

A Conceptual Discussion of Rewriting as a Tool for the Translation(al) Turn

Çeviri(sel) Dönüş için Bir Araç Olarak Yeniden Yazma Üzerine Kavramsal Bir Tartışma

Aysun Kıran * 

Marmara University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Translation and Interpreting, İstanbul, Turkey

Abstract

This article problematizes the strictly literary use of André Lefevere's conceptualization of rewriting solely in the analysis of translated texts. It aims to discuss how the concept of rewriting can be deployed in the areas of research in social sciences and humanities outside literature and translation studies. To this end, the review first situates the concept of rewriting within the history of translation studies, and especially the emergence of the cultural turn. Subsequently, it delineates the defining aspects of Lefevere's conceptualization of translation as a form of rewriting. While highlighting his contribution to a renewed understanding of the dynamics involved in the production of translated literature, this overview allows for elucidating the links between the notions of translation and adaptation through the frame of rewriting. In doing so, the article elaborates on the relevance of rewriting to the translation(al) turn by demonstrating its affinity with and divergence from the cultural turn. The Discussion and Conclusion section provides certain specific examples of how patronage can be applied to discuss the restraining or facilitating impact of a given political context on the production of film adaptations. Overall, this review proposes to consider the process of film production as one of rewriting in terms of the possible economic, ideological and status components involved therein. This conceptual discussion thus revisits the potential of rewriting as a methodological tool for a translation(al) turn in social sciences and humanities, which may develop avenues of collaboration between translation studies and other areas of interdisciplinary research.

Keywords: Rewriting, André Lefevere, Patronage, Adaptation, Translation(al) Turn.

Öz

Bu derleme makale, André Lefevere'in yeniden yazma kavramsallaştırmasının, çeviri metinlerin analiziyle sınırlı olacak şekilde katı bir biçimde edebiyat alanında kullanılmasını sorunsallaştırmaktadır. Makale, yeniden yazma kavramının edebiyat ve çeviribilim dışındaki sosyal bilimlerdeki araştırma alanlarında nasıl kullanılabileceğini tartışmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla, derleme ilk olarak yeniden yazma kavramını çeviri çalışmalarının tarihine ve özellikle de kültürel dönüşün ortaya çıkışına oturtuyor. Daha sonra, Lefevere'in çeviriyi bir yeniden yazma biçimi olarak kavramsallaştırmasının belirleyici yönlerini ayrıntısıyla betimliyor. Lefevere'in, çeviri edebiyatın üretiminde rol oynayan dinamikleri yeniden değerlendirmeye olan katkısını öne çıkarırken, bu derleme çeviri ve uyarlama kavramları arasındaki bağları yeniden yazma çerçevesi üzerinden açıklamaya da olanak sağlıyor. Bunu yaparken, makale, yeniden yazmanın çeviri(sel) dönüş ile olan ilişkisini, çeviribilim çalışmalarındaki kültürel dönüş ile arasındaki benzerliğini ve ondan farklılığını göstererek inceliyor. Tartışma ve Sonuç bölümü film uyarlamalarının üretiminde belli bir siyasi bağlamın kısıtlayıcı ya da kolaylaştırıcı etkisini tartışmak için hamiliğin nasıl uygulanabileceği üzerine bazı spesifik örnekler sunuyor. Genel olarak, bu derleme, film uyarlamalarının üretim sürecini muhtemel ekonomik, ideolojik ve statü bileşenleri açısından bir yeniden yazma süreci olarak tartışmayı öneriyor. Böylece, bu kavramsal tartışma, yeniden yazmanın çeviribilim ile diğer disiplinlerarası araştırma alanları arasındaki işbirliği yollarını geliştirebilecek, sosyal ve beşerî bilimlerde çeviri(sel) dönüşü sağlayacak yöntemsel bir araç olarak kullanılma potansiyelini değerlendiriyor.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yeniden Yazma, André Lefevere, Hamilik, Uyarlama, Çeviri(sel) Dönüş.

* Corresponding Author / Sorumlu Yazar: ayskir@gmail.com

Article Info / Makale Bilgileri:

Received / Gönderim: 07.10.2019 Accepted / Kabul: 01.07.2020

To cite this article / Atf için:

Kıran, A. (2020). A conceptual discussion of rewriting as a tool for the translation(al) turn. *Curr Res Soc Sci*, 6(2), 83-91. doi: 10.30613/curesosc.630543

To link to this article / Bağlantı için:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.30613/curesosc.630543>

Introduction

This review article problematizes the strictly literary uses of Andre Lefevere's concept of rewriting in the analysis of translated texts and the discussion of the power dynamics involved in the process of publishing literary translations. Relatedly, the article aims to explore the possibility of its extended application to the study of non-literary texts that draw on and re-interpret the discourse of another text or set of texts. By providing an overview of Lefevere's conceptualization of rewriting, it proposes the ways in which rewriting can be used as a methodological tool in the areas of research outside literature and translation studies. To achieve these ends, the review article first provides an insight into the emergence of the concept of rewriting with a reference to the cultural turn. Subsequently, it outlines the defining aspects of Lefevere's conception of translation as a form of rewriting and its components. This summary enables us to highlight the links between translation and adaptation through the frame of rewriting. Crucially, the article notes the relevance of rewriting to the translation(al) turn by demonstrating its affinity with and divergence from the cultural turn in translation studies. Finally, it discusses what the economic, ideological and status components can be when analysing the processes of production and distribution of film adaptations from the angle of rewriting. This conceptual discussion thus reflects on how far rewriting may constitute a methodological tool for extending the circumscribed scope of translation through its uses in other areas of interdisciplinary inquiry.

1.1. The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies

Translation Studies witnessed a continual redefinition of the concept of translation in the period after the Second World War (Brodzki, 2007, p. 1). Descriptive Translation Studies (henceforth DTS) emerged in the 1970s with a view to "establishing translation research as an empirical and historically oriented scholarly discipline" (Browlie, 2009, p. 77). Although early descriptive scholars largely focused on literary questions, those in the second phase of DTS have become more invested in questions concerning ideology and politics since the late 1980s (Tymoczko, 2007, p. 45). The latter are occasionally referred to as "committed approaches" to underline this divergence from the former (Browlie, 2009, p. 78). Overall, each school has advanced the thinking about translation by building on and moving beyond what was previously advocated since World War II.

As a prime example of the committed approaches, the cultural turn of the late 1980s and 1990s heralded a new era in the study of translations. The term "cultural turn" gained currency with the publication of a collection of essays entitled *Translation, History and Culture* (1990) and edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (Tymoczko, 2007, p. 43). In the editorial preface to the volume, Bassnett and Lefevere signalled "the shift from a more formalist approach to translation to one that laid greater emphasis on extra-textual factors" (Bassnett, 2007, p. 13). They suggested a redefinition of the object of study in translation studies as follows: "what is studied is text embedded within its network of both source and target cultural signs" (Bassnett and Lefevere, 1990, p. 12). The proponents of the cultural turn shifted the attention away from equivalence, which was prioritized in linguistic approaches to translation, into the role of context in the translation process. Therefore, this change of emphasis facilitated undermining the hierarchical view of the relationship between a source text and a translated text. The cultural turn then reconfigured translation "as a powerful mode of cultural construction" by focusing on culture and context instead of language (Marinetti, 2011, p. 26). Many scholars who wrote in this new paradigm continued to investigate texts and contexts but did so with an emphasis on the ideological aspects of translation, perspective and alternative viewpoints. Consequently, the cultural-studies paradigm set itself in opposition to the linguistic approaches to translation by dismissing them as inadequate due to their exclusion of cultural elements and context-bound factors.

Lefevere, one of the pioneering figures of the cultural turn, promoted the view of translation as "a discursive activity embedded within a system of literary conventions and a network of institutions and social agents that condition textual production" (Asimakoulas, 2009, p. 241). Further, Lefevere also criticized the notion of

equivalence and problematized the statuses assigned to texts such as “original” versus “derivative” or “source” versus “target.” Lefevere challenged this dualistic vision by maintaining that the new was “a combination of various elements from the old, the non-canonized, imports from other systems rearranged to suit alternative functional views of literature” (Lefevere, 2012, p. 217). Lefevere thus dismissed the criterion of equivalence and shifted attention to the role of ideology and manipulation as well as the contextual factors at work, thereby assigning translations an autonomous character of their own.

1.1.1. Translation as rewriting.

Lefevere’s conceptualization of translation as rewriting (or refraction, a term he used in the earlier works) constitutes an exemplar of the definitional strands in Translation Studies, in Maria Tymoczko’s terms (2007, p. 186). Lefevere initially introduced the concept of “refracted text” by which he meant texts that were “processed for a certain audience (children, for example) or adapted to a certain poetics or a certain ideology” (Lefevere, 1981, p. 72). Refraction was later largely superseded by the term “rewriting” that was defined as “the adaptation of a work of literature to a different audience, with the intention of influencing the way in which that audience reads the work” (Lefevere, 2012, p. 204). This definition arguably highlights the potential for extending the scope of the concept by marking two core aspects of rewriting. First, no mention of a different language implies that rewriting takes place not only when a writer’s work is transferred from one language into another but also when it is re-written in the same language (Lefevere, 1985, p. 235). Lefevere thus dismisses the idea that reduces any translation activity to being a purely linguistic transfer between two languages with a limited focus on textual comparisons.

The second aspect of rewriting is the implied role of manipulation that brings the modes of transformation, challenge and subversion into play in the process of textual (re)production. It is made clear that rewriting does not signify a repetitive task of writing a text again to transfer the meaning therein, but a type of practice that projects a perspectival image of a literary work (Lefevere, 1992, p. 10). It is marked by its capacity to add new form and content and serve a purpose that might contradict the previous text. In Lefevere’s view, rewritings have been “instrumental throughout the ages in the circulation of novel ideas and new literary trends” (Asimakoulas, 2009, p. 241). Translating constitutes the most recognizable and effective form of rewriting, while other examples include editing, reviewing and anthologizing (Asimakoulas, 2009). Following this point, the scope of “rewriting” can arguably be extended to include films or images of a text that are constructed through translations as well as other types of documents such as the film critiques. Therefore, in addition to translations, rewriting encompasses several forms and practices of textual (re)production that were not considered as sharing common ground with translations.

In Lefevere’s model, there are two main constraints that operate as “control factors” in the rewriting process: poetics and patronage (Lefevere 1984, p. 191). The concept of “poetics” is defined as “an inventory of literary devices, genres, motifs, prototypical characters and situations, and symbols” (Lefevere, 1992, p. 26). Further, it signifies a set of conventional principles and expectations in the literary system and imposes an idea of how literature has to, or may be allowed to, function in society (Lefevere, 2012, p. 206). Accordingly, poetics represents an internal constraint, since it controls a system from within through the professionals who serve as the regulatory forces. For instance, in the case of literary systems, the category includes editors, authors, and any related people and committees with a decision-making position in the selection and publication of literary works. Translators are thus attributed an agency of their own, while the finiteness of this agency is also recalled in view of the other role-players and constraints in the process.

Lefevere defines patronage as any groups of power that can exert significant control over the translator’s work (Hermans, 2009, p. 94). They can further or hinder the reading, writing or rewriting of literature (Lefevere, 1992, p. 15). This control can be exercised by “persons [...], groups of persons [...], a social class, a royal court, publishers [...] and, last but not least, the media” (Lefevere, 1992). Patrons may be an influential

individual in a given historical era, such as Elizabeth I in Shakespeare's England or Hitler in 1930s Germany or a political class or party (Munday, 2008, p. 128). Therefore, unlike poetics, patronage is an external constraint that operates from outside the system. Lefevere identifies three interrelated components of patronage: ideology, economics and status (1992, p. 15). Accordingly, the ideological component constrains the choice of subject and the form of presentation, and manifests itself in omissions, shifts and additions of various kinds during the translation process (Asimakoulas, 2009, p. 242). Lefevere's nebulous interpretation of ideology as a pervasive state of mind fails to clearly delineate its modes of operation, but this vagueness can also be construed as the ideological component being the most influential and domineering aspect of patronage.

The economic component concerns the payment of writers and rewriters in the form of royalty payments and translator's fees (Munday, 2008, p. 127). Patrons that ensure the rewriter's economic survival can be universities, publishers and governments, depending on the nature of the assigned work. The constraining role of this component can go beyond the domestic market in terms of the regulation of royalties and production costs nationally as well as internationally (Lefevere, 2012, pp. 215-16). As for the status component, Lefevere states that "acceptance of patronage implies integration into a certain support group and its lifestyle" (Lefevere, 1992, p. 16). It can occur in different forms. For instance, the status conferred on a rewriter may require her/him to conform to the patron's expectations or to behave in a way that is conducive to supporting a group whose member the rewriter is or has become. An example can be that the Beat poets used the City Lights bookstore in San Francisco as a meeting point in the 1950s (Munday, 2008, p. 126).

Further, patronage can be differentiated or undifferentiated, depending on the interaction between these three components. Patronage is undifferentiated in the cases when all three components are provided by the same person or group, as in the case of totalitarian regimes. In contrast, patronage is differentiated when there is no direct correlation and dependency between these components. This latter one is deemed as the rule in democratic or liberal societies where an array of different patrons is active at the same time and assumes disparate political positions (Lefevere, 2012, p. 206). For instance, in a differentiated structure of patronage, the financial success of a popular best-selling novel does not automatically confer a high status on its author or rewriter in the hierarchy of a literary system (Munday, 2008, p. 127).

1.1.2. Adaptation as an instance of rewriting.

Lefevere's proposition has broken new ground in the study of translations by drawing parallels between different types of texts that are conventionally not considered to share common ground with one another. Maria Tymoczko (2007, p. 82) stresses that Lefevere had his antecedents to his proposition, but he was the first to study translations as forms of rewriting and note the commonalities between translated texts and other texts that were not translations per se. Tymoczko brings our attention to the fact that, despite the tendencies to consider rewriting as a quasi-synonym for translation, Lefevere's model neither highlights "rewriting" as an attribute of translation nor equates rewriting with translation. Instead, Lefevere formulates the concept of rewriting as a frame of reference through which to describe the nature of translation and study translated texts (Tymoczko, 2007, p. 110). Translation is hence subsumed as only one instance of a superordinate category along with other forms of rewriting, such as editions, literary criticisms, anthologies, adaptations and historiographies. Consequently, Lefevere's proposition allows for the study of each instance of rewriting from a new angle in terms of its imbrications with the other members of the same category.

In order to elucidate the relationship between instances of rewriting, adaptation will be discussed briefly as a case in point here with a particular focus on its affinities with translation. The term "adaptation" encompasses the act of revising the original and repositioning the originating text in a new cultural context (Bryant, 2013, p. 54). Thomas Leitch stresses that the study of adaptations initially established itself as a "conservative, based-on-the-literary-text model" (2008, p. 65). However, the expansion of the phenomenon has also recently gained

currency in the field of adaptation studies with the effect of redefining the concept and reconfiguring the function of adaptations. In a similar fashion to the impact of the cultural turn in translation, the nature of dependency on a prior text has thus been opened to discussion with the added role of “reformatting” (Stam, 2000, p. 62). For instance, Barton Palmer suggests discarding the view that focuses on the extent to which an adapted text complies with the source one, and replacing it with a notion of adaptation, which is “by definition intertextual” (2004, p. 264).

In a similar vein, Robert Stam introduces the concept of intertextual dialogism which suggests that “every text forms an intersection of textual surfaces” (2000, p. 64). Stam thus undermines the presumption that a film adaptation is necessarily a subordinate form of expression in a one-to-one hierarchical relationship between an original and its copy. Likewise, Julie Sanders categorises adaptation as a “sub-section of the overarching practice of intertextuality as all texts invoke and rework other texts in an ever-evolving cultural mosaic” (2006, p. 17). Dudley Andrew goes a step further in expanding the remit of adaptation, arguing that every representational film is, to a degree, an adaptation as it “adapts a prior conception whole, some concept of person, place, event, or situation” (1984, p. 97). This expanded conception of adaptation may be deemed problematic for stretching the term beyond recognition and resulting in indeterminacy. However, such an argument can also be countered by pointing out that these challenges to the definition of adaptation as a circumscribed concept do not articulate a total disregard for the prior text(s). Instead, they strive to assert an autonomous identity for adaptations by accentuating their interpretational aspects, with the implication that an adaptive dimension can take the form of re-presentation and interpretation of previous ideas.

As an advocate of adopting a broader definition of the subject matter, Linda Hutcheon stresses in *A Theory of Adaptation* that adaptation is a “derivation that is not derivative – a work that is second without being secondary” (2006, p. 9). Further, Hutcheon contends that an authoritative historical rendering or fictionalised version of an actual event can also be regarded as an adapted text. Accordingly, adaptation represents a process of transforming a historical event or an actual person’s life into a re-imagined, fictional form. Crucially, she defines these instances as “paraphrases or translations of a particular other text, or a particular interpretation of history” (Hutcheon, 2006, p. 18). Hutcheon lists biopics, television docudramas and videogames based on a real event among some examples of adapted texts (Hutcheon, 2006, p. 17). Hutcheon’s utilisation of the terms “paraphrase” and “translation” is not coincidental but indicative of the imbrications between translation and adaptation in conceptual and processual terms. When considering together Hutcheon’s view of adaptation and Lefevere’s conception of rewriting, the examples of adapted texts based on an actual event can arguably be included in the same category of rewriting as translations.

The affinities and possible avenues of collaboration between two areas of research have also been explored in translation studies since the cultural turn of the 1990s. Lawrence Venuti addresses the impact of the extended view of adaptation as a form of intertextuality on the study of films in film studies (2007, p. 26). Venuti states that the film is, as a consequence, “rather viewed as necessarily transformative of prior materials and therefore demands analytical tools designed specifically to describe and assess the significance of the transformations” (Venuti, 2007, p. 26). Strikingly, Venuti argues that translation theory can advance thinking about film adaptations due to the act of interpretation forming an indispensable part of both translation and adaptation. However, in order for this to happen, Venuti adds, the view of translation as the transfer of a univocal meaning inherent in the source text needs to be abandoned and replaced by one that considers the relation of a translation to a source text as hermeneutic (Venuti, 2007, p. 41). This emphasis on the transformative and interpretive aspects of both processes echoes Lefevere’s proposition, which subsumes adaptation and translation under the same rubric of rewriting.

In addition to forging relations of convergence between translations and other texts based on contiguity, Lefevere’s conception of rewriting as part of the cultural turn has also paved the way for a wider metaphorical understanding of translation through a re-definition of the term. Rainer Guldin notes that the culturally enlarged

definition highlights transformation, displacement, change and creativity as the aspects of translation instead of the pre-cultural turn notions of transference and equivalence (2015, p. 74). Rewriting can be deemed as a metaphor for translation that embodies all these meanings as well as being a key concept that represents the paradigmatic shift linked to the cultural turn. In this respect, rewriting signifies a form of displacement rather than the exact transfer or reiteration of meaning. It is thus implied through a process of rewriting that what is displaced can take different forms and shapes across different times and contexts. Translation in general and rewriting in particular can thus be seen as a mode through which a particular discourse is promoted and circulated over years.

Overall, Lefevere's conceptualization of rewriting has been regarded as a trailblazing proposition in the study of translations. It has contributed to "dispelling the previous conception of translation as an innocuous bridge between cultures and communities" while facilitating the examination of any meaningful discrepancies between the source text and its translation(s) from a socio-cultural perspective (Díaz-Cintas, 2012, p. 282). Lefevere repositioned the function of translations in their relevant contexts, be it literary or non-literary, thereby propelling a re-evaluation of the impact of the translator's task on the social and political life of a particular country. The conception of translation has thus been reconfigured in a manner that promotes translation as an active contributor in the development of new knowledge and empowers translators as active agents involved in the (re)production of a text. Along with the cultural turn, Lefevere's conceptualization of translation as rewriting has made it necessary for the metaphors that evoke transfer and equivalence to be replaced by those which convey the sense of re-birth or re-shaping in another form. Finally, the rewriting model allows for forging textual kinships between translations and other acts of textual production and opens up the possibility of connecting texts to other texts horizontally and diachronically. Most crucially, this perspective, along with the cultural turn, has prepared the ground for a translation turn in the social sciences and humanities.

1.2. The Relevance of Rewriting to the Translation(al) Turn

Almost a decade after the cultural turn, the proponents of the cultural turn articulated a call for the translation(al) turn in the humanities so that the discipline of translation studies could share its insights and perspectives with other disciplines and thus promote interdisciplinary collaboration. The translation(al) turn is used here to mean that the concepts of translation theory are exported to be drawn on in studies where the object of study is not necessarily translations per se. In other words, the term encompasses the cases when translation is employed as an analytical framework, paradigm or an approach rather than as a physical practice. Susan Bassnett notes that translation studies have imported concepts and approaches from other disciplines such as cultural studies and sociology but exported too little throughout its historical development (1998, p. 134). Therefore, Bassnett emphasizes that the translation turn can capitalize on the fertile ground provided by the interdisciplinary nature of translation studies and expansion of the concept 'translation' after the cultural turn.

There are scholarly works that can be considered as a contribution to the translation turn, and hence are relevant to this paper in providing examples of exporting translation theory for interdisciplinary research outside the discipline. Bella Brodzki's work (2007) entitled *Can Bones Survive?* can be mentioned as an example in this category. Brodzki takes her cue from Walter Benjamin's notion of "afterlife" and defines translation as a form of displacement and "the mode by which various discourses read each other, locate their commonalities, and name their differences" (Brodzki, 2007, p. 3). Christopher Rundle notes a similar use of translation as "an approach, a paradigm and an interpretative key for transcultural and transnational interdisciplinary research" (2014, p. 2). In this initiative, translation is conceived in its broadest possible sense and addresses processes that are intermedia or intercultural as well as those that are interlingual. Tymoczko also deems as significant that translation is used as an approach in fields such as anthropology, ethnography and cultural studies to refer

to the process of engaging with and interpreting the subject matter involved in the researcher's task (2007, p. 82). Despite her promotion of the translation turn in the humanities, however, Tymoczko also adds:

Unfortunately, very few who use the concept translation in this way have actually taken the time to read the literature of translation studies and to understand the problematization of translation that has emerged since World War II. Anthropologists and cultural studies writers often continue to act as if the concept translation were transparent or obvious, remaining roughly at the level of sophistication about translation as the ordinary language definition that we began with (2007, p. 82).

As is pointed out in the above quote, Tymoczko critically observes that extended uses of translation are largely done without gaining specific insight into the theories of translation and historical development of the discipline. Therefore, on the one hand, translation scholars who argue for a translation turn in the humanities are not dismissive of the uses of translation outside the field. On the contrary, they deem this prospect as the means for translation studies to reach its full potential as an interdisciplinary area of research. On the other hand, these proponents of the translation turn are arguably underwhelmed by the lack of readiness and depth in the relevant fields to import translation theory. These can be further linked to two suggestions inferred from Tymoczko's observation. First, Tymoczko implies that the translation turn can be fully achieved through importing specific conceptualisations formulated by translation scholars rather than using translation as a framework in an extended manner. Second, Tymoczko's observation can be construed as a call for translation scholars per se to pioneer the translation turn by applying translation theory to the study of texts that bear resemblance to translations in terms of processes involved. This interpretation not only highlights the link between the cultural turn and translation turn but also strikes a chord with Lefevere's conception of rewriting.

Discussion and Conclusion

Although the conceptualisation of "rewriting" originally concerned the practice of translation of literary texts, existing scholarship, and especially Tymoczko's reflections on Lefevere's contribution, arguably acknowledge the potential of "rewriting" as a tool for the translational turn. By extension, the frame of rewriting can be deployed to analyse the interplay between two sets of texts whose relationship is underpinned by the modes of relevance and transformation. Here, relevance signifies the presence of possible forms of connecting two separate texts based on thematic content. The transformative aspect means that this relationship goes beyond a form of reiteration, assimilation or subjugation in parallel with the emphasis on manipulation and subversion as the defining elements of textual (re)production in Lefevere's conception of rewriting. Possible examples may include an actual event and its adapted versions on screen, in the media and in literature. These examples would also resonate with Hutcheon's view of fictionalised or mediated version of an actual event as an adapted text, as noted above.

To illustrate this point, if we take such film adaptations as a particular instance of rewriting here, patronage is applied to discuss the restraining or facilitating impact of the political context on the production of these adaptations. Accordingly, the ideological component of patronage concerns the ideological pressures of the periods that inform the form and content of these films. The economic component will address the sources of funding provided to produce a film, such as the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism and Eurimages, if the film is produced for the domestic film market in Turkey. Relatedly, whether such adaptations are self-funded or foreign co-productions will also be considered as part of the economic component. The status component might concern the details about the imposition of any censorship and restraints during and after the production as well as the awards granted. Therefore, the proposition of extending the concept of patronage entails considering the role of the interaction between these three components in the production, distribution, financial and critical success of a film.

Further, as in Lefevere's distinction between differentiated and undifferentiated form of patronage, it will be important for a researcher to identify whether there is a total dependence between the government's policies

and a film's receipt of the Ministry's financial assistance or experiences of censorship and distributional restraints. Therefore, studying the role of patronage in the production and distribution of such filmic rewritings may enable the researcher to identify the historical and political dynamics and power asymmetries involved. Such an extended application of rewriting to the analyses of the processes of the making of adapted texts, such as fictional films and documentaries, may also encourage researchers to explore commonalities between a translator's and director's task.

This review article suggests that the ways of analysing and interpreting texts in translation studies can offer a new understanding of films and media texts which are produced based on other texts. The focus on the concept of rewriting has demonstrated the relevance of the methodologies and concepts used in the study of translation to the intertextual and thematic analysis of texts of different genres and times. Specifically, "rewriting" may offer a tool for analysing the factors that play a role in making multimodal texts by inviting the researcher to examine the presence of interaction and negotiation between different discourses and texts in consideration of the filmmaker's and producer's agency. The use of this tool in future research may thus point to a new direction that can contribute to the translation turn through enlarging the conception of rewriting and focusing on the kinship between translations and texts of different genres. Finally, this interdisciplinary approach may enhance the collaboration between translation studies and other areas of social sciences and humanities.

References

- Andrew, D. (1984). *Concepts in film theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Asimakoulas, D. (2009). Rewriting. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopaedia of translation studies* (pp. 241-246). London: Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. (1998). The translation turn in cultural studies. In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere (Eds.), *Constructing cultures: essays on literary translation* (pp. 123-140). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bassnett, S. (2007). Culture and translation. In P. Kuhiwczak & K. Littau (Eds.), *A companion to translation studies* (pp. 13-23). Clevedon, Buffalo, and Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, A. (1990). Introduction: Proust's grandmother and the thousand and one nights. *The cultural turn in translation studies*. In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere (Eds.), *Translation, history, and culture* (pp. 1-13). London, New York: Pinter Publishers.
- Brodzki, B. (2007). *Can these bones live?: Translation, survival, and cultural memory*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brownlie, S. (2009). Descriptive vs committed approaches. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopaedia of translation studies* (pp. 77-81). London: Routledge.
- Bryant, J. (2013). Textual identity and adaptive revision: Editing adaptation as a fluid text. In J. Bruhn, A. Gjelsvik & E. F. Hanssen (Eds.), *Adaptation studies: New challenges, new directions* (pp. 47-69). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Díaz-Cintas, J. (2012). Clearing the smoke to see the screen: Ideological manipulation in audiovisual translation. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*, 57(2), 279-293. DOI: 10.7202/1013945ar.
- Guldin, R. (2015). *Translation as metaphor*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hermans, T. (2009). Translation, ethics, politics. In J. Munday (Ed.), *The Routledge companion to translation studies* (pp. 93-105). London; New York: Routledge.
- Hutcheon, L. (2006). *A theory of adaptation*. New York: Routledge.
- Lefevere, A. (1981). Translated literature: Towards an integrated theory. *The Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, 14(1), 68-78. DOI: 10.2307/1314871.
- Lefevere, A. (1984). Refraction: Some observations on the occasion of Wole Soyinka's Opera Wonyosi. In O. Zuber-Skerrit (Ed.), *Page to Stage: Theatre as Translation* (pp. 191-198). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Lefevere, A. (1985). Why waste our time on rewrites? The trouble with interpretation and the role of rewriting in an alternative paradigm. In Theo Hermans (Ed.), *The Manipulation of Literature* (pp. 215-243). London: Croom Helm.
- Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, rewriting & the manipulation of literary fame*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Lefevere, A. (2012). Mother courage's cucumbers: Text, system and refraction in a theory of literature. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *Translation studies reader* (pp. 203-219). London: Routledge.
- Leitch, T. (2008). Adaptation studies at a crossroads. *Adaptation*, 1(1), 63-77. DOI: 10.1093/adaptation/apm005.
- Marinetti, C. (2011). Cultural approaches. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies vol II* (pp. 26-30). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing translation studies: theories and applications*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Palmer, R. B. (2004). The sociological turn of adaptation studies: The example of film noir. In R. Stam & A. Regno (Eds.), *A companion to literature and film* (pp. 258-277). London: Blackwell.
- Robinson, D. (1997). *What is translation? Centrifugal theories, critical interventions*. London: Kent State University.
- Rundle, C. (2014). Theories and methodologies of translation history: the value of an interdisciplinary approach. *The Translator*, 20(1), 2-8. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2014.899090.
- Sanders, J. (2006). *Adaptation and appropriation*. London: Routledge.
- Stam, R. (2000). The dialogics of adaptation. In J. Naremore (Ed.), *Film adaptation* (pp. 54-76). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Tymoczko, M. (2007). *Enlarging translation, empowering translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Venuti, L. (2007). Adaptation, translation, critique. *Journal of Visual Culture*, 6(1), 25-43. DOI: 10.1177/1470412907075066.