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In her “critical introduction” to postcolonial theory, Leela Gandhi speaks the “new fields of knowledge – often classified under the rubric of the ‘new humanities’ – [which] have endeavoured first, to foreground the exclusions and elisions which confirm the privileges and authority of canonical knowledge systems, and second to recover those marginalised knowledges which have been occluded and silenced by the entrenched humanist curriculum “(Gandhi 1998: 42). These fields are, in the words of Michel Foucault, “subjugated knowledges … knowledges that have been disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated: naïve knowledges, located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificty (Foucault 1980: 82); Gandhi 1998: 43).” From among these knowledges, Foucault cites “that of the psychiatric patient, of the ill person, of the nurse, of the doctor … of the delinquent, etc” (Foucault 1980: 82). Gandhi’s examples are perhaps these days more respectable: “disciplines such as women’s studies, cultural studies and gay/lesbian studies” – and postcolonial studies, of course (Gandhi 1998: 42). Translation Studies is one of “the new humanities”1 and sits somewhere between the types of knowledge which Foucault and Gandhi describe.

In this paper, I come as both a practitioner and a scholar of translation.

---

1 Susan Bassnett’s book Translation Studies, Methuen, London 1980, p. 1, credits the name of the new discipline to a proposal made by André Lefevre in 1976: her book is “an attempt to demonstrate that Translation Studies is indeed a discipline in its own right; not merely a minor branch of comparative literary study, nor yet a specific branch of linguistics, but a vastly complex field with many far-reaching ramifications.”