

André Lefevere
Susan Bassnett

INTRODUCTION:
PROUST'S GRANDMOTHER
AND THE THOUSAND AND ONE NIGHTS:
THE 'CULTURAL TURN' IN TRANSLATION STUDIES

IN *SODOME ET GOMORRHE* Marcel Proust's narrator muses about his grandmother's attitude towards translations and, more especially, new translations superseding the translations she has been familiar with all her life. To put it briefly, she does not like them at all. The reasons why will provide a useful starting point for the introduction to a volume of essays trying to rethink the role of translation in literary studies in a way that finally begins to do justice to the central role translation has played in Western culture almost from the very beginning.

But first, the grandmother:

If an *Odyssey* from which the names of Ulysses and Minerva were absent was no longer the *Odyssey* for her, what would she have said when she saw the title of her *Thousand and One Nights* already deformed on the title page, when she could no longer find the immortally familiar names of Sheherazade and Dinarazade transcribed exactly as she had been used to pronouncing them from time immemorial in a book where the charming Caliph and the powerful Genies were hardly able to recognize themselves, having been decapitated as it were, if one dares use that word in the context of Muslim stories, and now being called one the 'Khalifat', the others the 'Gennis?' (Proust, 1954: 238-9; trans. A. Lefevere).

The text quoted immediately directs our attention to a number of points, few of which, if any, will be made by authors of linguistic studies of translation.

The first point is that the grandmother quite obviously accepts the existence of translations as such. It is unlikely that she will have read either the *Odyssey* or *The Thousand and One Nights*, or both, in the original. Unlike a certain group of theoreticians of translation, therefore, discussed in Mette Hjort's contribution to this volume, Proust's grandmother definitely thinks translation is possible. We might even go on to surmise that, like many of her contemporaries and many who have lived in successive generations since, she may never have been very interested in the problem as such. Her initial attitude towards translations can, therefore, be said to have been of a somewhat pragmatic nature: since they exist, let us make use of them.

Yet Proust's grandmother clearly distinguishes between what are, to her, 'good' and 'bad' translations. It should be noted, however, that 'good' and 'bad' have, for her, no bearing whatsoever on the actual 'quality' of the

translations, since that is precisely a feature of translation she is utterly unable to judge. Rather, Proust's grandmother likes the translations she has grown up with. 'The' *Odyssey* for her is a translation in which the hero is still called by his Latinized name: Ulysses, and in which the goddess Athena is likewise still called Minerva. Other *Odysseys* or rather, other texts deemed to represent Homer's *Odyssey*, simply will not do, they are impostors, as are translations of *The Thousand and One Nights* that change the very names of the protagonists.

Proust's grandmother, therefore, does not really like or dislike a translation; rather, she trusts or distrusts a translator. The translator whose work she is familiar with is, to her, a 'faithful' translator. Of course Proust's grandmother is not the only person to determine whether a translation is 'faithful' or not. It is highly unlikely, for instance, that the publisher of the translations Proust's grandmother liked published them solely because he liked them. Then, as now, he will most probably have had the translation read by a number of 'experts' in the field, and he will have published the translation at least in part because of their favourable recommendation.

Yet, suddenly, a translation appears in which the 'immortally familiar' Ulysses has been transmogrified into the barbaric Odysseus, and another translation in which the beloved 'Caliph' has been mutilated almost beyond all recognition and is now called 'Khalifat'. What has gone wrong? Why was it necessary to publish new translations designed at least to compete with the familiar old translations, or even to supersede them altogether? Were the experts wrong? Did they change their minds? If they did, who can we ever trust again?

Something has, indeed, changed between two translations, but that something was not any expert's mind. Rather, the experts who gave the translations familiar to Proust's grandmother a favourable recommendation have, most likely, passed on and been replaced by other experts. But surely we are entitled to ask, together with Proust's grandmother, that should not matter, because are the standards themselves not for ever beyond any conceivable change?

Proust's grandmother finds herself in distinguished company here, namely that of many more linguistically oriented writers on translation who, as Mary Snell-Hornby points out in her chapter, cling rather tenaciously to standards of that nature: 'equivalence' was (and is) one such, second only to the admittedly somewhat chimerical, but therefore all the more inexorable *tertium comparationis*, the 'something' which presumably hovers somewhere between languages in some kind of air bubble and 'guarantees' (no less) that a word in the language you translate into (target language) is, indeed, equivalent to a word in the language you translate from (source language). The celebrated *tertium comparationis* would, therefore, guarantee that your translation say: 'Le baisage du dernier ménestrel is equivalent to the title of Sir Walter Scott's

original *Lay of the Last Minstrel*, were it not for the unfortunate fact that the primary meaning of 'lay' has shifted somewhat in English over the last 180 years.

The trouble with standards, it would seem, is that they turn out not to be eternal and unchanging after all. Most writers on translation who come to the subject from linguistics appear to be unable to face this, probably because they are (still) caught up in the more positivistic aspects of linguistics - what Snell-Hornby calls its 'scientific' side. And positivism, which was beginning to dominate science at the time of Proust's grandmother, was bent, among other things, on casting out relativity, on which a paper which would prove to be rather influential was published sixteen years before the eventual publication of *Sodome el Gomorrhe* itself. And yet, though many linguists writing on translation have no doubt familiarized themselves with the work of Sir Karl Popper, Thomas Kuhn and other theorists of science, positivism still leads a shadowy existence as the 'invisible theory' (Livingston, 1988: 13) behind much of what those same linguists write on our topic.

The *tertium comparationis* raises more problems - more, in the end, than it is worth, but we shall only list one more here - suppose it 'guarantees' that every word used in a translation is 'equivalent' to every word used in the original. There is no way it can 'guarantee' that the translation will have an effect on readers belonging to the target culture which is in any way comparable to the effect the original may have had on readers belonging to the source culture. Every word in the Loeb Classical Library's translation of the *Odyssey*, for instance, is no doubt equivalent to every word in Homer's original. The original is literature, the translation a crib. Or take the case of Emile Littré's celebrated translation of Dante's *Divina Commedia* into thirteenth-century French. Again, every word in the translation is equivalent to every word in the original, but very few readers of the translation would have been able to understand it any better than the original.

Those who write on the linguistic aspects of translation will, no doubt, think the above comments unfair. They began to write about translation the way they did not necessarily because of any deep 'scientific' conviction, but because the fifties of this century were the time when many in the field were either convinced, or very willing to let themselves be convinced, that the triumph of machine translation was just around the corner. And machines need to be programmed, and well programmed. Hence the emphasis on equivalence and 'guarantees', and the focus, almost exclusively for a long time, on the 'word as the unit of translation. Later linguists have moved from word to text as a unit, but not beyond. Furthermore, they would argue that what they have written on translation was never meant to be applied to the translation of literature, since literature, the argument went, was 'a special case'. It is not clear whether we are to understand by this that literature is not really

written in any language at all, or in a language so different from the language linguists would like to analyse that it is not worth the effort. The overall position of the linguist in translation studies would be rather analogous to that of an intrepid explorer who refuses to take any notice of the trees in the new region he has discovered until he has made sure he has painstakingly arrived at a description of all the plants that grow there.

At the end of her contribution, Mary Snell-Hornby exhorts linguists to abandon their 'scientific' attitude and to move from 'text' as a putative 'translation unit', to culture - a momentous step that would go far beyond the move from the word as a 'unit' to the text. The contributions in this volume have all taken the 'cultural turn' advocated by Snell-Hornby, which explains why certain staple features characterizing 'volumes of essays on translation' as published in the past will no longer be found here, and why certain new categories - new, at least, in comparison to volumes of the kind just mentioned - will be introduced. The 'cultural turn' also explains why this volume, as opposed to so many others in the field, displays a remarkable unity of purpose. All contributions deal with the 'cultural turn' in one way or another, they are so many case studies illustrating the central concept of the collection.

The reader will no longer find painstaking comparisons between originals and translations, largely because such comparisons, after paying lip service to the text-as-unit, tend to fall victim to the 'invisible theory' of the *tertium comparationis* which is implicitly postulated to underwrite judgements on why a certain translation (usually the one proposed by the writer of the paper in question) is better than another (usually contained in the translation being compared with its original). Nor will the reader find suggestions for either the production of foolproof translations or the training of foolproof translators, simply because both are utopian chimerae, to say the least.

Two contributions in the present volume touch on the one feature that makes the 'cultural turn' all but inevitable: time or, if you prefer, history. Over and against the positivistically posited existence of absolute standards by which a translation should be measured - standards so absolute that any text presenting itself as a translation would be found wanting - Mette Hjort argues that texts presenting themselves as translations of other texts can and do satisfy appropriateness conditions and intersubjectively mediated rules and norms dominant in the field of translation in a certain culture at a certain time. For most of the nineteenth century, for instance, one of the appropriateness conditions to be satisfied in the translation of poetry was that the translation had to rhyme - even if, as in the case of the Greek and Roman classics, the original did not. One of the 'norms' mediated in that century in

connection with translations of those classics was that they needed to be kept on the 'classical' level: erotic and scatological passages would either not be translated or, in the case of the Loeb Classical Library, translated from Greek into Latin and from Latin into Italian. (It is hardly a coincidence, therefore, that Latin and Italian dictionaries tend to suffer most from use in public libraries in the British Isles.)

Mette Hjort states that norms, rules and appropriateness conditions are liable to change. Translations made at different times therefore tend to be made under different conditions and to turn out differently, not because they are good or bad, but because they have been produced to satisfy different demands. It cannot be stressed enough that the production of different translations at different times does not point to any 'betrayal' of absolute standards, but rather to the absence, pure and simple, of any such standards. Such are the facts of life in the production - and study - of translations.

André Lefevere attempts a sketch of a genealogy of translation in the West, both documenting the changes in question and trying to explain why they occurred. Empirical historical research can document the changes he lists; to explain them, he needs to go into the vagaries and vicissitudes of the exercise of power in a society, and what the exercise of power means in terms of the production of culture, of which the production of translations is a part. The 'invisible presence' behind much of his writing is, of course, that of Michel Foucault. It should be noted here, too, that the concepts of norms and rules, which have already been mentioned, as well as the concept of the function of the translated text, which will soon be brought into play, were introduced nearly a decade ago by the Israeli translation scholar Gideon Toury. Yet his somewhat more than hermetic style, as well as the relative inaccessibility of his book, owing partially to the relative obscurity of its publisher, have tended to obstruct, rather than facilitate the spread of his ideas.

Both Barbara Godard and Mahasweta Sengupta deal with the category of power as a constraint on the production of translations. Barbara Godard documents how feminist writing uses translation to subvert dominant (male) discourse. In doing so, she links translation 'proper' to parody, thus pointing out one more direction in which the field of translation studies can grow. In his contribution, Dirk Delabastita points out yet another, complementary direction; we shall come back to both near the end of this introduction. In the body of her text Godard decisively eliminates 'equivalence' as the precondition, or even the goal, of translation. Rather translation should amount to 'transformation', a term which appears to be the other side of Piotr Kuhiwczak's 'appropriation'.

In both cases we are faced with texts purporting to be 'translations' of a

source text, yet in both cases the translators wittingly and willingly manipulate the source text to make it serve their own ends. The feminist writers Godard mentions manipulate with the aim of advancing their own ideology. The translators Kuhlwiczak mentions manipulate mainly to protect the reader not from an ideology (Kundera is not suspect in *that* respect, anyway) but from a poetics: Kundera writes novels in such a way that they may be too difficult for the average English-speaking reader to understand, and they must therefore be simplified, be made to read more like what that average reader (whoever s/he may be) is used to. Kuhlwiczak's case study is also a perfect illustration of the use of power in Foucault's sense, which is also the sense in which 'power' is to be understood in this introduction. Foucault writes:

If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it? What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. (1980: 119)

The publisher who allows the translators to manipulate/mutilate the original does, at the same time, have the power to introduce Kundera to a new audience, albeit not in optimal conditions. And the conditions are not optimal because the publisher has to bow to another kind of power, that wielded by his banker(s): he will not be able to publish anything any more in the not too distant future if what he publishes now does not sell.

Translation as mimicry of the dominant discourse (i.e. the discourse of the colonizer) is the topic of Mahasweta Sengupta's contribution on Rabindranath Tagore's auto-translations. She convincingly demonstrates that Tagore wrote in a totally different style in English and in Bengali, and that his fame in England, Europe and the Americas was severely limited by the way he could be made to function within the structure of imperial power: as long as he accepted the role of the sage, or even mystic imposed on him, he was *also* hailed as a great poet. Once he began to lecture against nationalism during the First World War, his star began to wane in England and its dominions.

This, then, is perhaps the time to introduce the category of 'function' in translation studies. It is obvious that not everyone in the field will be happy with a notion of translation that encompasses both an interlinear version of a poem, say, *and* the cases of 'transformation', of 'appropriation', and of 'mimicry' described earlier. Translations are never produced in an airlock where they, and their originals, can be checked against the *tertium comparationis* in the purest possible lexical chamber, untainted by power, time, or even the vagaries of culture. Rather, translations are made to respond to the demands of a culture, and

of various groups within that culture. This is probably never more clearly in evidence than when two cultures live together within the borders of one state, as evidenced by Sherry Simon's analysis of French/English translations, and vice versa, in Canada.

Cultures make various demands on translations, and those demands also have to do with the status of the text to be translated. If the text comes even close to the status of 'metanarrative' (Lyotard, 1985: xxxiv), or 'central text' embodying the fundamental beliefs of a culture (the Bible, the Koran), chances are the culture will demand the most literal translation possible. The same will generally hold true of scientific and technical texts: even if a computer manual has been written by a man, no woman translator is likely to get away with a translation that 'subverts male discourse' to such an extent that users begin to return the machines because they cannot figure out how to operate them. If, on the other hand, the text has little, or acceptably little, to do with either the beliefs of members of a culture, or their bank accounts, as is the case with most literary texts, translators are likely to be given much more leeway.

Proust's grandmother liked a translation of the *Odyssey* in which the hero was called 'Ulysses'. Yet a professor of classics occasionally visiting her 'salon' might have far preferred a translation restoring to the hero his original name of 'Odysseus'. Neither preference is likely to have caused the collapse of the political and/or financial institutions of the French Third Republic. Both Proust's grandmother and our fictitious professor of classics might also have concurred in the opinion that if a children's version of the *Odyssey* were to appear in the 'Bibliothèque Bleue', or some other series aimed at children, it should probably not contain every single part of the action of the original.

'Faithfulness', then, does not enter into translation in the guise of 'equivalence' between words or texts but, if at all, in the guise of an attempt to *make* the target text function in the target culture the way the source text functioned in the source culture. Translations are therefore not 'faithful' on the levels they have traditionally been required to be - to achieve 'functional equivalence' a translator may have to substantially adapt the source text. Translators, on the other hand, can be faithful, and they are said to be when they deliver what those who commission their translations want: 'Ulysses', among other features, for Proust's grandmother; 'Odysseus', among other features, for her acquaintance the classics professor.

A culture, then, assigns different functions to translations of different texts. The way translations are supposed to function depends both on the audience they are intended for (there are very few translations of *Gulliver's Travels* for children, for instance, in which the hero actually urinates on the imperial palace of Lilliput to put out the flames that threaten to consume it, as he does in the

original - he usually runs to the sea, fills his hat with water and empties it over the palace), and on the status of the source text they are supposed to represent in their own culture. In some cases, one of which has been described in this volume by Vladimír Macura, translation actually 'constitutes' a culture. In his contribution, Macura shows how nineteenth-century Czech culture virtually 'cloned' itself on the German model. In this case the 'function' of translation has very little to do with the transfer of information which is so often claimed to be its one and only *raison d'être*, since, as Macura points out, the readers of the translation did not really need it at all, as they were perfectly able to read the original. Translation, then, becomes one of the means by which a new nation 'proves' itself, shows that its language is capable of rendering what is rendered in more prestigious languages - as when Julius Nyerere, for instance, translates Shakespeare into Swahili. Translation, in this case, amounts to a seizure of power, more than anything else, any transfer of anything at all.

If neither the word, nor the text, but the culture becomes the operational 'unit' of translation, it might be wise to distinguish between 'intracultural' and 'intercultural translation, even though it is doubtful whether these kinds of distinctions and definitions are likely to be blessed with a long life. Let us try to put it this way: in every culture there are texts which claim to represent other texts. Some of these texts claim to represent texts belonging to a different culture; they are usually known as 'translations'. Proust's grandmother, for instance, read a book called *The Thousand and One Nights*, which represented for her a book written originally in Arabic which she was unable to read. Yet some of these texts also claim to represent texts belonging to the same culture. Excerpts from the work of Proust's grandmother's grandson, for instance, or Marcel himself, if you prefer, tend to appear in school and university anthologies in France. Professors and other scholars write critical essays on *Sodome el Gomorrhe* and other volumes of *À la recherche du temps perdu* in French, and publish them as books or in French scholarly journals. Histories of French literature, published in Paris, Quebec or Dakar are likely to include at least some attempt at a summary of *À la recherche*, and there are professors busily writing almost line-by-line commentaries, designed to elucidate nearly every word. But the French-speaking man or woman in the street is likely to think of Jeremy Irons when asked about Swann, if s/he thinks of anything or anybody at all. The movie based on *Un amour de Swann* is likely to have represented Proust to many more people than any of the other forms of representation described here. This, then, would be the 'intracultural' translation, which we propose to call 'rewriting', with the proviso that certain texts originally translated from another culture (the Bible, Lenin, Shakespeare) can become naturalized to such an extent that they are given the same 'intracultural' treatment as texts which have originally been generated within the culture in question.

Now let us turn the argument around, and look at it from the receiving end. It is extremely unlikely that the great majority of French-speaking people have actually ploughed through the whole of *À la recherche*. Yet they will all 'have read' or at least 'know' Proust. If they have read him, chances are they have read short excerpts in anthologies; if they 'know' him and they are professional students of literature, they may have read one or two volumes of *À la recherche* and supplemented this 'basic' knowledge with further knowledge gleaned from criticism, histories and commentaries, often during those dark nights of the soul preceding final examinations. If they are not professional students of literature, they will feel they can, at all times, look up 'Proust' in the *Petit Larousse* and, if all else fails, they can claim to have seen the movie.

We suggest that this is cultural reality, i.e. this is the way literature operates in a culture in this day and age. Since 'our common culture, however much we might wish it were not so, is less and less a book culture and more and more a culture of cinema, television and popular music' (Hillis Miller, 1987: 285), literature reaches those who are not its professional students much more by way of the 'images' constructed of it in translations, but even more so in anthologies, commentaries, histories and, occasionally, critical journals, than it does so by means of 'originals', however venerable they may be, and however much professors of literature and its students who approach it in a 'professional' way may regret this state of affairs. What impacts most on members of a culture, we suggest, is the 'image' of a work of literature, not its 'reality', not the text that is still sacrosanct only in literature departments. It is therefore extremely important that the 'image' of a literature and the works that constitute it be studied alongside its reality. This, we submit, is where the future of 'translation studies' lies.

'Translation', then, is one of the many forms in which works of literature are 'rewritten', one of many 'rewritings'. In our day and age, these 'rewritings' are at least as influential in ensuring the survival of a work of literature as the originals, the 'writings' themselves. One might even take the next step and say that if a work is not 'rewritten' in one way or another, it is not likely to survive its publication date by all that many years, or even months. Needless to say, this state of affairs invests a non-negligible power in the rewriters: translators, critics, historians, professors, journalists. They can make or break a writer, and they can - as the Kundera example shows - make and break him or her on their own terms. Their power should, therefore, be analysed, as well as the various ways in which they tend to exercise it.

If we study rewritings of all kinds: translations, histories, critical articles, commentaries, anthologies, anything that contributes to constructing the 'image' of a writer and/or a work of literature, there is, as Dirk Delabastita reminds us, no reason why we should stop at rewritings

in the written medium as we usually understand it. His contribution to this volume takes the whole concept one step further, into the 'rewriting' of film, arguably the most powerful medium today. His contribution could be said to represent one pole of a future 'translation/rewriting studies'. The other pole could be represented by the contributions by Palma Zlateva and Elzbieta Tabakowska appearing in this volume. Whereas Delabastita deals with a more 'global' picture, both Zlateva and Tabakowska engage in what could be called detail studies by comparison, but the difference between their detail studies and those contained in 'volumes of essays on translation' published in the past should be obvious. Zlateva's concept of 'pre-text', i.e. the cultural assumptions that largely determine the success or failure of a translated text in the target culture, and which have almost nothing to do with the quality of the translation itself, seems destined for a fruitful career in translation/rewriting studies, if only because publishers, as described by Kuhiwczak, often use the pre-text problem as a pretext not even to consider a translation for publication. Finally, Tabakowska demonstrates the extent to which culture 'shows' in both text and translation. The original, she argues, is not a monolithic statement made by one speaker, which should therefore be translated in the same monolithic manner. Rather, the source text is already a polyphonic statement, and the translation should inspire similar, or at least analogous, polyphonic reactions in its readers. We have come far indeed from certain concept of equivalence which held, in practice, that anybody with a fairly good knowledge of two languages supplemented by a fairly reliable dictionary should be able to produce fairly decent translations. Since languages express cultures, translators should be bicultural, not bilingual.

What the development of Translation Studies shows is that translation, like all (re)writings is never innocent. There is always a context in which the translation takes place, always a history from which a text emerges and into which a text is transposed. Translation involves so much more than the simple engagement of an individual with a printed page and a bilingual dictionary; indeed, the bilingual dictionary itself is an object lesson in the inadequacy of any concept of equivalence as linguistic sameness. How many readers are constantly frustrated as they endeavour to look up a word or phrase in a bilingual dictionary, only to discover that the range of terms available offers them a series of choices that they are ill-equipped to undertake. Examples of the kind of translation that results from blind trust in a bilingual dictionary divorced from contextual knowledge abound; wherever one travels one encounters tourist brochures, hotel information documents, instructions in elevators and so forth written in a sublanguage that is often extremely funny because of the ludicrous errors that result from such inadequate translation practice.

The papers in this present collection all testify to the fact that

translation as an activity is always doubly contextualized, since the text has a place in two cultures. Moreover, although idealistically translation may be perceived as a perfect marriage between two different (con)texts, bringing together two entities for better or worse in mutual harmony, in practice translation takes place on a vertical axis rather than a horizontal one. In other words, either the translator regards the task at hand as that of rising to the level of the source text and its author or, as happens so frequently today, particularly where the translator is dealing with texts distanced considerably in time and space, that translator regards the target culture as greater and effectively colonizes the source text. For example, Maria Tymozcko reminds us that cultural appropriation via translation is not confined to the twentieth century, and cites the example of Geoffrey of Monmouth, whilst Mahasweta Sengupta looks at the way in which Rabindranath Tagore shaped his own translations according to the paradigms of imperialist Europe and in so doing lost his own sense of poetry. Piotr Kuhlczak, in the concluding essay looks at a case study of deliberate ideological shift in translation, where effectively what has taken place is an act of appropriation.

The study of translation practice, therefore, has moved on from a formalist approach and turned instead to the larger 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 within 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. Moreover, with the demise of the notion of equivalence as sameness and recognition of the fact that literary conventions change continuously, the old evaluative norms of 'good' and 'bad', 'faithful' and 'unfaithful' translations are also disappearing. Instead of debating the accuracy of a translation based on linguistic criteria, translators and translation scholars (who hopefully are one and the same) are tending to consider the relative function of the text in each of its two contexts. Ezra Pound realized this a long time ago when he contemptuously dismissed those who criticized him for inaccuracies in his translations, pointing out that if accuracy were the principal criterion of a good translation, then any fool with a bilingual crib could produce just such a result.

Translation/rewriting Studies tend to deal with the constraints that enter into play during the process of both the writing and rewriting of texts. These

constraints both belong to the field of literary studies 'proper' and transcend it. They ultimately have to do with power and manipulation, two issues potentially of enormous interest not only to those engaged in literary studies, but also to all their victims outside. The student of translation/rewriting is not engaged in an ever-lengthening and ever more complex dance around the 'always already no longer there'. S/he deals with hard, falsifiable cultural data, and the way they affect people's lives.

Traditionally, the study of translation has been relegated to a small corner within the wider field of that amorphous quasi-discipline known as Comparative Literature. But with the development of Translation Studies as a discipline in its own right, with a methodology that draws on comparatistics and cultural history, the time has come to think again about that marginalization. Translation has been a major shaping force in the development of world culture, and no study of comparative literature can take place without regard to translation. We have both suggested on occasions, with a deliberate intention of subverting the status quo and drawing attention to the importance of Translation Studies, that perhaps we should rethink our notions of Comparative Literature and redefine it as a sub-category of Translation Studies instead of vice versa.

We hope that this collection of essays will provoke further debate about the ways in which literary establishments manipulate originals. Rewriting, as John Frow reminds us is:

[T]he results of a complex articulation of the literary system with other institutions (the school, religion), institutionalized practices (moral or religious training, commemoration, or else a relatively autonomous aesthetic function) and other discursive formations (religious, scientific, ethical). (1986: 182)

Translation is one example of this complex articulation, and an examination of the processes of translation offers a way of understanding how those manipulative shifts take place. Like Proust's grandmother, we all need to feel we can trust a translator; understanding the constraints upon a translator and recognizing the measures that the translator can take in order to escape those constraints is an important step towards establishing that trust. We may not like what we see, but at least we shall not be kept in the dark. At the end of the most violent century in history, when even the air we breathe may be contaminated by forces unknown to us and unseen by us, the more understanding we have of the processes that shape our lives, the more hopeful we can be of a future of greater integrity.

References

- Foley, Barbara. (1985) 'The Politics of Deconstruction', in *Rhetoric and Form: Deconstruction at Yale*, ed. Robert Con Davies and Ronald Schleifer. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Foucault, Michel. (1980) *Power/Knowledge*, ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Frow, John. (1986) *Marxism and Literary History*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Hillis Miller, J (1987) 'The Triumph of Theory, the Resistance to Reading, and the Question of the Material Base', *PMLA* 102: 281-91.
- Johnson, Barbara. (1987) *A World of Difference*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Livingston, P. (1988) *Literary Knowledge*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.
- Lytard, Jean-Francois. (1985) *The Postmodern Condition*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Merod, Jim. (1987) *The Social Responsibility of the Critic*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press.
- Proust, Marcel. (1954) *Sodome et Gomorrhe*. Paris: Livre de Poche.
- Tompkins, Jane. (1985) *Sensational Designs*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Toury, Gideon. (1980) *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.

Reference: *Translation, History and Culture*, ed. by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, London and New York, Pinter Publishers, 1990, p. 1-13.