

- Cassell's *Encyclopedia of World Literature* (1973). New York: William Morrow.
- Clurman, Harold (1966) *The Naked Image*. New York: Macmillan.
- Clurman, Harold (1974) Bertolt Brecht. In M. Freedman (ed.) *Essays in the Modern Drama*. Boston: Heath.
- The Concise Encyclopedia of Modern World Literature* (1963). New York: Hawthorn Books.
- Corrigan, Robert W. (1978) [1973] *The Theatre in Search of a Fix*. New York: Delacorte Press. In *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism* Vol. 1. Eds Dedria Brynofski and Phyllis Carmel Mendelson. Detroit: Gale Research Company.
- Esslin, Martin (1978) [1959] *Brecht: The Man and His Work*. New York: Doubleday. In *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism* Vol. 1. Eds Dedria Brynofski and Phyllis Carmel Mendelson. Detroit: Gale Research Company.
- Esslin, Martin (1969) *Reflections*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Funk and Wagnall's Guide to World Literature* (1973). New York: Funk and Wagnall.
- Gassner, John (1978) [1954] *The Theatre in Our Times*. New York: Crown Publishers. In *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism* Vol. 1. Eds Dedria Brynofski and Phyllis Carmel Mendelson. Detroit: Gale Research Company.
- Gottfried, M. (1969) *Opening Nights*. New York: Putnam.
- Greenberg, Clement (1978) [1961] *Art and Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press. In *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism* Vol. 1. Eds Dedria Brynofski and Phyllis Carmel Mendelson. Detroit: Gale Research Company.
- Hays, H.R. (1941) *Mother Courage*. New York: New Directions.
- Manheim, Ralph (1972) *Mother Courage*. In Ralph Manheim and John Willet (eds) *Brecht. Collected Plays* Vol. 5. New York: Vintage Books.
- Modern World Drama* (1972). New York: Dutton.
- O'Donnell J.P. (1978) [1969] *The Ghost of Brecht. The Atlantic Monthly, January 1969*. In *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism* Vol. 1. Eds Dedria Brynofski and Phyllis Carmel Mendelson. Detroit: Gale Research Company.
- Politzer, Heinz (1982) How epic is Bertolt Brecht's epic theater? *Modern Language Quarterly*. Excerpted in Sharon K. Hall (ed.) *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism* Vol. 6. Detroit: Gale Research Company.
- Pryce-Jones, Alan (1978) [1963] Brecht. *Theatre Arts*, June 1963. In *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism* Vol. 1. Eds Dedria Brynofski and Phyllis Carmel Mendelson. Detroit: Gale Research Company.
- Schieps, K.H. (1977) *Bertolt Brecht*. New York: Putnam.
- Skelton, Geoffrey (1990) [1951] Bertolt Brecht's *Mother Courage*. *World Review*, No. 23, January. In *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism* Vol. 35. Ed. Paula Kepos. Detroit: Gale Research Company.
- Szczesny, Gerhard (1969) *The Case Against Bertolt Brecht*. New York: Ungar, 1969. In *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism* Vol. 6.
- Twentieth Century Authors. First Supplement* (1965). New York: Wilson.
- Twentieth Century Writing* (1971). Levittown, NY: Transatlantic Arts.
- Willet, John (1990) [1984] *Brecht in Context*. London: Methuen. In *Twentieth Century Literary Criticism* Vol. 35. Ed. Paula Kepos. Detroit: Gale Research Company.

Chapter 8

The Translation Turn in Cuiturai Studies

SUSAN BASSNETT

In 1990, André Lefevere and I edited a collection of essays entitled *Translation, History and Culture*. We co-wrote the introductory essay to the volume, intending it as a kind of manifesto of what we saw as a major change of emphasis in translation studies. We were trying to argue that the study of the practice of translation had moved on from its formalist phase and was beginning to consider broader issues of context, history and convention:

Once upon a time, the questions that were always being asked were 'How can translation be taught?' and 'How can translation be studied?' Those who regarded themselves as translators were often contemptuous of any attempts to teach translation, whilst those who claimed to teach often did not translate, and so had to resort to the old evaluative method of setting one translation alongside another and examining both in a formalist vacuum. Now, the questions have changed. The object of study has been redefined; what is studied is the text embedded in its network of both source and target cultural signs and in this way Translation Studies has been able both to utilize the linguistic approach and to move out beyond it. (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1990)

We called this shift of emphasis 'the cultural turn' in translation studies, and suggested that a study of the processes of translation combined with the praxis of translating could offer a way of understanding how complex manipulative textual processes take place: how a text is selected for translation, for example, what role the translator plays in that selection, what role an editor, publisher or patron plays, what criteria determine the strategies that will be employed by the translator, how a text might be received in the target system. For a translation always takes place in a continuum, never in a void, and there are all kinds of textual and extratextual constraints upon the translator. These constraints, or manipulatory processes involved in the transfer of texts have become the primary

focus of work in translation studies, and in order to study those processes, translation studies has changed its course and has become both broader and deeper.

In the 1970s, anyone working in translation studies experienced a clear demarcation line between that work and other types of literary or linguistic research. The study of translation occupied a minor corner of applied linguistics, an even more minor corner of literary studies, and no position at all in the newly developing cultural studies. Even those who worked in translation and other related fields appeared to experience a kind of schizophrenic transformation when it came to methodological questions. In an age that was witnessing the emergence of deconstruction, people still talked about 'definitive' translations, about 'accuracy' and 'faithfulness' and 'equivalence' between linguistic and literary systems. Translation was the Cinderella subject, not taken seriously at all, and the language used to discuss work in translation was astonishingly antiquated when set against the new critical vocabularies that were dominating literary studies in general. To pass from a seminar on literary theory to a seminar on translation in those days was to move from the end of the twentieth century to the 1930s. Debate on translation was dominated by evaluative critical language.

The first clear signal of a change in the wind was, I believe, the Leuven seminar of 1976, which brought together for the first time scholars from Israel working on polysystems theory with scholars in the Low Countries and a handful of people from elsewhere in Europe. There André Lefevere was given the task of drawing up a definition of translation studies, which appeared in the 1978 proceedings. The goal of the discipline (he saw it *as* a discipline at that stage) was to 'produce a comprehensive theory which can be used as a guideline for the production of translations'. The theory was to be neither neopositivistic, nor hermeneutic in inspiration and should be constantly tested against case-studies. Instead, It would be dynamic, not static because it would be in a state of continuous evolution. The statement went on to add:

It is not inconceivable that a theory elaborated in this way might be of help in the formulation of literary and linguistic theory; just as it is not inconceivable that translations made according to the guidelines tentatively laid down in the theory might influence the development of the receiving culture. (Lefevere, 1978)

So theory and practice were to be indissolubly intertwined; theory was not to exist in the abstract, it was to be dynamic and involved a study of the

specifics of translation practice. Theory and practice were to supply mutual nourishment.

This very brief statement by Lefevere, which Edwin Gentzler has described as 'a fairly modest proposal' (Gentzler, 1993) nevertheless laid down some ground rules for the next stage in developing translation studies. Fundamental to the statement was a rejection of the old evaluative position, and a refusal to locate translation studies either strictly within literary studies or in linguistics. This, with hindsight, we can see as crucially important: what was effectively being proposed, though none of the proposers realised it at the time, was for translation studies to occupy a new space of *its* own.

What we can also see, looking back, is that already translation studies shared common ground with that other rapidly developing interdisciplinary field, cultural studies. From its origins as a counter-hegemonic movement within literary studies, challenging the dominance of a single concept of 'Culture' determined by a minority, the subject had moved by the late 1970s, shifting ground away from literature towards sociology. Richard Johnson, one of the pioneers of the subject, warned against the dangers of splitting the sociological from the literary within cultural studies, pointing out that:

Cultural processes do not correspond to the contours of academic knowledges as they stand. Cultural studies must be interdisciplinary or a-disciplinary in its tendency. Each approach tells us about one small aspect of a larger process. Each approach is theoretically partisan, but also very partial in its objects. (Johnson, 1986)

Cultural studies, Johnson, says must be 'interdisciplinary' or 'a-disciplinary', which is what the Leuven group were effectively saying about translation studies back in 1976. With such similar agendas, it is hardly surprising that the meeting between cultural studies and translation studies, when it finally happened, would be a productive one. Work in both fields called into question disciplinary boundaries and seemed to be moving towards the notion of a new space in which interaction could happen. No single approach would be prioritised, and the partisan nature of different approaches was established from the outset.

The Leuven group did, however, in the early years, tend to favour one particular approach. From 1970 onwards, Itamar Even-Zohar, the Israeli literary theorist, had been propounding his polysystems approach to the study of literatures. He was explicit about the source of his theories: they derived from the Russian formalists. The pioneering work of Tynjanov, Eichenbaum or Zirmunski on literary historiography and history, claimed

Even-Zohar, had never been fully appreciated or developed. There was minimal research in literary studies into the historical functions of a text, not only translated texts but also children's literature, detective fiction, romantic fiction and a host of other genres. Here again, we can see the close parallels between translation studies and cultural studies: both questioned the distinction made within traditional criticism between 'high' and 'low' culture; both mounted a challenge to the concept of the literary canon; both urged a broadening of the study of literature to include the functions of a text in a given context. Following Bahktin and Lotman, Even-Zohar argued that the mechanism of relations between what he called 'high' and 'low' literature (the terminology that would be seriously challenged by cultural studies) needed proper investigation. Any study of literature that ignored works deemed to have no artistic merit was bound to be flawed and would result in a completely inadequate picture of textual production and reception.

Even-Zohar's contribution to the 1976 Leuven seminar was a paper entitled 'The position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem', which remains a seminal text for scholars of translation studies. Even-Zohar proposed, by applying his systemic notion of literary study to translation, a new way of looking at translation. Questions needed to be asked about the correlations between translated works and the target system, about why certain texts might be selected for translation at a given time and others ignored and then about how the translations might adopt specific norms and behaviours. Why, for example, we might ask, did Fitzgerald's Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam enter into the English literary system so completely that it has ceased to be regarded as a translation, when other 19th century translations of similar texts disappeared without trace? The old aesthetic argument plainly does not hold here; other factors must have been in play, and it is an investigation of those factors that should occupy the translation studies scholar.

Even-Zohar also raised other significant questions: what might the dynamics be in a literary system between innovation and conservatism, and what role might translated literature have to play here. He went on to suggest that there might be a whole other way of looking at the role of translation in literature, seeing translation as a major shaping force for change. This notion of translation as a crucial instrument of literary renewal was a very radical one, and one which traditional literary history had tended to downplay.

We might take as an example the case of European lyric poetry. A classic comparative study of the field is Peter Dronke's *The Medieval Lyric*, a very erudite and immensely readable book that traces the development of the

lyric across medieval Europe, following the '*chansonniers* or *Liederhandschriften* in all their diversity' (Dronke, 1968). Dronke discusses the fusion of Roman and Christian traditions, and the similarities and differences between religious and secular lyric verse. A central chapter is entitled 'The Transformations of the Medieval Love Lyric', and looks at how the Provençal lyric entered Italian and was transformed into the *dolce stil nuovo*. Missing from Dronke's analysis is adequate discussion of the links between the early Provençal and Catalan lyric and Arabic poetry, but others have taken that task in hand. What is striking about Dronke's study, however, is that at no point does he ever discuss the role played by translation in the development and dissemination of the lyric. Yet unless we assume that all singers and poets were multilingual, then obviously translation was involved, as a fundamental activity.

A translation studies approach to the medieval lyric would use a similar comparative methodology to Dronke's, but would ask different questions. It would also look at the development of a literary form in terms of changing sociological patterns across Europe (the end of feudalism, the rise of the city state etc.) and in terms of the history of language. For the development of vernacular languages in Europe was bound up with translation, just as several centuries later, in the Renaissance, the rise of vernacular languages to a status equal to that of the classical languages was also accompanied by a ferment of translation activity. Far from being a marginal enterprise, translation was at the core of the processes of transformation of literary forms and intimately connected to the emergence of national vernaculars.

Even-Zohar proposed the systematic study of the conditions that enable translation to take place in a given culture. In a controversially worded statement, he argued that there are certain conditions that can be discerned whenever major translation activity takes place:

- (a) when a polysystem has not yet been crystallised; i.e. when a literature is 'young', in the process of being established; (b) when a literature is either 'peripheral' or 'weak', or both, and (c) when there are turning points, crises or literary vacuums. (Even-Zohar, 1978a)

Today, we find this statement somewhat crude. What does it mean to define a literature as 'peripheral' or 'weak'? These are evaluative terms and present all kinds of problems. Is Finland 'weak', for example, or Italy, since they both translate so much? In contrast, is the United Kingdom 'strong' and 'central' because it translates so little? Are these criteria literary or political? This is the same difficulty encountered by scholars working with the terminology of 'minority/majority', of course. But despite its crudity, it is still startlingly important, for it can be opened out into a call for a radical

rethinking of how we draw up literary histories, how we map out the shaping forces of the past and present.

Polysystems theory opened so many avenues to researchers in translation studies that it is hardly surprising that it dominated thinking for the next decade. All kinds of new work began to be undertaken: the systematic study of the history of translation and translating, the recovery of the statements by translators and translation theory of previous times. This kind of work paralleled similar research in women's studies, particularly of the 'hidden from history' variety.

There was a great deal of valuable, essentially descriptive research, and a great deal of comparative study that followed James Holmes' model of mapping out hierarchies of correspondences between texts in order to better analyse translators' strategies (Holmes, 1988).

There was also some criticism of the polysystems approach, most notably that it had shifted attention too far away from the source text and context onto the target system. This was inevitable. Part of the brief of early polysystems thinking was to get away from notions of a dominant literary canon, and by emphasising the fortunes of a text in its target context, problems of the status of the source text could be set to one side. But as research expanded, so translation scholars began to investigate previously marginalised areas. In similar fashion, early work in cultural studies tended to be contestatory and oppositional, setting itself firmly against the concept of studying canonical texts and arguing for a broader literary spectrum that encompassed (and indeed emphasised) the popular.

By the late 1980s, a lot was happening in translation studies, and a great deal of activity was taking place outside Europe. For polysystems theory, useful though it was to start us all thinking in new ways about cultural history, was a European product. But the work in Canada, in India, in Brazil and Latin America that was looking in very complex ways at ideological issues surrounding translation did not use polysystems theory as a starting point. The concerns of Latin America involved the relationship between source and target extended to a discussion of the relationship between colonised and coloniser. In his essay on the Brazilian anthropophagist movement, 'Tupy or not Tupy: Cannibalism and Nationalism in Contemporary Brazilian Literature', Randall Johnson discusses the metaphor of cannibalism as a statement of cultural identity:

Metaphorically speaking, it represents a new attitude towards cultural relationships with hegemonic powers. Imitation and influence in the traditional sense of the word are no longer possible. The *antropófagos* do not want to copy European culture, but rather to devour it, taking advantage of its positive aspects, rejecting the negative and creating an

original national culture that would be a source of artistic expression rather than a receptacle for forms of cultural expression elaborated elsewhere. (Johnson, 1987)

There is no space here to go into the intricacies of the cannibalistic argument, but it is important because it provides us with a clear post colonial metaphor that can be applied to the history of literary transfer and to the history of translation. Traditional notions of translation saw it essentially as a 'copy' of an 'original'. Today, we can see that such terminology is ideologically loaded, and we can also see that it developed at a certain point in time. But significantly, the colony has so often been regarded as the 'copy' of the 'home-country', the original. Any challenge to that notion of original and copy, with the implications of status that go with it, is effectively a challenge to a Eurocentric world view. The *antropófagos* offered the metaphor of cannibalisation, the ritual devouring that would be in the control of the devourer, the colonised rethinking the relationship with the original coloniser. This is clearly a post colonial perspective.

So also is the perspective on translation offered by Sherry Simon when she argues that:

The poetics of translation belongs to a realization of an aesthetics of cultural pluralism. The literary object is fragmented, in a manner analogous to the contemporary social body. (Simon, 1996a)

The key phrase here is 'cultural pluralism'. The post-colonial perspective throws into crisis any notion of fixed boundaries and frontiers become unstable. We are compelled to recognise what Tejaswini Niranjana has defined as the strategies of containment that translation produces. For, she argues, 'translation reinforces hegemonic versions of the colonised, helping them acquire what Edward Said calls representations or objects without history' (Niranjana, 1992).

Now wait a minute, someone may say. Didn't a whole line of thinking in translation emerge out of the cultural work of Bible translators like Eugene Nida? Yes, of course it did; but Nida's assumptions about culture derived from anthropology, and we hardly need reminding of the Eurocentric bias of anthropology until very recently. Moreover, Nida's translation work, splendid though it is, comes out of a specific purpose: the translation of a Christian text with the goal of converting non-Christians to a different spiritual viewpoint. His *Customs and Cultures* is subtitled: 'Anthropology for Christian Missions', and the opening sentence of the volume reads: 'Good missionaries have always been good anthropologists' (Nida, 1954).

In case anyone fails to recognise the ideological assumptions underpin-

ning much thinking on anthropology, let us consider the famous (or infamous) case of Wole Soyinka, who in his *Myth, Literature and the African World* recounts his attempt in the early 1970s to offer series of lectures on African literature at Cambridge, when he was Visting Fellow. He was not permitted to give the lectures in the English department and eventually a space was found for him in the Department of Social Anthropology. The English department, he notes, 'did not believe in any such beast as African literature' (Soyinka, 1976). For many Europeans, any non-European cultures were automatically 'anthropologised' and their cultures studied and evaluated as 'other'. The norm was European.

I am not attacking cultural anthropology outright. There are many viewpoints in anthropology, and indeed cultural anthropology and now translation studies have also been moving more closely together. What I want to do is simply to posit the notion that the terms of reference of early 'culturalists' in translation studies derived from a Eurocentric anthropological perspective and not from a cultural studies perspective. That was to come later.

Let us now turn to look at the evolution of cultural studies. The field of study is generally held to have begun in the 1960s, initiated by the publication of a series of texts by British academics who had worked in universities and in adult education. Richard Hoggart's *The Uses of Literacy* appeared in 1957, followed by Raymond Williams' *Culture and Society* and by E.P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* in 1963. Hoggart set up the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham in 1964 and the rest, we might say, is history.

The work of Hoggart, Williams and Thompson did not constitute any kind of school or locus of strategic thinking when their books first appeared. It was only later that they came to be seen as a coherent group, because of their common concern with aspects of the English class system and their commitment to reassessing the meaning of the term 'culture'. Their starting point in the post-war period was the recognition of a gap in intellectual life in Britain: there was no broad notion of culture that could cut across regional and class lines. Raymond Williams in particular challenged the way in which F.R. Leavis had used 'culture', to describe exclusively high cultural forms. Williams argued that no account of 'culture' can ignore the popular culture that is the expression of working class life. In *Culture and Society*, he suggested that the world was now so complex that no individual could lay claim to total understanding and participation, and hence no single perspective could or should be prioritised:

any predictable civilization will depend on a wide variety of highly specialized skills, which will involve, over definite parts of a culture, a

fragmentation of experience ... A culture in common, in our own day, will not be the simple all-in-all ^society of old dream. It will be a very complex organization, requiring continual adjustment and redrawing ... To any individual, however gifted, full participation will be impossible, for the culture will be too complex. (Williams, 1957)

Williams posits here the notion of a complex culture that can never be grasped in its entirety and will always be fragmented, partly unknown and partly unrealised. Like Hoggart, he saw culture as plurivocal and as process, a shifting mass of signs rather than a single entity. In the early years of cultural studies, as the subject sought to establish itself within the academy, the principle concern was to reevaluate oral culture and working class culture, to reclaim the word 'culture' for a mass public rather than an elite minority. Under the leadership of Hoggart's successor, Stuart Hall, the Birmingham Centre moved to considerations of race and gender also, and became less specifically English, drawing more upon theoretical work from the continent of Europe.

Anthony Easthope has long argued that the move from literary studies to cultural studies is an inevitable, ongoing process. In a recent essay, entitled 'But what *is* cultural studies?', he traces the transformations that cultural studies has undergone since the late 1950s and argues that there have been effectively three phases: what he calls the Culturalist phase of the 1960s, the Structuralist phase of the 1970s and the Post-structuralist/Cultural Materialist phase of the last twenty years (Easthope, 1997). These three phases correspond to different stages in the establishment of the subject as an academic discipline. The culturalist phase records the period when the principal challenge was to the appropriation of the term 'culture' by an elite minority, and the goal was to broaden concepts of 'culture' to include other than canonical texts. The structuralist phase marks the period when attention shifted to an investigation of the relationship between textuality and hegemony, and the third stage reflects the recognition of cultural pluralism.

This tripartite distinction, which traces in broad brush strokes a series of profoundly significant shifts of emphasis that have affected the study of literature just as much as the study of culture, could just as well apply to translation studies over the last twenty years or so. In translation studies, the culturalist phase would describe the work of Nida and probably also of Peter Newmark, as well as the work of scholars such as Catford or Georges Mounin. The value of their attempts to think culturally, to explore the problem of how to define equivalence, to wrestle with notions of linguistic versus cultural untranslatability is undeniable. The problem that the next

wave of translation scholars had with that early work was that it was so pragmatic and unsystematic, and it was also unconcerned with history.

The polysystems phase may also be described as a structuralist phase, for systems and structures dominated thinking in the field for a time. We may have used figurative language and talked about 'mapping' (Holmes) labyrinths (Bassnett) or even refractions (Lefevere) but what we were concerned with was a more systematic approach to the study and practice of translation. While translation studies took on polysystems theory, cultural studies delved more deeply into gender theory and the study of youth cultures. It also began to move away from the specifically English focus, and in the 1980s cultural studies expanded rapidly in many parts of the world, notably in the United States and Canada and Australia, changing and adapting as it moved. Questions of cultural identity, multiculturalism, linguistic pluralism became part of the agenda, shifting the emphasis away from those specifically British concerns of the early years. What has remained of cultural studies in the British context, however, can be described as cultural materialism, which Alan Sinfield has defined as a homegrown British alternative to the American new historicism (Dollimore & Sinfield, 1985).

In an essay entitled 'Shifting Boundaries, Lines of Descent', Will Straw endeavours to summarise what has happened to cultural studies in the United States. Cultural studies, he claims, 'represented the turn within a number of disciplines in the humanities' to concerns and methods that had previously been seen as sociological:

towards, for example, the ethnography of audiences in media studies, the study of intellectual formations and institutional power in literary history, or accounts of the construction of social space in a variety of cultural forms. (Straw, 1993)

And he also points out that cultural studies offered a way forward for English studies and film studies that had, as he puts it, 'lived through their post-structuralist moments'. I take this to mean that they had become enmeshed in a post-structuralist discourse as limiting as old formalism had been, and in consequence unable to deal with the vital new ways of thinking about textual practices that were becoming so evident in the rest of the world.

So cultural studies in its new internationalist phase turned to sociology, to ethnography and to history. And likewise, translation studies turned to ethnography and history and sociology to deepen the methods of analysing what happens to texts in the process of what we might call 'intercultural transfer', or translation. The moment for the meeting of cultural studies and

translation studies came at exactly the right time for both. For the great debate of the 1990s is the relationship between globalisation, on the one hand, between the increasing interconnectedness of the world-system in commercial, political and communication terms and the rise of nationalisms on the other. Globalisation is a process, certainly: but there is also massive resistance to globalisation. As Stuart Hall points out, identity is about defining oneself against what one is not:

To be English is to know yourself in relation to the French, and the hot-blooded Mediterraneans, and the passionate traumatized Russian souk You go round the entire globe: when you know what everybody else*1s, then you are what they are not. (Hall, 1991)

In short, cultural studies has moved from its very English beginnings towards increased internationalisation, and has discovered the comparative dimension necessary for what we might call 'intercultural analysis'. Translation studies has moved away from an anthropological notion of culture (albeit a very fuzzy version) and towards a notion of cultures in the plural. In terms of methodology, cultural studies has abandoned its evangelical phase as an oppositional force to traditional literary studies and is looking more closely at questions of hegemonic relations in text production. Similarly, translation studies has moved on from endless debates about 'equivalence' to discussion of the factors involved in text production across linguistic boundaries. The processes that both these interdisciplinary fields have been passing through over the past two or three decades have been remarkably similar, and have led in the same direction, towards a greater awareness of the international context and the need to balance local with global discourses. Methodologically, both have used semiotics to explore the problematics of encoding and decoding.

The often uneasy relationship between literary studies and sociology that has characterised debates in cultural studies also has its parallel in translation studies in the uneasy relationship between literary studies and linguistics. But here again, there have been significant changes. Linguistics has also undergone its own cultural turn, and a great deal of work currently taking place within the broad field of linguistics is of immense value to translation: research in lexicography, in corpus linguistics and frame analysis demonstrate the importance of context and reflects a broader cultural approach than the old-style contrastive linguistics of the past.

A fundamental line of debate within cultural studies has focused upon the notion of value — whether aesthetic value or material value — as culturally determined. The old idea was that texts had some kind of intrinsic universal value of their own that helped them to survive down the ages. So

Homer, for example, or Shakespeare were presented as monolithic universal writers. The idea of a literary canon is premised upon the universal greatness of key writers, whose works transcend time and offer, as Leavis puts it, 'the finest human experience of the past' (Leavis, 1930). But as cultural studies developed, so the question of the conscious construction of aesthetic ideals acquired significance. Alongside our admiration for Shakespeare, questions need to be asked about how we know what we do know about Shakespeare and his plays and to what extent other factors than purely aesthetic criteria come into play. These questions are also asked within translation studies, where it is apparent that the transfer of texts across cultures by no means depends on the supposed intrinsic value of the text itself alone.

If we were to consider both Homer and Shakespeare from another angle than that of their literary stature, either from within cultural studies or translation studies, all kinds of questions would arise. In the case of Homer, we might need to ask how ancient texts have been handed down to us, how representative they might be, given that obviously far more texts have been lost than we have to hand at the present time, how they might have been read originally and by whom, how commissioned and paid for, what purpose they might have served in their original context. Beyond this archaeological survey, we would then need to consider the history of the fortunes of Homer in western literatures, paying especial attention to the rediscovery of the world of the ancient Greeks in the Enlightenment and the use of Greek models in education in the nineteenth century. We would also need to look at the history of translations of Homer, and the role played by those translations in different literary systems. Perhaps most significantly today, as the learning of ancient Greek declines, we would need to consider why Homer continues to occupy such a significant position in the literary hierarchy when almost nobody has access to any of his writings. Except through translation, of course.

Similarly with Shakespeare, we would need to consider the complex method of production of the plays in the first place (whether written prior to rehearsals with actors, during rehearsals and transcribed by someone, or written piecemeal as roles for individual actors to modify themselves, similar to the scenarii of the *commedia dell'arte*), the sources employed in that process of production, the even more complex history of the editing of the plays, the fortunes of Shakespeare prior to the eighteenth century, the great Shakespeare boom of early Romanticism, and the gradual process of canonisation that has taken place ever since. We would also need to look at the very different Shakespeares that appear in different cultures: the radical, political author of Central and Eastern Europe, for example, or the high

priest of the imperial British ideal who was exported to India and the colonies. And in considering how these different Shakespeares have been created, we are led back to the role played by translation.

Both translation studies and cultural studies are concerned primarily with questions of power relations and textual production. The idea that texts might exist outside a network of power relations is becoming increasingly difficult to accept, as we learn more about the shaping forces that control the world in which we live and about those forces that controlled the world in which our predecessors lived. Before he died, André Lefevere was working out a theory of cultural grids, based on the work of Pierre Biburdieu and his ideas of cultural capital. In Lefevere's schema, a kind of grid system can be mapped out that shows the role and place of texts within a culture and the role they might occupy in another culture. Such a system would show clearly that texts undergo all kinds of variations in status both intertemporally and interculturally, and would help us to explain some of the vagaries of those changes in terms other than those of greater or lesser aesthetic value.

As any translation studies scholar knows, a comparison of translations of the same text, particularly of a text that has been translated frequently, exposes the fallacy of universal greatness. The translations that are heralded as definitive at one moment in time can vanish without trace a few years later. Exactly the same happens with all types of text, but we are less clearly able to see the process than with translations of the same text. Countless hugely successful authors have disappeared completely, and it takes a concerted effort, such as the deliberate policy of rediscovering women authors undertaken by feminist scholarship, for example, to excavate those lost texts. As Sherry Simon succinctly puts it:

Those spaces which were identified as universal (the great humanist tradition, the canon of great books, the public space associated with democratic communication, the model of culture which sustained the ideal of citizenship) have been exposed as being essentially expressive of the values of the white, European and middle-class male. (Simon, 1996b)

So far, the links between cultural studies and translation studies have remained tenuous. A great deal of work in cultural studies, particularly in the English-speaking world, has been monolingually based, and attention has been focused on the investigation of cultural policies and practices from the inside. Increasingly, however, there is a move towards intercultural studies, and this is already well-established within, for example, gender studies, film studies or media studies. On the whole though, while the

translation studies world has been slow to use methods developed within cultural studies, the cultural studies world has been even slower in recognising the value of research in the field of translation. Yet the parallels between these two important interdisciplinary fields and the overlap between them are so significant that they can no longer be ignored. The cultural turn in translation studies happened more than a decade ago; the translation turn in cultural studies is now well underway.

Both cultural studies and translation studies practitioners recognise the importance of understanding the manipulatory processes that are involved in textual production. A writer does not just write in a vacuum: he or she is the product of a particular culture, of a particular moment in time, and the writing reflects those factors such as race, gender, age, class, and birthplace as well as the stylistic, idiosyncratic features of the individual. Moreover, the material conditions in which the text is produced, sold, marketed and read also have a crucial role to play. Bourdieu points out that:

every power which manages to impose meanings and to impose them as legitimate by concealing the power relations which are the basis of its force, adds its own symbolic force to those power relations. (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977)

Translation, of course, is a primary method of imposing meaning while concealing the power relations that lie behind the production of that meaning. If we take censorship as an example, then it is easy to see how translation can impose censorship while simultaneously purporting to be a free and open rendering of the source text. By comparing the translated version with the original, the evidence of such censorship is easy to see where written texts are concerned. The novels of Emile Zola, for example, were heavily cut and edited by translators and publishers when they first appeared in English. Recently a number of researchers have begun to look at other, less immediately identifiable forms of censorship, particularly in cinema, where, for example, technical factors can be used as means of removing material deemed unacceptable (the particular constraints of sub-titling, for example, with the restricted number of characters that can appear in a single line, or the need in dubbing to make sounds match physical movements shown on screen). It is also interesting to speculate on whether the development of dubbing industries in certain countries is related to the existence at different points in time of totalitarian governments. Why do Italy, Germany, Greece, Spain, the former Soviet Union, China and numerous other countries that have endured dictatorships or military regimes have established dubbing industries as opposed to the use of subtitles? For dubbing erases the original voices, and restricts access to

other languages. Subtitling, in contrast, makes a comparative perspective possible, as audiences are allowed to access both source and target systems.

Lawrence Venuti points out that translation, wherever, whenever and however it takes place, is always to some extent circumscribed:

Every step in the translation process — from the selection of foreign texts to the implementation of translation strategies to the editing, reviewing and reading of translations — is mediated by the diverse cultural values that circulate in the target language, always in some hierarchical order. (Venuti, 1995)

Translation is therefore always enmeshed in a set of power relations that exist in both the source and target contexts. The problems of decoding a text for a translator involve so much more than language, despite the fact that the basis of any written text *is* its language. Moreover, the importance of understanding what happens in the translation process lies at the heart of our understanding of the world we inhabit. And if translation studies has been increasingly concerned with the relationship between individual texts and the wider cultural system within which those texts are produced and read, it is therefore not surprising that within cultural studies, and in post-colonial theory in particular, translation is increasingly being seen both as actual practice and as metaphor.

Homi Bhabha, in an essay entitled 'How Newness Enters the World', rereads Walter Benjamin and considers the role of translation in cultural (re)negotiation:

Translation is the performative nature of cultural communication. It is language *in actu* (enunciation, positionality) rather than language *in situ* (*énoncé* or propositionality). And the sign of translation continually tells, or 'tolls' the different times and spaces between cultural authority and its performative practices. The 'time' of translation consists in that *movement* of meaning, the principle and practice of a communication that, in the words of de Man, 'puts the original in motion to decanonize it, giving it the movement of fragmentation a wandering of errance, a kind of permanent exile'. (Bhabha, 1994)

Translation as a sign of fragmentation, of cultural *déstabilisation* and negotiation is a powerful image for the late twentieth century. And as English extends its international influence, so more and more people outside the English-speaking world actively participate in translational activity. Soon native speakers of English will be disadvantaged in a world that is predominantly multilingual.

So where does this leave us? Actually, at a very good point to move

forward. Both translation studies and cultural studies have come of age. Both interdisciplines have entered a new internationalist phase, and have been moving for some time away from their more overtly parochial and Eurocentric beginnings, towards a more sophisticated investigation of the relationship between the local and the global. Both are now vast wide-ranging fields, within which there is no consensus, but neither are there radical disagreements that threaten fragmentation or destruction from within. There are now clearly several areas that would lend themselves fruitfully to greater cooperation between practitioners of both interdisciplines.

- There needs to be more investigation of the acculturation process that takes place between cultures and the way in which different cultures construct their image of writers and texts.
- There needs to be more comparative study of the ways in which texts become cultural capital across cultural boundaries.
- There needs to be greater investigation of what Venuti has called 'the ethnocentric violence of translation' and much more research into the politics of translating.
- There needs to be a pooling of resources to extend research into intercultural training and the implications of such training in today's world.

It is not accidental that the genre of travel literature is providing such a rich field for exploration by both translation studies and cultural studies practitioners, for this is the genre in which individual strategies employed by writers deliberately to construct images of other cultures for consumption by readers can be most clearly seen.

In pointing out that none of us are able to comprehend fully the entirety of the complex network of signs that constitutes a culture, Raymond Williams effectively freed us from the old myth of the definitive version of anything. His thesis also offers a way forward that invites a collaborative approach, for if the totality is denied the individual, then a combination of individuals with different areas of expertise and different interests must surely be advantageous. Both cultural studies and translation studies have tended to move in the direction of the collaborative approach, with the establishment of research teams and groups, and with more international networks and increased communication. What we can see from both cultural studies and translation studies today is that the moment of the isolated academic sitting in an ivory tower is over, and indeed in these multifaceted interdisciplines, isolation is counterproductive. Translation is, after all, dialogic in its very nature, involving as it does more than one voice. The study of translation, like the study of culture, needs a plurality of

voices. And, similarly, the study of culture always involves an examination of the processes of encoding and decoding that comprise translation.

References

- Alvarez, Roman and Vidal, Africa (eds) (1996) *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bassnett, Susan (1997) *Studying British Cultures: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Bassnett, Susan and Lefevere, André (eds) (1990) *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter. (Reprinted, Cassell: 1995).
- Bhabha, Homi (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Passeron, J.C. (1977) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Transl. R. Nice. London/Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Dollimore, Jonathan and Sinfield, Alan (eds) (1985) *Political Shakespeare. Essays in Cultural Materialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Dronke, Peter (1968) *The Medieval Lyric*. London: Hutchinson.
- Easthope, Anthony (1991) *Literary into Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Easthope, Anthony (1997) But what is Cultural Studies? In Susan Bassnett (ed.) *Studying British Cultures: An Introduction* (pp. 3-18). London: Routledge.
- Eyen-Zohar, Itamar (1978a) The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In James Holmes, Jose Lambert and Raymond van den Broek (eds) *Literature and Translation* (pp. 117-127). Leuven: ACCO.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1978b) *Papers in Historical Poetics*. In *Papers on Poetics and Semiotics Series*, no. 8. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Publishing Projects.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar (1990) Polysystems studies. *Poetics Today* 11 (1), Spring.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar and Toury, Gideon (eds) (1981) *Translation Theory and Intercultural Relations*. Special Issue of *Poetics Today* 2 (4), Summer/Autumn.
- Gentzler, Edwin (1993) *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hall, Stuart (1991) The local and the global: Globalization and ethnicity. In Anthony D. King (ed.) *Culture, Globalization and the World-System* (pp. 19-41). London: Macmillan.
- Hoggart, Richard (1957) *The Uses of Literacy*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Holmes, James (1988) *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Johnson, Randall (1987) Tupy or not Tupy: Cannibalism and nationalism in contemporary Brazilian literature. In John King (ed.) *Modern Latin American Fiction: A Survey* (pp. 41-59). London: Faber and Faber.
- Johnson, Richard (1986) The story so far: and further transformations. In David Punter (ed.) *Introduction to Contemporary Cultural Studies* (pp. 277-314). London: Longman.
- Leavis, F.R. (1930) *Mass Civilisation and Minority Culture*. (Minority Pamphlets No. 1). Cambridge: Gordon Fraser.
- Lefevere, André (1978) Translation studies: The goal of the discipline. In James Holmes, Jose Lambert and Raymond van den Broek (eds) *Literature and Translation* (pp. 234-235). Leuven: ACCO.
- Lefevere, André (1992) *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nida, Eugene (1954) *Customs and Cultures*. New York: Harper and Row.

- Niranjana, Tejaswini (1992) *Siting Translation: History, Poststructuralism and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Simon, Sherry (1996a) Translation and interlingual creation in the contact zone. Paper for Translation as Cultural Transmission Seminar, Concordia University, Montreal.
- Simon, Sherry (1996b) *Gender Translation. Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Soyinka, Wole (1976) *Myth, Literature and the African World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Straw, Will (1993) Shifting boundaries, lines of descent. In Vanda Blundell, John Shepherd and Ian Taylor (eds) *Relocating Cultural Studies* (pp. 86-105). London and New York: Routledge.
- Thompson, E.P. (1963) *The Making of the English Working Class*. London: Gollancz.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Williams, Raymond (1957) *Culture and Society 1780-1950*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

index

- Aaltonen, S. 93, 107
 Ali, Mehmet 41
 Alvi, M. 61-2, 74
 Andrews, R. 51-2, 56
 An Shi»uo 21
 Aristotle 32
- Barba, E. 105, 108
 Barthes, R. 27, 40
 Beckett, S. 30-31, 38, 40
 Benjamin, W. xix, 59, 66, 75, 137
 Ben-Shahar, R. 107-8
 Bentley, E. xvii, 109-121
 Bhabha, H. xx, xxi, 137, 139
 Blake, W. 63
 Blau, H. 114
 Bloom, H. 27
 Bly, R. 67, 75
 Bonnefoy, Y. xix, 65, 69, 74-5
 Borges, J.L. 25-6, 28, 30, 40
 Bosley, K. xiv, 77, 85-8
 Bourdieu, P. xiii, 41, 135-6, 139
 Branch, M.A. 80
 Brecht, B. xi, xvi, xvii, 109-122
 Brockett, O.G. 113, 122
 Brustein, R. 114, 119, 122
 Buber, M. 83
 Buchanan-Brown, J. 111
 Burton, R. xv, 32-3, 38
 Byron, Lord G.G. xix, 71-3, 75, 99
 Byron, R. xv, 34-5, 40
- Camões, L.V. 32
 Carlson, M. 92-4, 108
 Carrière, J.C. 106, 108
 Gary, E. xix, 71, 73, 75
 Catford, J.C. 131
 Catullus 65
 Caxton, W. 29
 Chang'an 22
 Chapman, T. 25
- Chekhov, A. 91, 94
 Clurman, H. 112, 116, 121-22
 Confucius 32
 Conington, J. 44-48, 50, 54, 56
 Corrigan, R. 113, 120
 Crawford, J.M. 83-88
- Dalrymple, W. 35-6, 40
 Dante xix, xx, 70-4
 Dao'an 20, 23
 Davidson, J. 52-4, 56
 Day Lewis, C. xvi, 44-6, 56
 de Campos, A. xix, 58-9, 63, 75
 de la Motte, A. 25
 de Man, P. xix, xx, 137
 Derrida, J. xix, xxi, 137
 Dickinson, E. 27
 Douglas, G. 43-4, 47-9, 56, 85
 Dronke, P. 126-7, 139
 Dryden, J. 11, 43-48, 50-1, 56
 Ducis, J.-F. 92-3
 Durling, R.M. xix, 71-3, 75
- Easthope, A. xx, xxi, 131, 139
 Esslin, M. 109-11, 119, 122
 Even-Zohar, I. xx, 125-7, 139
- Fairfax Taylor, E. 47-50, 56
 Feng Chi 22
 Fitzgerald, E. 32, 126
 Fitzgerald, R. 42, 56
 Frayn, M. 93-4, 108
 Friberg, B. 78, 85-7, 89
 Frost, R. xix, 57
 Fu Jian 22
- Gassner, J. 118, 122
 Gentzier, E. 125, 139
 Godard, B. 25, 40
 Goethe, J.W. xx
 Gottfried, M. 112, 122