

TRANSLATION AND READERSHIP:

**Readers' Opinions and Preferences in Two Translations
of *The Little Prince***

Axelle Chazal

**Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of
Master of Arts in Translation and Interpreting
Macquarie University**

March 2003

DECLARATION

I declare that this dissertation has not been submitted for a higher degree at any other educational institution.

Axelle Chazal

March 2003

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The success of this project has depended on the willingness of the subjects to participate in it. I would like to thank all the participants who agreed to take part in the study; in Sydney: Principals, French teachers and students in private and public schools, university students, French teachers and students in private institutions, my colleagues and friends; around the world: translators' associations and translators. I would like to thank them for their time, their willingness to complete yet another questionnaire and their valuable comments.

I would also like to thank Peter Vitez, NCELTR/AMEP Website Manager, for his precious help in putting the questionnaire online.

I am extremely grateful to Dr Ian Tent, Department of Linguistics, Macquarie University, for helping me with the statistical aspect of the study.

I would like to thank my partner for his help in proof reading and editing this study.

Finally, I wish to express my deepest thanks to my supervisor, Helen Slatyer, for her extraordinary help and endless patience without which this study would not have been possible.

ABSTRACT

Many speakers of English will have come to know Saint-Exupéry's "*Le Petit Prince*" through its initial translation into English published in 1943. In 1995, more than fifty years after the first, a new translation of this much-loved children's classic was published. The blurb on the dust jacket claims that this is a "radical new translation" which has managed to capture the "lightness, the liveliness, the basic simplicity which is the essence of childhood". In the preface, the translator, Alan Wakeman, describes the earlier translation as "ponderous".

Alan Wakeman's claims are of course very subjective and this study proposes to investigate the impressions and preferences of a range of readers. Questions asked in the survey seek to find responses to the following: does a majority of people agree with Wakeman? Did his translation capture the spirit of the original? Can readers really differentiate between two different translations? Numerous theories describe, analyse and judge the translation process but the perspective of the reader has hitherto been ignored and this is why I decided to concentrate on the views of the readers.

The findings of this survey research could generate a certain interest in the professional translation milieu where research has mainly been conducted on the theoretical and practical aspects of the translation process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background and context.....	1
1.2 Aim of the study.....	4
2. Literature review.....	5
2.1 Katherine Woods' translation (1943).....	7
2.2 Allan Wakeman's translation (1995).....	8
2.3 Marilyn Gaddis Rose's analysis of two English translations of <i>L'Etranger</i> (1997)	10
2.4 Translators' backgrounds.....	13
2.5 The target audience.....	14
2.5.1 Review.....	14
2.5.2 The target audience of the French original version of <i>The</i> <i>Little Prince</i>	16
2.5.3 Translating for children.....	19
2.6 A different analysis of the same translations using Systemic Functional Grammar.....	21
2.7 Some readers' opinions.....	22
3. Methodology.....	24
3.1 The questionnaire.....	24
3.1.1 Background information.....	24
3.1.2 Questionnaire on the translations.....	25

3.2 Methods of administration for each group.....	27
3.2.1 Children English speakers.....	28
3.2.2 Adult English speakers.....	28
3.2.3 French/English translators.....	29
4. Data analysis.....	30
4.1 Introduction.....	30
4.2 Overview of results.....	30
4.3 Frequencies and cross tabulations.....	30
4.4 Results by questions.....	31
4.1 Question 1.....	31
4.4.2 Question 3.....	34
4.4.3 Question 6.....	36
4.4.4 Question 8.....	37
4.4.5 Question 5.....	45
4.5 Summary of results.....	48
4.6 Conclusion.....	49
5. Discussion.....	50
5.1 The translations and their differences.....	50
5.2 The translations' suitability for children and respondents' preferences.....	52
5.3 The translators' group of respondents.....	55
5.4 Adults and children respondents.....	55
5.5 Translators' backgrounds.....	57
5.6 Translation theories and translation readership.....	58
5.7 Conclusion.....	59
5.8 Implications.....	61
5.9 Further research.....	62
6. Appendix.....	1

6.1 Questionnaire.....	2
6.2 Questionnaire on line.....	16

1. Introduction

1. 1 Background and context

The Little Prince is the third most widely read book of the twentieth century, after the Bible and The Koran (L'Express, 1990:55). It has been translated into more than a hundred languages. Unfortunately, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry never witnessed the achievement of his book, written in 1940 and published in April 1943 in New York by Reynal and Hitchcock. Journalist, writer and pilot, he disappeared in 1944 on a reconnaissance mission flight, one year after the publication of his masterpiece.

Philip Lezard, editor at Gallimard, France's biggest publisher, summarises well what many readers feel about *The Little Prince*: "We really can't explain the phenomenon. The book has an aura about it. It is almost inexplicable". *The Little Prince* is the story of a little boy who decides to leave his minuscule planet to discover the universe and ends up on Earth where he meets a pilot in the desert. From this simple tale, Saint Exupéry explores the human condition, its contradictions and its complexity. His fable takes us on a real existential journey. Martin Heidegger even said that "*The Little Prince* was one of the great existential books of the century".

Even if *The Little Prince* has, like the Bible, the capacity to preserve its power through translation (Archives, epelorient), its translation itself is nevertheless a challenge: how does one translate an 'inexplicable phenomenon', an 'aura'?

"(...) the literary work has at any moment and with any reader a certain 'aura'. The greater the work, the harder it is to describe that aura, let alone articulate it. We can however, translate it. We do so by replicating its lexical and syntactical cues. Not that a translation will transfer the aura. Neither completely nor for all time. Have we all not agreed that literary translation is flawed by nature (...)? Put another way, if a

translation is successful, has it not become something else? Yes, yes, yes.” (Rose, 1997: 5)

T.V.F Cuffe (another translator) would disagree with Rose by saying that Katherine Woods’ translation was published at the same time as the original in 1943 and by the same publishing company. For him, “the unusual bilingualism of the story’s publication means that the first translation, by Katherine Woods, is properly speaking as much the original work as the French text from which it was drawn”(Cuffe, 1985: XXXIII). According to Denis de Rougemont, the first version was actually published in English in 1943 by Reynal & Hitchcock in New York and later the same year in French with Saint-Exupéry’s drawings. There are now more than six English translations. After Katherine Woods’ translation, one of the first to be released was written by Allan Wakeman in 1995 and published by Pavillion in London. This translation was not ‘approved’ by Gallimard and the Saint-Exupéry Foundation (according to them, Pavillion took the opportunity to publish Wakeman’s version under a legal loophole). However, it is the translation I chose to compare with Woods’ version.

Why Wakeman’s translation and not another when there are so many on the market? I would answer by quoting the dusk jacket of Wakeman’s translation. Speaking about Woods’ version Wakeman wrote:

“Imagine my disappointment (...) when I found that this profound magical book was available in English only in a ponderous translation that in my opinion failed to capture the shining spirit of the original”. (Wakeman, 1995: 9)

Such a claim implies naturally that his translation tried to avoid being ponderous and tried to capture the shining spirit of the original. One could be struck by the subjectivity and the

straightforwardness of the claim but more importantly, one could certainly feel curious about such a claim. Capturing the ‘shining spirit’ of the original is surely another subjective matter that could be problematical to measure in Wakeman’s or anyone’s translation. Such considerations are very impressionistic. I thought it would be interesting to follow the same path in inquiring about people’s impressions and preferences to find if the majority agreed with Wakeman. Wakeman’s claim also implies that translations of the same text can be different. I also wanted to discover if the majority of readers agreed with this implication.

“The target receiver, who is not always aware of reading a translated text (and does not always care much about translation in any case) may accept the translation as a manifestation of the sender’s intention.” (Nord, 1997: 80). In this dissertation we will analyse the perception of the target receiver when exposed to two different ‘manifestations of the sender’s intention’. By creating an artificial context in which the target readers are presented with two different translations of the same original literary text, it becomes possible to study their reactions, preferences and opinions in order to compare them to their individual profiles. The findings could lead to a better understanding of the target audience of translated texts and offer realistic data on an unexplored aspect of translation.

This dissertation will, therefore, concentrate on a more social aspect of the translation process in providing empirical data about the readers of translations, which is something that has hitherto been ignored. Such data could provide important findings because analysing the final effects of the translation process could allow for the verification of different translation theories. The results of the survey may also demonstrate what readers expect from translation, it could in addition show whether they can differentiate between two translations of the same text and whether they prefer a translation that takes into consideration its target audience.

1. 2 Aim of the study

After having identified three distinct groups of readers amongst the readership of *The Little Prince* (children, adult English speakers and translators), the aims of the study were as follows:

- To investigate and compare impressions and preferences of the three groups concerning two English translations of *The Little Prince*.
- To investigate associations between readers' profiles and their impressions.

The data was obtained through the administration of an anonymous survey questionnaire that was distributed through professional associations of translators and through educational institutions. Each participant was given a copy of the first two chapters of both translations. The first part of the questionnaire (background information) sought to provide a profile of the respondents based on their biodata. The second part of the questionnaire focused on specific aspects of the translations and translators, such as readers' preferences and translators' backgrounds. Respondents were asked to answer eight questions on their personal impressions of and their preference for each translation.

The anonymous questionnaire has been piloted with a small group of English native speakers and it has been modified according to the findings of the pilot study. Responses to each question have been quantified and run through a statistical package to determine significance of responses for each group. Hypotheses of association have been conducted on the responses and the biodata.

The dissertation will first propose a theoretical framework to the study before describing the methodology, the presentation and the analysis of the survey results. Finally, a discussion will link the results to the different parts of the study.

2. Literature review

Translation is now part of our lives. The books we buy, the news we read, the instructions we follow, the songs we listen to may have been translated and most of the time we do not even realise it – and most of us certainly do not care about it. Literary translation is the oldest type of translation. Between the translation of ancient Greek texts into Arabic and the several translations of *Harry Potter*, there is a gigantic gap. A gap filled with different approaches, different translation theories.

In the following literature review a theoretical background will be established in order to provide a framework to the analysis of the readership survey. Firstly, different translation theories corresponding to the date of the publication of each translation of *The Little Prince* will be presented. Next, a literary criticism analysis of two translations of another French classic will be introduced, in order to offer a parallel study in a different field. The two translations studied in that literary criticism analysis were almost written at the same time as the two translations of *The Little Prince* and can thus provide interesting parallel features which will lead to the importance of the translator's backgrounds. The value of the translator's backgrounds will be demonstrated, discussed and connected to the significance of the target audience in translation. The target audience of the French original of *The Little Prince* will be established as well as the English-speaking target audience. A discussion on how to write for that particular audience will follow. Finally, a study of the same two translations using Systemic Functional Grammar as an analytical tool will be presented, which will later offer a vital comparison with the results of the survey.

The end of the 20th century represents the beginning of a more 'scientific' description and a more independent status for translation theories. The discipline is now extremely vast, much research has been conducted on the theoretical and practical aspects of the translation process, numerous theories describe, analyse and judge that process. A complete literature

review on the subject would be an enormous task and it is beyond the scope of this dissertation. In this multitude of descriptions and analyses, the perspective of the reader has hitherto been ignored and this is what the review will focus on.

It is true that some theories contradict each other about the importance of the target audience when translating a literary text. Nord (1997) and Benjamin (1923) illustrate perfectly this point. However, neither the German Functionalist School, nor Venutti (2000) or Nord, who praise the value of the target audience, based their views on any empirical data about this important target audience.

Speaking about different translations of *The Thousand and One Nights*, Borges wrote: “Word for word, Galland’s version is the most poorly written of them all, the least faithful, and the weakest, but it was the most widely read.” (Borges, 1935:35). Just as Wakeman did when qualifying Woods’ translation as ‘ponderous’, Borges criticised in a subjective way Galland’s translation of *The Thousand and One Nights*: one could certainly question the terms ‘poorly written’ and ‘weakest’. Cary (1985) disagreed; he stated that “the novel had been presented by this marvellous translator (Galland) in a way that could seduce the audience of his time” (p.35) and that “his text remains worthwhile and very beautiful.” (Cary, 1985: 37; my translation). This example illustrates the different opinions that one particular translation can generate. To relativise the degree of subjectivity found in these criticisms we must turn to translation theories. By comparing some of the main theories corresponding to the time during which each translation of *The Little Prince* was written, we can hope to obtain a more objective theoretical background before analysing the readership’s views.

It is of course impossible to know for certain which particular theory (if any) has been used by one or the other translator of *The Little Prince*, but it is important to relate the context in which both translators found themselves at the time.

2. 1 Katherine Woods' translation (1943).

Woods wrote her translation in 1943. In 1937, José Ortega y Gasset in his paper called 'The Misery and Splendour of Translation' gave an interesting point of view regarding the style of translation:

"It is clear that a country's reading public do not appreciate a translation made in the style of their own language. For this they have more than enough native authors. What is appreciated is the inverse: carrying the possibilities of their language to the extreme of the intelligible so that the ways of speaking appropriate to the translated author seem to cross in theirs." (Ortega, 1937: 63).

Basing his judgment on the sale of his books translated into the German language, Ortega thought he knew about the readers' preferences. It is unlikely that Borges would agree with him. For Borges, the fact that Galland's version of *The One Thousand and One Nights* was the most widely read certainly did not correspond to any degree of quality, however he did not comment on that wide reading public's preference. Before Ortega, Benjamin, was already writing in 1923 "The basic error of the translator is that he preserves the state in which his own language happens to be instead of allowing his language to be powerfully affected by the foreign tongue." (Benjamin, 1923: 22). So it is clear that there was a strong interest in the style of the translated text in the period immediately preceding the first translation of *The Little Prince*: for Benjamin and Ortega the special foreign flavour was essential.

Gentzler (2001), in his description of translation theories at the beginning of the 20th century, stated that until the late 20th century, there was no real 'systematic approach' to translation in North America and that "People *practiced* translation, but they were never quite sure what they were practicing." (Gentzler, 2001: 44). It could be then tempting to say that this was the case for Katherine Woods who was an American living in North America in the early to mid 20th century.

2. 2 Allan Wakeman's translation (1995)

Wakeman wrote his translation in 1995 and, by this time, translation theories had obtained a certain status of their own (in many universities around the world) and their diversity could at times be disconcerting. Since the beginning of the 1990's, different disciplines have been supporting different theories: Baker (1992) used textlinguistics and pragmatics to shape a practical approach to translation, Rose (1997) used literary criticism to analyse translation. More generally it can be said that linguistics form a base for translation theories (Snell-Hornby, 1995; Bell, 1991).

As in the previous period, contradictions and oppositions were still of great magnitude. For example, Nord stated, "In literary translation, the translator is expected to transfer not only the message of the source text but also the specific way the message is expressed in the source language." (Nord, 1997: 89) whereas Delisle, in direct opposition believes that "(...) the essence of translation is to create an English version that reads as if it were not a translation." (Delisle as cited in Krause, 1993: 8). Krause believes that scholar-translators are the most appropriate to translate literary texts.

Bringing equivalence into the debate, Albert (1993:680) stated that the "total equivalence" is not possible; that the translator has to interpret the text. "It is the translators' task and responsibility to choose the pertinent features of the source-text, and translation theory can

only give them indications, orientations, strategies to follow, possible approaches.” (Albert, 1993: 680; my translation). For Bell as well, “(...) the ideal of total equivalence is a chimera. (p. 6) To shift from one language to another is, by definition, to alter the forms.” (Bell, 1991: 6). Similarly Lederer (1993: 632) stated that “every translation is an interpretation” (my translation) and that the meaning is more important than the words.

Conversely, Oittinen (1993:11) who clearly supports the importance of the target reader, especially in children’s literature, said that the “guidelines” for translators are still “[to] be faithful to the original, [to] be invisible.”

Relativising this idea, Nord (1997:103) said: “Today the conventional translation type in literary prose seems to be documentary and exoticism, with the exception of many children’s books (...).” It is problematic to pigeonhole Wakeman’s translation because neither ‘documented’ nor ‘exoticised version’ categorises his work satisfactorily. Just like for Woods’, it is impossible to label the translation because it does not present regular specific characteristics allowing a categorisation. However it is still possible to label certain features of a particular translation: for example, Rose (1997) uses a terminology that could be applied to many translations. She opposes free to literal translations as well as target oriented to source oriented and meaning based to language based translations.

Because it is so difficult to categorise the two translations of *The Little Prince*, let us then discuss a particular study of two translations of another French classic, *L’Etranger* (The Stranger) written by Albert Camus in 1942. This study uses literary criticism as its analytical tool and represents a rare comparative study in translation theory. This may allow us to find some parallel features with *The Little Prince*’s translations because these two translations of *L’Etranger* have been written at almost exactly the same time as the translations of *The Little Prince*.

2.3 Marilyn Gaddis Rose's analysis of two English translations of *L'Etranger*

(1997).

In *Translation and Literary Criticism*, Rose offers an in-depth analysis of two English translations of *L'Etranger* by Camus. The temporal similarities linked to the translations of *The Little Prince* make the comparison necessary. *L'Etranger* was written in 1942 by Camus and its first translation by Stuart Gilbert, who was a British Modernist, was published in 1945. The second translation appeared in 1988, written by Matthew Ward, who was an American Postmodernist.

	<i>The Little Prince</i>	<i>The Stranger</i>
Original version	1943 Saint-Exupéry	1942 Camus
First translation (1)	1943 Woods	1945 Gilbert
New translation (2)	1995 Wakeman	1988 Ward

“Both translators conceived their task by the literary norms of their own generations.” (Rose, 1997: 17). The first translation has been the most widely read, especially among students, and according to Rose it “would be termed ‘faithful’, (...), it is free, target-oriented (domesticated) and meaning-based (interpretative).” (p.18). Newmark (1988: 173) speaks about Gilbert “trying to be more colloquial than the original.” Ward’s translation on the other hand is “intentionally literal, source-oriented (foreignized) and language-based (neoliteral).” (p.18). Rose claims that Gilbert’s translation “does not have the same effect on the target audience as did Camus’s text on the source audience” (p.19) and that Ward’s translation “probably does achieve an effect comparable to what happens in French.” (p.19). She gives several examples comparing the original and both translations that could be summarized with “The differences between the 1945 British translation and the 1988 American translation are slight when isolated, but the accretion of differences leads to a difference in impact.” (p.21).

The 'impact' and the 'effect on the target audience' are here founded on literary criticism. It is tempting to compare Rose's account with the two English translations of *The Little Prince*. The periods of publication concur, however the backgrounds of the translators do not: Woods (1943) was American and Wakeman (1995) is English; this is probably one of the reasons why the characteristics corresponding to Gilbert's and Ward's translations can not be applied to Woods' and Wakeman's versions of *The Little Prince*.

To my knowledge, there are no literary criticisms of Woods' and Wakeman's versions of *The Little Prince* but it is interesting that these translations— written almost at the same time as the two versions of *L'Etranger*—offer almost the exact opposite characteristics. Using the equivalence theory (Baker, 1992) it is possible to illustrate this point. Saying that the new translation of *The Little Prince* is target-oriented can be justified by Wakeman's use of contractions (Saint Exupéry, obviously, did not use contractions but Wakeman's choice definitely takes us to a more childlike genre which seems to respect the feel of the source text.) His choice of vocabulary and register is another clear example of the same idea.

Eg. (Fr) J'avais été découragé par l'insuccès...

(1) I had been disheartened by the failure...

(2) I was depressed by the failure...

Eg. (Fr) et c'est fatigant

(1) and it is tiresome

(2) and it's boring

Eg. (Fr) J'ai ainsi eu, au cours de ma vie, des tas de contacts avec des tas de gens sérieux.

(1) In the course of this life I have had a great many encounters with a great many people who have been concerned with matters of consequence.

(2) In the course of this life I've had lots to do with lots of serious people.

Through these examples, it is possible to perceive a more faithful, target oriented and meaning based approach from Wakeman; and a more language based translation from Woods. Let us summarise these points in a more practical way.

Gilbert 1945	Ward 1988
British	American
Faithful	
Free	Literal
Target oriented	Source oriented
Meaning based	Language based
Woods 1943	Wakeman 1995
American	British
	Faithful
Literal	
	Target oriented
Language based	Meaning based

Even if it is not a perfect 'transfer' of characteristics, it is quite obvious that Gilbert's and Wakeman's translations have generally more in common. For Ward and Woods the similarities are not as obvious, nevertheless Ward's translation features are certainly closer to Woods' than to Wakeman's.

If the temporal factor has not had the same influence on these two pairs of translators, the next aspect to be taken into consideration is naturally the translators' backgrounds. It is apparent that both British translators share certain characteristics.

2. 4 Translators' backgrounds

It is a tradition in literary translation to present the text with a statement such as 'translated by ...' or 'translated from French by ...'. Woods' version was presented with 'Translated from the French by Katherine Woods' and Wakeman's with 'A new translation by Alan Wakeman'. It is interesting that in French for example, titles originally published in the US are presented with a statement such as 'translated from the American language by...'
(eg : "Traduit de l'américain par Lisa Rosenbaum" (Roth, 1968 : cover page)). The opposite is however not true: 'Translated into the American language by...' is not a statement that one encounters, not in literary translation. For technical, legal or business translations the background of the translator is important. When looking for a potential translator, agencies and employers always specify the background desired for the assignment, which is called 'localisation'.

Brisset (1996) showed that 'localisation' is equally desirable in literary translation by highlighting the differences obtained when translating a literary text into French and Quebecois. Her examples underline the importance of the target readers in terms of their national cultural backgrounds. If differences become obvious and of consequence in French and Quebecois, the same will be found in British and American English. Perhaps the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the translator should be taken into consideration when working on literary translation. Perhaps literary translators should be chosen, as in some technical fields, according to their linguistic group. It is risky to say that a British translator would translate better for a British audience than an American translator. It is risky because there are no empirical data on the subject and that is why it will be interesting

to find if respondents were affected by the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of the two translators of *The Little Prince*.

Confirming Brisset's view, Reiss offers a practical example:

“Ideally, given the identical interpretation, the form of a version in German as the target language would be quite different depending on whether the translator is a Swiss, Austrian or German – or even a North, West, South or East German (quite independently of political affiliations).” (Reiss, 2000: 108)

If accepting Gutt's view that “by translating a text for a target audience with a cultural background other than that envisioned by the original writer, the translator is, in effect, quoting the original author ‘out of context’” (Gutt, 1998: 49), we can then suggest that in order to balance out this problem of ‘out of context’, the best translator for a given target audience should be the one who understands perfectly the cultural background of the target audience. This would minimise and maybe adapt cultural differences. This emphasises the concept of localisation in literary translation by demonstrating the importance of the choice of the translator. From that angle it is clear that the background of the translator and the target audience are closely linked. Let us consider then the different views on the target audience of translations.

2. 5. The target audience

2.5.1 Review

A consideration of the weight of the translator's background leads us to the significance of the target audience in the translation process. Different academics and authors disagree on the importance of the target audience in translation, as can be seen in the following quotes.

“(…) it is tempting to suggest that diachronically, too, the different ways in which people have translated at different times in history can be attributed to differences in what the translator believed to be relevant to his contemporary audience.” (Gutt, 1991: 390).

This is a suggestion that Benjamin, in 1923, would certainly not have agreed with.

“In the appreciation of a work of art form, consideration of the receiver never proves fruitful.” “(…) bad translation (….) inferior translation(…). This will be true whenever a translation undertakes to serve the reader.” (Benjamin, 1923: 15).

Approving his own suggestion, Gutt determined

“(…) in what respects the translation should resemble the original – only in those respects that can be expected to make it adequately relevant to the receptor language audience.” (Gutt, 1991: 378).

Venutti, when speaking about Ash’s translation of Sagan’s *Bonjour Tristesse* which was a free translation, concerned about its readership, and a big commercial success in the US, said “ Ash inscribed Sagan’s novel with a domestic intelligibility and interest, addressing a community that shared little of the foreign context where the novel first emerged.” (Venutti, 2000: 484). For him, “ In serving domestic interests, a translation provides an ideological resolution for the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text.” (Venutti, 2000: 485). Here we can actually link the translator’s background and the target audience: Ash’s ‘American’ translation was perfectly suited to its American audience and one could wonder if a British translation would have aroused such an interest for the novel in the US.

The target audience is certainly not just an issue of linguistic and cultural background. Within a society, many different groups co-exist; different socio-economic groups, different age groups and translators should always take into consideration these elements. To do so, translators have to know who the target receivers are, they may have to conduct some research on them, inquire about them. (Nord, 1997). “Translators are always translating for their readers, they are always acting in a dialogic relationship with the author of the original, publishers, and, above all, the future readers of the translation.” (Oittinen, 1993: 12). When talking about Ward’s new translation of *L’Etranger*, Rose wrote, “His backers at Knopf must have assumed that American readers were ready for Camus written with English words.” (Rose, 1997: 19). This emphasizes the consideration of the publishing house for the target audience. Nida (1959) highlighted the dependence of translation upon its purpose; if a translation is not read its purpose will never be achieved, therefore it is the audience that make the realisation of the purpose possible. Knowing and understanding their target audiences can help translators to achieve their purpose in an efficient way.

Now that the importance of the target readers has been established, we have to define the target audience of *The Little Prince* and to do so we first have to define its French target audience.

2. 5. 2 The target audience of the French original version of *The Little Prince*.

When presenting the preliminary results of the pilot study for this research at a conference on translation (Language, Text and Culture Workshop 3) at The University of Sydney in February 2002, I was surprised about the reactions of some people in the room; they disagreed about the French target audience of *The Little Prince*. Some of the French people present that day argued that it was not a book written for children. “Written like a children’s

story, *The Little Prince* is in reality a bitter message to adults from Saint-Exupéry.” (McDougall, 1998).

To contradict this view, Maryse Brumond, in her book *‘Parcours de lecture’* on *The Little Prince*, devoted six pages to the topic of the target audience in order to decide whether it is a book for adults or for children. She emphasised firstly the appearance of the book: the watercolour picture representing the Little Prince in a naïve style, the particular calligraphy of the title that reminds one of the writing of school teachers. These are some of the elements that indicate which target readers Saint-Exupéry had in mind. With all its illustrations, the book itself enters the category of picture books, which are usually designed for children. On the cover of the ‘Folio Junior’© Gallimard edition, it is even mentioned: ‘from eight years old’. Finally it can be said that the book has all the ‘exterior attributes’ of a children’s book: the age of the hero, watercolours, a fairy tale’s title and pictures. The dedication is extremely important; Saint-Exupéry dedicated his book to his best friend Léon Werth – when he was a little boy – but he does it addressing children.

« Je demande pardon aux enfants d’avoir dédié ce livre à une grande personne. »

“ I ask children who may read this book to forgive me for dedicating it to a grown-up.”

“The ‘I’ author of the book does not address Léon Werth here, but the children who thus become the privileged addressees of the speaker.” (Brumond, 2000: 15; my translation).

Furthermore, when analysing the text itself, it is easy to find many examples that define a style intended for children: the frequent occurrence of the pronoun ‘ça’ (‘it’) (which children use very often), the word ‘tas’ (‘lots’) used in its familiar form and more generally the use of the familiar register (*‘Mon dessin numero 1. Il était comme ça.’ ‘ça n’a pas trop*

arrangé mon opinion.’) (My drawing number 1 was like this. It hasn’t improved my opinion much.) (Brumond, 2000: 90; my translation). De Galembert (2002) analysed the text with *Flesh* (Word 2000) and noticed the extreme simplicity of the style and vocabulary used as well as the low number of passive forms. His example about the ‘désert du Sahara’, which is a pleonasm, shows Saint-Exupéry’s pedagogical concern about children.

Too many elements seem to demonstrate that *The Little Prince* was originally written for children. If adults enjoy the book and feel that they are the target readers it can only be an additional positive aspect and maybe it is because, as Brumond said “This tale, apparently intended for children, can (must?) also be read by adults, provided they know how to find their child mind state.” (Brumond, 2000: 18; my translation). Cuffe (1995), who is another English translator of *The Little Prince*, goes even further; for him “(...) Saint-Exupéry’s narrator addresses children and only children.” (Cuffe, 1995: XXXIII) De Galembert agrees, “In brief, half a century after its publication, *The Little Prince* (...) is still considered a children’s tale.” (De Galembert, 2002: introduction; my translation). He also stated that Curtice Hitchcock, Saint-Exupéry’s American publisher, had requested of the writer a Christmas tale. Saint-Exupéry accepted “but very quickly, it seems that the perspective of the text had evolved.” (De Galembert, 2002: first part; my translation). Saint-Exupéry explored complex concepts using metaphors and images thus managing to reach the youngest readers (love is represented by a flower, friendship by a fox and death by a snake).

If *The Little Prince* is a children’s book, its English translations should then consider English-speaking children as their target audience. It is time, then, to describe the process of translating for children.

2. 5. 3 Translating for children.

The process of translating for children is naturally the same as the one of translating for adults. The only differences are the target audience, very often the presence of illustrations and the possibility of the text being read aloud. It is not difficult to understand the importance of translating for children because we know how crucial it is for children to read. Reading stories and tales from other cultures can only help children to understand the world and respect others. How should we translate for children? As for adult translation, two main trends emerge: we cannot really speak about ‘documentary’ and ‘exoticism’ because a documented translation would be impractical for children and too much ‘exoticism’ would be impossible to understand. We could speak about adapted and faithful versions. Nord (1997) praised Barbara Teush’s German translation of *Alice in Wonderland* in which she actually used German nursery rhymes with altered lyrics to transpose the effect obtained in English (eg: twinkle twinkle little bat). The decision seems perfectly understandable; without it one could wonder about the effect of ‘twinkle twinkle little bat’ in German. (Her publisher was not convinced straight away though.) However such adjustments are not always as positive.

“If we want to acquaint children with people and their customs elsewhere – and that, I think, is one of the main tasks of literary translation – we have to stick to the original, otherwise the whole business would not make much sense. Or it would be easier to simply publish books written in their own country to begin with.” (Roy-Seifert, 1993: 48).

There is a fine line between respecting one’s target audience and being obsessed with it. “(...) often the story will lose much of its interesting quality when recorded in flat, poor language, when the special “flair”, the atmosphere gets lost and it might get dangerously near a boring pedagogical treatise.” (Roy-Seifert, 1993: 48). In his book *Children’s Fiction*

in *the Hands of the Translators* (1986) Göte Klingberg speaks about many difficulties that arise when translating for children.

“In the case of most texts I think cultural context adaptation should be restricted to details. It is all too easy to find instances of a purely arbitrary cultural context adaptation. Even when there is some reason for it, it should not be tried when not absolutely necessary. In principle the source text must have the priority, and cultural context adaptation ought to be the exception rather than the rule. At all events it should always be borne in mind that the source text is to be manipulated as little as possible.” (Klingberg, 1986: 17)

He also speaks about *modernisation* (“used here for the replacement of stylistically old-fashioned language by more modern expressions” (Klingberg, 1986: 12)) and states that it should be by all means avoided (Klingberg, 1986: 57). Unfortunately, his approach focuses on expressions (rather than style in general) and dates; which does not correspond to the ‘modernisation’ of the new translation of *The Little Prince*. The contractions used in Wakeman’s translation and examples such as:

Eg. (Fr) J’ai ainsi eu, au cours de ma vie, des tas de contacts avec des tas de gens sérieux.

(1) In the course of this life I have had a great many encounters with a great many people who have been concerned with matters of consequence.

(2) In the course of this life I’ve had lots to do with lots of serious people.

are not detrimental to the source text and actually capture the essence of the style of the original. ‘Tas’ is a colloquial French expression that children like to use and ‘lots of’, which

is much more modern than 'great many', convey the spirit of the original sentence far better.

Translating for children seems fairly complex and just like translating for adults, it requires a good knowledge of the specific age group for which the text is destined. This does not mean that only parents or people involved with children should translate for the younger ones but maybe "when translating for children, we should listen to the child, the child in the neighbourhood and the child within ourselves." (Oittinen, 1993: 15).

I would like to conclude this literature review by presenting research applied to the study of the same two translations of *The Little Prince*. This research analysed the translations using Systemic Functional Grammar (as described by Michael Halliday) as a linguistic tool. As in my study, only the first two chapters of each translation were examined and they were compared to the French original in order to answer two questions: 1. which translation is more formally equivalent to the source text? and 2. what makes Woods' translation 'ponderous'?

2. 6 A different analysis of the same translations using Systemic Functional Grammar

Mohamed Ali Bardi wrote his MA dissertation on the same two translations of *The Little Prince* using Systemic Functional Grammar as his analytical linguistic tool. The results of his research seem to be in favour of Wakeman's translation: "To sum all this up, the content is similar in the three texts. What has made the difference is the style. In fact, by relying too much on nominalisation along with making inadequate lexical choices, among other things, have made [Woods'] translation more ponderous." (Bardi, 2002). Helen Slatyer who co-presented the pilot study of this research at a conference at the University of

Sydney agrees with Bardi; "It appears that the inappropriateness of [Woods'] translation could be put down to three factors which have contributed to the text being cumbersome: frequent nominalisation, added complexity in the clause structure with the addition of embedded clauses and qualifiers within qualifiers and lexical choices which are not commonly associated with the language of children." (Slatyer, 2002). These results are the product of one linguistic theory and could be refuted by other theories, nevertheless it is very stimulating to be able to consult a research concerning exactly the same subject and it will be even more interesting to compare it with the readership's results later on.

These results seem to have the approval of some of the readers of the first translation as can be seen in the following anecdote.

2.7 Some readers' opinions

On a more subjective level, it is intriguing to read that Louise Pelan (Vice President and publisher of children's books at Harcourt Incorporated in San Diego) received letters, several letters a year, complaining about Woods' translation. She says herself that "It was a bit stilted, and in some cases, rather contrived." (Big and Small Show). This is why Harcourt published a new translation that was "closer to the author's initial literary impulse." This supports Wakeman's claim and can only make the results of this research more significant as it demonstrates the need for a synthesis of the opinion of a wider readership.

"The complex process of text comprehension and interpretation inevitably leads to different results by different translators. To my mind, this is not at all a bad thing. Since different readers will interpret the original differently, translators should have the right to translate their interpretation of the text (after thorough investigation, of course). It is interesting to observe that, in history, translations based on the most

personal interpretations are often the ones that become most famous.” (Nord, 1997: 88).

It would be wrong to say that Woods’ translation is a very personal interpretation; it unquestionably has been the most famous, until now, but this can easily be explained by the comparatively recent arrival of new translations.

According to this literature review, Wood’s version seems to be less appropriate than Wakemans’ translation, mainly because, unlike Woods, Wakeman took into consideration the target audience and respected the style of the original version. The following study will provide empirical data about the readership’s opinions on the matter in order to provide a different perspective to the comparison of the two translations.

3.Methodology

In order to discover the opinions and preferences of the readership of *The Little Prince*, a questionnaire-based study was conducted. As participants had to read the first two chapters of each translation, it was decided that a written questionnaire would be the best tool to collect data. It offered respondents the possibility to take part in the study in their own time and provided the researcher with open and closed questions that could be used for quantitative and qualitative data. A pilot study was conducted in January 2002, which included only a small group of English native speakers.

For this dissertation the anonymous survey questionnaire has been slightly modified according to the findings of the pilot study (in question 5 for example, respondents were asked if they could suggest where the translators may be from instead of having to decide if the translators were from the same linguistic backgrounds). A new section including questions on the readers' biodata has also been added in order to investigate and compare impressions and preferences of the three respondents' groups. The scope of the respondents has been considerably enlarged: there are three different types of respondents (children, adults and translators). After receiving the approval of my supervisor and the Macquarie University Ethics Review Committee, the data collection took place.

The data was collected by one method: anonymous survey questionnaire.

3.1 The questionnaire

3.1.1 Background information

In this part of the questionnaire, respondents were asked about their mother tongue. They were also asked if they could speak French, if they had read *The Little Prince* in French or in another language, and if so, if they had been adults or children at the time. They were

asked about their literature preferences and their age groups. Translators were asked in which direction(s) they translated.

This information established the profile of the respondents, which was then cross tabulated with the findings of the next part of the questionnaire.

3.1.2 Questionnaire on the translations

The questionnaire was shaped with a combination of closed and scale item questions – to obtain numerical responses for data analysis – as well as open-ended item questions in order to provide respondents with the opportunity to justify their answers and to express themselves freely. (See copy in appendix 1)

All the questions except question 5 were structured in the same way: a closed item question followed by an open item question for respondents to explain and justify their answers. Question 5 was an open item question.

In question 1 and 2, participants were asked about their opinions on the differences and similarities of the two translations. This is a logical start: to be able to compare and evaluate, one must acknowledge two or more separate entities.

Question 3 dealt with the period of the publication of the two translations. Hypothesising (from the pilot study) that most of the respondents would find the two translations stylistically different, it had to be discovered if they did so because of the differences connected to the temporal contexts of the translations. The fact that they were written more than fifty years apart could be reflected in the translators' writing and could be an element leading to preference. For the translators' group of respondents who were able to compare

with the style of the original, this question could help them to reflect on the equivalence of the original style linked to temporal factors. (For example, if they discovered that the new translation was much more recent because of its style, would they condemn the fact that the translator had not respected the style of the original?).

Two translations written by English native speakers were chosen for the study (Katherine Woods is an American and Allan Wakeman is English) to be sure that respondents differentiated between the translations because of distinctive features that were not connected to the ‘unnatural’ style of a non-native translator. Nevertheless in question 4 readers were asked their opinion on the question: could one style or another suggest to them that it belonged to a non-native speaker? And if yes, why? Cross tabulations of these results with those of the last question of the survey (which translation do you prefer?) may then yield interesting findings. For example, if respondents preferred the translation that they thought had been translated by a non-native speaker it could imply that they expected a certain ‘unnatural’ tone and style when reading a translation.

Question 5 asked the participants about the translator’s backgrounds. As mentioned above, Katherine Woods is American and Allan Wakeman is English. Could their native backgrounds be revealed in their translations and could this influence respondents’ preferences?

In question 6, respondents were asked which translation they thought more suitable for children. As demonstrated in the literature review, children are the target audience of *The Little Prince*. As this should be conveyed in the translations, could the readership perceive such a feature and could it influence their preference? Even if respondents did not know *The Little Prince* prior to answering the questionnaire, the cover page (consent form approved by the Macquarie University Ethics Review Committee) informed them that *The Little*

Prince was a French children's classic. The results of this question were extremely interesting to compare with the results of the last question (Which translation do you prefer?) and it revealed meaningful aspects about the importance of the target audience (especially in the children's group).

Question 7 dealt with inappropriate choices of words. The question was also connected to the significance of the target audience and the translators' backgrounds. If respondents thought that one or the other translation was less appropriate for children, could it be linked to certain inadequate choices of words by the translator? Could these inadequate choices of words reveal that the translations had been written by non-native speakers? For the translators' group, this question emphasized the problems of equivalence with the source text.

The last question, question 8, concluded with the personal preferences of the readers. The results, important in themselves, were essential when comparing with the results of the other questions. For example, did readers prefer the translation they thought was more recent, written by an American native speaker, less suitable for children or had no inappropriate choices of words?

3.2 Methods of administration for each group

Three groups are represented in this study: children, adult English speakers and translators. Each participant was given a copy of the first two chapters of both translations and was asked to complete an anonymous questionnaire. Translators were also given the first two chapters of the original French version. In the first part of the questionnaire (background information), respondents were asked six questions (seven for translators) about their biodata (in a combination of closed item and scale item questionnaire). The second part of

the questionnaire focused on specific aspects of the translations and translators in relation to the respondents' opinions and preferences (in a combination of closed item, open-ended item and scale item questionnaire). I will now describe the method of administration for each group.

3.2.1 Children English speakers (68 respondents, 44.7% of the respondents)

Two metropolitan private schools and one metropolitan public school took part in the study. The questionnaire was administered by French teachers who thought that the study could be of some interest for their students as some classes had already read *The Little Prince* or they were going to read it. Some teachers participated because they thought the questionnaire could be a good activity for children. Respondents were therefore all learning French (from year 6 to year 12). In the first metropolitan private school, there were 23 respondents, 26 in the second one and 17 in the public school. In both private schools, questionnaires were administered to the students during their French lesson and in the public school they were given as homework. The schools were contacted by mail and once authorisation was granted by Principals, French Language Programs Coordinators distributed the questionnaire to their students. This was an opportunistic sampling.

3.2.2 Adult English speakers (62 respondents, 40.8% of the respondents)

Most of the respondents in this group were students of French in a metropolitan university. Participation was entirely voluntary. There was no coercion from the researcher or teachers to their students to encourage them to participate. Only students interested in the research took part in the study and they completed the questionnaire in their own time. One French private school and one adult education college also took part in the study. Some of my

colleagues and friends who were interested completed the questionnaire as well. This was also an opportunistic sampling.

3.2.3 French/English translators (22 respondents, 14.5% of respondents)

Most of the translators (19) answered the anonymous questionnaire online. The translators were contacted through professional associations' websites around the world: after authorisation, a message was sent to all translators of an association with a link to the questionnaire online (see copy in appendix 2). Some translators preferred to get the questionnaire as an attachment via e-mail; two requested a hard copy by mail. A few of my friends and colleagues also took part in the study; but for this group, it was mainly a purposeful sample.

4. Data analysis

4.1 Introduction

The results of the survey were processed on Excel spread sheets and then analysed through a statistical package (SPSS 11). Descriptive statistics were used to examine the results. Frequencies and cross tabulations obtained will be presented in this chapter in order to reveal clear figures and statistical significance. The qualitative data (respondents' comments obtained in the open-ended item questions) will only be overviewed, as they will be more thoroughly presented in the next chapter in order to support the discussion.

4.2 Overview of results

The results of all closed and scale item questions from the questionnaire relating to the translations will be presented. The order of the questionnaire will, however, not be respected as it will be more interesting to determine the statistical significance of responses for each group of respondents and to present associations of responses. Cross tabulation with respondents' biodata will also be presented.

4.3 Frequencies and cross tabulations

For each question, frequency will be presented first and then various cross tabulations will offer associations of responses in order to provide a better insight into the respondents' answers.

4.4 Results by question

4.4.1 Question 1

TABLE 1

Question 1: do you think that the two translations are:

	Frequency	Percentage
Very different	17	11.2%
Different	53	34.9%
Slightly different	51	33.6%
Similar	21	13.8%
Very similar	10	6.6%

A large majority (121 respondents or 79.7%) thought that the two translations were different, very different or slightly different. This is a promising result: participants could differentiate between the translations and they mainly cited style and/or vocabulary as the reason for their choice. It is interesting to compare the same results with the type of participants (children, adults and translators) because the results are statistically very significant (table 2).

TABLE 2

Percentage/ (frequency)

	Do you think that the two translations are				
	Very different	Different	Slightly different	Similar	Very similar
Children	7.4% (5)	14.7% (10)	39.7% (27)	26.5% (18)	11.8% (8)
Adults	14.5% (9)	43.5% (27)	33.9% (21)	4.8% (3)	3.2% (2)
Translators	13.6% (3)	72.7% (16)	13.6% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)

(Chi-Square = 43.132, df 8, p = 0.000)

For the translators' group, results were unanimous: translators thought that the two translations were very different, different or at least slightly different. This could be explained by their professional judgment, allowing them to go further into both texts, to decipher details and subtleties. For adults, the results stayed close to the translators' ones: a very low percentage of them thought that the translations were similar (4.8%) or very similar (3.2%). Their responses were, however, more in the range between 'different' and 'slightly different' than they were for the translators. This shows again that the translators' group was, in the majority, able to differentiate more subtly between the translations than the adults' group. For the children's group, even though a majority agreed with the two other groups (61.8% thought the translations were very different, different or slightly different), a much greater number of respondents (26.5% and 11.8%) chose the last two categories ('slightly similar' and 'very similar') as their answers. This can be explained by the young age of some of the children who may not have been able to differentiate between the two translations. All these results are logical but they nevertheless give a good basis in order to interpret further results, in establishing clear distinctions between the three groups of participants.

Another high level of statistical significance can be observed when comparing the age of the respondents and their opinions regarding the differences and the similarities of the translations.

TABLE 3

Percentage/ (frequency)

Age group	Do you think that the two translations are				
	Very different	Different	Slightly different	Similar	Very similar
<15	2.2% (1)	10.9% (5)	41.3% (19)	30.4% (14)	15.2% (7)
15-25	10.3% (6)	36.2% (21)	41.4% (24)	8.6% (5)	3.4% (2)
25-45	25.0% (7)	57.1% (16)	14.3% (4)	3.6% (1)	0% (0)
>45	15.0% (3)	55.0% (11)	20.0% (4)	5.0% (1)	5.0% (1)

(Chi-Square = 50.007, df 12, p = 0.000)

There is not a clear pattern but it can be seen that the older the respondents, the more they found the translations different. The younger they were, the less difference they perceived.

As mentioned above, reasons given by the respondents to justify their opinions were mainly the style and the vocabulary but a closer look at the comments of each group shows that the reasons differed greatly. Many children stated that translation 2 used a simpler style that was more appropriate to young readers. However, some found the first translation more enchanting and interesting. The same pattern can be found in the adults' and translators' groups. (Comments will be presented and discussed in the next chapter).

4.4.2 Question 3

Let us compare these perceptions with question 3 (Do you think that these two translations were written during the same period, a few years apart or many years apart?) for which there is a real, undisputable answer.

TABLE 4

Question 3: do you think that these two translations were written

	Frequency	Percentage
During the same period	13	8.6%
A few years apart	33	21.7%
Many years apart	59	38.8%
Don't know	47	30.9%

More respondents thought that the translations were written many years apart. Let us compare these results with the respondents' age groups to verify if it is a constant feature.

TABLE 5

Percentage/ (frequency)

Age group	These translations were written			
	During the same period	A few years apart	Many years apart	Don't know
<15	6.5%(3)	34.8% (16)	17.4% (8)	41.3% (19)
15-25	12.1%(7)	19.0% (11)	36.2% (21)	32.8% (19)
25-45	3.6%(1)	10.7% (3)	67.9% (19)	17.9% (5)
>45	10.0%(2)	15.0% (3)	55.0% (11)	20.0% (4)

(Chi-Square = 24.677, df 9, p = 0.003)

The two translations were written 50 years apart and the age groups that were able to accurately perceive this feature were the two oldest groups (in their comments, they stated that translation 1 had been written a long time before the second one). For younger children, this question must have certainly been challenging as the high number of “don’t know’s” can attest (41.3%). The fact that the older respondents recognised the periods of the publication of the translations does not give their other opinions more value but simply entitles us to establish a background that could help in discussing other results.

Let us now compare the same question with the type of participants.

TABLE 6

Percentage/ (frequency)

	These translations were written			
	During the same period	A few years apart	Many years apart	Don't know
Children	10.3% (7)	32.4% (22)	19.1% (13)	38.2% (26)
Adults	8.15 (5)	11.3% (7)	53.2% (33)	27.4% (17)
Translators	4.5% (1)	18.2% (4)	59.1% (13)	18.2% (4)

(Chi-Square = 22.467, df 6, p = 0.001)

Very statistically significant results can again be observed. The majority of adults (53.2%) and translators (59.1%) were able to perceive the reality concerning the time frame, which confirms the preceding results.

4.4.3 Question 6

TABLE 7

Question 6: which translation do you think more suitable for children?

	Frequency	Percentage
Woods' translation (1945)	32	21.1%
Wakeman's translation (1995)	103	67.8%
Don't know	17	11.2%

A clear majority of respondents (67.8%) thought that the new translation was more suitable for children. Let us compare these results with the different age groups and the different types of participant to discover if this majority is constant.

TABLE 8

Percentage/ (frequency)

Age group	More suitable for children		
	Woods'	Wakeman's	Don't know
<15	26.1% (12)	58.7% (27)	15.2% (7)
15-25	17.2% (10)	70.7% (41)	12.1% (7)
25-45	17.9% (5)	75% (21)	7.1% (2)
>45	25.0% (5)	70.0% (14)	5.0% (1)

(Chi-Square = 3.903, df 6, p = 0.690)

These results may not be statistically significant but they certainly indicate that the majority of respondents, whatever their age, thought that Wakeman's version, the new translation, was more suitable for children.

TABLE 9

Percentage/ (frequency)

	More suitable for children		
	Woods'	Wakeman's	Don't know
Children	23.5% (16)	66.2% (45)	10.3% (7)
Adults	17.7% (11)	72.6% (45)	9.7% (6)
Translators	22.7% (5)	59.1% (13)	18.2% (4)

(Chi-Square = 2.169, df 4, p = 0.705)

Here again the results are not statistically significant but definitely show that the majority of all the types of participants chose Wakeman's translation as being more appropriate for children.

4.4.4 Question 8

According to these last results and the fact that the respondents knew that *The Little Prince* is a children's classic, one could have had some expectations about respondents' preferences (it would seem logical for respondents to prefer Wakeman's version given that they knew the original target audience and had acknowledged Wakeman's greater suitability for children). However the results of the last question indicate the contrary to be true.

TABLE 10

Question 8: which translation do you prefer?

	Frequency	Percentage
Woods' translation (1945)	74	48.7%
Wakeman's translation (1995)	58	38.2%
Don't know	20	13.2%

Even if there is not a majority of respondents who preferred one or the other translation, it is clear that more participants (48.7%) favoured Woods' translation. However, very significant results can be found when cross tabulating the respondents' preferences and their opinions on which translation is more suitable for children.

TABLE 11

Percentage/ (frequency)

Suitable for children	Preferred translation		
	Woods'	Wakeman's	Don't know
Woods'	87.5% (28)	9.4% (3)	3.1% (1)
Wakeman's	36.9% (38)	50.5% (52)	12.6% (13)
Don't know	47.1% (8)	17.6% (3)	35.3% (6)

(Chi-Square = 34.579, df 4, p = 0.000)

Table 11 gives a more precise view of the results. In majority (87.5% and 50.55), respondents preferred the translation they thought was more suitable for children which relativises the separate findings of question 6 and 8 (which showed respectively that the majority of respondents found Wakeman's translation more suitable for children and that more respondents chose Woods' translation as their favourite).

When only considering respondents who chose one or the other translation as their favourite, we obtain more definite results. This manipulation of data (table 12) can be justified: we should remember the large number of participating children who may have found the question too challenging. As the question is about preferences, it is more interesting to consider only the respondents who were able to choose between the translations.

TABLE 12

Question 8: which translation do you prefer?

	Frequency	Percentage
Woods' translation (1945)	74	56.1%
Wakeman's translation (1995)	58	43.9%

When explaining their choice, many respondents' comments were in total opposition, which shows that respondents reacted differently to the texts.

To gain a better insight into these results, let us observe some more cross tabulations about the participants' types, ages and mother tongues.

TABLE 13

Percentage/ (frequency)

	Preferred translation		
	Woods'	Wakeman's	Don't know
Children	52.9% (36)	30.9% (21)	16.2% (11)
Adults	48.4% (30)	40.3% (25)	11.3% (7)
Translators	36.4% (8)	54.5% (12)	9.1% (2)

(Chi-Square = 4.420, df 4, p = 0.352)

Even though these results are not statistically significant, they show us interesting differences between each group. Surprisingly, it is the children's group in which the majority preferred Woods' 1945 translation (52.9%). As expected it is also this group that has the largest number of "don't know's" (16.2%). This may be explained by the young age of some participants who may have found this question too challenging. The adults' group also preferred Woods' translation (48.4%) but here the difference between preferences is

less marked. For translators, the reverse is observed: they preferred Wakeman's translation (54.5%).

Let us now compare these results with the differences according to age groups.

TABLE 14

Percentage/ (frequency)

Age group	Preferred translation		
	Woods'	Wakeman's	Don't know
<15	58.7% (27)	19.6% (9)	21.7% (10)
15-25	44.8% (26)	44.8% (26)	10.3% (6)
25-45	46.4% (13)	42.9% (12)	10.7% (3)
>45	40.0% (8)	55.0% (11)	5.0% (1)

(Chi-Square = 12.017, df 6, p = 0.062)

In table 14, results are not statistically significant but again, they show us clear differences. As in the preceding question, it is surprising (when remembering the results of question 6 – the majority of respondents found Wakeman's translation more suitable for children – and views explored in the literature review) to discover that the youngest group preferred Woods' translation. This could be questioned: it is possible that the youngest readers found the whole task too difficult and chose Woods' translation because it was the one they read first. Nevertheless when comparing with the other age groups it is obvious that the preference for Woods' translation seems to decline with the age of the participants: the older they are and the more they prefer Wakeman's version.

When cross tabulating the participants' mother tongues and their preferences, no statistical significance can be found but clear variations can be observed.

TABLE 15

Percentage/ (frequency)

Mother tongue	Preferred translation		
	Woods'	Wakeman's	Don't know
English	52.3% (57)	35.8% (39)	11.9% (13)
French	35.3% (6)	58.8% (10)	5.9% (1)
Other	42.3% (11)	34.6% (9)	23.1% (6)

(Chi-Square = 6.038. df 4. p = 0.196)

English native speakers preferred Woods' translation (52.3%) whereas French native speakers favoured Wakeman's translation (58.8%). All the French native speakers who participated in the survey had already read *The Little Prince* in French as adults or as children. This means that they all had a certain impression of the book, a certain feel for the story and its style. The fact that they preferred Wakeman's translation should be taken into consideration.

When all the other groups are considered, having already read *The Little Prince* in French is not a statistically significant factor but presents some similarities with the French native group.

TABLE 16

Percentage/ (frequency)

	Preferred translation		
Read <i>The Little Prince</i> in French	Woods'	Wakeman's	Don't know
Yes	38.3% (23)	46.7% (28)	15.0% (9)
No	55.4% (51)	32.6% (30)	12.0% (11)

(Chi-Square = 4.318, df 2, p = 0.115)

As can be seen in table 16, more respondents who had read *The Little Prince* in French preferred Wakeman's translation (46.7%) and the majority of respondents who had not, preferred Woods' translation (55.4%).

Some of the most statistically significant results can be found when comparing participants' preferences and their opinion on whether or not the translations were written by English native speakers.

TABLE 17

Percentage/ (frequency)

	Preferred translation		
Translation 1 written by native English speaker	Woods'	Wakeman's	Don't know
Yes	67.2% (39)	24.1% (14)	8.6% (5)
No	28.1% (16)	57.9% (33)	14.0% (8)
Don't know	51.4% (19)	29.7% (11)	18.9% (7)

(Chi-Square = 20.501, df 4, p = 0.000)

The fact that respondents thought that the first translation was written by a native English speaker evidently influenced their preferences. This confirms some of the points discussed in the literature review about translators' backgrounds. We have to remember that both

translators were native English speakers and that therefore we are only speculating on people's impressions and not on reality, but it could be seen that the translator's background does matter to readers.

The same can be observed for the second translation.

TABLE 18

Percentage/ (frequency)

	Preferred translation		
	Woods'	Wakeman's	Don't know
Translation 2 written by native English speaker			
Yes	38.2% (29)	50.0% (38)	11.8% (9)
No	61.1% (22)	27.8% (10)	11.1% (4)
Don't know	57.5% (23)	25.0% (10)	17.5% (7)

(Chi-Square = 9.923, df 4, p = 0.042)

Participants preferred the translation they thought had been written by a native speaker.

Another statistically significant result can be seen when cross tabulating the translation the respondents preferred and the fact that they found that one or the other translation used inappropriate words. Let us first observe the frequency obtained for this question in order to understand the cross tabulation.

TABLE 19

Question 7: are there any choices of words that you find inappropriate for this type of text?

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes, in translation 1	31	20.4%
Yes, in translation 2	20	13.2%
No	52	34.2%
Don't know	17	11.2%
Yes, in both translations	32	21.15%

A large portion (34.2%) of respondents thought that there were no inappropriate choices of words in either translation; however, a larger number of participants (20.4%) thought that there were more inappropriate choices of words in Woods' translation than in Wakeman's. It is interesting to observe the effect that these impressions had on respondents' preferences.

TABLE 20

Percentage/ (frequency)

Inappropriate words in	Preferred translation		
	Woods'	Wakeman's	Don't know
Yes, in translation 1	22.6% (7)	71.0% (22)	6.5% (2)
Yes, in translation 2	70.0% (14)	30.05 (6)	0% (0)
No	59.6% (31)	19.2% (10)	21.2% (11)
Don't know	58.8% (10)	23.5% (4)	17.6% (3)
Yes, in both translations	48.7% (74)	50.0% (16)	13.2% (4)

(Chi-Square = 31.257, df 8, p = 0.000)

When focusing on the first two rows of table 20, it is clear that for a large majority (71.0% and 70.0%), participants preferred the translation in which they thought there were no inappropriate words.

4.4.5 Question 5

TABLE 21

Question 5: can you suggest where the translators may be from?

Translation 1

	Frequency	Percentage
England	35	23%
America	1	0.7%
France	21	13.8%
Australia	1	0.7%
Don't know	94	61.8%

TABLE 22

Translation 2

	Frequency	Percentage
England	24	15.8%
America	10	6.6%
France	15	9.9%
Australia	5	3.3%
Don't know	98	64.5%

For both translations there are a very large numbers of respondents (61.8% and 64.5%) who could not make any suggestion regarding the translators' backgrounds. This indicates that, for the majority of respondents, the translators' backgrounds were not revealed through

their writing. England is the only suggestion of consequence for both translations (23% and 15.8%). Again, the large number of children involved in the survey has to be taken into consideration: this question must have been very challenging for them. Let us then compare the types of participants to get a better insight into the results.

TABLE 23

Percentage/ (frequency)

	Translation 1 written by a translator who was				
	English	American	French	Australian	Don't know
Children	16.2% (11)	0% (0)	4.4% (3)	0% (0)	79.4% (54)
Adults	29.0% (18)	0% (0)	21.0% (13)	1.6% (1)	48.4% (30)
Translators	27.3% (6)	4.5% (1)	22.7% (5)	0% (0)	45.5% (10)

(Chi-Square = 23.967, df 8, p = 0.002)

As expected, both groups of adults and translators made a higher number of suggestions especially for the English and French backgrounds.

TABLE 24

Percentage/ (frequency)

	Translation 2 written by a translator who was				
	English	American	French	Australian	Don't know
Children	8.8% (6)	0% (0)	11.8% (8)	1.5% (1)	77.9% (53)
Adults	19.4% (12)	12.9% (8)	9.7% (6)	3.2% (2)	54.8% (34)
Translators	27.3% (6)	9.1% (2)	4.5% (1)	9.1% (2)	50.0% (11)

(Chi-Square = 20.218, df 8, p = 0.010)

As it can be seen in table 24, for the second translation, the majority of the three groups could not make any suggestion about the translators' backgrounds (children: 77.9%, adults: 54.8%, translators: 50.0%). For adults and translators who did make a suggestion, numbers are slightly more evenly spread across the four nationalities than it is for translation 1.

For the cross tabulation of the translators' backgrounds and the participants' preferences, results are statistically significant for translation 1 but not for translation 2. The low number of suggestions should be taken into consideration when observing these results.

TABLE 25

Percentage/ (frequency)

Translation 1 written by a translator who was	Preferred translation		
	Woods'	Wakeman's	Don't know
English	60.0% (21)	25.7% (9)	14.3% (5)
American	0% (0)	100.0% (1)	0% (0)
French	28.6% (6)	71.4% (15)	0% (0)
Australian	0% (0)	100.0% (1)	0% (0)
Don't know	50.0% (47)	34.0% (32)	16.0% (15)

(Chi-Square = 17.227, df 8, p = 0.028)

These results can only offer us a distinction between the French and English backgrounds: evidently, respondents preferred Woods' translation when they thought that it had been written by an English translator (60.0%); they preferred Wakeman's version when they thought that Woods' had been written by a French translator (71.4%). These results confirm the respondents' preferences for English native speaker translators but do not provide any information about the issue of localisation.

The same pattern can be observed with translation 2 when comparing the French background group with the other groups. Respondents preferred Wakeman's translation when they thought it had been translated by an English translator (45.8%). They preferred Woods' version when they thought Wakeman's had been written by a French translator (60.0%).

TABLE 26

Percentage/ (frequency)

Translation 2 written by a translator who was	Preferred translation		
	Woods'	Wakeman's	Don't know
English	41.7% (10)	45.8% (11)	12.5% (3)
American	40.0% (4)	50.0% (5)	10.0% (1)
French	60.0% (9)	33.3% (5)	6.7% (1)
Australian	60.0% (3)	40.0% (2)	0% (0)
Don't know	49.0% (48)	35.7% (35)	15.3% (15)

(Chi-Square = 3.478, df 8, p = 0.901)

The very low number of respondents (6) who suggested an Australian background (in tables 25 and 26) indicates that we should not place too much importance on these results; it is interesting however, considering the respondents' background, to notice that for both translations, more respondents who suggested that one translation had been written by an Australian translator preferred the other translation.

4.5 Summary of results

The data analysis provides interesting frequencies and cross tabulations. Whether statistically significant or not, results offer valuable information about the two translations and the three different groups of participants.

Respondents agreed in finding the translations somehow different and Wakeman's translation more suitable for children. It has to be noted, however, that respondents tended to favour the translation they found more suitable for children.

Woods' translation was generally preferred when considering all respondents. The majority of children and more adults preferred Woods' translation, whereas translators favoured Wakeman's version.

French native speakers, participants who were older than 45 and respondents who had read *The Little Prince* in French preferred Wakeman's translation. So it can be said that the respondents' mother tongue, age and the fact that they had read *The Little Prince* in French or not influenced their preferences.

The impressions regarding the translators' linguistic backgrounds also influenced respondents' preferences. They favoured the translation they thought had been written by a native English speaker and in which there were no inappropriate words. Questions 4, 5 and 7 confirm this fact.

4.6 Conclusion

Some of these results confirm, while others seem to contradict views explored in the literature review. A discussion and a further analysis are necessary in order to provide a clearer interpretation of the data.

5. Discussion

The data analysis offers surprising and interesting results. In the pilot study, conducted in February 2002, a majority of respondents (in a small group of Australian native speakers) favoured Woods' translation and the new research confirms this result. The new study offers more detail by providing statistical analysis and comparison of three distinct groups of respondents.

It should not be forgotten that the sampling used in this study is not representative of the population at large because participants were not chosen randomly. The researcher had no access to random sampling methods; she therefore used the Internet and her French language teaching professional milieu to recruit participants. As a result, most of the respondents had some interest in the French language. Children were all learning French at school, many adults were university students learning French and translators were, obviously professional bilinguals. The statistical significance of the study is only relative due to the small number of respondents and the sampling methods used.

Based on the results of the data analysis, the following discussion will try to clarify the results by linking them to the views explored in the literature review.

5.1 The translations and their differences

The fact that a large majority of respondents thought that the two translations were somehow different is a very positive result because it concurs with findings revealed in the Systemic Functional Grammar analysis (Bardi, 2002) and the equivalence theory analysis seen at the beginning of the dissertation. It is, however, necessary to know why respondents felt this way. In the data analysis, it was mentioned that comments made by respondents differed, diverged and even contradicted each other greatly. For example, many children stated that translation 2 (Wakeman's translation) used a "simpler style that was more

appropriate to young readers” (for example, *‘the vocabulary of the first translation is harder with use of more difficult wording. The second one is easier to understand and relate to.’ ‘The style of writing in the first translation is a little bit more complicated than in the second. I believe that the second one is directed more at children.’*). However, some found the first translation (Woods’ translation) “more enchanting and interesting” (for example, *‘Translation 1 is written in a much more ‘enchanting’ style, and you can imagine in your mind the imagery as the story unfolds.’ ‘Translation 2 is very blunt and almost uninteresting, whereas translation 1 uses a much more colourful and descriptive language.’*)

A similar pattern can be found in the adults’ group. Some found that Wakeman’s translation was “simpler”, “more concise”, “better structured” and found Woods’ translation “disjointed” and “old-fashioned”. However, some adults found Woods’ version “more descriptive”, “more flowing”, “more sophisticated”, “more imaginative”, “more stylish” and found Wakeman’s translation “disjointed”, “over-simplified” and “abrupt”.

Comparable impressions can be observed in the translators’ group. Some of them found Wakeman’s translation “more concise” and “less old-fashioned” while finding Woods’ translation “more awkward”, “less natural” and “less enchanting”. However, some translators found Woods’ translation “more readable”, “more appropriate to the original style” and found Wakeman’s version “too ‘commercial’ and over-simplified”.

From these comments, it can be seen that the majority of respondents arrived at the same conclusion (that the translations were different) for very diverse reasons. It is also evident that their personal preferences, based on the stylistic features of each text, played a major role in judging the translations. The comments are subjective and it can be felt that in answering this first question participants were already indicating which translation they

preferred. Even if participants agreed that the translations were different in terms of style and vocabulary, their perceptions of each translation's style and vocabulary vary greatly. It should then be said that most of these comments do not confirm views seen in the literature review but, coincidentally, reach the same conclusion in finding the translations different.

From this first question, it is possible to be aware of the magnitude of the respondents' different perspectives and impressions of the translations. Literary criticism demonstrates that there are different possible interpretations of the original version of a text because different readers perceive it differently. Because the translation process goes through two stages of interpretation (by the translator and the reader) instead of one, it is logical that comparing two translations of the same text generates great variations of perception.

The translators' professional backgrounds and the fact that they could compare the translations with the original should be taken into consideration. It should not, however, be forgotten that their perceptions of the original are also personal ones, which means that children's and adults' opinions are not less valid. Furthermore, these latter groups represent the broader readership of translations in general.

5.2 The translations' suitability for children and respondents' preferences

The fact that such a large number of respondents found Wakeman's translation more suitable for children confirms the views presented in the literature review. All types of participants cited the simpler style, vocabulary and syntax of Wakeman's translation to justify their choice (for example: *'translation 1 is more awkward in construction and less natural. It is more verbose, and it sounds more formal sometimes, which dispels the enchantment.'*). This concurs with the features revealed in the Systemic Functional Grammar analysis (Bardi, 2002) and the equivalence theory analysis presented in the literature review. The importance of the target audience was established in the literature

review: a translation concerned with its target audience is preferable. The fact that respondents found Wakeman's translation more suitable for children – the target audience of *The Little prince* – should have had, theoretically, more impact on respondents' preferences.

The most surprising results concern the respondents' preferred translation. Even though the majority of respondents found that Wakeman's translation was more suitable for children, more participants, nevertheless, chose Woods' translation as their personal favourite. This challenges the views expressed in the literature review because even if respondents agreed that Wakeman's translation was more suitable for children, it did not – in majority – influence their preferences. These findings can, however, be better understood when cross tabulated with participants' preferred translation (see table 11, [page](#)): respondents preferred the translation they thought was more suitable for children. This finding confirms some aspects of the target audience theory seen in the literature review by validating the concept that a translation concerned with its target audience is preferable. These results may appear contradictory: the majority of respondents found Wakeman's translation more suitable for children but more respondents preferred Woods' translation. However, if we look at the results presented in table 11, it is clear that the majority of respondents preferred the translation they thought more suitable for children. Therefore, it can be seen that there is a difference of perceptions: some respondents found Woods' translation more suitable for children and also preferred it. The concept of the target reader is thus approved by the majority of respondents, but a problem remains in defining the suitable style for those target readers. In describing how to write for children, “when translating for children, we should listen to the child, the child in the neighbourhood and the child within ourselves.” (Oittinen, 1993: 15), Oittinen did not define that ‘child’. This is where the issue lies because, as the results show, respondents have different impressions and representations of ‘the child in the neighbourhood’ and the child within themselves.

Some children preferred Wakeman's translation (translation 2) because they found it "easier to follow", "more understandable", "clearer" and "more enjoyable" (for example:

'Translation 1 is not the type of writing suited to an audience of children. If translation 1 were read to an audience of children the whole time you would just be explaining what the words mean!'). However, some children preferred Woods' translation because they found it "more childlike", "more interesting", "more descriptive" and "more poetic".

Some of the adults preferred Wakeman's translation (translation 2) because they thought it was "simpler", "more comprehensive", "more coherent", "more appropriate" (for example:

'Translation 2 flows beautifully and captures the interest of the reader with its concise yet descriptive language. Almost every sentence is marked. The typical subject and verb beginning to a sentence (there) is rarely used. As a result it is not only the story which captures you but the writing itself. The author offers the reader a sinuous passage through literary prowess.') However, some adults preferred Woods' version because they found it "more enjoyable", "more sophisticated", "more charming" and "closer to the original".

Some translators preferred Wakeman's translation because they found it "suited to today's youth readership" and "conveyed Saint-Exupéry's writing style more accurately". Some translators preferred Wood's version because they found it "closer in style to the original", "more elegant" and "more suited to children because it could broaden their vocabulary and imagination".

In each group of participants, many of the comments are in total opposition and illustrate the differences of respondents' perceptions and interpretations. The issue raised by these findings is not the concept of a target audience – because the majority of respondents preferred the translation they thought was more suitable for children – but the concept of

how to write for that target audience. Perceptions and interpretations are the core of this issue that cannot be resolved because they are subjective values.

5.3 The translators' group of respondents

More translators preferred Wakeman's translation. It seems logical that translators' choices concur with the analyses presented in the literature review (stating the inappropriateness of Wood's translation (Slatyer, 2002)) because of their professional and educational backgrounds. At least some of them must be aware of the trends of contemporary translation theories because of the profession's requirements nowadays. It should be remembered, however, that even though the majority of translators preferred Wakeman's translation, it is not a large majority (54.5%). This demonstrates the diversity of opinions in the professional group. When justifying the choice of their favourite translation, translators made some very different comments about the translations in relation to the original. Some found Wakeman's translation (translation 2) "closer to the original" and some thought the opposite (for example: *'Translation 1 is closer in style to the original and more true to it.'* *'If Saint Exupéry had been English, he would have written this version (translation 1).'* *'Translation 2 conveys Saint Exupéry's writing style in French a lot more accurately.'* *'Generally version 2 is closer to St Exupéry's style.'*) These comments demonstrate clearly the differences of opinions among the translators and show the impossibility of obtaining a consensus on judging translations.

5.4 Adults and children respondents

These two groups of respondents are more representative of readers of translations in general than the translators and therefore represent the focus of this study. Table 13 (page 39) in the data analysis illustrates these two groups of respondents' preferences and reveals different penchants with no large majority favouring one or the other translation. As mentioned above, translated texts go through two stages of interpretation, which could

explain the heterogeneousness of the respondents' preferences. Because "(...) *Every translation is necessarily also an interpretation*" (Reiss, 2000:107), there cannot be one translation satisfying all audiences. Different interpretations might suit different types of readers, and promoting the existence of different interpretations could entitle readers to become aware of the reality of the translation process and the author's message. "Literature needs many translators in the same language and different languages, so that readers can put together the originary (*sic*) message." (Rose, 1997: 41).

When talking about whether the respondents had read *The Little Prince* in French or not (table 16, page 42) – which is a factor that seemed to have influenced their preferences for Wakeman's translation – it should be noted that 90.9% of translators had read it in French; 30.6% of adults and 30.9% of children also had. These results should consequently be taken into consideration when interpreting the results of the cross tabulation, but it should not be forgotten that readers of translations in general do not read texts in their original version prior to reading the translation. The opportunistic sample used in the research could be responsible for these results: the very large majority of respondents had some interest in the French language which explains the fact that so many of them had read *The Little Prince* in its original version. All the participating children were learning French at school, the majority of adults were learning French at university or in a private school and translators were, obviously, native to near native French speakers. A random sample would probably have not offered such results. This is the reason why we should not place too much emphasis on the results of the cross tabulation of respondents' preferred translation and whether they had read *The Little Prince* in French or not. The fact that respondents who had read the original version preferred Wakeman's translation is interesting in itself but it is not representative of the average reader of translations. Furthermore, respondents who had read the original version and preferred Wakeman's translation do not represent a majority

(46.7%) (see table 16), which is another reason why we should not place too much emphasis on the results of this cross tabulation.

5.5 Translators' backgrounds

Definite results can be found with the cross tabulation of the participants' preferences and their opinions on whether or not the translations had been written by English native speakers. Respondents could, of course, only judge according to their impressions: the fact that they made a selection is entirely subjective and is based on their perceptions of the stylistic features of each text. The fact that they preferred the translation they thought had been written by a native speaker refutes José Ortega y Gasset's views about the foreign flavour style in translations:

“It is clear that a country's reading public do not appreciate a translation made in the style of their own language. For this they have more than enough native authors. What is appreciated is the inverse: carrying the possibilities of their language to the extreme of the intelligible so that the ways of speaking appropriate to the translated author seem to cross in theirs.” (Ortega, 1937: 63).

Results of the cross tabulation of respondent's preferences and the fact that they found that at least one of the translations used inappropriate words confirm this idea; it shows that a majority of respondents preferred the translation in which they thought there were no inappropriate words. This also validates Delisle's view that “(...) the essence of translation is to create an English version that reads as if it were not a translation.” (Delisle as cited in Krause, 1993: 8).

The results of question 5 also confirm this view: participants, when they could suggest a particular background, favoured the translation they suspected had been written by a native speaker (see tables 23 and 24 page 46).

The results of three different questions concur in showing that readers prefer what they believe to be the style of a native speaker translator. This demonstrates a general penchant for translations “that read as if [they] were not translations.” (Delisle as cited in Krause, 1993: 8). We must however, remember that both Woods and Wakeman are English native speakers and the impressions of the respondents that one or the other is not a native speaker are erroneous. This finding is therefore not conclusive because the results show that some readers can perceive native speaker’s writing style as non-native.

5.6 Translation theories and translation readership

This research shows a certain gap between some translation theories and the professional milieu on the one hand and the reality of the readership’s opinions on the other. Comparing the views expressed in the literature review and the preferences of the respondents is interesting because it offers different perspectives: translation theories (Systemic Functional Grammar analysis and equivalence theory analysis (Bardi, 2002)) seen in the literature review propose a definite view in judging the two translations. According to their findings, Woods’ translation is less appropriate than Wakeman’s translation. The respondents’ opinions, however, are almost evenly divided. The data presented in this dissertation show the variety of opinions and preferences in the group that represents the average readers of translation (adults and children) as well as in the professional group (translators). In each group, answers and comments are diverse, and often oppose each other, which demonstrates the impossibility of a consensus when judging translations.

The manipulated data (participant's preferences without the 'don't know' category) offer an unambiguous result with a majority of 56.1% of respondents favouring Woods' translation. This is an important result that contradicts Wakeman's claim that Woods' translation is a ponderous version that failed to capture the shining spirit of the original. It also contradicts analyses and views explored in the literature review about the inappropriateness of Woods' translation. However, 56.1 % is clearly not a large majority; it may contradict Wakeman's claim, but it mainly shows that about half the respondents preferred Woods' translation while the other half preferred Wakeman's version. This demonstrates the variety of tastes among the readership of translation as well as the impossibility of agreeing on the description of a particular translation.

5.7 Conclusion

If "every translation is an interpretation" (Lederer, 1993:632; my translation), readers should have access to as many 'interpretations' as possible to be able to get closer to the original message.

"(...) Literary texts are fuller when read with their translations, regardless of whether literature and literary norms are in an expansive or restrictive phase. This is because taken together these texts and translations loosely enclose an interliminal space of meaning, allusion and sound. This space will vary from reader to reader; for an individual reader from one reading time to the next; and most markedly from one period to another. This last variance may well elicit a new translation because changing norms in culture and, consequently, rhetoric have brought too many disjunctions into that space." (Rose, 1997: 73).

Subjective critical statements such as Wakeman's should be avoided or at least formulated in a more constructive way. Wakeman could have restricted himself to speaking about his

translation. Instead he chose to criticise Woods' version in a totally unnecessary and subjective way in order to glorify his own.

“A consistent appreciation of the personal category of translation criticism should replace sweeping and petty criticisms. This would not only give recognition to the subjective conditions of the hermeneutical process, but also what is actually involved: the personality of the translator and how it affects the translation in the target language.” (Reiss, 2000: 109).

The existence of different translations of the same text should be praised because it offers readers who do not speak the language of the original the opportunity to be more objective and less restricted. Every translated book should be translated at least twice and preferably many times to avoid interpretation despotism.

“Whatever our assessment of the translation in question, whether cultural consensus is expanding or contracting, reading literature with a translation will always ensure our collaboration with the author, and it will always add more to our experience of the work.” (Rose, 1997: 73)

Because the vast majority of readers of translations do not have the privilege of reading the original, the only way to ‘ensure their collaboration with the author and to add more to their experience of the work’ is for them to read different translations. The survey results indicate that we should accept and encourage the possibility of several translations of the same text, instead of selecting and excluding.

5.8 Implications

The results of this study have shown that readers have different preferences when exposed to different translations of the same text. This is why the general reader should be more aware of the reality of the translation process; bookshops could offer – when possible – different translations of the same text and these translations could each be presented with a complete bibliography and biography of the translator. This would entitle readers to be aware of the different features of the translation, such as the period of its first publication and the professional experience of the translator. A little introduction could precede the main text and explain the goals of the translator for this particular translation. This could give readers more control in choosing a translation; it could also generate a curiosity among readers about other versions of the text. As mentioned in the conclusion of the literature review, I would agree with Nord that:

“The complex process of text comprehension and interpretation inevitably leads to different results by different translators. To my mind, this is not at all a bad thing. Since different readers will interpret the original differently, translators should have the right to translate their interpretation of the text (after thorough investigation, of course). (Nord, 1997: 88).

Nowadays, unfortunately, publishing companies and original version copyright owners impose their choices on the majority of the readership, depriving the average reader of a global approach to translation. Nathalie des Vallières (from the Saint-Exupéry Foundation) told me that I should not work on Allan Wakeman’s translation because it was not an ‘official’ translation and had not been approved by Gallimard (France’s biggest publisher) and the Saint-Exupéry Foundation. As a result of this type of attitude, readers “may accept the translation [they read] as the [exact] manifestation of the sender’s intention.” (Nord, 1997: 80).

5.9 Further research

A study using random sampling and involving a larger number of respondents in several countries could offer a more complete account on the readership of translations than this dissertation. Including different translations written by native and non-native speakers from different linguistic backgrounds could provide an objective view on the issue of localisation in literary translation (as seen in 'translators' backgrounds in the literature review'). Giving respondents the opportunity to read the complete version of the translated text instead of a limited number of chapters would offer a more precise account on the readership's impressions and preferences. Further research on the readership of translations can develop the authority of translation theories because the readership of translations represents the final stage of the translation process and should, therefore, be included in the study of the discipline.