

Even Zohar, Itamar 1987. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem." In *Translation Across Cultures*, Toury, Gideon, ed. New Delhi: Bahri, pp. 107-115.

The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem¹

ITAMAR EVEN-ZOHAR
Porter Institute,
Tel Aviv University, Israel

Dedicated to the memory of James
S Holmes—a great student of
translation and a dear friend

ABSTRACT. *The present paper argues for the imperativity of considering translated literature as a system within the target literary polysystem rather than treating individual translated texts on an individual basis, as is usually the case. It then goes on to discuss the circumstances under which translated literature may maintain a central or a peripheral position in the target literary polysystem (i.e. participate actively in shaping its very centre or adhere to models already conventionally established in it, respectively) and the dependence of the norms which govern the act of translating and its products on that position.*

I

In spite of the broad recognition among historians of culture of the major role translation has played in the crystallization of national cultures, relatively little research has been carried out so far in this area. As a rule, histories of literatures mention translations when there is no way to avoid them, when dealing with the Middle Ages or the Renaissance, for instance. One might of course find sporadic references to individual literary translations in various other periods, but they are seldom incorporated into the historical account in any *coherent* way. As a consequence, one hardly gets any idea whatsoever of the function of translated literature for a literature as a whole or of its position within

that literature. Moreover, there is no awareness of the possible existence of *translated literature as a particular literary system*. The prevailing concept is rather that of "translation" or just "translated works" treated on an individual basis. Is there any basis for a different assumption, that is for considering translated literature as a system? Is there the same sort of cultural and verbal network of relations within what seems to be an arbitrary group of translated texts as the one we quite willingly hypothesize for original literature? What kind of relations might there be between translated works, which are presented as completed facts, imported from other literatures, detached from their home contexts and consequently neutralized from the point of view of centre-and-periphery struggles?

My argument is that translated works do correlate in at least two ways:

(a) in the way their source texts are *selected* by the target literature, the principles of selection never being uncorrelatable with the home co-systems of the target literature (to put it in the most cautious way); and

(b) in the way they adopt specific *norms, behaviours and policies*—in short, in their use of the literary repertoire—which results from their relations with the other home co-systems. These are not confined to the linguistic level only, but are manifest on any selection level as well. Thus, translated literature may possess a repertoire of its own, which to a certain extent could even be exclusive to it. (As regards translation-specific items of the *lexical* level see e.g. Toury 1985; in press).

It seems that these points make it not only *justifiable* to talk about translated literature, but rather *imperative* to do so. I cannot see how any scholarly effort to describe and explain the behaviour of the literary polysystem² in synchrony and diachrony can advance in an adequate way if that is not admitted. In other words, I conceive of translated literature not only as an integral system within any literary polysystem, but as a most active system within it. What is, however, its position within it, and how is this position connected with the nature of its overall repertoire? One would be tempted to deduce from the peripheral position of translated literature in the study of literature that it also permanently occupies a peripheral position in the literary polysystem, but this is by no means the case. Whether translated literature becomes central or peripheral, and whether this position is connected with innovatory ("primary") or conservatory ("secondary") repertoires, depends on the specific constellation of the polysystem under study.

II

To say that translated literature maintains a central position in the literary polysystem means that it participates actively in shaping the

centre of the polysystem. In such a situation it is by and large an integral part of *innovatory forces*, and as such likely to be identified with major events in literary history while these are taking place. This implies in fact that no clearcut distinction is then maintained between "original" and "translated" writings, and that often it is the leading writers (or members of the avant-garde who are about to become leading writers) who produce the most conspicuous or appreciated translations. Moreover, in such a state when new literary models are emerging, translation is likely to become one of the means of elaborating the new repertoire. Through the foreign works, features (both principles and elements) are introduced into the home literature which did not exist there before. These include possibly not only new models of reality to replace the old and established ones that are no longer effective, but a whole range of other features as well, such as a new (poetic) language, or compositional patterns and techniques. It is very clear that the very principles of selecting the works to be translated are determined by the situation governing the (home) polysystem: the texts are picked according to their compatibility with the new approaches and the supposedly innovatory role they may assume within the target literature.

What then are the conditions which give rise to a situation of this kind? It seems to me that three major cases can be discerned, which are basically various manifestations of the same law:

(a) When a polysystem has not yet been crystallized, that is to say, when a literature is "young", that is in the process of being established;

(b) When a literature is either "peripheral" (within a large group of correlated literatures) or "weak"³, or both; and

(c) When there are turning points, crises, or literary vacuums in a literature.

In the first case translated literature simply fulfills the need of a younger literature to put into use its newly founded (or renovated) tongue for as many literary types as possible in order to make it functionable as a literary language and useful for its emerging public. Since a young literature cannot immediately create texts in all types known to its producers, it benefits from the experience of other literatures, and translated literature becomes in such a way one of its most important systems. The same holds true for the second instance, that of relatively established literatures whose resources are limited and whose position within a large literary hierarchy is generally peripheral. As a consequence of this situation, such literatures often do not develop the same full range of literary activities (organized in a variety of systems), observable in adjacent larger literatures, that may at a certain time be felt as indispensable. Parallely, they may be "lacking" a repertoire which is felt to be badly needed *vis-à-vis* that adjacent literature. This

lack may then be filled, wholly or partly, by translated literature. For instance, all sorts of peripheral literature may in such cases consist of translated literature. But far more important is the consequence that the ability of such "weak" literatures to initiate innovations is often less than that of the larger and central literatures, with the result that a relation of dependency may be established not only in peripheral systems, but in the very centre of these "weak" literatures. (To avoid miscomprehension, I would like to point out that these literatures may rise to a central position in a way analogous to the way this is carried out by peripheral systems within a certain polysystem, but this cannot be discussed here.)

Since peripheral literatures in the Western hemisphere tend more often than not to be identical with the literatures of smaller nations, as unpleasant as this idea may seem to us, we have no choice but to admit that within a group of relatable national literatures, such as the literatures of Europe, *hierarchical relations* have been established since the very beginnings of these literatures. Within this (macro-)polysystem some literatures have taken peripheral positions, which is so much as to say that they were often modelled to a large extent upon an exterior literature. For such literatures, translated literature is not only a major channel through which fashionable repertoire is brought home, but also a source of reshuffling and supplying alternatives. Thus, whereas richer or stronger literatures may have the option to adopt novelties from some periphery within their indigenous borders, "weak" literatures in such situations often depend on import alone.

In the third case, the dynamics within the polysystem creates turning points, that is to say, historical moments where established models are no longer tenable for a younger generation. At such moments, even in central literatures, translated literature may assume a central position. This is all the more true when at a turning point no item in the indigenous stock is taken to be acceptable, as a result of which a literary "vacuum" occurs. In such a vacuum, it is easy for foreign models to infiltrate, and translated literature may consequently assume a central position. Of course, in the case of "weak" literatures or literatures which are in constant state of impoverishment (lack of literary items existing in a neighbour or accessible foreign literature), this situation is even more overwhelming.

III

On the other hand, contending that translated literature may maintain a peripheral position means that it constitutes a peripheral system within the polysystem, generally employing secondary models. In such a situation it has no influence on major processes and is modelled according to norms already conventionally established by an already dominant type in

the target literature. Translated literature in this case becomes a major factor of *conservatism*. While the contemporary original literature might go on developing new norms and models, translated literature adheres to norms which have been either recently or long before rejected by the (newly) established centre. It thus no longer maintains positive correlations with original writing.

A highly interesting paradox manifests itself here: translation, by which new ideas, items, characteristics can be introduced into a literature, becomes a means to preserve traditional taste. This discrepancy between the original central literature and the translated literature may have evolved in a variety of ways. For instance, when translated literature, after having emerged as a central system within a situation of great changes, soon lost contact with the original home literature which went on changing, and thereby went on clinging to an unchanged repertoire. Thus, a literature that might have emerged as a revolutionary type may go on existing as an ossified *système d'antan*, often fanatically guarded by the agents of secondary models against even minor changes.

The conditions which enable this second state are of course diametrically opposite to these which give rise to translated literature as a central system: either there are no major changes in the polysystem or these changes are not effected through the intervention of interliterary relations materialized in the form of translations.

IV

The hypothesis that translated literature may be *either* a central or peripheral system does not imply that it is always *wholly* the one or the other. As a system, translated literature is itself stratified, and from the point of view of polysystemic analysis it is often from the vantage point of the central stratum that all relations within the system are observed. This means that while one section of translated literature may assume a central position, another may remain quite peripheral. In the foregoing analysis I pointed out the close relationship between literary contacts and the status of translated literature. This seems to me the major clue to this issue. When there is intense interference, it is the portion of translated literature deriving from a major source literature which is likely to assume a central position. For instance, in the Hebrew literary polysystem between the two world wars literature translated from the Russian assumed an unmistakably central position, while works translated from English, German, Polish and other languages assumed an obviously peripheral one. Moreover, since the major and most innovatory translational norms were produced by translations from Russian, other translated literature adhered to the models and norms elaborated by those translations, so that they resembled them very much.

The historical material analysed so far in terms of polysystemic operations is too limited to provide any far-reaching conclusions about the chances of translated literature to assume a particular position. But work carried out in this field by various other scholars (Gideon Toury, José Lambert), as well as my own research, indicates that the "normal" position assumed by translated literature tends to be the peripheral one. This should in principle be compatible with theoretical speculation. It may be assumed that in the long run no system can remain in a constant state of weakness, "turning point", or crisis, although the possibility should not be excluded that some polysystems may maintain such states for quite a long time. Moreover, not all polysystems are structured in the same way, and cultures do differ significantly. For instance, it is clear that the French cultural system, French literature naturally included, is much more rigid than most other European systems. This, combined with the long traditional central position of French literature within the European context (or within the European macro-polysystem), has caused French translated literature to assume an extremely peripheral position. The state of Anglo-American literature is rather similar, while Russian, German, or Scandinavian would seem to show different patterns of behaviour in this respect.

V

What bearings may the position taken by translated literature have on translational norms, behaviours, and policies?⁴

As I stated above, the distinction between a translated work and an original work in terms of literary behaviour is a clear function of the position assumed by the translated literature in a given time. When it takes a central position, the borderlines are *diffuse*, so that the very category of "translated works" must be extended to semi- and quasi-translations as well. From the point of view of translation theory I think this is a more adequate way of dealing with such phenomena than to reject them on the basis of a static and a-historical conception of translation. Since translational activity participates, when it assumes a central position, in the process of creating new, primary models, the translator's main concern here is not just to look for ready-made models in his home repertoire into which the source texts would be transferable. Instead, he is prepared in such cases to *violate the home conventions*. Under such conditions the chances that the translation will be close to the original in terms of adequacy (in other words, a reproduction of the dominant textual relations of the original) are greater than otherwise. Of course, from the point of view of the target literature the adopted translational norms might for a while be too foreign and revolutionary, and if the new trend is defeated in the literary struggle, the translation made according

to its conceptions and tastes will never really gain ground. But if the new trend is victorious, the repertoire (code) of translated literature may be enriched and become more flexible. Periods of great change in the home system are in fact the only ones when a translator is prepared to go far beyond the options offered to him by his established home repertoire and is willing to attempt a different treatment of text making. Let us remember that under stable conditions items lacking in a target literature may remain untransferable if the state of the polysystem does not allow innovations. But the process of opening the system gradually brings closer certain literatures and in the longer run enables a situation where the postulates of (translational) adequacy and the realities of equivalence may overlap to a relatively high degree. This is the case of the European literatures, though in some of them the mechanism of rejection has been so strong that the changes I am talking about have occurred on a rather limited scale.

Naturally, when translated literature occupies a peripheral position, it behaves totally differently. Here, the translator's main effort is to concentrate upon finding *the best ready-made secondary models* for the foreign text, and the result often turns out to be a non-adequate translation or (as I would rather prefer to put it) a greater discrepancy between the equivalence achieved and the adequacy postulated.

In other words, not only is the socio-literary status of translation dependent upon its position within the polysystem, but the very practice of translation is also strongly subordinated to it. And even the question of what is a translated work cannot be answered *a priori* in terms of an a-historical out-of-context idealized state: it must be determined on the grounds of the operations governing the polysystem.

Seen from this point of view, translation is no longer a phenomenon whose nature and borders are given once and for all, but an activity dependent on the relations within a certain cultural system. Consequently, such key concepts as *adequacy* and *equivalence* cannot be dealt with fairly unless the implications of polysystemic positions are taken into account. I would go as far as to say that neglecting these basic insights is one of the major mistakes of contemporary translation theories, which lean too heavily on static linguistic models or underdeveloped theories of literature.

NOTES

- 1 This is a revised version of Even-Zohar 1978 (=Even-Zohar 1978a: 21-27).
- 2 In Jurij Tynjanov and Roman Jakobson's approach, both language and literature (as well as other semiotic systems) are suggested to be conceived of as "systems of systems" rather than single systems. This approach, only in part adopted by Prague Structuralism (for functional styles, language varieties, interference and fusion), was however to a great extent neglected in literary studies after 1930, when it had enjoyed a short, but intense (if not always theoretically self-conscious) use, not only in the work of Tynjanov himself, but of many other poeticsians, including younger students. It seems to have been picked up, as if from the point when it was laid down, by the present author, who has been working since 1970 on renewing and further elaborating this conception, for which he suggested the term of *polysystem*.

The literary polysystem, i.e. the "system of systems of literature" is viewed in polysystem theory (Even-Zohar 1978a, 1979) as a multiply stratified whole where the relations between centre and periphery are a series of oppositions, which actually allow for hypothesizing more than one "centre", although in most historical cases, centres are stratified in such a way that only one eventually succeeds in dominating the whole. Polysystem theory thus makes explicit the Tynjanovian idea of heteronomy versus (partial) autonomy of systems. It makes it possible to deal with *disconnected* relations, while the single system approach imposed the view of total connectedness and mutual "motivation" (which often tended to be transferred by most literary students back to the organicistic ideas about both text and literature). Thus, canonicity is conceived of as a bundle of relations rather than a simple opposition. This allows to recognize states of oscillations under shifts as perfectly "systemic" rather than "violations of the system". Intrasystemic processes (transfer of models between centre and periphery involved with position shifts), the role of interference between various literatures and the channels and procedures through which it occurs seem to be more adequately discussible and perhaps accounted for in the polysystem approach. Moreover, whole sections of literary production, such as popular, translated and children's literature, as well as semi-literary texts, not only have been integrable into poetics, but have made transparent various seemingly unrelated phenomena in "literature".

- 3 On the concept of "weak" see my "Interference in dependent literary polysystems" (Even-Zohar 1981 [=Even-Zohar 1978:54-59]).
- 4 On the bearings of the position of translated literature within the target literary polysystem on translational norms cf. especially Toury 1977; 1980.

REFERENCES

- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1978. The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In James S Holmes, José Lambert and Raymond van den Broeck (eds.) *Literature and translation: New perspectives in literary studies*. Leuven: Acco. 117-127.
- , 1978a. *Papers in historical poetics*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University.
- , 1979. Polysystem theory. *Poetics today*. 1.1-2. 287-310.
- , 1981. Interference in dependent literary polysystems. In *Actes du VIIIe Congres del 'AILC*, Budapest: Hungarian [Academy of Sciences and Stuttgart: Bieber, 617-622.
- , 1986. System, literary. In Thomas A. Sebeok et al. (eds.) *Encyclopedic dictionary of semiotics*. Berlin and New York: Mouton/De Gruyter.
- Matejka, Ladislav and Krystyna Pomorska (eds.) 1971. *Readings in Russian poetics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.
- Toury, Gideon. 1977. *Translational norms and literary translation into Hebrew, 1930-1945*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University. (in Hebrew)
- , 1980. *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University.
- , 1986. Translational solutions on the lexical level and the dictionary (abstract). In Jerzy Tomaszczyk and Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.) *International conference on meaning and lexicography: Abstracts. Lodz, 19-21 June, 1985*. Lodz: University of Lodz, Institute of English Studies. 87-89.
- , In press. Translation-specific lexical items and their representation in the dictionary. In Jerzy Tomaszczyk and Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.) *Meaning and lexicography*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tynjanov, Jurij. 1929. O literaturnoj evoljucii. In Jurij Tynjanov. *Ayxalsty i novatory*. Moskva: Akademia—(rep. Munchen: Fink, 1967), 30-47. [English translation: On literary evolution. In Matejka and Pomorska 1971:66-78.]
- Tynjanov, Jurij & Roman Jakobson. 1923. Problemy izucenija literatury i jazyka. *Novi lef*. 12.36-37. English translation: Problems in the study of literature and language. In Matejka and Pomorska 1971: 79-81.

Itamar Even-Zohar is a Professor of Poetics and Comparative Literature at Tel Aviv University (Israel). His main fields of interest are the semiotics of culture, historical poetics and intercultural contacts. His collection *Papers in Historical Poetics* was published in Tel Aviv in 1978. In addition, he published numerous articles in several languages and translated many books from various languages into Hebrew. Co-edited (with Gideon Toury) *Theory of Translation and Intercultural Relations* a special number of *Poetics Today*, 1981) and a selection of Roman Jakobson's articles in Hebrew translation (Tel Aviv, 1986).