question, Atwood asserts, is easy to answer: “It stands up very well” (xiii). The second one must be answered by each of us individually. She challenges us to look into the mirror: Whom do we see, Lenina Crowne, eternally beautiful and entertained, or John the Savage on his quest for meaning beyond immediate sensual gratification? Atwood concludes that it was Huxley’s genius to “present us in all our ambiguity” and that the unique structure of human language enabled him to both conjure up the picture of an apparently perfect world and, at the same time question its construction (xiv). Atwood’s insistence that Huxley’s novel is still highly relevant for contemporary times transcends geographical and linguistic borders to include readers in all modern societies and cultures. Although not saying so explicitly, she means translations of Huxley’s works as well, including those German. Just as Huxley’s original was formed by the time and society in which it was written, the German versions must be judged within the contexts from which they sprang, through the critical eyes of an investigator who understands those times and contexts, and of course through the eyes of the many German speakers who still read them today. My examination of the two key German translations of the novel is an extension of Atwood’s argument, and one which proves her case even more strongly.

## **Bibliography**

### Primary Works

- Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1932.
- . *Brave New World*. New York: Harper & Row, 1946.
- . *Brave New World: With an Introduction by Margaret Atwood*. Toronto: Vintage, 2007.
- . *Welt – wohin?: ein Roman der Zukunft*. Trans. Herberth E. Herlitschka. Leipzig: Insel, 1932.
- . *Wackere neue Welt: ein Roman der Zukunft*. Trans. Herberth E. Herlitschka. Zürich: Steinberg, 1950.
- . *Schöne neue Welt: ein Roman der Zukunft*. Trans. Herberth E. Herlitschka. Lizenzausg. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1953.
- . *Schöne neue Welt: utopischer Roman*. Trans. Eva Walch. Berlin: Das Neue Berlin, 1978.
- . *Schöne neue Welt: ein Roman der Zukunft*. Trans. Herberth E. Herlitschka. Rev. Übers. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch, 1981.
- . *Schöne neue Welt: utopischer Roman*. Trans. Eva Walch. Leipzig: Reclam, 1988.

### Secondary Works

- Ackley, Katherine Anne, ed. *Misogyny in Literature: An Essay Collection*. New York: Garland, 1992.
- Adorno, Theodor. *Zur Lehre von der Geschichte und von der Freiheit* (1964/65). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2001.

“Aldous Huxley Society.” *Centre for Aldous Huxley Studies*. 9 July 2008.

<<http://www.anglistik.uni-muenster.de/huxley/ahs.html>>

Atwood, Margaret. Introduction. *Brave New World*. By Aldous Huxley. Toronto: Vintage, 2007.

Baier, Hans. *Verlagswesen und Buchhandel in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik : eine Dokumentation des Börsenvereins der Deutschen Buchhändler zu Leipzig*. Leipzig: Börsenverein der Deutschen Buchhändler, 1986.

Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: a Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Berndt, Michael. *Brave New World*. Lektoratsvorlage. Berlin: Das Neue Berlin Verlag, 1976.

Birnbaum, Milton. *Aldous Huxley's Quest for Values*. Knoxville: U of Tennessee Press, 1971.

“Blumenbach, Johann Friedrich.” *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. 19 Aug. 2008.

<<http://www.search.eb.com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/eb/article-9015787>>.

Bode, Christoph. *Aldous Huxley: Brave New World*. München: Fink, 1985.

Brecht, Bertolt. *Arbeitsjournal*. 2. Aufl. Bd. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1973.

*Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch nebst Einführungsgesetz und umfangreichem Sachregister*.

Berlin: Klette, 1900.

“bunk”. *Cambridge Klett Comprehensive German Dictionary: Ger-Engl, Engl-Ger*. 1<sup>st</sup>

ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP ; Stuttgart: Klett, 2002.

“Class Consciousness.” *Oxford Reference Online*. 31 Aug. 2008.

<<http://www.oxfordreference.com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t88.e270>>

“Cornhill Magazine.” *The Literary Encyclopedia*. 19 Sept. 2008.

<<http://www.litencyc.com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/php/stopics.php?rec=true&UID=226>>

“Das Neue Berlin.” *Eulenspiegel-Verlagsgruppe*. 31 Aug. 2008.

<<http://www.eulenspiegel-verlag.de/dasneueberlin.html>>

Deery, June. “Technology and Gender in Aldous Huxley's Alternative (?) World.” *Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia: Chelsea House, 2003. 129-45.

Derrida, Jacques. *Margins of Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Döblin, Alfred. “Der moderne schöngeistige Verlag: Vortrag zum Tag des Buches am 22.3.1929.” *Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel*. 79 (1929): 374-76.

Fisher, James. “‘Everyone Belongs to Everyone Else’: the Influence of *Brave New World* on Cinema”. *Huxley's Brave New World: Essays*. Ed. David Garrett Izzo and Kim Kirkpatrick. Jefferson: McFarland, 2008. 172-82.

Ferguson, Stefan. “Margaret Atwood in Germany: a Case Study.” *Translating Canada*. Ed. Reingard Nischik and Marie-Luise von Flotow. Ottawa: U of Ottawa Press, 2007: 93-110.

---. “Translating Margaret Atwood into German: a Study of Translation as Cultural Transfer.” Diss. U Konstanz, 2005.

Fisher, Jerilyn, and Ellen S. Silber, eds. *Women in Literature: Reading through the Lens of Gender*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2003.

- “foster, to.” *Cambridge Klett Comprehensive German Dictionary: German-English, English-German*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP; Stuttgart: Klett, 2002.
- Canadian Oxford Dictionary*. Toronto: Oxford UP, 2004.
- Fulbrook, Mary. *People's State: East German Society from Hitler to Honecker*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Garneau, Theo. “*Brave New World* as Prototypical Musicalized Fiction.” *Huxley's Brave New World: Essays*. Ed. David Garrett Izzo and Kim Kirkpatrick. Jefferson: McFarland, 2008. 132-44.
- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
- Gentzler, Edwin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2001.
- Göpfert, Herbert G. “Die Bücherkrise 1927 bis 1929: Probleme der Literaturvermittlung am Ende der zwanziger Jahre”. *Das Buch in den zwanziger Jahren: Vorträge des zweiten Jahrestreffens des Wolfenbütteler Arbeitskreises für Geschichte des Buchwesens, 16. Bis 18 Mai 1977*. Ed. Paul Raabe. Hamburg: Hausdewell, 1978. [33]-45.
- Hall, Stuart. “The Whites of Their Eyes.” *The Discourse Reader*. Ed. Adam Jaworski and Nikolas Coupland, 2006. 396-406.
- Handbuch Deutsche Demokratische Republik*. Ed., Lexikonredaktion des VEB Bibliographisches Institut Leipzig. 2., neubearb. Ausg., Jubiläumsausg. Leipzig: VEB Bibliographisches Institut, 1984.

- Harvey, Elizabeth. "Culture and Society in Weimar Germany: the Impact of Modernism and Mass Culture". *Twentieth Century Germany: Politics, Culture and Society 1918 – 1990*. Ed. Mary Fulbrook. London: Arnold, 2001. [58]-76.
- Herlitschka, Herberth E. Letters to Anton Kippenberg. 22 April, 30 May, 19 July, 20 July, 2 Aug. 1932. Klassikstiftung Weimar, Goethe und Schiller Archiv.
- Higdon, David Leon. "The Provocations of Lenina in Huxley's *Brave New World*." *International Fiction Review* 29.1/2 (2002): 78-83.
- Höhne, Horst . Nachwort. *Schöne neue Welt: utopischer Roman*. By Aldous Huxley. Trans. Eva Walch. Berlin: Das Neue Berlin, 1978. 251-[96].
- Holzer, Angela. "To Reflect, to Sit Down: the Hinzutretende in Huxleyan Characters in Horkheimer's and Adorno's Philosophy." *Huxley's Brave New World: Essays*. Ed. David Garrett Izzo and Kim Kirkpatrick. Jefferson: McFarland, 2008. 117-31.
- Hoops, Rainald. "Die Weltanschauung Aldous Huxley's." *Englische Studien* 72 (1937/38) : 73-92.
- Huxley, Aldous. "To Ralph Pinker." 11 June 1932. *Selected Letters*. Ed. James Sexton., Chicago: Dee, 2007. 285.
- Huxley, Aldous, and Grover Cleveland Smith. *Letters of Aldous Huxley*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1969.
- Huxley, Aldous, and James Sexton. *Aldous Huxley : Selected Letters*. Chicago: Dee, 2007.
- "Huxley, Aldous." *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. 19 Sept. 2008.  
<<http://www.search.eb.com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/eb/article-9041652>>

- Izzo, David Garrett and Kim Kirkpatrick, eds. *Huxley's Brave New World: Essays*. Jefferson: McFarland, 2008.
- Jansohn, Christa. "Titelprobleme in der anglistischen Literatur- und Übersetzungswissenschaft." *Sprachkunst: Beiträge zur Literaturwissenschaft* 31.2 (2000) : 339-55.
- Jaworski, Adam, and Nikolas Coupland, eds. *Discourse Reader*. 2nd. ed. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Kade, Otto. *Sprachmittlung als gesellschaftliche Erscheinung und Gegenstand wissenschaftlicher Untersuchung*. 1. Aufl. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1980.
- Karlsruher Virtueller Katalog KVK*. Universität Karlsruhe (TH). Aug. 23, 2008.  
<<http://www.ubka.uni-karlsruhe.de/kvk.html>>
- Katalog der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek*. Deutsche Nationalbibliothek. Nov. 16, 2008.  
<<http://dispatch.opac.ddb.de/DB=4.1/>>
- Keulks, Gavin "Huxley, Aldous." *The Oxford Encyclopedia of British Literature*. 2005.  
9 July 2008.  
<<http://www.oxford-britishliterature.com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/entry?=t198.e0229>>
- Kippenberg, Anton. Letters to Herberth Herlitschka. 2 June, 28 July, 2 Aug., 21 Sept. 1932. Klassikstiftung Weimar, Goethe und Schiller Archiv. 1932.
- Kossak-Raytenau, Karl L. *Die Welt am laufenden Band: Roman*. Wien: Höger, 1937.
- Macksey, Richard. Foreword. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. By Gérard Genette. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. xi-xxii.

- Madden, Deanna. "Women in Dystopia: Misogyny in *Brave New World*, 1984, and *A Clockwork Orange*." *Misogyny in Literature: an Essay Collection*. Ed. Katherine Anne Ackley. New York: Garland, 1992. 292-96.
- March, Christie L. "A Dystopic Vision of Gender in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932)." *Women in Literature: Reading Through the Lens of Gender*. Ed. Jerilyn Fisher and Ellen S. Silber. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2003. 53-55.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei*. München: Fink, 1969.
- Meckier, Jerome. "Onomastic Satire: Names and Naming in *Brave New World*." *Aldous Huxley Annual*, 3 (2003): 155–203.
- Meckier, Jerome. *Aldous Huxley: Modern Satirical Novelist of Ideas: a Collection of Essays; Presented on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Ed. Peter Edgerly Firchow. Berlin: Lit, 2006.
- Miller, Gavin. "Political Repression and Sexual Freedom in *Brave New World* and 1984". *Huxley's Brave New World: Essays*. Ed. David Garrett Izzo and Kim Kirkpatrick. Jefferson: McFarland, 2008. 17-25.
- MLA International Bibliography*. Electronic Research Database. University of Waterloo. Aug. 23, 2008.
- <[http://search2.scholarsportal.info.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/ids70/advanced\\_search.php?SID=104cd17d20fe14028643fc57eb44fe15](http://search2.scholarsportal.info.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/ids70/advanced_search.php?SID=104cd17d20fe14028643fc57eb44fe15)>
- "Mumpitz." *Cambridge Klett Comprehensive German Dictionary: German-English, English-German*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Stuttgart: Klett,

2002. *Duden: Rechtschreibung der Deutschen Sprache*. 24., völlig neu bearbeitete und erw. Aufl. Mannheim: Dudenverlag, 2006.

Nida, Eugene Albert. *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill, 1964.

Nida, Eugene, and Jan de Waard. *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*. Nashville: Nelson, 1986.

Nischik, Reingard and Marie-Luise von Flotow, eds. *Translating Canada*. Ottawa: U of Ottawa Press, 2007.

Nord, Christiane. *Einführung in das funktionale Übersetzen: am Beispiel von Titeln und Überschriften*. Tübingen: Francke, 1993.

Nordgren, Joe. "Aldous Huxley." *The Literary Encyclopedia*. 2005. 15 July 2008.

<<http://www.litencyc.com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/php/speople.php?rec=true&UID=2281>>

Nusser, Tanja. "Schöne neue Welten: die Debatten um Gen- und Reprotechnologien vor dem Hintergrund von Huxleys Roman." *Deutschunterricht*, 55.5 (2003) : 71–79.

Ossietsky, Carl von. "Ketzereien zum Büchertag." *Die Weltbühne*, 25.12 (1929) : 441-45.

Ploog, Hannelore. *Im Netz der Manipulierung: Aldous Huxley und seine "Brave New World"*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1979.

Poschmann, Wilhelm. *Das kritische Weltbild bei Aldous Huxley: eine Untersuchung über Bedeutung, Grenzen und Mittel seiner Kritik*. Diss. Bonn. 1937.

Raabe, Paul, ed. *Das Buch in den zwanziger Jahren: Vorträge des zweiten Jahrestreffens des Wolfenbütteler Arbeitskreises für Geschichte des Buchwesens, 16. Bis 18 Mai 1977*. 1. Aufl. Hamburg: Hauswedell, 1978.

“Rathenau, Walther.” *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. 18 Aug. 2008.

<<http://www.search.eb.com.proxy.lib.uwaterloo.ca/eb/article-9062765>>

Rothe, Arnold. *Literarische Titel: Funktionen, Formen, Geschichte*. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1986.

Rumland, Marie-Kristin. *Veränderungen in Verlagswesen und Buchhandel der ehemaligen DDR: 1989-1991*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1993.

Salevsky, Heidemarie. *Translationswissenschaft: ein Kompendium*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2002.

Scheller, Bernhard. “Gesichter und Gesichte des Aldous Huxley.” Afterword. *Schöne neue Welt: utopischer Roman*. By Aldous Huxley. Trans. Eva Walch. Leipzig: Reclam, 1988. 221-[34].

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. “Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Uebersetzens.” *Das Problem des Übersetzens*. Ed. Hans-Joachim Störig. Stuttgart: Goverts, 1813/1963. 38-70.

Schlösser, Anselm. *Die englische Literatur in Deutschland von 1895 bis 1934: mit einer vollständigen Bibliographie der deutschen Übersetzungen und der im deutschen Sprachgebiet erschienenen englischen Ausgaben*. Jena: Biedermann, 1937.

Schlosser, Horst Dieter. *Die deutsche Sprache in der DDR zwischen Stalinismus und Demokratie: historische, politische und kommunikative Bedingungen*. Köln: Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik, 1990.

Schroeter, Sabina. *Sprache der DDR im Spiegel ihrer Literatur: Studien zum DDR-typischen Wortschatz*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994.

- Shakespeare, William. *Der Sturm*. Trans. [August Wilhelm] Schlegel und [Ludwig] Tieck. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1962.
- . *The Tempest*. New York: Dover, 1964.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1988.
- Toy Miller, Katherine. "Deconstructing the Savage Reservation in *Brave New World*." *Huxley's Brave New World: Essays*. Ed. David Garrett Izzo and Kim Kirkpatrick. Jefferson: McFarland, 2008: 145-160.
- "Utopisch." *Brockhaus: Enzyklopädie in vierundzwanzig Bänden*. 19., völlig neu bearb. Aufl. Bd. 23. Mannheim: Brockhaus, 1986-1994.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Routledge, 1995/2008.
- Verfassung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*. 1. Aufl. Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, 1975.
- "Verlagsgeschichte." *Insel Verlag*. 17 Aug. 2008.
- <<http://www.suhrkamp.de/verlage/insel/geschichte.cfm>>
- Vermeer, Hans. "Hermeneutik und Übersetzungs(Wissenschaft)." *TextConText* 9.3 (1994) : 163-82.
- Walch, Eva. "Brave New World." E-mail to Maria Reinhard. 23 Aug. 2008.
- . "Noch einmal Schöne Neue Welt." E-mail to Maria Reinhard. 23 Aug. 2008.
- . "Re: Noch einmal Schöne Neue Welt." E-mail to Maria Reinhard. 25 Aug. 2008.
- Watts, Harold H. "Brave New World." *Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia: Chelsea House, 2003. 21-32.

“Weib.” *Cambridge Klett Comprehensive German Dictionary: German-English, English-German*. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP ; Stuttgart: Klett, 2002. *Duden: Rechtschreibung der Deutschen Sprache*. 24., völlig neu bearbeitete und erw. Aufl. Mannheim: Dudenverlag, 2006. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen*. Bd. 3. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1989. Grimm, Jakob und Wilhelm Grimm. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. 14. Bd. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1854-1965.

Wittmann, Reinhard. *Geschichte des deutschen Buchhandels: ein Überblick*. München: Beck, 1991.