

THE NOTION OF ‘TRANSLATION AS REWRITING’ AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE POST-COLONIAL APPROACH TO TRANSLATION

İrem ÜSTÜNSÖZ¹

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to analyse the notion of ‘rewriting’ in translation as introduced by André Lefevere and further developed by Maria Tymoczko. The basic research question to be dealt with is to what extent Lefevere’s notion of ‘rewriting’ coincides with Tymoczko’s conception of ‘rewriting’ with a view to questioning the role this notion has played in developing the post-colonial approach to translation. André Lefevere views ‘translation’ as a process of ‘rewriting’, as a result of which the translators of literary texts have played a significant role in terms of the acceptance or rejection, canonization or non-canonization of those works. According to him, the issues of power, ideology and manipulation are also related to the process of ‘rewriting’, which is embedded in ideological as well as poetological motivations. Maria Tymoczko, who borrows the term from Lefevere, defines every writing as a ‘rewriting’, every creation as a ‘re-creation’, focusing on the metonymic dimensions of the texts to be translated. Tackling the notion from a more political point of view, Tymoczko provides a much broader perspective; in a sense, she takes up from where Lefevere left off. The broader influences of ‘rewriting’ in terms of constructing the images of the ‘non-Western’ cultures in the West and displaying the manipulation involved in the process of rewriting the texts of the ‘non-Western’ cultures are most visible in the translations of the texts of post-colonial cultures, in which the impact of ‘power’, ‘ideology’ and ‘patronage’ is particularly relevant.

Key Words: Rewriting, ideology, post-colonial approach to translation, patronage, manipulation.

¹ Lecturer, Marmara University, Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies.

ÖZET

Bu makalenin amacı, André Lefevere tarafından gündeme getirilen ve Maria Tymoczko tarafından geliştirilen ‘yeniden yazım’ kavramını çeviri bağlamında incelemektir. Ele alınan temel araştırma konusu, Lefevere tarafından geliştirilen ‘yeniden yazım’ kavramının, Tymoczko’nun kullandığı ‘yeniden yazım’ kavramıyla ne ölçüde örtüştüğünü inceleyerek, bu kavramın çeviriye yönelik sömürgecilik sonrası yaklaşımın gelişmesinde oynadığı rolü sorgulamaktır. André Lefevere çeviriyi bir ‘yeniden yazım’ süreci olarak görür; bu süreç sonucunda edebi metinlerin çevirmenlerinin, söz konusu metinlerin kabul veya reddedilmelerinde, saygınlık kazanmalarında veya kaybetmelerinde önemli bir rol oynadıklarını öne sürer. Lefevere’ye göre, güç, ideoloji ve yönlendirme gibi konular da hem ideolojik, hem de yazınbilimsel unsurlarla örülü olan ‘yeniden yazım’ süreciyle ilintilidir. ‘Yeniden yazım’ kavramını Lefevere’den ödünç alan Maria Tymoczko, çevrilecek metinlerin metonimik boyutları üzerinde durarak, her yazımı bir ‘yeniden yazım’, yaratılan her eseri bir ‘yeniden yaratım’ olarak tanımlar. Kavramı daha politik bir açıdan ele alan Tymoczko daha geniş bir bakış açısı sunarak, bir bakıma, konuyu Lefevere’nin yaklaşımından bir adım daha öteye taşır. ‘Yeniden yazım’ kavramının, ‘Batılı olmayan’ kültürlerin ‘Batı’daki imgelerini oluşturmak ve ‘Batılı olmayan’ kültürlerin metinlerinin yeniden yazımındaki yönlendirmeleri sergilemek bakımından daha geniş kapsamlı etkileri, sömürgecilik sonrası kültürlerin metinlerinin çevirilerinde daha da belirgindir. Bu metinlerin çevirilerinde ‘güç’, ‘ideoloji’ ve ‘patronaj’ gibi konular özellikle ön plandadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Yeniden yazım, ideoloji, çeviriye yönelik sömürgecilik sonrası yaklaşım, patronaj, yönlendirme.

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to analyse the notion of ‘rewriting’ in translation as introduced by the prominent Translation Studies scholar André Lefevere and further developed by Maria Tymoczko. ‘Rewriting’ can be defined as a process whereby the literary texts of a certain culture are rewritten for another target culture. Lefevere refers to ‘rewriting’ as “the motor force behind literary evolution” and asserts that “rewriters adapt, manipulate the originals they work with to some extent, usually to make them fit in with the dominant ideological and poetological currents of their time” (Lefevere 1992b: 8). In such a process, the issues of power and ideology come into play as the rewriters may

manipulate the texts they rewrite and a process of acculturation may take place. Lefevere's conception of 'rewriting' does not merely consist of translation as he conceives of the process being at work at historiography, anthologization, criticism and editing, as well (Lefevere 1992b: 9). He argues that if "analyzed seriously and comprehensively, [rewriting] will tell us much about the influence of power and ideology on creation and education" (Lefevere 1992a: 14). It is my contention that a comprehensive study of the notion would also provide valuable information on the relevance of the issues of power and ideology to translation, which is, as Lefevere asserts, the most influential type of rewriting (1992b: 9).

Another scholar whose work is an elaboration of Lefevere's notion is Maria Tymoczko. The two scholars' discussions of the notion coincide in the sense that Tymoczko's argumentation involves the more political aspects of the issues of power and ideology. Borrowing the term from Lefevere and defining every writing as a 'rewriting', every creation as a 'recreation' and every telling as a 'retelling' (Tymoczko 1999: 41), Tymoczko further develops the notion in such a way as to constitute a step to the tackling of the notions of power and ideology within the post-colonialist approach to translation. The basic research question to be dealt with is, then, to what extent Lefevere's notion of 'rewriting' coincides with Tymoczko's conception thereof with a view to questioning the role this notion has played in developing the post-colonial approach to translation.

The first part of the paper deals with the notion of 'rewriting' as displayed in Lefevere's conception of literary systems. The rewritings of certain literary works have a significant role to play in terms of shaping their receptions in not only the target systems but also the source cultures in which such literary works are produced. The issues of power, ideology and manipulation involved in the process are discussed in this section with reference to Lefevere's assertion that rewritings are inspired and influenced by 'ideological' and/or 'poetological' motivations (1992b: 7), which are closely interrelated despite being categorized as separate factors.

In the second part, an account of Maria Tymoczko's approach to the notion of 'rewriting' will be given with a view to analysing to what extent it coincides with Lefevere's approach. Tymoczko develops her arguments on the basis of 'metonymy', which is "a figure of speech in which an attribute or an aspect of an entity substitutes for the entity or in which a part substitutes for a

whole” (Tymoczko 1999: 42). Tymoczko elaborates upon the notion of ‘rewriting’ by discussing its implications for the ‘metonymics’ of translation, which entails a choice or a set of choices on the part of the translator. Such a choice as to which metonymic aspects of the source text s/he is going to reflect in the course of translating, or ‘rewriting’ it involves a complex set of issues like the power relations under the influence of which the translator may be supposed to work. Thus, studying Tymoczko’s conception of ‘rewriting’ as a complementary part of the analysis of the notion might shed light upon the broader influences of ‘rewriting’ on constructing the images of the ‘non-Western’ cultures in the West and the manipulation involved in the process of translating the texts of the ‘non-Western’ cultures.

Accordingly, the implications of the process of ‘rewriting’ intermingled with the issues of ideology, power relations and the asymmetry involved therein will be the subject matter of the next section of the paper. To put it more precisely, the notion of ‘rewriting’ will be discussed in this section with reference to its impact upon the post-colonial approach to translation. Robinson defines the term ‘post-colonial’ as “part of the interdisciplinary field of cultural theory or cultural studies, which draws on anthropology, sociology, gender studies, ethnic studies, literary criticism, history, psychoanalysis, political science and philosophy to examine various texts and practices” (1997: 13). The more specific notion of the ‘post-colonial approach to translation’, on the other hand, can be defined as the study of translation by scholars in such a way as to consider the power asymmetries involved in translations between the dominating and the dominated cultures.

I- Lefevere’s Notion of ‘Rewriting’

Lefevere argues that ‘rewriting’ has always been with us and can be realized in various forms ranging from the Greek slave’s putting together anthologies of Greek literature to teach the children of his Roman masters to the creation of the images of a certain writer as in the case of W. Butler Yeats’ construction of William Blake as a poet of Irish origin (1992b: 8). According to Lefevere, it has always had a dominant position in forming literary systems.

The very first chapter of Lefevere’s *Translation, Rewriting, Manipulation of Literary Fame* (1992b) starts with a quotation from Edward Fitzgerald, who translated the “Rubayyat” of the Persian poet Omar Hayyam in the nineteenth century. Fitzgerald explicitly states that it is an amusement for him to take what

'liberties' he likes in the translation of Hayyam's works since he thinks that the "Persians are not Poets enough to frighten one from such excursions" and thus, their works are in need of 'improvement' (1992b: 2). Fitzgerald's statements are perfect indicators of the very stereotypical 'Western' conventions and ways of approaching the 'Third World' of his time. Such 'Western' approach towards the translation of the 'Third World'; the 'non-Western' will be dwelt upon in detail in the last section of the paper; and is reflective of the role played by the translators as the rewriters of originals for the target culture. It is, however, interesting to note that Lefevere chose to start the whole discussion with this quotation of Fitzgerald's statements, thereby laying the ground for his analysis of the factors of power relations and ideology within the whole process.

Lefevere points out the split between the 'high', or 'canonized' literature and the 'low', or 'non-canonized' literature. This partially accounts for the rewriting of a literary work in its own source language and for its own source culture. Works of 'high' literature address a limited readership of 'professional' readers. Therefore, reaching a target audience of a higher number of 'unprofessional readers' entails the rewriting of the 'high' literature in various ways like simplifying the text to address a target audience of children or to render it 'more reader-friendly' in our time when we live in "less and less a book culture and more and more a culture of cinema, television and popular music" (Lefevere 1992b: 3). That is why "[r]ewriting is simply a cultural given of our time" (Lefevere 1992a: 14). The case was no different in the past; "rewriters have always been with us" and in Lefevere's conception of literary systems, they do not merely consist of translators, or even the rewriters of the originals in their own source language: There are many other agents involved ranging from the "nineteenth century critic expounding the sweetness and the light contained in works of classical or modern literature to an increasingly uninterested audience" to the "twentieth century compiler of Reader's Guides that provide quick reference to the authors and books" (Lefevere 1992b: 2).

A case in point is Yeats' rewriting of Blake: A writer like William Blake, who is certainly one of the most canonized poets of English Literature and whose works constitute an indispensable part of any course syllabus on English Literature was 'rewritten'; 'reinvented', so to speak, by W.B. Yeats, who "literally invented an ancestry of aristocratic Irish origin" for Blake, together with Edwin Ellis (Lefevere 1992b: 8). I think this is a typical example of the 'rewriting'; 'reinvention' and in a way, a 'rediscovery' on the part of the readers

of a poet in his own source culture and it is absolutely shaped by the ideological and poetological motivations of the ‘rewriter’; of Yeats, in this particular case, for whom it was so important at that particular stage of his poetological development to link Blake to the ‘Celtic Twilight’ (Lefevere 1992b: 8). Needless to say, Yeats’ ideological motivations as a poet of Irish origin, wholeheartedly supporting the Irish liberation struggle were also at work.

It is necessary to note at this point that there are two basic components of ‘rewriting’ as conceived by Lefevere; namely ‘ideological motivations’ and ‘poetological motivations’; the former of which is tackled more emphatically by the post-colonial theorists who are critical of the images of the ‘non-West’ created by the ideological rewritings of the ‘West’. Although such motivations are categorized separately, there is a close connection and interaction between the two. The ‘ideological motivations’ for rewriting appear in the form of conforming to or reacting against the dominant ideology, while ‘poetological motivations’ have to do with a preference for the dominant or alternative poetics. Going back to the discussion based on the example of Blake rewritten by Yeats, it can be suggested that not only the ‘non-professional readers’ of literature who would, in any case, depend on the secondary sources in evaluating the work of a canonized writer, if they ever read such canonized works at all, but also the ‘professional readers’ were exposed to Blake through the eyes of Yeats and Ellis, who were the editors of the 1893 edition of Blake’s works. In a way, Blake, who was “totally unknown in his lifetime” was “rescued from oblivion” thanks to ‘rewriting’ (Lefevere 1992a: 137). The rewriting of William Shakespeare over the centuries by many writers in the form of adaptations to a certain poetics and/or ideology constitutes yet another typical example to how the same poet and playwright has been presented in many different ways to an ever-changing target audience as well as to how a poet defined as a ‘potboiler’ in his time becomes canonized in the later stages of his ‘afterlife’ as a poet. As Lefevere argues, “rewriters have created images of a writer, a work, a period, a genre, sometimes a whole literature” (Lefevere 1992a: 5). The fact that the images of a literary work created by “rewriting are far more likely to attract “nonprofessional readers than the work’s strength or venerability as an original is” (Lefevere 1992b: 14) may have had a certain contribution on enhancing the impact and increasing the prevalence of rewriting: “The non-professional reader increasingly does not read literature as written by its writers, but as rewritten by its rewriters” (1992b: 4).

Presenting the broad scope of 'rewriting' as such, Lefevere develops his arguments regarding the issue with an analysis of 'translation as rewriting'. Lefevere sees translation as the most obviously recognizable and the most influential type of rewriting in the sense that it "projects an author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin" (1992b: 9). His definition of the role of translators as bringing the original across cultures conjures up in the mind the image of the translator as a 'cultural envoy' and in some cases 'a harbinger of change' in the target culture. As Lefevere argues, such a change may not always be welcome by the target culture concerned about preserving its own self image. Quoting Victor Hugo on the possibility of a culture's negative reaction to translation, he notes that "translations not only project an image of the work that is translated, and through it, of the world that the work belongs to; they also protect their own world against images that are too radically different, either by adapting them or by screening them out" (Lefevere 1992a: 125). Before going into more detail about the function of translations as rewritings in a culture and the role of translators in the evolution of a culture as such, I think it is worthwhile discussing the two main factors in control of the system in which translation functions, namely the controlling factors within the literary system and those to be found outside the literary system in relation to the issues of poetics and ideology.

In terms of the control factors that function within and outside the system, the notion of 'patronage' should be mentioned. While the professionals within the literary system include critics, reviewers, teachers and translators who constitute the first control factor and exert their controlling power in line with the dominant poetics, the second factor referred to as 'patronage' by Lefevere, is usually more concerned with the ideology of literature (Lefevere 1992b: 15). In my opinion, taking into consideration the fact that this second controlling group falls outside the literary system, it seems plausible that their control is more of an ideological sort than a poetological one. After all, these patrons who are not necessarily 'men of letters' are not always in a position to define or challenge the dominant poetics but are able to impose an ideological impact on the 'rewriting' process thanks to their power of controlling the relationship between the literary system and other systems. Operating by means of institutions like the academic and educational establishments, censorship bureaus, critical journals and publishing houses or powerful individuals, patronage can be exercised in the form of 'differentiated' and 'undifferentiated' patronage. It consists of ideological, economic and status components. In case

of ‘differentiated patronage’, the ideological, economic and status components are not dependent on each other so each component is controlled by different agents and “economic success is relatively independent of ideological factors, and does not necessarily bring status with it, at least not in the self-styled literary elite” (Lefevere 1992b: 17). An example of such a situation is the case of the best-selling Turkish author Ayşe Kulin, whose novel *Adı Aylın* has been published in 82 editions. As a prolific writer of novels, stories and biographies, Ayşe Kulin complains about how being ‘a best-selling author’ has led to her being marginalized by the literary elite in Turkey. I assume Kulin’s case is a typical example of how an award-winning (Haldun Taner Öykü Ödülü in 1996, Sait Faik Hikaye Armağanı in 1997) and a best-selling author may receive high recognition, certain economic rewards and even literary awards but has difficulty in making her way into the hierarchy of the literary system (for further information see her interview available at: www.aruz.com.roportaj/aysekulin.htm).

In the case of undifferentiated patronage, on the other hand, all the three components are provided by one and the same person or institution as in the case of the patronage of Elizabeth I on the poets and playwrights of her time or poet laureates or the totalitarian regimes which control the production and publishing of literature with strict practices of censorship. Although undifferentiated patronage appears to be associated more with the ideological component at a first glance, and it seems as though the cases of undifferentiated patronage are scarcer today, with the growth of large bookstore chains, and the accompanying publishing houses’ market sharing competition, it is possible to suggest that “undifferentiated patronage need not be based mainly on ideology as it was in most literary systems in the past; [t]he economic component may well lead to the re-establishment of a system with a relatively undifferentiated patronage” (1992b: 19).

I think Lefevere’s notion of ‘translation as rewriting’ outlined briefly above within the framework of the notions of patronage, poetics and ideology has most critically been approached in terms of his discussion of the component of ‘ideology’. While few scholars seem to question the way he evaluates the dominant poetics in his conception of ‘rewriting’, his approach to the factor of ideology has been criticized by theorists like Douglas Robinson for his ‘neutralism’ regarding ‘ideology’ (Robinson 1997a: 39). Robinson’s notion of ‘ideology’ is of a more political kind, whereas Lefevere does not limit ‘ideology’ to the political sphere but he rather regards it as also acting “as a

constraint on the choice of both form and subject matter"; "ideology being defined as the "grillwork of form, convention and belief which orders our actions" (Lefevere 1992b: 16). Despite the fact that Jeremy Munday argues that for Lefevere, "the most important consideration is the ideological one, which, in this case, refers to the translator's ideology, or the ideology imposed upon the translator by patronage" (Munday 2001: 130), Robinson, justifiably, poses the question of "what ideology?" (Robinson 1997a: 39): "Lefevere himself notes that "even such bastions of 'objectivity' as dictionaries might have some kind of ideology behind them" (ibid), in that sense, Robinson asserts that Lefevere, and polysystems theorists seem to have close affinities with the foreignists and post-colonialists. Robinson further argues, however, that in comparison to the foreignists and post-colonialists, who definitely have stronger political arguments, Lefevere's 'neutralism' makes him seem to be in solidarity with the hegemonic systems the foreignists and post-colonialists attack. After all, set side by side with, say, Venuti, "Lefevere's neutrality looks unmistakably like a whitewash of systemic hegemony" (Robinson 1997a: 39), in Robinson's terms. However, does such neutrality as against the strong leftist arguments of Venuti, provide enough ground for asserting that Lefevere was for assimilation or state power, systemic authority, capitalism and so on, as Venuti claims? I doubt so. I agree with Robinson in that Lefevere is concerned with the issues of 'power' and 'ideology' to the extent that they shape the rewriting process by means of imposing constraints on the literary system, i.e. controlling and regulating what most readers read, writers write and translators, or rewriters translate and determining what gets published. Moreover, as Robinson suggests in his criticism of the polysystem theory, one reason why Lefevere refrains from associating 'ideology' predominantly with politics might be that "polysystems theorists work hard not to propagate any ideology – their political ideology, as their more overtly political colleagues in the postcolonial camp would insist, is that scholars shouldn't have a public ideology, that true scholarship is value-free" (Robinson 1997a: 40). This is definitely the way Robinson evaluates the stance of the polysystem theorists, arguably including Lefevere in the same category and as such, it need not be taken for granted. In my opinion, Lefevere himself provides an explanation for his 'neutralism', – if one might justifiably use the term – regarding the place of ideology in rewriting: His analysis is of a descriptive nature and accordingly, his notion of 'power' is different from that of post-colonialists and foreignists in that he wants to analyse 'power' and its role in the rewriting process but "he doesn't want his analysis to be (mis)taken

for an indictment” so he “scientizes it, descriptivizes it and portrays it as value-free inquiry” (Robinson 1997a: 31). Such approach of Lefevere’s to the notions of ‘power’ and ‘ideology’ might be criticized for being ‘philosophical pretensions’ (Robinson 1997a: 27) and failing to reflect his opinions clearly enough, but his line of thinking is consistent in itself as he himself states his intentions quite explicitly in explaining why he would refrain from evaluation: “Since I have tried to describe, not prescribe, there is no reason why I should evaluate. That task is better left to the reader.” (Robinson 1997a: 29). In that sense, I think Maria Tymoczko, whose perspective is closer to the post-colonialists and as such, more inclusive of the political factor in rewriting, continues to elaborate on the notion of ‘rewriting’ taking up from where Lefevere left off.

II- Tymoczko’s Notion of ‘Rewriting’

As already mentioned above, Tymoczko’s conception of ‘rewriting’ is an elaboration of the notion in terms of both poetological and ideological components. Tymoczko discusses literary translation in the form of ‘rewriting’ within the framework of the metonymic aspects of literature and in comparison to post-colonial writing. Much in the same fashion as Lefevere, whom she refers to, Tymoczko states that translation is a major form of ‘rewriting’ and being as such, “[translated texts] are to be grouped with other modes of processing primary texts, including film versions of texts, children’s versions, criticism, reviews, literary histories, anthologies, editions, and the like, all of which shape the evolution of literature and culture” (Tymoczko 1999: 42).

In “The Metonymics of Translation”, the first chapter of her 1999 book *Translation in a Post-Colonial Context*, Tymoczko notes that translation is metonymic; ‘metonymy’ being “a figure of speech in which an attribute or an aspect of an entity substitutes for the entity or in which a part substitutes for a whole” (Tymoczko 1999: 42). The fact that rewritings and retellings are ‘metonymic’, in terms of evoking all the previous versions of the same story as in the case of myths for which there are no ‘originals’ and reflecting the specific aspects of the culture in which they arise, requires the reader to be familiar with, or at least aware of all this cultural legacy of the texts as well as the cross references and the intertextuality between them. Or else, the reader will end up with a ‘strange’ conception of the text, as Tymoczko underlines in her example of Joyce’s *Ulysses* (Tymoczko 1999: 44). A similar example could be G. Cabrera Infante’s *Tres Tristes Tigres* (1965) (*Three Trapped Tigers*), in which

there are numerous allusions to the Havanan culture. The cultural elements in a literary text are metonymic of the whole culture including its values, laws, history and so on (Tymoczko 1999: 45) and in turn, a literary text might also become metonymic of the common, universal qualities of mankind and I think that is why, for instance, Shakespeare's tragedies and the sufferings his characters go through never seem to lose their relevance and appeal; they have become "emblematic of larger human experience" (Tymoczko 1999: 47).

What are the implications of the metonymic dimension of literary texts for 'translation as rewriting', then? Being a reader and a rewriter herself, the translator who is aware of the metonymic nature of literature has a relatively easier task when dealing with a source text whose metonymic aspects are related to the literary and cultural patterns of the receptor audience. However, when that link or affinity between the two literary systems becomes weaker, in other words, when the text is a 'marginalized text', as Tymoczko refers to it (Tymoczko 1999: 47), the translator is, then, supposed to make certain choices as to which metonymic aspects of the source text s/he is going to reflect in the course of translating, or rewriting it. In my opinion, it is right at this point of making choices that the 'ideological motivations' of the translator, as defined by Lefevere as well as the dominant 'poetics', which definitely bears on the ideological choices of the translator come into play. Admittedly, it is not possible for the translator to reflect all the metonymic aspects since "the information load becomes too heavy for comprehension" (Tymoczko 1999: 48) and the receiving audience can not understand the translated text. Then, I suppose there is a number of other questions to be posed: If the target reader fails to comprehend the text because of its heavy load of metonymic information or feels intimidated by the defamiliarized literary language and does not read the text, will the writer and the translator be contented with having an audience of 'professional readers', in Lefevere's terms (Lefevere 1992b: 3), namely an audience consisting merely of the scholars and students of literature? Is translation really a 'rewriting' of a familiar text or the telling of a new story in this case? As the receptor audience will not be familiar with the 'myth' of the text and since not all literary texts are necessarily reflective of the universal human condition, the translator has a more difficult task when translating those so-called 'marginalized texts'. In my opinion, these circumstances not only provide translators with a sense of freedom, as now they are to determine what metonymic aspects of the text to produce in translation but they also cause them to bear a heavier burden of responsibility since they will admittedly be more

prone to scrutiny and criticism. After all, “rewriting has always had a dominant position in forming literary systems and the rewriting of literary texts, most notably, by translators plays a significant role in terms of the acceptance or rejection, canonization or non-canonization of literary works” (Lefevere 1992: 2). With all these demands on her/him, the translator makes the basic choice of reflecting the language of the source culture, or the generic conventions, or the cultural values thereof (Tymoczko 1999: 50). Such a choice would be shaped by the intentions of the translator and/or the expectations of the receptor culture but in any case, the translator plays a primary role. Likewise, what strategy the translator may follow, “there is never total or complete translation” and “translations are always partial” (Tymoczko 1999: 55): ‘Partial’ in the sense that they are never total, and ‘partial’ in terms of being representative of the translator’s subjective choices. In fact, translated texts are the stories of the translators who retell these stories depending on their perceptions of how the author of the source text first told them. But then again, unlike an ordinary reader or reteller of a myth, translators/rewriters have the ethical and professional responsibility of being aware of the underlying metonymics of the ‘stories’ they rewrite and of justifying why they rewrite them the way they do. I think Tymoczko’s underlining the active role of the translator in the process of ‘rewriting’ through constantly making choices and decisions highlights the role of the ‘ideological motivations’ involved in the process of rewriting as well as the dominant poetics which influence the translator’s choices.

The other perspective within which Tymoczko tackles the notion of ‘rewriting’ is a comparison between literary translation and post-colonial writing. Maria Tymoczko dwells upon the similarities and differences between the two literary activities of post-colonial writing and literary translation defining both as ‘intercultural transposition’ (Tymoczko 1999: 20). The basic aspect these two practices have in common is that both can be defined as ‘intercultural writing’ in terms of reflecting, or ‘mirroring’ the elements of the culture they write about or translate from. In the sense that both writers –the post-colonial writer and the translator as the ‘rewriter’- deal with cultural material, and thus have to make choices as to which aspects of that cultural material shall be reflected in their writing, I agree with Tymoczko that there are similarities between the post-colonial writer and the literary translator/rewriter. I do, however, find her argument that “the culture or tradition of a post-colonial writer acts as a metatext which is rewritten” while ‘the interlingual translator’ has one text, i.e. the source text to deal with, self-contradictory. Comparing the

two activities in terms of having to deal with a "metatext of a whole culture and tradition" as against "a fixed text including cultural and linguistic elements that are given" (Tymoczko 1999: 21) and reaching the conclusion that this is a significant difference that contradicts Tymoczko's own arguments regarding the metonymic aspects of translation. It can thus be argued that the metonymic nature of any given source literary text requires the translator to be familiar with all the cultural legacy surrounding the text as well as the cross-references and intertextuality. In that sense, it is, I believe, perfectly possible to speak about a 'metatext' relating to the literary text to be translated just as in the case of post-colonial writing. And the translator, as the rewriter, rewrites the texts against such a background of a 'metatext' filtering them through a "poetics and Universe of Discourse" (Lefevere 1992a: 87). After all, as Lefevere points out, "[t]exts are not written in a vacuum" and translators rewrite texts within the parameters set by the culture for which they translate their texts and as "[n]either the poetics nor the ideology of a culture is monolithic" (Lefevere 1992a: 86), they sometimes try to bend such parameters or go beyond them.

The same notion of parameters setting up constraints for the translator/rewriter in the process of 'rewriting' is also discussed by Tymoczko. The "parameters of constraints" acting upon the literary translator and the post-colonial writer alike, make them face the dilemma of 'faithfulness' in terms of "obscuring or muting the cultural disjunctions" (Tymoczko 1999: 21). While the translator is supposed to make a choice in terms of the 'ideological' and /or 'poetological' motivations, the post-colonial writer also faces the dilemma of representing the unfamiliar cultural elements in an 'aggressive manner' totally 'defamiliarizing' the text for the receiving audience and thus risking to be read by a relatively small audience of 'professional readers', on the one hand, and adopting an 'assimilative', or not necessarily an assimilative but a milder manner and thus reaching a greater audience, on the other. In fact, both forms of (re)writing are 'partial' and that partiality has to do specifically with the fact that in both forms of (re)writing, a 'metatext' is at play rendering the task of the (re)writer more of a matter of making constant choices than in any other form of writing. Although such a heavy burden of making choices in terms of reflecting whichever metonymic aspects of the metatext seems to put certain constraints upon the (re)writers, it also enhances their authorial creativity as they experiment with the language itself.

A very specific common point between the respective approaches of Lefevere and Tymoczko appears in the latter's emphasis on the importance of 'patronage' as "a determinant of translation practice" (Tymoczko: 1999: 31). In fact, the issue of 'patronage' as perhaps the most important component associated with 'ideology' in the whole process of 'rewriting' also accounts for why and how the 'non-Western' texts are rewritten for the 'Western' audience since it is the patrons who decide what gets translated and published and in which form: "Patrons determine the parameters of what is translated just as they determine the parameters of what is published" (ibid). Although the factor of audience as an integral part of 'patronage' is discussed in a similar fashion by both Lefevere and Tymoczko, the link between patronage and the target audience is stronger in Tymoczko's conception from a more political viewpoint. Stating that issues about intended audience are often deceptive, Tymoczko poses certain questions regarding the target audiences of the translators/rewriters acting under the influence of certain patrons. In my opinion, her questions concerning the targeted audience in (re)writing become all the more relevant in the case of a 'non-Western' text rewritten for a 'Western' audience since the issues of power relations and ideology intertwined with the demands of patronage are so typically involved in the process. Indeed, this is what constitutes the following section of the present paper.

III- The Impact of 'Rewriting' in terms of Constructing the Images of the 'Non-Western' Cultures in the 'West'

Translation scholars like Tejaswini Niranjana, Rosemary Arrojo, Maria Tymoczko, to name but a few, are generally defined as having a 'post-colonial' approach to translation. Douglas Robinson defines the term 'post-colonial studies' as "part of the interdisciplinary field of cultural theory or cultural studies, which draws on anthropology, sociology, gender studies, ethnic studies, literary criticism, history, psychoanalysis, political science and philosophy to examine various texts and practices" (1997b: 13). Robinson traces back the growth of post-colonial studies to the break-up of the great European empires in the 1940's, 50's and 60's and the "subsequent rise to prominence in academic circles of counterhegemonic cultural studies" thereby linking post-colonial studies with cultural studies (1997b: 13).

The notion of 'rewriting' as developed by Lefevere and employed by Tymoczko is relevant to the post-colonial approach in the sense that the works of the 'non-Western', or 'Third World' literature have been rewritten and

appropriated for a 'Western' audience for quite some time now. The images of the once colonial, now post-colonial cultures have been established according to the ideological choices of the 'Western' translators/rewriters rewriting for the 'Western' target audiences. As a matter of fact, this is not specific to only post-colonial cultures; in western countries or in countries which have never literally been colonized, cultures have been misrepresented through rewriting. The notion of 'translation' in the post-colonial approach entails the consideration of the 'power differentials', as Robinson puts it, between the source and target cultures (Robinson 1997b: 28). The inclusion of the criterion of 'power differentials' in terms of approaching translation between the languages of the so-called 'hegemonic cultures' (1997b: 31) and the 'dominated cultures', or in simpler terms, the colonizer and the colonized, is extremely important. It is important not only in the sense that translation between such cultures "becomes increasingly problematic, even impossible" but also in terms of the fact that a number of 'translation inequalities' arise (Robinson 1997b: 28). It would not be wrong to suggest that the very first problem arising in the problematic process of rewriting concerns the definition of the terms. In fact, just as there is not a homogeneous, unified West, i.e. the 'First World', there is not either a unified 'Third World'; as Aijaz Ahmad asserts: "speaking of a unified Third World – in a global context (...) is at least, to put it very mildly, an extremely misguided notion (Ahmad 1992: 17). Thus, acknowledging the fact that translation between the 'hegemonic' and 'dominated' cultures is a fact of life, the basic question to be asked is to what extent and in what ways the hybrid and heterogeneous natures of the 'East' and the 'West' influence the translation process, and what kind of implications such inequalities between the cultures and languages have. Jacquemond states that "authors in a dominated culture who dream of reaching a large audience will tend to write for translation into a hegemonic language, and this will require some degree of compliance with stereotypes" (Jacquemond in Robinson 1997b: 32). In other words, when authors from the 'Third World' want to reach a target audience of readers from the 'First World', they will adapt their language, their style, their choice of 'metonymics", as Tymoczko puts it, in such a way as to make the target text as accessible as possible. This immediately connotes the statements by the Nobel laureate Orhan Pamuk, who declares that he specifically writes bearing in mind that his work will be translated and thus, "with an eye to conforming to hegemonic stereotypes"(Robinson 1997: 32) of the Anglo-American cultures.

Yet another case in point is the auto-translations of Rabindranath Tagore. In her case study of the auto-translations of Tagore, who has deliberately chosen to ‘manipulate’ his own poetry to conform to the norms of the ‘Anglo-American’ taste, Mahasweta Sengupta emphasizes how the ‘ideological motivations’ and the asymmetrical power relations between the two cultures may go as far as to force the translators, -the poet/translator, in Tagore’s case- to ‘manipulate’ the source text: In Tagore’s auto-translations, the poems are manipulated to such an extent that the imagery, the tone and the registry of his language are radically changed to “cater to the discursive parameters of English” (Sengupta in Dingwaney & Maier (ed.) 1995: 168). In that sense, ‘manipulation’, which is dealt with in Lefevere’s book *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame* (1992) is evident. According to Sengupta, the tendency to appropriate, simplify and reduce the literature of the ‘Orient’ while translating into the languages of the hegemonic European cultures-into English, in most of the cases- is due to the dominant culture’s attempts to construct the images of the ‘Other’ in a manner that is acceptable to the ‘West’. Thus, “an identity of the source culture that is recognizable by the target culture as representative of the former” is constructed whereby the texts themselves are “denuded of their complexity and variety” (Sengupta in Dingwaney & Maier (ed.) 1995: 159). Sengupta asserts that such a rendering and rewriting of the texts serve to justify the ‘colonizer’s ‘civilizing mission’ and reaffirm its ‘inherent superiority’ over the ‘Other’.

Regarding the issues of the unequal power relationship and ideology involved in the rewritings of the ‘non-Western’ texts for a ‘Western’ audience in a manipulative manner so as to make the translated text fit the norms of the target culture, another post-colonial scholar to be mentioned is Anurandha Dingwaney. Dingwaney refers to the notion of ‘violence’ involved in translating from a non-Western culture stating that such violence is exercised with a view to making the translated culture comprehensible by the receiving culture (Dingwaney & Maier (ed.) 1995: 4): Violence, in varying degrees, arises from the asymmetrical relationships existing between the two cultures leading to the familiarization, or domestication of the translated text with the assumption that the ‘West’ already has the required concepts with which to represent another culture (Asad in Dingwaney & Maier (ed.) 1995: 5). Violence also results from the actual exercise of the (Western) colonial power. In fact, it is again this power that determines “what and who gets translated” (ibid) and what happens to be representative of the ‘Other’ in the West. In other words, by means of

“constructing a canon that valorizes certain writers and texts while excluding others”, the West displays the power and authority to determine what the Western readers would read in order to get to know the subaltern cultures. I think, this is also an exercise of violence, violence involved in ‘patronage’, albeit implicitly, because it determines how the non-West is construed by the West.

Conclusion

All these discussions around the notion of translation as ‘rewriting’ brings us back to a re-analysis of the issues of ‘power’ ‘ideology’ and ‘patronage’ in Lefevere’s conception of the notion. Lefevere’s reference to ‘power’ as shaping the mechanisms of ‘patronage’ and his definition of the ‘ideological’ component of the rewriting process as the most important consideration are certainly significant contributions to the ‘cultural turn’ in Translation Studies. However, as discussed in the previous chapters of this paper, his notion of ideology which acts as a set of constraints on the choices of the translator and as the “grillwork of form, convention and belief which orders our actions” (Lefevere 1992b: 16) seems to lack of the political dimension of the term and likewise, the question of the inequality of power obtaining between the source and target cultures is overlooked in his discussion of ‘power’. The issue of ‘patronage’, which is of utmost importance in even initiating the process of rewriting is similarly tackled in a descriptive manner. Taking his approach one step further, Tymoczko elaborates on the notion of ‘rewriting’ taking into account both the poetological and ideological components in her analysis of the metonymic aspects of translation and her comparison of literary translation with post-colonial writing. The impact of ‘power’, ‘ideology’ and ‘patronage’, the basic factors of Lefevere’s conception of ‘rewriting’ is particularly relevant in post-colonial thinking about translation since the manipulation of the source texts to make them appropriate for the dominant ideology of the target culture becomes all the more evident in the case of the rewriting of the texts of the post-colonial cultures. By means of the rewriting process combined with the restriction of “the entry of texts that do not fit their idea of the Other” (Sengupta 1995: 160), the dominant power constructs the images of the ‘Other’ in a manner that is acceptable to the ‘West’. Thus, an identity of the source culture that is recognizable by the target culture as representative of the former is constructed by means of the texts which no longer have their original variety and complexity. Likewise, the exclusion of some texts and writers during the

process of constructing a canon of the texts of such cultures is a perfect indicator of the role of ‘patronage’ exercised by the ‘Western’ patrons determining what gets translated/rewritten and appropriated to the tastes of the dominant culture. I would still argue that Lefevere deserves the credit for paving the way for a more comprehensive reflection upon the notion of ‘translation as rewriting’, despite the criticisms against him for ignoring the political implications of power and ideology in the process. After all, his observation that “rewriting is simply a cultural given of our time” (Lefevere 1992a: 14) appears to be valid for translation more than any other form of rewriting today.

REFERENCES

- AHMAD, A (1992). *In Theory Classes, Nations, Literatures*.. Verso. London and New York.
- DINGWANEY, A. & Maier, C. (ed.) (1995) “Translating “Third World” Cultures” in: *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*. University of Pittsburgh Press., pp. 3-14.
- INFANTE, Cabrera G., (1965/1985). *Three Trapped Tigers* (trans. Gardner D., Levine S.J., Infante G.C.), First Bard Printing, USA.
- LEFEVERE, A (1992a.). *Translating Literature /Practice and Theory in A comparative Literature Context*. The Modern Language Association of America. New York.
- LEFEVERE, A (1992b). *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. Routledge. London and New York.
- MUNDAY, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies Theories and Applications*. London-New York: Routledge.
- ROBINSON, D (1997a). *What is Translation? Centrifugal Theories, Critical Interventions*. Kent State U.P., Ohio.
- ROBINSON, D (1997b). *Translation and Empire*. St. Jerome. Manchester, UK.
- SENGUPTA, M (1995). “Translation as Manipulation: The Power of Images and The Images of Power” in: *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts* (ed.) Dingwaney, A. & Maier, C.). University of Pittsburgh Press. pp. 159-173.
- TYMOCZKO, M (1999). “Post-Colonial Writing and Literary Translation” in: *Post-Colonial Translation Theory and Practice* (ed. Bassnett and Trivedi). Routledge. London and New York.
- TYMOCZKO, M (1999). “The Metonymics of Translation” in: *Translation in a Post-Colonial Context*. St. Jerome, Manchester.