Edwin Gentzler

Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*

FOREWORD

IN THEIR WORK OVER THE PAST TWENTY YEARS, Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere have consistently built bridges within the field of translation studies and developed interdisciplinary connections to fields of study outside the discipline. In 1990, they were the first to suggest that translation studies take the 'cultural turn' and look toward work of cultural studies scholars. In their new book *Constructing Cultures*, they present a strong case for moving the field of cultural studies closer to translation studies. New strategies gleaned from translation histories, such as we see in Lefevere's discussion of *Aeneid* translations or Bassnett's discussions of *Inferno* translations that follow, not only give translators more insight into the actual practice of translation, but they also give cultural studies critics new insight into cultural manipulation by those in power. Following Bassnett and Lefevere, translators have increasingly become more empowered and less self-effacing, a development that has allowed theorists to better view the process of mediating between cultures and/or of introducing different words, forms, cultural nuances, and meaning into their own respective culture. As Bassnett and Lefevere argue in *Constructing Cultures*, the study of translation *is* the study of cultural interaction, and thus the appeal of this book to cultural studies scholars, literary theorists, anthropologists, ethnographers, psycholinguists, and language philosophers and all of those interested in multicultural socialisation processes.

Constructing Cultures builds on a series of landmark texts by Bassnett and Lefevere, who, perhaps more than any other scholars in the field, have been responsible for putting translation studies on the academic map. Both were present at the historic 1976 conference in Leuven (Louvain), Belgium, which most scholars agree was the conference at which translation studies was founded. In the collected papers of that conference entitled *Literature and Translation* (Holmes *et al*, 1978), Lefevere contributed the essay 'Translation: The Focus of the Growth of Literary Knowledge', which traces the linguistic, literary, and cultural components of translation studies, topics that are further elaborated in essays that follow in this anthology. His often quoted 'Translation Studies: The Goal of the Discipline', also collected in the 1978 anthology, argues that translation practice should inform theory and vice versa, a dynamic that has allowed the field to grow so productively. In the same anthology, Bassnett's essay 'Translating Spatial Poetry: An Examination of the Theatre Texts in Performance', expands the purely linguistic and literary methodologies for study to include intertextual and

intersemiotic factors, again topics further developed in essays collected here. Bassnett went on to write the book *Translation Studies* (1980), a book that remains the definitive text in the field. Bassnett provides scholars with an historical survey of theoretical developments as well as illuminating samples of comparative analysis. She also discusses strategies for practising translators of poetry, drama, and fiction, again showing how translation theory and comparative analysis can inform practice.

In 1985, the next milestone in the development of the field of translation studies appeared: *The Manipulation of Literature* (1985), edited by Theo Hermans. The title of the anthology ended up giving this group of contributing scholars, including Bassnett and Lefevere, the nickname 'The Manipulation School', a name some associated with the new discipline resisted, but one which in some ways is appropriate. For translation studies scholars were beginning to show that translations, rather than being a secondary and derivative genre, were instead one of the *primary* literary tools that larger social institutions — educational systems, arts councils, publishing firms, and even governments — had at their disposal to 'manipulate' a given society in order to 'construct' the kind of 'culture' desired. Churches would commission Bible translations; governments would support national epic translations; schools would teach great book translations; kings would be patrons for heroic conquests translations; socialist regimes would underwrite socialist realism translations. The 'manipulation' thesis posited in 1985 evolves into 'cultural construction' of the anthology in your hand. The present analysis is much more sophisticated and complex than some of the early ideas, but the ideas posited then have held up to academic and cultural scrutiny.

The *Manipulation of Literature* contained significant contributions by Bassnett and Lefevere. In 'Ways Through the Labyrinth: Strategies and Methods for Translating Theatre Texts', Bassnett suggested including more semiotic markers — gestures, lighting, sound, silences, etc. — than just verbal signs in her methodology for translating drama texts. One can see the development of her thought over the past decade in the essay 'Still Trapped in the Labyrinth' that follows in the present volume. Lefevere contributed the essay 'Why Waste our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm', in which he lays out his concept of 'rewriting' — a genre that includes interpretation, criticism, anthologising, as well as translation — and shows how all rewriters operate under constraints of poetic norms and ideological beliefs inherent in the target culture. We see the development of his pioneering ideas in essays such as Translation Practice(s) and the Circulation of Cultural Capital: Some *Aeneids* in English' and 'Acculturating Bertolt Brecht' in the essays that follow in this book.

A real breakthrough for the field of translation studies came in the 1990s with the collection of essays titled *Translation, History, and Culture,* co-edited by Bassnett and Lefevere. It was then that translation studies officially took the 'cultural turn', the authors redefining the object of study as a verbal text within the network of

literary and extra-literary signs in both the source and target cultures. As Bassnett notes in Chapter 8, 'The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies', that follows, she and Lefevere were suggesting that such a redefinition of the field

> could offer a way of understanding how complex manipulative textual processes take place: how a text is selected for translation ... what role the translator plays in that selection, what the role of an editor, publisher, or patron plays, what criteria determine the strategies that will be employed for the translators, and how a text might be received in the target system.

While many scholars were inching toward the cultural turn in the early 1990s, Bassnett and Lefevere were the first to articulate the position. In the explosion of events that have followed, Bassnett and Lefevere again have led the way.

In 1992, Lefevere published not just one, but *three* books on translation: *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame, Translation/ History/Culture: A Sourcebook,* and *Translating Literature.* In addition, he published them not with obscure firms, but with major publishing firms such as Routledge and MLA Press. The books sold well, and the boom in translation studies was on. New journals such as *The Translator* and *Target* sprang up. Conference activity increased all over the world, including England, Holland, Poland, Finland, Spain, Austria, Brazil, and Canada. New publishing firms got into the market, e.g., Kent State University Press in the USA or Jerome Publishing in England. Old series were revived, such as the Rodopi Series in Holland. Encyclopedias of translation studies were developed in England, Germany, China, and elsewhere. Perhaps most significantly, translation studies entered academia, with new MA and PhD programmes starting at universities such as Middlesex, Massachusetts, Salamanca, São Paulo, and elsewhere. It is a shame that André Lefevere is no longer with us and is unable to see the fruits of the seeds that he planted.

In many ways, *Constructing Cultures* can be viewed as a celebration of André Lefevere's life and work. Everyone in the field, most deeply Susan Bassnett, perhaps his closest colleague and friend, is saddened by his passing. With difficulty and great care, Bassnett has collected and edited his final words in the shape that follows here.

The explosion of thinking and writing on and about translations has made it hard for anyone to keep up. For those recently discovering the field, Bassnett's and Lefevere's *Constructing Cultures* offer a variety of essays that reflect the evolution of the field: these essays address the most recent developments in theory, in cultural studies, in translation research (called descriptive studies by translation studies scholars), and in teaching translation. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere also continue to push the boundaries of the definition of the field of translation studies. This book is not just a collection of essays and talks presented at colloquia of the past and/or previously published in journals. Rather, it presents new and unpublished material, either in the form of new work the two of them

had presented in process at closed seminars of the graduate programme at the Centre for British and Comparative Cultural Studies at the University of Warwick, or radically rethinking and revising positions taken in previously published essays.

Constructing Cultures begins with three new essays: first, the introduction co-authored by Bassnett and Lefevere entitled 'Where are we in Translation Studies?'; then the first chapter by Lefevere entitled 'Chinese and Western Thinking on Translation'; and next the second chapter by Bassnett entitled 'When is Translation not a Translation?'. The co-authored introductory essay combines a blend of translation history followed by a new set of questions and openings for future research. It also contains the central thesis of the book, and answers a question those who first pick up the book might ask. Why is a book by two prominent translation scholars called *Constructing Cultures?* The answer indicates just how far translation studies has evolved since 1978. Translators, argue Bassnett and Lefevere, have always provided a vital link enabling different cultures to interact. The next logical stage posited by Bassnett and Lefevere is not just to study translations but to study cultural interaction. Perhaps the most obvious, comprehensive, indeed empirical data for studying cultural interaction are the translated texts themselves. To do so, Bassnett and Lefevere posit three models for studying translations that they have found useful: the Horatian model, in which the translator tends to be faithful to his/her customers, i.e., the target audience; the Jerome model, in which the translator tends to be faithful to the source text, in this case the Bible; and the Schleiermacher model, which emphasises preservation of the alterity of the source model for the target reader. Rather than suggesting that one theory of translation is valid across cultures and time, Bassnett's and Lefevere's multiple models are helpful for studying translations in different cultures during different periods. They also offer new critical tools to enable such study, such as the concept of 'textual grids' derived from the work of Pierre Bourdieu. A textual grid is understood as the collection of acceptable literary forms and genres in which texts can be expressed. For example, Chinese novels have their own set of rules, rules which differ from the ways in which novels in Europe tend to be constructed. These 'grids' cause patterns of expectations in the respective audiences, and both practising translators and in particular literary historians need to take into consideration such grids in order to better produce and/or analyse translations. Of most interest in the introductory essay are the set of questions Bassnett and Lefevere ask. For example, why are certain texts translated and not others? What is the agenda behind translation? How are translators used by those in control of such agendas? Can we predict how a given translation might function in any given culture? The future of the field is bright, according to Bassnett and Lefevere; areas for future research include, among others, the study of the history of translation to better relativise the present, the study of postcolonial translation to better re-evaluate Eurocentric models, and the study of different kinds of criticism, anthologies, reference works,

as well as translations, to see how images of texts are created and function within any given culture.

In Chapter 1, ‘Chinese and Western Thinking on Translation’, André Lefevere shows how a textual grid might help scholars doing comparative analysis. He views the concept of translation historically, showing just how culturally dependent our Western definition is. In a fascinating essay that juxtaposes the history of translation in the West and China, we see that our definition (white, Anglo-Germanic) of translation may not be as universal as some theorists speculate. Lefevere compares a system in the West in which translations are invariably written by a single author and read in silence by single readers to a system in China in which translations tend to be oral in nature, often translated by teams of scholars, and frequently recited and/or chanted publicly. In the West, he suggests, the ‘original’ text always consciously or subconsciously looms behind the translated text, whereas in China, the translated text often *replaces* the original, with the reader asking few questions about the ‘original’. Lefevere examines powerful institutions that may shape such sensibilities such as the Roman Catholic Church in the West and powerful emperors in China. As a result, Lefevere forces the reader to see that our very definition of translation as a kind of language transfer is embedded in larger systems or grids that define and limit our practice to a greater degree than hitherto imagined. Only by taking a step back from the immediate language transfer process, and by taking the larger institutions involved in cultural construction into consideration can the scholar begin to see the nature of the role translations play in cultural construction.

Lefevere continues to explore the usefulness of the concept of a textual grid throughout the book that follows. For example, in Chapter 5, ‘The Gates of Analogy: The *Kalevala* in English’, Lefevere examines the construction and translations of the Kalevala, a collection of Finnish oral poetry, a kind of Finnish national epic, to show how readers and critics consciously and unconsciously submit to a culturally constructed concept of an acceptable form for national epics, a ‘grid’ influenced by our concept of Homeric epics or Nordic epics. Lefevere argues that submitting to such a grid that underlies our notion of ‘world literature’ is particularly important to literatures written in languages less widely spoken. If a nation wants to be recognised as a nation among world nations, as was true of Finland in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, then constructing a national epic is one of the main requirements. Lefevere shows that that very construction was exactly what a series of Finnish critics and translators set out to do. Quoting *Kalevala* translator Keith Bosley, Lefevere points out that the Finnish historians who constructed the epic were ‘concerned less with fidelity to sources than with the validation of a national culture’. Ironically, because of the predominance of the Swedish language in Finland at the time, the very scholars who constructed the Finnish epic had to do so using *Swedish* at first, the only literary language they knew. For lesser-known languages such as Finnish, Czech, Flemish, Gaelic, such a ironic twist is not unusual; their revival is often dependent

upon translations from Swedish, German, French, or English to bring them into existence. In 'The *Kalevala* in English', Lefevere shows that both critics such as Lönnrot and translators such as the first two English translators very definitely use grids such as those of the classical Nordic epic to manipulate the original to conform to what readers typically associate with classical epics. This kind of research on the role translations play in emerging nations is one of the most exciting contributions of translation studies scholars. Pioneering work by translation studies scholars such as Lefevere provide us with models from the past that will have enormous influence on cultural studies and identity formation in the future.

One of the most fascinating texts illustrating the phenomenon of the construction of a national epic via translation is James Macpherson's translation of *Ossian,* a Scottish national epic, right around the same time Finnish scholars were constructing the *Kalevala.* The only problem was that no original existed. Macpherson's translation was a hoax, or what translation studies has come to call a 'pseudo-translation', a term coined by Gideon Toury in 'Translation, Literary Translation, and Pseudotranslation' (1985). Lefevere's essay on the translation of 'epic' literature in lesser-known languages is complemented by Susan Bassnett's essay in Chapter 2, 'When is a Translation Not a Translation?' She, too, points out how cultural construction is a determinant factor in presenting and marketing a text as a translation, when it is in fact an original work. Why might someone do such a thing? Often certain cultural constraints make it impossible to write about certain topics or use certain poetic forms. In the USA, for example, with free verse reigning as the norm in poetic circles, publishing serious verse in rhymed couplets might be difficult; however, if one masked one's identity and posed as the greatest writer from some other country, perhaps one could perhaps find one's way into print. Examples of such deception abound, including the recent publication of the work of 'Araki Yasusada' in English. Yasusada, a Japanese Hiroshima 'survivor', writes poems whose surreal images and abrupt juxtapositions were in stark contrast to the often sentimental images of other Hiroshima poets translated into English. The problem was Yasusada didn't exist. While rumours are still flying, the lead suspect, according to Emily Nussbaum (1997) in 'Turning Japanese; The Hiroshima Poetry Hoax' is one Kent Johnson, professor of English and Spanish at Highland Community College, who has published his own poems in the voice of a Hiroshima survivor, masking his identity to lend authenticity to his voice. The difference between an imagined survivor and a 'real' Japanese survivor/eyewitness are two different things, especially when one considers that the constructed biography of Yasusada includes his daughter dying of radiation poisoning.

In 'When is Translation Not a Translation?' Bassnett introduces a new concept she calls 'collusion' to analyse such pseudo-translations, arguing that readers go along with this ruse for a variety of conscious and subconscious reasons. Given the number of examples she cites, pseudo-translations are much more prevalent than the reading public and/or literary critics ever imagined: Thomas Mallory's

Morte d'Arthur, Richard Burton's *The Kasidah of Hají Abdú El-Yezdí* are pseudo-translations; others are found within travel writing texts such as Robert Byron's *The Road to Oxiana*, in which dialogues are presented as translations, but the reader subconsciously knows that the traveller does *not* know the indigenous language; thus they must indeed be fabricated rather than factual. Because readers do not want to admit this, readers 'collude' with the writer in perpetuating the facade that these texts and/or dialogues are based on 'fact' rather than fiction. The scheme also allows the original writer to remain the authority and effectively erases the translator from the mediatory process. Bassnett's insights point out just how difficult it is to determine the border between original writing and translation and how critics 'collude' with a culture that tends to have very distinct and separate concepts of original writing and translation. Such thinking makes *Constructing Culture* appeal to cultural studies scholars and language philosophers alike.

Bassnett and Lefevere deploy these new critical tools well in *Constructing Cultures* when they revisit sites of their thinking about translation developed during their earlier years. In Chapter 3, 'Translation Practice(s) and the Circulation of Cultural Capital: Some *Aeneids* in English', Lefevere provides a diachronic study of translations of the *Aeneid* into English, the kind of translation history characteristic of translation studies during its descriptive phase of the 1980s. This time, however, Lefevere incorporates the concept of 'cultural capital' from Pierre Bourdieu, by which he refers to information a person needs in any given cultural context to belong to the 'right circles', information that Lefevere argues is regulated and transmitted by translation. Attacking translation critics who set up some sort of universal standard of good versus bad to judge translations and to explain their success or failure in a given culture, Lefevere instead argues that the success of certain translation of Virgil's *Aeneid* has to do less with the quality of the translation, and more to do with the *prestige* of the source language culture for the audience of the translation, i.e., the elite reading public, (whose skill in Latin is decreasing over time) in England who want to belong to the right literary and social circles. Behind this article we see the concept of patronage developed by Lefevere. For example, in a 1984 essay called 'That Structure in the Dialect of Man Interpreted', Lefevere talked about patronage as any kind of force that can be influential in encouraging or discouraging, even censoring, works of literature. Lefevere's concept of patronage is a broad one: kings, queens, booksellers, school systems, arts councils, governments, are all implicated. In the case of 'Some *Aeneids* in English', Lefevere gives the example of the Pope serving as a patron for Christopher Pitt's 1740 translation, or the broadcasting industry serving as a patron in the case of Cecil Day Lewis' 1952 translation. What I find interesting in this essay is that Lefevere actually uses his theory to predict future translations, arguing for example that patrons of feminist bookstores will no doubt contribute to the production of a new feminist translation of the *Aeneid.*

On goal of Lefevere's work is to unmask institutional forces that create a kind of translation hegemony which influences the kinds of translation that get produced. In Chapter 7, 'Acculturating Bertolt Brecht', Lefevere turns to the literary criticism industry and uses the example of Brecht translations in the USA to illustrate his point. Although he dealt with Brecht translations previously in his essay 'Mother Courage's Cucumbers' (1982), this time he expands the parameters of translation studies to include both translations, literary criticism, and reference works such as encyclopedias. Using his concept of translation as a kind of 'rewriting', introduced in 1987 in an article called '"Beyond Interpretation" or the Business of (Re) Writing', and referring to all those writers who interpret, explain, paraphrase literary texts. Lefevere reveals how both translators and literary critics are guilty of perpetuating certain cultural values at the expense of others as they rewrite. This new essay 'Acculturating Bertolt Brecht' exposes literary and ideological prejudices in the United States during the World War II period through the early 1970s, and demonstrates how translators and critics were not innocent bystanders of such cultural prejudices, but rather active participants contributing to particular cultural constructions. Discussing *Mother Courage* translations by H.R. Hays (1941), Eric Bentley (1967), and Ralph Manheim (1972), for example, Lefevere reveals the leading role translators played in making Brecht part of the American canon. While the translators' negotiations to make Brecht accepted tended to remain at the level of language, stage directions, and literary form, Lefevere goes on to argue that the real critical battle over the reception of Brecht was waged by the literary critics. In his analysis of the criticism, Lefevere shows another kind of collusion, in which critics ignored Brecht's epic forms and alienation effects, dismissed his politics and Marxism, and instead turned Brecht into another kind of liberal humanist. Lefevere's quotes are especially damning: Bentley, for example, sublates 'epic theatre' into 'theatre of narrative realism'; Brocket turns Brecht's alienation effects into another kind of Aristotelian catharsis. Some critics went so far as to argue that Brecht's Marxism damaged his work and that Brecht's primary significance was his ability to 'entertain'. The powerful combination of critics and translators succeeded in constructing an *image* of Brecht in the West for those who do not know German. For those who do, such a social constructing is actually appalling; one begins to wonder whether there are any professional standards in literary translation or literary criticism at all. One of the goals of translation studies over the past two decades has been to reveal the social and literary norms of the target culture and show the impact that such constraints have on practising translators; Lefevere's essay not only effectively demonstrates such constraints, but it also shows how translators and critics participate in that very construction. For those postcolonial critics who are attempting to unmask cultural institutions that serve to marginalise minority voices and for those with alternative political persuasions, one can learn much from Lefevere's essay. Such translation studies research might also inform the training of literary and cultural critics as well.

Armed with a new set of critical tools, Bassnett also productively revisits a site of her previous thinking, i.e., that of theatre translation, in Chapter 6, 'Still Trapped in the Labyrinth: Further Reflections on Translation and Theatre'. Less than comfortable with certain literary critical notions prevalent in the West, Bassnett uses examples of third world translations to illustrate her points. Playing with the overlapping boundaries among play text, translation, and performance, she expands the boundaries of translation studies to include visual as well as verbal signs. The central argument circles around Bassnett's discomfort with certain scholars' notion of 'performability', i.e., those who claim that a kind of universal 'performability' (or 'speakablity' or 'gestic subtext') is inherit in the text, one that determines whether or not the play can be translated and/or performed in the first place. Indeed, Bassnett sees a danger in such universalising concepts: for once the translator/director has a vision of this elusive universal gestic subtext, many contradictions, subtle nuances, and shifts in tone in the text may get smoothed out for the sake of a unified conceptual vision. Using well chosen examples, such as Vicki Ooi's discussion of the translation of O'Neill's *Long Day's Journey into Night* into Chinese, Bassnett shows how certain non-Western cultures do not have the convention of searching for subtextual patterns within a playtext. One of the strengths of both Bassnett and Lefevere's work over the years has been the fact that they are not interested in theory as philosophy, but in theory that may be of use for *practising* translators. Indeed, very little practical advice exists for those translating drama. Yet here Bassnett offers explicit and well-taken advice: trying to render a text performable is *not* the translator's task; rather, Bassnett recommends leaving in the contradictions, nuances, and shifts in tone if found in the original. The director, the dramaturge, or the actor, may end up unifying the text. The goal of the translator, however, is to *maintain the strangeness* of the text in order to allow the reader (or artistic director) to discover the text for themselves. In fact, the only way to construct a multicultural theatre in the West will be if translators reject strategies that conform to Western dramatic conventions and cultural practices, reject searching for deep, unifying structures, and instead focus on the translation of the signs of the texts — the words, the silences, the shifts of tone — in all their the contradictions and multi-layered play.

Bassnett further blends theory and practical advice in Chapter 4, 'Transplanting the Seed: Poetry and Translation'. Her advice for poetry translators is similar to the advice she gives theatre translators: to focus on the play of language in the text. Bassnett distances herself from notions that poetry is some intangible, ineffable spirit or presence, taking issue with poets such as Robert Frost who suggest that poetry is what gets lost in translation. Supporting a thesis posited by poet and translator Frederic Will (1993) in *Translation, Theory and Practice: Reassembling the Tower,* Bassnett argues that texts consist of language — nouns, verbs, grammatical patterns _ the very material with which translators work with to construct their translations. Citing famous translators such as Ezra Pound, Augusto de Campos, Yves Bonnefoy, and Octavio Paz, Bassnett argues the

task of the translator is to dismantle the raw linguistic material of the poet, and to reassemble the signs in a new language. The task is less to copy an original, but to compose an analogous text. Paz suggests we think in terms of transmutation; Bassnett suggests that we think in terms of transplanting a seed. To illustrate her theory, Bassnett gives several illuminating examples of both how to and how not to translate. She cites, for example, Sir Thomas Wyatt's translations of Petrarch as an example of Paz' translation approach. While some critics are uncomfortable with Wyatt's translation strategy, Bassnett is not. She allows that Wyatt makes many changes, including altering the rhyme scheme and foregrounding many pronouns, especially the self-referential *I*, which makes the poetry less mystical and more concrete. Yet by subtly altering the form, Bassnett shows how Wyatt created a new form with new possibilities in the English language, one that was later to be used by writers such as Sidney, Spenser, and Shakespeare. The seed, once transplanted, flourishes. She also gives excellent examples of how not to translate, citing several versions of the Paolo and Francesca story from Dante's *Inferno*, Canto V. In a typical translation studies fashion, Bassnett compares translations by Gary (1816), Byron (1820), Longfellow (1867), Norton (1941), Sayers (1949), Sisson (1980) and Durling (1996). What strikes the reader is how confusing and devoid of feeling nearly all of them are. The signs never become free, but instead remain tied to their source, clumsily bound to two syntactic structures, and uncertain with regard to their intended audience. Bassnett hopes to liberate translators from their slavish attachment to the source text, and empower them with positive imagery. Bassnett views translation as energy-releasing, as freeing linguistic and semiotic signs to circulate among the best creative writing in the receiving culture. Such a theory of translation has post-structuralist resonance; one can hear echoes of Benjamin, Derrida, and de Man in Bassnett's position; recent work of translation studies scholars such as Lawrence Venuti and Teraswini Niranjani indicate its growing acceptance in the field. Yet, perhaps most importantly, is the appeal of such a translation approach for cultural studies and postcolonial scholars.

Susan Bassnett's final essay 'The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies' makes the connection between translation studies and cultural studies. A fitting conclusion to this book, the essay announces a new era for interdisciplinary research. Translation studies scholarship over the last three decades has now built up what might be called a critical mass of scholarship, enough that any cultural studies scholars discussing intercultural movement, or lamenting the lack thereof, needs to consult the findings of the translation studies scholarship. I have argued that translated texts serve as empirical data documenting intercultural transfer; Bassnett argues similarly that translations are the *performative* aspect of intercultural communication. Using models developed by Anthony Easthope in a recent essay 'But what *is* Cultural Studies' (1997), Bassnett traces a parallel development of both cultural studies and translation studies over the past three decades, both going through a culturalist phase (Nida and Newmark), a structuralist phase (Even-Zohar and Toury), and a post-structuralist phase (Simon and

Niranjana). As cultural studies now enters a new internationalist phase, incorporating sociological and ethnographic methodologies, Bassnett suggests that the moment has come for the two disciplines to jump off their parallel track and join together. Cultural studies is now dealing with questions of power relations and textual production. Translation studies scholars know something about this: their years of research in historical comparison of Greek and Latin classics or canonical writers such as Dante, Shakespeare, Goethe, have given them great insight into how cultural values and ideals are constructed and whose interests such values represent. Yet while cultural studies has embraced gender studies, film studies, and media studies, Bassnett points out that they have been slow to recognise the value of translation studies research. Quoting Homi Bhabha's citation of Paul de Man from *The Location of Culture* (1994), Bassnett argues that translations provide the scholar with actual situations of cultural transfer rather than hypothetical situations: translation, de Man notes, 'puts the original in motion to decanonise it, giving it movement of fragmentation, a wandering of errance, a kind of permanent exile'. For Bassnett, this image of translation as a sign of fragmentation, wandering, and exile, characterises the new internationalist phase of cultural studies in the late twentieth century. More than a metaphor, Bassnett concludes, the study of culture would do well to study the processes of encoding and decoding involved in translation. For in the study of translations, the scholar can demonstrate how fragments survive, which wanderings occur, and how texts in exile are received. As Barbara Johnson (1985) has argued in 'Taking Fidelity Philosophically', a text that Bassnett has cited in the past, it is time to move the study of translations from the margins of critical investigations to centre stage. Translation studies has taken the cultural turn; now cultural studies should take the translation turn.

In *Constructing Cultures*, Bassnett and Lefevere again present the field with a pioneering text. For the past two decades, translation studies has conducted much descriptive work. The methodology has been sound, the comparisons valid, and the values and interests of the cultural elite in various European and North American societies exposed. Yet much of this work has been carried out behind the scenes and has not yet reached wider audiences. Many scholars in the field have been asking where will translation studies go after its descriptive studies period. In *Constructing Cultures,* Bassnett and Lefevere not only report on the latest developments in the field of translation studies, they also point to new directions for the discipline for the next millennium. When I read work by Jacques Derrida, Homi Bhabha, or Edward Said, I am often struck by how naive their ideas about translation sound in comparison to the detailed analysis provided by translation scholars. Bassnett and Lefevere point the field to a new interdisciplinary phase. As cultural studies scholars, postcolonial critics, and language philosophers discover translation studies, they should like what they see. Translation studies scholars need also to learn from methods of cultural studies disciplines to broaden their investigations. In 'The Translation Turn', Bassnett points to new avenues for

interdisciplinary investigations into what Venuti calls the 'ethnocentric violence of translation', into how cultures construct 'images' of writers, and into which texts become cultural capital for the ruling elite. The task is large, for no one scholar from any single discipline can fully comprehend the complex network of signs that constitute a culture. Bassnett forcefully argues that we need to combine resources, broaden research, and begin a new era of intercultural training, thereby opening the field to a plurality of voices.

References

Bassnett, Susan (1980) *Translation Studies.* London: Methuen. (Rev. edition: London: Routledge, 1988).

Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere (eds) (1990) *Translation, History, and Culture.* London: Pinter.

Bhabha, Homi (1994) *The Location of Culture.* London: Routledge.

Easthope, Anthony (1997) But what *is* Cultural Studies. In Susan Bassnett (ed.) *Studying British Cultures: An Introduction.* London: Routledge.

Hermans, Theo (1985) *The Manipulation of Literature.* New York: St. Martins Press. Holmes, James S., Lambert, José and van den Broek, Raymond (eds) (1978) *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies.* Leuven: Acco. Johnson, Barbara (1985) Taking fidelity philosophically. In Joseph F. Graham (ed.) *Difference in Translation.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Reference: Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation* (1998), Multilingual Matters, p. ix-xxi.