



# Translation Today

VOLUME 11, ISSUE 1, 2017



राष्ट्रीय अनुवाद मिशन

NATIONAL TRANSLATION MISSION  
CENTRAL INSTITUTE OF INDIAN LANGUAGES

Editor  
TARIQ KHAN

മലയാളം

हिन्दी

भाषा

తెలుగు లిపి

ಕನ್ನಡ

ગુજરાતી

मराठी म्हाली

മുൻ

ವಾಣಿ

ଓଡ଼ିଆ ବାଣୀ

অসমীয়া

संस्कृतम्

விக்கிப்பீடியா

## Publication Policy

Translation Today (TT) is a double-blind peer-reviewed, indexed and refereed journal of the National Translation Mission (NTM). This has been listed in the UGC approved list of journals. It follows the standard publishing norms and therefore, invites original and unpublished submissions in the following categories:

- Research articles
- Academic interviews
- Translations
- Disciplinary dialogues
- Book reviews
- Annotated bibliography

## Vision

- Seeks a spurt in translation activity.
- Seeks excellence in the translated word.
- Seeks to further the frontiers of Translation Studies.
- Seeks to raise a strong awareness about translation, its possibilities and potentialities, its undoubted place in the history of ideas, and thus help catalyse a groundswell of well-founded ideas about translation among people.

## Submission

Translation Today welcomes submissions in the following areas (but not limited to): Annotated and original translations of all literary genres, translated excerpts from novels are accepted where they stand on their own, glossaries in any subject in any language-pair (Indian Languages TO Indian Languages or Indian Languages TO English or English TO Indian Languages), specialties in the translation profession: religious, technical, scientific, legal, commercial, specialties in the interpreting profession: court, conference, medical and community, multimedia, terminology, localization, translation technology: HMT, translation memory softwares, translation teaching softwares, papers on translation as a category of or a significant dimension of thought, pieces relating translation to society, to culture, to philosophy, to poetics, to aesthetics, to epistemology, to ontology, to movements like feminism, subalternism, to power and so on, translation universals etc., to awarenesses like civilisational space, nationalism, identity, the self, the other and so on, on translation pedagogy, translation curriculum, translation syllabus etc., ethics, status, and future of the profession, translator-related issues, translator studies: legal, copyright issues etc., squibs and discussion notes which are short pieces throwing up an interesting problem or analytical puzzle, reviews of translated texts, dictionaries and softwares, letters to the Editor.

For submissions and queries, please write to:

### Project Director

National Translation Mission,  
Central Institute of Indian Languages,  
Hunsur road, Manasagangotri, Mysuru-570006.  
E-mail: projectdirector.ntm[AT]gmail[DOT]com, cc to:  
ntmtranslationtoday[AT]gmail[DOT]com

# Translation Today



**Editor**

TARIQ KHAN

Volume 11, Issue 1

2017



## **Editor**

**TARIQ KHAN**

Officer in Charge, NTM

## **Editorial Board**

**SUSAN BASSNETT**

School of Modern Languages and  
Cultures, University of Warwick,  
Coventry, United Kingdom

**HARISH TRIVEDI**

Department of English,  
University of Delhi,  
New Delhi, India

**MICHAEL CRONIN**

School of Applied Language and  
Intercultural Studies, Dublin  
University, Dublin, Ireland

**DOUGLAS ROBINSON**

Department of English,  
Hong Kong Baptist University,  
Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong

**SHERRY SIMON**

Department of French,  
Concordia University,  
Quebec, Canada

## **Assistant Editors**

**GEETHAKUMARY V.**

**ABDUL HALIM**

**ADITYA KUMAR PANDA**

**JEREMY MUNDAY**

School of Languages, Cultures and  
Societies, University of Leeds,  
Leeds, United Kingdom

**ANTHONY PYM**

Translation and Intercultural Studies,  
The RoviraiVirgili University,  
Tarragona, Spain

**PANCHANAN MOHANTY**

Centre for Applied Linguistics and  
Translation Studies, University of  
Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India

**AVADHESH KUMAR SINGH**

School of Translation Studies and  
Training, Indira Gandhi National Open  
University, New Delhi, India

**SUSHANT KUMAR MISHRA**

Centre of French and Francophone  
Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University,  
New Delhi, India

## **Advisors**

**D. G. RAO**

Director, CIIL

**C. V. SHIVARAMAKRISHNA**

Head, Centre for Translation  
Studies, CIIL

# **Translation Today**

Volume 11, Issue 1, June 2017

Editor: TARIQ KHAN

© **National Translation Mission, CIIL, Mysuru, 2017.**

This material may not be reproduced or transmitted, either in part or in full, in any form or by any means, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from:

Director  
Central Institute of Indian Languages,  
Manasagangotri, Hunsur Road, Mysuru – 570 006, INDIA

Phone : 0091/0821-2515006 (Director)      Fax: 0091/0821-2515032/2345218  
Grams: BHARATI      Website: <http://www.ciil.org>  
E-mail: [projectdirector.ntm@gmail.com](mailto:projectdirector.ntm@gmail.com) / [ntmtranslationtoday@gmail.com](mailto:ntmtranslationtoday@gmail.com)

## **For Publication orders**

### **Head, Publication Unit**

Contact: 0821-2345026  
Email: [umarani@ciil.org](mailto:umarani@ciil.org)

### **R. NANDEESH**

Publication Unit  
Contact: 0821-2345182, 09845565614  
Email: [nandeesh@ciil.org](mailto:nandeesh@ciil.org)  
[nandeesh77@gmail.com](mailto:nandeesh77@gmail.com)

**ISSN: 0972-8740**

**e-ISSN: 0972-8090**

**One Year Subscription: INR 500; US \$ 100; EURO 80; POUND 60**

Excluding postage (air-mail)

**Published by** : D. G. RAO, Director, CIIL, Mysuru  
**Head Press & Publication** : UMARANI PAPPUSWAMY, Professor-cum-Deputy Director  
**Officer in Charge** : ALEENDRA BRAHMA, CIIL, Mysuru  
**Supervision by** : R. NANDEESH, Publication Unit  
M. N. CHANDRASHEKAR  
**Layout & Design** : M. L. SEETHALAKSHMI & NANDA KUMAR L.  
**Printed at** : CIIL Printing Press, Mysuru

# Contents

<b>Editorial</b> .....	i
<b>Articles</b>	
Shape-Shifting Sources and Illusory Targets: Jhaverchand Meghani and Saurashtrani Rasdhar <i>KRUPA SHAH</i> .....	1
Ambapali's Verse in Therigatha: Trajectories and Transformations <i>SUPRIYA BANERJEE</i> .....	15
Enigma of Translation and Indian Philosophy: A Reading of Harivansh Rai Bachchan's Madhushala <i>MANISH PRASAD</i> .....	26
The Holy Register: Its Equivalence and Strategies <i>MATTHEW PRATTIPATI</i> .....	51
Should the Translator Ask: Woman, What have I to do with You? <i>LEVIN MARY JACOB</i> .....	66
<b>Interviews</b>	
An Interview with Shyam Ranganathan <i>ABDUL HALIM</i> .....	81
An Interview with Douglas Robinson <i>ADITYA KUMAR PANDA</i> .....	94
<b>Book Review</b>	
What is Cultural Translation? by Sarah Maitland <i>ARBINA PHONGLO</i> .....	105

Seven Thousand Ways to Listen: Staying Close to What is Sacred by Mark Nepo  
*ROZY SAMEJA PATEL* ..... 110

**Translations**

An Astonishing Method of Torture by Kerur Vasudevacharya  
*S. JAYASRINIVASA RAO* ..... 116

Resurrection by Jatin Bala  
*MRINMOY PRAMANICK* ..... 132

**Annotated Bibliography**

An Annotated Bibliography of Translation Studies Books  
Published in 2017  
*DEEPA V.* ..... 146

**Contributors** ..... 154

\*\*\*



## Editorial

Translation Studies, like any interdisciplinary pursuit, has been encountering attempts to delimit, define and re-define its scope. Arguably, such constant and coercive efforts have rendered Translation Studies more interdisciplinary than any of its counterparts in Humanities and Social Sciences. Following the Cultural Turn in the 1990s, translation is no more limited to the faithful rendering of a text in a target language. Scholars have been assimilating transcreation, recreation, interpretation, and adaptation into the intellectual fold of Translation Studies and thereby the idea of translation has been continuously expanding and turning more diverse than ever before. Translation Today has been interrogating the static notion of translation, carrying the discussion forward and redrawing the contours of Translation Studies. In this endeavour, the journal presents the first issue of volume number eleven containing five research papers, two academic interviews, two book reviews, two translations and an annotated bibliography. I am pleased to write this editorial and present a crisp view of the contents of this issue.

Krupa Shah tries to critically situate Saurashtrani Rasdhar under translation by challenging the static notion of a source text. This paper considers source and target not as binaries but as one mixing with the other. Supriya Banerjee does a comparative analysis of the Buddhist nuns as described in the *Therigatha*, and their receptions in the English translations. With the analysis of Harivansh Rai Bachchan's *Madhushala* and its archetype, Manish Prasad questions what a 'translation' is when we synthesize or transcreate a text. This issue of the journal has two papers related to the Bible translation. In the first, Matthew Prattipati discusses the word level problems in

the contexts of translating the holy register and in the second Levin Mary Jacob studies the gender nuances in the Malayalam translations of the select passages from the Gospel. As earlier, two interviews follow the research papers. In the first interview, Abdul Halim interviews Shyam Ranganathan on the ideas that are crucial for understanding the present scenario of Translation Studies. In this interview, Shyam Ranganathan reflects his ideas about the discipline from a broader perspective and suggests that the philosophers of language and translation theorists should work together. He emphasizes on the “Text-Type Conception” of Semantics for determinate translation. In the second interview, Aditya Kumar Panda interviews Douglas Robinson, an eminent translation theorist, on his scholarship as a theorist cum practitioner. This interview focuses on his writings: *The Translator’s Turn*, *Becoming a Translator*, *Who Translates?*, *Translation and the Problem of Sway* and *The Dao of Translation*. Two book reviews follow the interviews. Arbina Phonglo reviews Sarah Maitland's *What is Cultural Translation?* and Rozy Sameja Patel reviews Mark Nepo's *Seven Thousand Ways to Listen: Staying Close to What is Sacred*. This issue also offers two translations. In the first, S. Jayasrinivasa Rao does a back-translation of Kerur Vasudevacharya’s Kannada version of Sherlock Holmes's *An Astonishing Method of Torture* into English. In the second, Mrinmoy Pramanick translates Jatin Bala's *Resurrection* from Bangla to English. Publication focussing on Translation Studies is on a steady rise. Considering that the Translation Today has earmarked some space for the bibliography of new arrivals in the field. The aim of bibliography in this new section is not merely an enumeration of names of books or authors. Instead, it intends to provide crisp overviews and annotations on the intellectual content of each book monograph or thesis. Responding to this call, Deepa V. has contributed an annotated bibliography of 14

books on Translation Studies all of which have arrived in 2017.

I am glad to inform the readers that NTM has been working on thematic volumes, the frequency of whose publication would be one every year. For the academic year 2016-17, NTM has brought out a thematic volume titled *History of Translation in India* in print and electronic formats. The theme for the next publication is *Translation in Inter/Trans-disciplinary Contexts*. The published volume *History of Translation in India* and the call for papers for the next volume are available at the NTM website. On behalf of the National Translation Mission, it is my pleasure to invite all interested and concerned scholars to participate in this endeavour of NTM and contribute academic writings to it. The following recent developments at the NTM are also notable and worth sharing: (a) Translation Today is included in the UGC's list of approved journals and (b) NTM has restarted its quarterly newsletter with a new name *The Translation Bulletin*.

I am also pleased to inform the readers that Translation Today will carry a new section on Disciplinary Dialogues wherein subject experts can publish ideas for the improvement and expansion of Translation Studies as an academic pursuit. Therefore, in addition to the regular sections like research articles, academic interviews, book reviews, annotated bibliography and notes, the journal also invites academics teaching Translation Studies to contribute to this section of the journal.

The recent trends concerning scholarly contributions and subscription indicate that the support for the journal is continually escalating and its popularity is on the rise. On the one hand, these developments have enhanced the work of the

editors while on the other hand, they have heightened the sense of responsibility in the editorial team. It is a pleasure to acknowledge these developments with satisfaction.

Scholars from various disciplinary affiliations have been participating in the changing trends in Translation Studies. Therefore, the focus of research in translation is shifting from time to time. The shift from language and culture to the translators or the agencies that act, react, manipulate and take decisions is evidence for that. The Translation Today keeps the readers updated on the recent trends in the field of Translation Studies. I think this issue echoes the recent voices in translation and will make the readers understand that translation is evolving as a discipline without attaching itself to the stereotypes.

Hope you will have a riveting reading!

Tariq Khan

\*\*\*

# Shape-Shifting Sources and Illusory Targets: Jhaverchand Meghani and Saurashtrani Rasdhar

KRUPA SHAH

## Abstract

*This paper challenges the static notions of a 'source text', fixed and 'bordered' in language and time, and serving as the prototype for a translation that is always and inevitably seen to take place in a cultural 'elsewhere'. It explores instead the source and the target not as binaries separated by cultural and linguistic borders, but as a spectrum, one conflating into the other. This model of thought is particularly helpful in the context of the Gujarati writer Jhaverchand Meghani (1897- 1947) who was a prolific writer, critic and journalist. This paper limits itself to the context of his pioneering work in Gujarati folk literature, especially a collection of lokavarta or folk stories about the Rajput life and valour in medieval Saurashtra called Saurashtrani Rashdhar. Meghani travelled far and wide in Saurashtra over a period of several years collecting and documenting repositories of oral culture through folk stories, songs, ballads and various other popular forms. His sources were people from various occupations, castes, gender and class. Sometimes there was more than one version of the same tale and sometimes the same story contained idioms of two languages of regions that were linguistically similar, like Kutch and*

*Kathiawad. How does one think of borders and sources in these contexts? This paper looks at a number of such consequences in the context of Meghani's folk stories and examines sites of translational borders and exchanges in order to propose a new way of thinking about sources and targets.*

**Keywords:** Shape-shifting Sources, Illusory Targets, Meghani, Saurashtrani Rasdhar, Translation and Borders.

## **Introduction: Translation and Borders**

Notions of translation as they have been traditionally conceived of, speak of translation as a process predicated on displacement; a movement from one cultural, social, textual, linguistic environment to another. An oft used metaphor is one of transference or the transplanting of a text from one linguistic terrain into another semantic field. This notion of translation has operated squarely on the duality of the self and the other, the original and the derivative, the essence and the dilution and so on, and is inescapably founded on difference and separation. This discrimination has also served, as Venuti reminds us, to legitimize the writer's creativity while confounding the translator to invisibility. The idea of translation as displacement is also etymologically verified with the word's Latin root 'trans-latus' that refers to 'carrying across'. While translation etymologically inscribes the notion of borders within itself (trans-latus) it also involves an encounter with the other by movement. In a way this ambivalence resonates with the simultaneity of the border itself as confinement as well as site of exchange. It is also indicative of the possibility of spaces of liminality inherent in

both boundaries and acts of translation that enable alternative mappings of conflicted terrains.

Edwin Gentzler (2014) argues that while it is easier to move across traditional borders today, new borders are constantly created and drawn through emerging connections “between and among regional ethnic groups, professional associations, different races, genders, language minorities, communities, neighbourhoods, and generations. As individuals constantly traverse these multiple and increasing micro-borders, definitions of nations or nation-states are changing, and so too are definitions of language and translation”. In such a situation, asks Gentzler, is it not possible to rethink translation “not as a product—a translated text—nor a process—a carrying/ferrying a text across a divide” but as “an always ongoing process of *every* communication? [...] not a speech-act carried out between languages and cultures, but instead a condition underlying the languages and cultures upon which communication is based”. This notion of translation is not limited to the process of change from source to target but constitutes them both in the first place. The source and target are themselves always and already in-translation and hence the very categories of ‘source’ and ‘target’ do not hold. Instead I draw from Merrill (2009) and her reading of the term ‘anuvad’ as telling in turn, in order to see oral narratives as tellings rather than as source or target ‘texts’.

The metaphor of the border has come to be invested with multiple meanings from multiple cultural and literary standpoints. It has most prominently gained acceptance in the context of strategies of decoloniality evolved by Latin American thinkers such as Walter Mignolo and Gloria Anzaldúa among many others. Mignolo’s concept of border thinking for example, stresses ‘reversing the geography of

reason' by delinking from the modernity-coloniality matrix. Border living and thinking becomes a decolonial strategy for epistemological reconstitution as it provides a space for alternative ways of knowing and being to be crafted from reserves of native experience. Preyer and Bos (2013) discuss notions of border and membership put forth by Georg Simmel who sees borders not as spatial demarcations but as sociological facts that promote a sense of coherence through relationships of membership. Luhmann on the other hand, considers the border not as a line but as a membrane that enables exchange and interaction and connects a system with the environment (ibid.). For the scope of this paper, I draw from Preyer and Bos who take on both these ideas in a discussion centred on borders in the context of the conflicting tensions of globalisation: "Border structures are dynamic processes of connection and separation, be it the line or the membrane, there is always a three-way logic of borders: borders include, exclude and connect at the same time" (ibid.).

Drawing from this definition of dynamic borders and Genztler's idea of what I call 'dynamic translation', this paper examines Jhaverchand Meghani's *Saurashtrani Rasdhar* (1923-27) as an instance of unbordered tellings made possible through motile and plurally possessed 'sources.'

### **Meghani and *Rasdhar*: Context**

Saurashtra is the name of the Southeastern peninsular region of Gujarat which takes its other name Kathiawad from the Kathi rulers who ruled parts of it in the 18th century (Desai 5). *Saurashtrani Rasdhar* (1923-27) or *A Noble Heritage: A Collection of Short Stories based on the Folklore of Saurashtra* as it was called by Vinod Meghani in his English translation, is an exhaustive and unique treasure trove of folk stories intended



to show the brave and noble culture of the Rajput age of medieval Saurashtra (A.D. 875-1472). Its stories were collected from various sources and written and edited by Jhaverchand Meghani, a prolific journalist and writer, a pioneer in the field of Loksahitya and known by the celebrated appellation of ‘Rashtriya Shayar’ or ‘National Poet’ by Gandhi. In his preface, Meghani describes his collection as an attempt to redress the stereotype of Kathiawad as a land without cultural heritage and barren of literary inspiration (2014: 11). Meghani attempts to acquaint the reader with the land of Saurashtra through a rich palimpsest of more than a hundred folk stories of characters from various communities such as the Ahiyars, the Charans, the Bhils, the Mers among many others and recounts tales scattered over diverse locales ranging from the banks of the Shetrunji river, the hilly terrains of Kanado and Girnar in the South, sometimes meandering through remote and obscure villages including the proverbial Limadi and sometimes weaving through centres of mainstream life such as Ahmedabad or Vadodara which appear most often as places of employment and prosperity.

Apart from various communities, there are also characters from various classes and occupations much like the people from whom Meghani heard and wrote down these stories. The stories are boisterously populated with kings, queens, ordinary village folk, stingy Vaniyas and loyal Arabs, dauntless Rajputs, waylaying bandits and friends who forgive each other for terrible sins, lovers wrecked by envy and malice; women appear in various avatars, sometimes as bold Rajputanis fighting to their last breath, sometimes as victims of patriarchy exchanged like commodities among families. With such a rich tapestry of images and glimpses of what was then a hundred year old glorious past, *Saurashtrani Rasdhar* was an important intervention in the historiography of Kathiawad as well as in

its social imagination. It was also in many ways an important literary means to create a discourse of the past not just to claim a historical space but to breathe life into a sense of regional pride for Kathiawadi culture and identity even for future generations. As Meghani writes:

One who resides in Saurashtra will be able to go among any worshipper of culture and tell him proudly: My land has witnessed events that are comparable to the chronicles of England, Greece and Rome and that is why I ask to claim a space for that glorious past [...] -- not in the voice of a supplicant, but full-throated as one who demands his right.  
(Meghani P., *jhaverchandmeghani.com*).

In *Saurashtrani Rasdhar*, ‘rasdhar,’ a word coined by Meghani brings together ‘rasa’ and ‘dhar’ to mean a sense of heritage. Dhar can mean a stream, an edge and conveys both a sense of dynamic continuity as well as a firm sense of foundation as suggested by the similar word ‘aadhar.’ The word ‘rasa’ poses a significant issue for the translator as it has at least seven meanings in Gujarati. Among the variant ones, ‘rasa’ can mean juice, nectar, essence or flavour and also ‘mood’ along the rules of classical poetry which consists of the nava rasas. While the Rasdhar embodies all these nuances, it is also fitting that Meghani, as a writer of the people and an upholder of ‘the Desi’ instead of the ‘Marga’ tradition, uses this double entendre in naming a collection of work that is not about classical literature but about what A. K. Ramanujan has called the “literature of the dialects, those mother tongues of the village, street, kitchen, tribal hut, and wayside tea shop [...] the wide base of the Indian pyramid on which all other Indian literatures rest” (4). It is clear that Meghani plays with these meanings even as his five-volume collection of stories has a

separate index that classifies all the stories along certain qualities: Sauryakatho (stories of valour), Dilavarini Kathao (stories of large-heartedness), Sheel ane Swarpanni Kathao (stories of temperance and self-sacrifice), Premkathao (love stories). That the qualities of valour, generosity, temperance and self-sacrifice are qualities that best exhibit the true culture of Kathiawad to the unfamiliar reader is also significant for the nationalist context of the early twentieth century. On reading the Rasdhar, R. V. Pathak, a prominent writer and critic of the time wrote that the purpose of the stories was to acquaint readers with “lokswabhav” or the “nature of the popular” in emotive and expressive modes particular to the common man. He also points out that such stories and the qualities present in them such as heroism, the empowerment of women and virtuousness were all relevant for the present society which had lost its vigour (Doshi 2002: 217). Thus, what Meghani had intended to create at the level of a regional consciousness lent itself almost seamlessly for the cause of nationalism.

### **Shape-Shifting Sources**

Meghani, “a child of the mountains of Saurashtra”, as he called himself, travelled far and wide in over a period of 9 to 10 years collecting and documenting repositories of oral culture through folk stories, songs, ballads and various other forms of popular memory. He wrote these down in bits and pieces as he encountered them in all the variety of linguistic regional inflections spanning rural dialects of Sorathi, Kutchi among dozens of other variations and all these interwoven in the end with his own knowledge of chaste or *shisht* scholarly Gujarati. In addition to this linguistic confluence, he himself simultaneously worked as a journalist, editor, and writer as he wrote for the recently established journal *Saurashtra* on a few days of the week and took to travelling and collecting folktales

on other days. The notes he took were then freely edited, extended, rewritten into the final form of the stories of Rasdhar. Other insertions into the tale included details of location, time of the event and dialogue in order to create the sense of an oral narration in the written form (Doshi 220). This process of rewriting, editing and shaping the story out of a lokvarta that has elements of music, repetition and improvisation in its narrative constitute a number of translational changes on the sites of language, orality and form.

To illustrate the issue of language, when Meghani's first attempt at collecting, correcting stories from Saurashtra was published and brought him fame, Sundaram, a well-known poet and writer at that time, criticized the register of the language and found it to be refined with each edition:

One does not hear this kind of language from a Charan. [...] The stories of Rasdhar are beginning to be cast in the mould of our 'Shisht' Gujarati and this is why they are losing their singularity. I am afraid that in the days to come these stories will only be read and would have lost their oral potential (ibid.).

Sundaram further points out that "when a story remains circulating through orality, the problem of the 'correct register' does not arise. But when it is put down on paper, it falls unwittingly into this trap" (ibid.). This comment was taken so seriously by Meghani that the next volume of stories that came out had a distinctly Sorathi touch, with phrases and words left intact. He also included a glossary of terms and explanations in Gujarati for readers unfamiliar with certain terms of phrases and usages of Kathiawadi. One can clearly see that the problem that Sundaram was talking about was essentially a problem of translation and orality. Yet, the *Rasdhar* is not

merely a literary attempt at ‘translating’ a rural repository of oral traditions into ‘urban’ forms of language. The dichotomies of oral, print, rural, urban, pre-modern, modern and so on risk the danger of drawing unequal and inaccurate relations between the two. Many scholars have already laid bare the intellectual fallacies in conceiving the folk as primarily oral, pre-modern and a marker of a so-called rural mode of experience and memory. Let us look at some of these conceptions.

### **Theorizing Orality**

Several scholars have grappled with a meaningful understanding of the orality of narrative traditions. Linda Hess, in the context of the study of Kabir oral traditions, observes that one of the great features of orality is that it is embodied (Hess 2015: 1). It deals with more than words and comes from the corporeal moorings of a speaker and listener both engaged bodily and mentally in the same space and time. These performative exchanges of meaning-making and interpretation cannot operate without context. And each context is as integral to a telling as is its own message. By conceiving of orality outside the mechanism of the text “that holds its own shape” (ibid, 4), orality becomes not only a contextualised expressive mode but equally a domain of collective and individual experience.

Conventional notions of orality have dwelt upon fluidity as opposed to the fixity of the written letter as a primary feature of orality. But such polarisation is a fallacy as the written and the oral exist in tandem. Devy (2010) argues that literature and what he calls ‘orature’ are both overlapping linguistic manifestations of a society’s creative imagination. [...] A close analysis of any significant ‘written’ work of

literature will indicate that it has internalized and consciously foregrounded features of ‘spoken’ language, such as speech rhythms, conversational tones and musical tonality, dialects and regional styles. Similarly, no composition belonging to a given oral tradition is free of linguistic self-consciousness; and devices serving to aid memory, such as pauses and stops or ‘punctuation’, allusions to earlier compositions and texts, and even stylistic clues that help in exploration of the authorial imagination are all features of written literature (30).

Furthermore, the conception of orality as a bounded phenomenon anchored in rural or popular modes of expression implies a romantic view of the rural and risks the danger of pitting its perceived ‘impoliteness’ against the metallic excesses of the city. Scholar like A. K Ramanujan has convincingly observed:

“Folk texts are pervasive, behind, under, around all the texts of our society, and in all its strata, not merely among the rural and the illiterate, the “unreflective many.” City and village, factory and kitchen, Hindu, Buddhist, and Jaina, Christian, and Muslim, king, priest, and clown, the crumbling almanac and the runaway computer—all are permeated by oral traditions, tales, jokes, beliefs, and rules of thumb not yet found in books”.

Consequently, the trope of speaking that Merrill (2009) alludes to becomes an important aspect of orality in challenging not only the notion of text as written property, but also in unsettling anxieties about origin. Each telling becomes as valid as another, each version of a story as legitimate as another. The question that belies this situation is not then of

the authentic text, but of what each version itself points to and the contexts that it harbours and consists of.

More recently, scholars like Francesca Orsini and Katherine Butler Schofield have turned their attention to theorizing “the deep interdependencies of written text, sound, performer, audience and meaning” in order to study orality as part of “a cultural and literary field that can be mapped historically” (2015: 4).

Furthermore, there is no one form of a story, no one version. Meghani’s sources were people from various occupations, castes, gender and class. Sometimes there was more than one version of the same tale as in the case of a story called Hothal that has versions in both Kathiawad and Kutch. Which would be the original and what would be the source text? If a folktale can be defined as “a poetic text that carries some of its cultural contexts within it; it is also a travelling metaphor that finds a new meaning with each new telling” (qtd. in Mukherjee 2016). Doesn’t every telling then become another travelling metaphor, the metaphor of a metaphor and so on in a layered network of resonating intertextualities?

To conclude, how do we situate *Saurashtrani Rasdhar* in a discussion of Translation Studies? If we go back to Gentzler’s idea of translation as an always ongoing process of ‘every’ communication, *Saurashtrani Rasdhar* emerges as a negotiated retelling that embodies multiple encounters and border crossings. The encounter between Meghani and the people of Kathiawad, the encounter of two different classes, a retelling that not only spans different media but also enables the metaphorical border crossing between Saurashtra and Gujarat. Furthermore, the Rasdhar draws from the same cultural and linguistic socio-sphere as the oral narratives that it retells. Yet

is also an instance that deconstructs the sense of regional homogeneity of Gujarat as a bounded region where Gujarati is spoken. It allows for spaces of alterity challenging prescriptions of linguistic and historical modes of being and remembering. It also legitimizes the spoken language in all its unstandardised variety as a valid mode of literature. In addition, it establishes an alternative history not just vis a vis the mainstream narrative of stereotypes but effectuates this by retaining forms of remembering by those at the margins, economically, culturally and socially.

Oral narratives unsettle anxieties of origin by being untraceable and unbordered- shapeshifting sources- sources taken in their true etymological sense of ‘surgere’ in French or to ‘rise or to spring up,’ a travelling metaphor characterized by its motility. The Rasdhar then needs to be read in its own context, not as a target tied in limbo with a source, but as an elusive telling whose story needs to be read and uncovered on its own terms and the multiple contexts that it straddles as a self-conscious early twentieth century piece of writing. I resort once more to Ramanujan to conclude the matter of shape-shifting sources and elusive targets befittingly with a folktale.

In a folktale told about Aristotle in Europe and about a philosopher in India, the philosopher meets a village carpenter who has a beautiful old knife, and asks him, “How long have you had this knife?” The carpenter answers, “Oh, this knife has been in our family for generations. We have changed the handle a few times and the blade a few times, but it is the same knife”. Similarly, the structure of relations may remain constant, while all the cultural details change, as in a folktale that goes on changing from teller to teller. Any fixity, any reconstructed archetype, is a fiction, a label, a convenience” (Ramanujan 1988: 6).



## References

- Desai, Shambhuprasad H. 'British Samrajya.' Saurashtrano Itishas, (Junagadh: Sorath Shikshan ane Sanskriti Sangh) 712-757.
- Devy, Ganesh. 2010. Orality and Literacy. *A Concise Companion to Postcolonial Literature*, ed. by Shirley Chew and David Richards, 29-39. West Sussex: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Doshi, Yashwant et al. 2002. Sankalan: Saurashtrani Rasdhar -Vividh Lekhako. Meghanivechansandoh Khand 1, ed. by Jayant Meghani, 216-220. Ahmedabad: Gurjar Granthratna Karyalaya.
- Gentzler, Edwin. 2014. Translation without Borders. *Translation: A Transdisciplinary Journal* 4. Online: <http://translation.fusp.it/articles/translation-without-borders>.
- Hess, Linda. 2015. Introduction. *Bodies of Song*, 1-18. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meghani, Jhaverchand. 2014. Nivedan (Preface). *Samagra Meghani Sahitya: Granth 9*, ed. by Jayant Meghani, 1-33. Ahmedabad: Gujarat Sahitya Akademy.
- Meghani, Jhaverchand. 2014. Saurashtrani Rasdhar. *Samagra Meghani Sahitya: Granth 9*, ed. by Jayant Meghani. Ahmedabad: Gujarat Sahitya Akademy.
- Meghani, Pinaki. 2002. *Jhaverchand Meghani*. Online: <http://www.jhaverchandmeghani.com/life-2.htm>.
- Merrill, Christi. 2009. *Riddles of Belonging: India in Translation and Other Tales of Possession*. Fordham: Fordham Univ Press.
- Mukherjee, Oindrila. 2016. Why India's shape-shifting folk stories need to be read all over again. Bottom Shelf. Online: <http://scroll.in/article/801280/why-these-shape-shifting-indian-stories-need-to-be-read-all-over-again>
- Orsini, Francesca, and Katherine B. Schofield. 2015. Introduction. *Tellings and Texts: Music, Literature and Performance in North India*, 1-28. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.
- Preyer, G. and Mathias Bos. 2013. Introduction: Borderlines in the time of Globalisation. *Borderlines in a Globalized World: New Perspectives in a Sociology of the World-System*. Springer Science & Business Media, ix-xviii, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Krupa Shah

Ramanujan, A. K. March, 1988. Who Needs Folklore? The Relevance of Oral Traditions to South Asian Studies,1-15. Manoa: University of Hawaii.

\*\*\*

# Ambapali's Verse in Therigatha: Trajectories and Transformations

SUPRIYA BANERJEE

## Abstract

*Translation is a methodological democratic tool. It not only uses the 'original' discourses as its means to create awareness for texts in various language forms; it can also be credited for recreating adaptations, interpretations, and retellings as a knowledge form. An entire semiotic body of work is exchanged into another expansive body consisting of different registers and temporalities, which furthermore interfaces with a new social, political and cultural context. The role of time as a chronological factor only is a fallacy, as it meanders through the translation process and marks its presence through the transcreation processes. The paper proposes to delve into the lives of the Buddhist nuns as described in the Therigatha, and highlight how the fluidity and inter-textual nuances of translation in English language influences the reception of the centuries old text. Reading for the purpose of understanding a text is not only individualistic, but is a social and political process which may sometimes colour the entire spectrum of receiving a discourse.*

**Keywords:** Translation, Reception, Chronology, Culture Controlled Preferences, Transcreation.

## Introduction

Almost all the texts make a journey dodging variables akin to metamorphosis, hemi-metabolism, progeria or stagnation. The question we need to ask ourselves is that do we need to apply certain tools or methodologies specifically and systematically to map a discourse in a definitive framework *ala* Algebra? Etymologically, *Algebra* comes from an Arabic word which means "reunion of broken parts". Does a reader look at a reunion of variables in a text, finding its value, or encourage the chaotic randomness trying to evaluate their impact without pronouncing judgements? In the case of translated texts, the bone of contention lies with issues of accuracy with the source text, suitability of language, vocabulary and the cultural contexts. Whether a translated text can be read as a completely metamorphosized one, is it repetitive and stagnated, or in-between?

This paper proposes to analyse three translations of '*Ambapali - The Poems of Twenty Verses from the Therigatha*'. To begin with, the *Therigatha* is an anthology of poems by the first Buddhist ordained nuns in India. Although the poems are not as old compared to the Rigveda, they are still some of the "first" poems in India by women, and as a collection it is the first anthology of women's literature in the world. The usage of the adjective first is to point something of primary importance to us. However, how do we define first? Does this first define our readings, or our reception? Or does it predispose us towards finding the historicity, or does it in any way influence the aesthetics of its imaginative, expressive or emotional content?

These poetry, or songs, as we receive them today are in translation. *Therigatha* was originally composed in ancient

Indian vernaculars, or in various Prakrits which was reworked in Pali by Dhammapala, the Srilankan Bhikkhu. The imprints of linguistic, cultural and textual peculiarities of these songs/poetry, their definitive associations and expectations for audiences and the messages about impermanence leaves us with the question of mapping of broken parts through a methodology. If we refer to the *Therigatha* as a text which a student of literature decides to study, the ambiguity would lie in the numerous translations, which show remarkable trajectory of cultural and historical effects which marks the entire discourse. The labyrinth of traversing a discourse which is received in translation originally, becomes a paradox in itself as it is dated to the end of third century BCE.

What translations should one refer to, how one reads '*The Therigatha*', and what should be the concerns when one picks up a translation of the same. The translated version of Dhammapala had been translated in the sixth century CE. from different vernaculars or Prakrits, the time when Pali as a language also underwent certain standardization processes as a language in the scriptural canon. It is a part of the Theravada Buddhist religious canon, and John Ross Carter and Mahinda Palihawadana, when considering the *Therigatha*, say that 'it is a religious work, meant to inculcate a certain set of religious and ethical values and a certain manner of perception of life and its problems and their solutions'.

The *Therigatha* although in many different Prakrits did not fall into the canon of classical Sanskrit religious text, however, unlike other works in Apabhramsa or Prakrit compositions, it drew various translations in English. In *An Essay in Definition*, Sujit Mukherjee writes that 'absolutely literal translations, in any case, is impossible in literature, whether in ancient or modern works, but the degree of

correspondence sometimes decreases in inverse proportion to the distance in time between the original composition and the translation. For instance, the liberties taken by P. Lal in translating ancient texts was a case in point of churning out a *mélange* of interpretation, readability, and an attempt to bolster reception of classical texts in terms of one's own socio-cultural contexts.

*The Therigatha* is included in the ninth section of the book *Khuddaka Nikaya* of the *Sutapittaka*. The Pali canon has three divisions or *Tripitakas*, translated as the three baskets, along with the abstract doctrine or the *Abhidhamma*. *The Therigatha* is traditionally juxtaposed with a much larger collection 'The *Theragatha*'. These two anthologies, which were originally in different vernaculars of ancient India, date back to the earliest period of Buddhist history, though committed to writing perhaps only around 80 BCE. They were first printed in the West as translations from Dhammapala's '*Paramattadipani*' in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in versions edited by R. Pischel and H. Oldenberg respectively from Pali. The *Therigatha* has had a remarkable history of modern translations, beginning with the translation into German by Karl Eugen Neumann, into Bangla by Bijoy Chandra Majumdar, and into Sinhala by Martin Wickramasingha, who in turn, mentions an English translation by Caroline Rhys David. The *Therigatha* has been translated into many languages, the latest being in 2015 by Charles Hallisley, a professor of Buddhist Studies at Harvard, made available in paperback by Murthy Classics.

The paper explores three translations from the *Therigatha* which is generally attributed to Ambapali. She was a famous courtesan who turned a *bhikkhuni*, and is popularized in Bollywood as 'Amrapali'. The first of these translations is by

Catherine Rhys Davis (Oxford, UK), titled as *'The Psalms of the Sisters'* in 1909, the second translation is by Thanissaro Bhikku in 1995, and the third one by Charles Hallisley (Harvard, USA) in 2015. All three translations refer to Dhammapala's text in Pali as their primary source, and all three translations add to the text the rubrics of division of names or 'nipata' as followed by Dhammapala. The three translations are in English language, however it is a translation of a translation, thus it is problematic to acknowledge an absolute fidelity to the lexical or the linguistic, or cultural adjustment to the original.

When we look at a particular text in translation, especially in the case of religious texts, the maze begins to unfold regarding its structure, time and history. How do we read the translated texts, how do they differ in their choice of words, meter, meanings, sometimes they go as far as depicting a lady's eyes from blue to black, or arms from twin cylindrical pillars to rounded door bars to iron cross bars for holding doors shut, thighs from coils of a snake to the trunk of an elephant? The translator of older works may not have the advantage of inhabiting practically the same world that of the original author, which may give rise to generalizations due to the availability of readership of the original text, coupled with unfamiliarity with the world of the source text.

For instance, from 1909 to 2015, there is a difference of over a hundred years, which may explain why Catherine Rhys Davis uses the term 'mother of pearl' to describe Ambapali's neck, signifying rarity; whereas the other two translators use a more common 'conch shell' to describe the same. Before the creation of cultured pearls in the early 1990s, natural pearls were so expensive that they were reserved only for the noble and very rich, and when the pearl fever had reached its peak,

the historian Suetonius wrote that the Roman general Vitellius financed an entire military campaign by selling just one of his mother of pearl earrings. From the queen of Egypt, Cleopatra, who had a special fascination for pearls in Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* in which one can find the purported uses of 'Pearl' to a Buddhist monk. Thanissaro's interpretation, who does not distinguish a pearl from a conch shell, marks the distance in historic terms. Pearls started being commercially manufactured; the economic value of pearls came down, the Conch scored better as it had a religious significance in Theravada Buddhism and thus the preferred choice of words used. The culture controlled preferences, the linguistic choices a translator exercises constantly explains why modern versions of the texts can vary so much from earlier ones.

By translating '*The Therigatha*', Catherine Rhys David in 1909, and '*The Theragatha*' in 1913 reversed the order of the translation of Dhammapala by putting the women's writing first in the order of preference. She, in her introduction, went to some lengths in highlighting the uniqueness of the women's writings and rejected the doubts about feminine authorship cast by the German translator K. E. Neumann of both the gathas. She proclaimed on the universality of religious experiences, she drew the attention to need to remember "since the patriarchal age set in has women succeeded in so breaking through her barriers as to set on lasting record the expression of herself and of things as they appeared to her".

This period significantly coincides with the Suffrage movement in Great Britain, the women's right to political equality. In reading Catherine Rhys David, we take in the entire social political contexts of translating from a colonized nation that she brings into her writings. Note the difference in



*“Such and not otherwise runneth the rune, the word of the soothsayer”* and the next two translation’s *“it is just as the Buddha, the speaker of truth, said, nothing different than that”*. The dictionary gives us three meanings of the word ‘rune’: Rune is a letter of an ancient Germanic alphabet; Rune is a mark of mysterious or magical significance, or stones or bones bearing divinatory symbols. The Buddha is significantly absent from her translation.

The translation by Catherine Rhys Davis focuses the position of the senior ordained nuns, as a testimonial to their religious achievement, personal expression and self-realization processes. This is a period when feminists were fighting to be accorded the position of a logical rational human being, and not creatures prone to emotional attacks, hysteria and smelling salts. Translation thus became a discovery process; evidence used for social and political causes, the texts from the past became a point to recognize the literary quality among the native women, withstanding pseudo socio cultural heresies of the colonial present.

When we look at a translation of the same by Charles Hallisey in 2015, published by Murthy Classics, originally from the translated version of the Pali text of Dhammapala, which was a further transcription of the verses by Bihalpola Siri Dewarakkhita Thera, revised by Mahagoda Siri Nanissara Thera, published in the Sinhala script in the Simon Hewavitarne Bequest series in 1918. The rubrics on the length or Nipata are found in both Dhammapala’s commentary and Rhy Davis’s translations. However, Dhammapala’s commentary is a much elaborate work which provides background information on each writer, highlights the contexts, and historiographical insights to the poems.

In his notes on Ambapalli, Hallisey refers to Pruitt (Pruitt 1999: 260) inferring that Ambapali was made a courtesan by a judge because the princes fought over her to woo her over saying 'let her belong to everyone'. Charles Hallisey made a commendable attempt to integrate work from a non-western canon, so as to 'let it belong to everyone'. The translated verses come to us as a chorus from a social institution of women who have renounced the worldly pleasures and the objects therein. The minute details lie in the selection of words which perhaps did not exist in those days. 'The perfume box' which is referred by Hallisey is a 'casket of perfumes' by Rhys David, the 'colour of bees' is a transcreation from 'as the down of the bee', rabbit is derived from hare, and there is no mention of Rhys David's 'fallen fair plaits' but replaced by a more culturally appropriate 'held in by a bunch of pins' referring to Ambapali's hair. The Rune is absent here; substituted by again a more historically appropriate: 'It is just as the Buddha, the speaker of truth, said nothing different from that'.

Unlike Rhys Jones, one can find a sharp distinction in Charles Hallisey's translation used to describe Ambapali in the poem where she had described herself in Prakrit, translated by Dhammapala in Pali. Note the difference in the terminologies used by a colonizer as Rhys Jones translates Ambapali's eyes as blue and long lidded, swarthy plaits in head dresses, jewelled and golden, pencilled brows, arms like cylindrical pillars, thighs like coils of snake, and so on. However, in 2015, the advent of post-colonial thinking prompts the Harvard scholar uses a more anthropological thrust by using the corresponding adjectives as black eyes, hair adorned with gold, brows as contoured lines drawn by a good artist, arms as iron crossbars and thighs as the trunks of an elephant.

Interestingly, the disenchantment with possessions as a Buddhist world view has adorned the verse of Ambapali by Hallisey with analogies to bracelets 'finished' to perfection, 'polished' conch shells, 'polished' slabs of gold, 'smooth' rings of gold, 'smooth' anklets made of gold, a visual treat of opulence contrasting with modern objects of decay like 'falling' plaster, 'empty' leather water bags, 'out of shape' body parts. The tropes of opulence are contrasted with tropes of decay in nature to serve spiritual entropy, which eventually becomes the turning point. This particular verse by Hallisey focuses on how women reflected pragmatically on their defining traditions, and learned to change it towards a newer orientation. This is an entirely different perspective from Rhys Davis who translated *Therigatha* as of voice of the women from the distant exotic parts.

Furthermore, when we read Thanissara Bhikku's (Geoffrey DeGraff) translation, we find the use of hemp for hair in the place of jute by Hallisey, in the place of casket or box of fragrance we find a basket, the hair discovers a comb, no contour artist for the brows, the arms become door bars instead of crow bars and iron pillars and the elephant trunk remains the same as in Hallisey. However, the Rune and the Buddha translates into 'the truth of the truth speaker's words doesn't change'. Buddha's teachings is summed up in what is called the three noble truths, four universal truths and the eight fold path which together is translated as the Dharma for the global audiences. It is obvious that connotative and denotative importance of the word 'Truth sayer' by a monk who as a westerner, is the receiver of the word 'Truth', has however skirted aligning it to the principle of 'sva-prakasa' or that truth is knowledge which is self-illuminating. Satya which is a Sanskrit word for truth is one of the five yamas, the virtual restraint from falsehood and distortion of reality in one's

expressions and actions. The Indian philosophy treats truth within an epistemological context, and various knowledge is connected to various truths. If truth is veridicality, or pramana, then the truth sayer becomes attached to a series of cognitions and a series of beliefs, perceptual, inferential testimonial and hypothetical as a result of effort and action or karma. This then generally defeats the idea of an unattached self-hood proposed by Buddha.

Sujit Mukherjee writes in his *Essay on Translation as Discovery* that ‘the foreign translator is a rare creature since his affiliation with Indian literature is a by-product of his academic specialization in some Indian language’.

However, all the three translations refer to spiritual upliftment, inspired by the Dhammapala ‘Udanas’ which are inspired utterances about the joy of freedom and spiritual elevation. *Rupantar* (change in form) or *Anuvad* (speaking after) are commonly understood senses of translation, however, neither demands fidelity to the original. None of the hair splitting in the translations mentioned here is aimed at denigrating the uniqueness of the works and their contribution to the society on the whole. These translations are transformations which are new creations, adapting to the uniqueness of the comprehending translator.

So, can we take a leaf out of the page from here when we read, treating each text as a transcreation? The ambiguities of understanding a text completely, especially when we do not have an access to an original text, and one is only reading a translation of a translation, the smaller details though of great consequence can be brushed aside for a while for the greater good.

## References

- Carter, John Ross, and Mahinda Palihawadana (trans.) 2000. *The Dhammpada: Sayings of the Buddha*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Choubey, Asha. 2009. Voices from the Yore: Therigatha Writings of the Bhikkhunis. *The Indian Review of World Literature in English*, 5.2.
- Garg, G. R. (ed.) 1992. *Encyclopedia of the Hindu World*, Vol-3. New Delhi: Concert Publishing Company.
- Hallisey, Charles. 2015. *Therigatha Poems of the First Buddhist Women*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Jha, Bhaskar. (trans.) 1987. *History of Indian Literature: Buddhist Literature* by M. Winternitz. Delhi: Bhartiya Vidya Prakashan.
- Mukherjee, Sujit. 1994. *Translation as Discovery*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman Private Limited.
- Pischel, Richard. (ed.) 1883. *Therigatha* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, with an appendix by L. Alsdorf). London: Pali Text Society.
- Pliny, *Natural History*, IX.59.119-121; also Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, III.17.14-17.
- Pruitt, Willam, (ed.) 1998. *Therigatha-atthakatha*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Rhys Davids, C. A. F. and K. R. Norman. (trans.) 1989. *Poems of Early Buddhist Nuns (Therigatha)*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.

\*\*\*

# **Enigma of Translation and Indian Philosophy: A Reading of Harivansh Rai Bachchan's Madhushala**

**MANISH PRASAD**

## **Abstract**

*In Translation Studies, what is the relation of one text with another? When we 'synthesise' a composite text, as translation or as recreation, out of several 'variants' or source language text, what is its status and use? When several types get mixed together to form new texts, it becomes the admixture random and promiscuous. Or does it add up to a functioning unity, serving an artistic, meaningful whole? These are questions which are related with and raised against translation. In my proposed paper I would like to attempt answers to the above questions – not only theoretically but also through the analysis of Harivansh Rai Bachchan's Madhushala and its archetype, the 'mixture of types, the 'variants' with Edward Fitzgerald's Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam and Bachchan's own translation of Fitzgerald's Khayyam ki Madhushala and how do they mean what they actually mean. In the rest of the paper, I shall try to reconstruct and explain how translation can lead and help in the production of knowledge from some Indian Philosophical point(s) of view. For example, the cannibalistic theory of textual consumption has been reworked to offer an alternative perspective on the role of the translator, one in*

*which the act of translation is seen in terms of physical metaphors that stress both the creativity and the independence of the translator. This same theory finds its parallel in our Indian Philosophy in case of knowledge production, where knowledge is produced and reproduced through the process of translation and results in a new creative work of the translator, having his/her independence over the target language text. Thus, through Bachchan's Madhushala I would like to show one of the possible Indian views of translation as a process of knowledge production and the need for freedom of knowledge that is translation from barrier, which Lawrence Venuti calls "the scandal of translation".*

**Keywords:** Translation, Knowledge, Indian Philosophy, Madhushala, Scandal, Freedom

## **Introduction**

Translation is a two-way process and to translate is, in all conceivable sense, to get translated, as the process of algorithm gives us a way and our categories become exposed, implicated, vulnerable and compromised. The act of translation is a weaving of relationship whereby the intimate whisperings and pulsation of the given text begin to resonate, as its semantic recreations delve through our being. Over the last three decades, Translation Studies as a discipline has emerged as a highly evolved and differentiated field of enquiry and the chorus of scholarly opinion has built the new century as the century of translation. However, there are certain questions which are raised against in relation to it, such as - what is the

relation of one text with another? When we ‘synthesise’ a composite text, as translation or as recreation, out of several ‘variants’ or source language text, what is its status and use? When several types of texts get mixed together to form new texts, is the admixture random and promiscuous, or does it add up to a functioning unity, serving an artistic, meaningful whole? In this paper, I would try to answer some of the above questions and also seek to explore how translation can be a way of knowledge production, through the analysis of Dr. Harivansh Rai Bachchan’s *Madhushala* (1935) and its archetype, the ‘mixture of types, the ‘variants’ with Edward Fitzgerald’s *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* (1859) and Bachchan’s own translation of Fitzgerald’s as *Khayyam ki Madhushala* (1933).

### **Journey of Madhushala from Khayyam to Bachchan**

The famous Hindi poet Bachchan translated the poetry of Omar Khayyam from Edward Fitzgerald’s English translation into his mother tongue. Omar Khayyam in his *Rubaiyat* was primarily concerned with spiritual values, a man going in his own way to solitude, appealed to others but independent of their thoughts. He was passionate to revolt against the fixed ideas of his age. According to Monsieur Nicolus, although Omar is the material epicurean for the general reader, he was also a mystic figure. He shadowed the deity under the figure of wine, wine-bearer, and cup, as Hafiz, Jami, and other Sufi poets used to do (Maine, Introduction 2000). Omar took recourse to wine to excite himself to that pitch of devotion which other Sufis reached through crisis and ‘hurlemens’. Whenever wine, wine-bearer and cup occur in the text of Bachchan, one is tested to think that he was indoctrinated by the Sufi tradition within which he read the poems.



When Edward Fitzgerald translated Omar Khayyam into English, he gave his own emotions and thought to it. To him a translation must have appeared as a living body. If there is no soul in the original then the translator should give his own soul and voice. He did the same in case of Omar Khayyam. Therefore, the soul and life force we find in Fitzgerald's translation of Omar is present in no other translation (Bachchan, Preface 2014). It was the great Victorian crisis between Science and Religion that provided the background for Fitzgerald to translate Omar. Bachchan in his Preface to *Khayyam Ki Madhushala* writes, in everyone's life there comes such a moment that the *Rubaiyat of Omar* starts echoing his own thought. Fitzgerald's *Rubaiyat* is an elegy of all faith whatsoever. It states its case with a certain touch of melancholy, but without any cry of distress. Too resigned to be poignant, too philosophical to be bitter about it, it dismisses the dream, and accepts with appetite – almost with gratitude – what is left (Houseman, Introduction, the *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*).

Fitzgerald's translation creates an interest from its form, and also in its detail. According to George F Maine, he did not translate Omar to make a poetic transfusion of the quatrains to suit his own fancy. This he did in such a way that his work appears better than the original, although he took liberty with the text. About half of the quatrains are faithful paraphrases of the original. The remaining quatrains are built up of ideas taken from this quatrain and that of figures which have no prototypes in the original but arrive from numerous sources such as Hafiz and the *Discourse of the Birds* of Attar.

Bachchan translated Fitzgerald's Omar Khayyam in his mother tongue, Hindi in 1933. He opines that it was the very failure of Indians' protest against the British that prepared the

setting for his translation of Fitzgerald's Omar. In the 1930s there was a huge crisis of thought among the Indians regarding their freedom. The arrest of Indian Revolutionaries like Bhagat Singh, Chandrashekhar Azad and some other political leaders, the captivity of Mahatma Gandhi just after his return from the second Round Table Conference, challenged the beliefs and faith of nationalism. Their voice like that of Bachchan found its echo in Fitzgerald. In his essay "Vernacularizing Rubaiyat: the politics of Madhushala in the context of the Indian Nationalism", A. Casting opines that this also led Omar's translation into many regional languages of India, including even in Hindi (Seyed-Gohrab 2012).

In his preface to Fitzgerald's translation entitled *Khayyam ki Madhushala*, Bachchan writes that the Rubaiyat of Fitzgerald is neither completely of Omar Khayyam nor of Fitzgerald. The thoughts, feeling and artistry of both the writers have together given birth to a third product which has the maturity of the ancient and attractiveness of the modern, the fragrance of the East and the "*chaitanya*" of the West. In Bachchan's translation as in the original, Rubaiyat is a song of morning to evening, from beginning of life to its end. There are two figures, Omar Khayyam and his beloved. But this is not simply a dialogic relation between Omar and his Lady-Love. This is about the life's long journey from birth to death. This is about the time from when we human beings become aware of this world till we leave it. It is a voice of such a soul which cannot see anything beyond this world, one who is not satisfied, but unable to leave this world.

Suna maine, kahte kuch log  
Madhur jag par maanav ka raaj.  
Aur kuch kehte-jag se door  
Swarg mai he sab such ka saaj.

Door ka chhor pralovan, moh,  
Karo, jo paas usi ka mol,  
Suhana bhar lagte hai, pran,  
Aare, ye door-door ke dhol. (Bachchan 2014: 12)

The soul becomes affectionate to this world. However, the more he gets closer, the more the feeling of sadness comes to him. He dreams of another world, but his weakness drives him to this world.

Bachchan in his preface to *Bachchan ki Madhushala* writes that he has not been satisfied with his early translation. His beliefs and feelings for his motherland did not find a complete expression in *Khayyam ki Madhushala*. Therefore, like Omar, he now takes up wine, wine-bearer and cup to speak about his views on nationalism and express his concerns of humanism. Maine noted in Omar's Rubaiyat, wine is symbolic of the spirit; the cup – the receptacle of the spirited powers poured out in service; Bread, the Divine Mind or Food from Heaven; the Bulbul or Persian nightingale – the symbol of the soul in the darkness or hidden depths of man's own being. Bachchan used these signifiers into a new system of signification.

Bachchan's *Madhushala* seems to have the same Sufi tone that Omar had when he writes *Madhubala* (the wine bearer) and *Madhukalash* (the decanter) at the same time. Bachchan's *Madhushala* is not simply about nationalism, freedom and independence of India, it in fact speaks about the liberation of the whole humanity. Humanism appears much stronger when the feelings of sensuousness pour out in his poetry.

Adhro par ho koi bhi ras  
Jibha par lagti hala,

Bhojan ho koi hathon mai  
Lagta rakha hai pyala,  
Har surat saki ki surat  
Mai parivartit ho jati,  
Ankho ke age ho kuch bhi,  
Ankho mai hai Madhushala. (Bachchan 2001: 32)

The magical transmutation of the variegated objects into the chosen signifiers of haala – pyala – saki and Madhushala, speaks out very clearly of the poets' overarching humanism.

Bachchan's Madhushala apperars as the attempt of the translator to produce a text which is so transparent that it seems to be a recreation, not merely a translation. It is a point to be noted that a translated text is often acceptable by readers, reviewers and publishers when it is fluently readable, when the change in form and style of any linguistic and semantic peculiarities involved in it seem transparent, creating the impression that it truly reflects the source language text writer's personality or intension or may be the underlying meaning of the respective text. It is a fact that immediately after translating *The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* into Hindi Bachchan became famous as the poet of *Madhushala*. It is as if with the birth of Bachchan the translator, the poet Bachchan is also born in the realm of Hindi poetry. The process of translation is not inferior to poetic creation has been a well-known and well-appreciated view in Translation Studies. But far more interesting view would be the foregrounding of the poetic poetic-self hand in hand with the translator-self, as it happens in case of Bachchan. And it happens in reality much more interestingly than one could generally think about it. For Bachchan not only translated Khayyam through Fitzgerald, he also recreated the Rubaiyat in his own way different from

Fitzgerald, and made it available to public through recitations on stage. He says that *Rubaiyat* as poetry becomes much more appealing when it is sung and listened to rather than when it is read. With Bachchan, it is generally said that the tradition of poetry singing and recitation started in Hindi for the stage. Before him when the major Chayavaadi poets including Dinkar used to come on stage, very few people paid attention to contemporary Hindi poetry. But after Bachchan appearing in 'Kavi Samelan', the practice of poetry singing reached a height. It used to continue for night after night and people came to listen to them with full excitement and devotion towards poetry.

### **Scandal, Marginalization and Importance of Translation**

When a text is already translated into English, and translated fluently and has become popular for whatever reason it may be, any other translation of that text or of the English version is scandalized probably due to the power relation of such languages with the English tongue. This particular issue may be critically read from the angle Lawrence Venuti has sought to provide while talking about the scandals of translation, which are cultural, economic and political. Translation is stigmatized as a form of writing, discouraged by copyright law, depreciated by the academy, exploited by publishers and corporations, governments and religious organisations (Venuti 2002). Translation, according to Venuti, is tackled so disadvantageously, partly because it occasions revelations that question the authority of dominant cultural values and institutions, which is also a method of critique for the Post-Colonial thinkers. The scandal of translation is also partly determined by the individualist's conception of authorship that continues to prevail in the Western culture. According to this conception, in writing, the author freely

expresses his thoughts and feelings. And most importantly it is viewed as an original and transparent self-representation, unmediated by trans-individual determinants which are linguistic, cultural and social. What is more, sometimes translation complicates the authorial originality. And so it becomes an apparent complication whether to consider Fitzgerald's *The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* as original or just as an assimilation of variants of other Persian poets and a transcreation of original as translation.

This draws two implications. On the one hand, translation is defined as a second-order interpretation: the translated language text is taken to be derivative, potentially a false copy, a Platonic creation, while the source language text is taken to be original, an authentic copy, which is true to the author's personality or creation. On the other hand, translation is required to efface its second-order status with the effect of transparency, producing the illusion of authorial presence whereby the translated text can be taken as the original (Venuti 2000). This implication becomes clear when we place Bachchan's *Khayyam ki Madhushala* and his magnum opus *Bachchan ki Madhushala* close to each other. Bachchan translated Fitzgerald as *Khayyam ki Madhushala* in 1933. He became known as a poet and translator only after the publication of *Bachchan ki Madhushala* in the year 1935, probably because his earlier translation got marginalized and persevered under the Colonial Masters' tongue. Bachchan writes in the preface about the way in which this work became the cry of his soul. He did not undertake the translation as a literary exercise: rather, it was a demand from within, a compulsion of a typical Indian poet translating at the time of pre-independence crisis. *Khayyam* supplied a symbol and an idiom for the things endured, suffered and lived, those were massing inside him. Reverting to Bachchan's metaphor used in

his preface, I would say that his gun was already loaded, and that too with ammunition that was very much live, powerful and piercing: what he learned from Omar Khayyam was to pull the trigger. However, this remains an uncultivated area which one may take as a typical case of scandalization of translation.

There is no point of denial these days that the very concept of world literature as a discipline which is fit for academic study depends on the availability of translation. In the conceptualization of an enlightened civilisation, it almost defines the European Renaissance or to speak in a broader sense, every renaissance- the European and non-European. We all know that the 're-birth' of knowledge began as the translation into Latin and then the vernacular languages of the ancient Greek philosophy and science were initiated. Therefore, it can be perhaps taken for granted that translation is essential to our sense of ourselves as readers, and as literate. We will probably find that it is inconceivable to read and study in the absence of translation. According to Edith Grossman, roughly there are about six thousand extant languages in the world of which only about one thousands of them are written. Now, what will happen if we imagine the impact that the disappearance of translation would have on us? To expand our ability to explore the world, the thoughts and feelings of people through literature across the globe, translation is the most important medium. It broadens and deepens our consciousness in countless, indescribable ways (Grossman 2010: 13-14). It enlarges and allows more and more readers to be touched by an author's work. For those writers, as in case of Bachchan, whose first language i.e. Hindi is spoken by millions, though a maximum number of them may be illiterate or so impoverished that buying books is not an option, translation is also essential. English is the world's lingua franca and it is meant to be spoken in places where literacy is

prevalent and people are capable enough to purchase books. To break the discrimination between English language and other languages, translation's role is imperative. To understand this discrimination more clearly one may note one of the double-edged politics about the Nobel Prize where no writer who has not been translated into English can hardly hope for the prize in literature, because English is the one language all the judges can read.

One of the many aspects of Post-Colonial translation – though certainly not the only one – is to raise questions against the Western Eurocentric discrimination between English and the other languages of the world. This becomes more aversive when the translator's visibility is kept aside. The translator's invisibility is weird self-annihilation, a way of conceiving and practicing translation that undoubtedly reinforces its marginal status in the Western Cultures. Even the typical mention of the translator in a review takes the form of a brief aside in which, the fluency and transparency of the translation is gauged. The things appear worse when the space for the translator's authorship is not defined by copyright law, which is equal to or a restriction of the Source Language Text's author's right. The majority of British and American publishers resists the very idea of translation and continuously reduces the presence of too many translated works in their catalogues. Translator's invisibility and the scandal of translation are the flip sides of the same coin. The scandal of translation means the marginalisation of translation by the current hegemonic powers, primarily the West, which is at three levels – cultural, economic and political. For Venuti, the focus on the marginality of translation is strategic. It assumes that a study of the periphery in any culture can illuminate and ultimately revise the centre.” The hegemonic or dominant cultures just make the translation as subordinate to itself. For Venuti, it is



the English language which acts as a vehicle of marginalization, because English is the most translated language and one of the least translated into. Language can form a hierarchy of power relationships, where English speaking societies are at the top. Translation has thus become a neglected entity reinforcing the supremacy of the English language on the one hand and a subversive tool of resistance on the other. The categories that contribute in the marginalisation of translation are: heterogeneity, authorship, copyright, and the formation of cultural identities, the pedagogy of literature, philosophy, the best seller and globalisation.

Once another famous Indian poet and translator A. K. Ramanujan noted that a translator is ‘an artist on oath’. He has a double allegiance, indeed, several double allegiances. All too familiar with the rigors and pleasures of reading a text and those of making another; caught between the need to express himself and the need to represent another; moving between the two halves of one brain, he has to use both to get close to ‘the originals’. Then, translation is interpreted as scandalous not only because it crosses national boundaries, but also because it crosses the ever so precarious institutional borders, in which translation has been tightly bound. But what no one should ever forget or overlook is that what we read in a translation is the translator’s writing. Although the inspiration is the Source Language Text, and thoughtful literary translator like Bachchan approaches the work of Fitzgerald with great deference and respect; the execution of the book in Target language is the task of the translator and so, that work should be judged and evaluated on its own terms. Still, most reviewers do not acknowledge the fact with regard to Bachchan’s translation and a significant majority of them seem incapable of shedding light on the values of his translation or on how it

reflects the original and the sense of Omar's *Rubaiyat* and Sufism. For Bachchan, translating poetry is always a difficult task. He has to separate himself away from his present condition and then start to write his poetry. For him, his poetry is about experiences of his life, not only about life's thinking or meditation. By 1933 Bachchan was defamed as 'Halavaadi' with the publication of his translated work *Khyyam ki Madhushala*. Bachchan never wanted to call himself a 'Halavaadi'. Before him there were many poets who wrote about 'hala, pyala and Madhushala' (Bachchan 2006: 209). It might be because of the success he got in expressing 'hala'. He writes that to make other understand that he was not a 'halavadi', he wrote *Madhubala* and *Madhukalash*. Through the songs of "*Madhukalash*" and "*Madhubala*" he gained his potential energy and gave his reply to the critics. According to Bachchan, there was a need of a ladder to move from Chayavaad to Progressive era and this was provided by a ladder named Halavaad. For Bachchan this much is the importance of Halavaad. However, this tag of 'halavadi' remained under his name.

### **Status of Translation in Indian Philosophy**

Indian philosophy is one of such a branch which also speaks about the translator's visibility and probably provides a way out from the scandal of translation. In Indian philosophy, more especially in the Nyaya tradition, knowledge is often defined as a special form of cognition. The Sanskrit term used for indicating cognition in general has been *buddhi*. The special form of valid knowledge is called *Pramana*. It is believed that everything is revealed to us when they turn into objects of knowledge. It is with the help of the light of knowledge we deal with other objects of the world surrounding

us. The principal categories of Pramana are perception, inference, comparison and testimony.

Testimonial category of knowledge source or Pramana in Indian philosophy is a place for debate since what or whose testimonial evidence would be treated as trustworthy has not been clear. There is a word in the dictionary of Indian philosophy for trustworthy persons, “apta” and certain branches of Indian philosophy and specific groups of philosophers accept “aptavakya” or trustworthy speech as testimonial source of knowledge. The Nyaya philosophers, however, accept the trustworthy speeches only after testing through reason and logic, but these are schools who consider the Vedas as the epitome of testimonial evidence almost unquestioningly.

The testimonial knowledge source depends primarily on the significance of the veridicality of speech or language. Bachchan as translator also depends on the veridicality of Fitzgerald. This can be explained clearly with specific examples from Fitzgerald’s *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*. The veridicality of a poet and his work can be proved when his work follows the tradition of his poetic ancestors. In the essay “Tradition and the Individual Talent” printed in *The Sacred Wood* is very seminal in this respect. Eliot says that the best, even the most ‘individual’ parts of a poet’s work may be those most alive with the influence of his poetic ancestors. There is no significance of a poet or artist in isolation. The whole of past literature should be ‘in the bones’ of the poet with the true historic sense which recognises the presence, as well as the ‘pastness’ of the past. According to Eliot the interdependence of present and past is something which he believed the poet must cultivate. “He must become the continuing current of thought which transcends his private mind, casting off old

writers as defunct, but by growing more complex and perhaps more refined with time” (Blamires 325).

According to Bachchan there is something special at the level of feeling and rhythm in the translation of Fitzgerald which we can find in Alfred Lord Tennyson, for whom it is said that in case of rhythm he can do anything. In his preface to *Khayyam ki Madhuasala* Bachchan writes, from the tune of Rubaiyat “Morning in the Bowl of Night has flung the stone”, one can understand that there is a fusion in the imagery of dawn and twilight and the sound of the ringing bells. There is the sound of flying wings of the bird in the line “Put the stars to flight”. While pronouncing the line “And David’s Lips are lock’t”, it appears that the last word has locked our mouth. From “the brave Music of a distant Drum” it appears that someone is playing the Drum with his hands. Reading the line “their mouths are stopt with Dust”, it seems that someone has filled our mouth with sands. In the Rubaiyat number 46,

For in and out, above, about, below,  
‘Tis nothing but a Magic Shadow-show,  
Play’d in a Box whose Candle is the sun,  
Round which we Phantom Figures come and go.

Bachchan notes that, there is some magic in these symbols. The whole world is dancing on its rhythm ‘in and out, above, about, below’. In the last three lines it appears that the sounds of the dancer’s anklets are also coming out.

In his preface, Bachchan further argues that Fitzgerald knew the English literary tradition very well. His mind could create such a beautiful poetic stanzas, rhythms, powerful words and poetic efficiency that it had become a store house of it. When he starts translating, it appears that the store house of

memories gets opened and very lucidly starts reflecting in his writing and makes it more decorative and mystic. While reading the translation of Fitzgerald, there are many poems which start echoing in the minds of the readers. Bachchan shows this in his preface by comparing the first Rubaiyat by quoting these famous lines of Spenser's *Epithalamion*:

Wake now, my love, awake! For it is time;  
 The Rosy Morne long since left Tithones bed,  
 All ready to her silver coche to clyme;  
 And Phoebus gins toshew his glorious hed. (Spenser)  
 Awake! For Morning in the Bowl of Night  
 Has flung the Stone that Puts the Stars to Flight  
 And Lo! The Hunter of the East Has Caught  
 The Sultan's Turret in a Noose of Light. (Fitzgerald)

There are too many similarities between them. Bachchan further says that, "into the Dust descend; Dust into Dust and under Dust, to lie" is taken from the Bible. From the surface level it appears, there are layers of sands that are placed one upon another. "take the present time" is a line from Shakespeare, and its sound echoes very clearly in Fitzgerald's "take the cash in Hand". In the Rubaiyat "Check of her's to' incarnadine, Bachchan opines that it reminds about the famous line from *Macbeth* "the multitudinous seas incarnadine". In the same way in the Rubaiyat "tomorrow? – why, Tomorrow I may be myself with yesterday's", he finds its voice in *Macbeth*'s famous soliloquy "Tomorrow and Tomorrow ...." The Rubaiyat "Sans Wine, Sans Song, Sans Singer, and-sans everything" is a complete emulation of Shakespeare's *As you like it*'s "Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything", where the only difference is that the earlier is more rhythmical than the other. The line from Robert Herrick's poem "To The

Virgins, to Make Much of Time” – “Old Time is still a flying” and Jasper Manes’ “Time is the feather’d thing...takes wing” appears together in the following lines of Rubaiyat:

“The Bird of Time has but a little way  
To fly – and Lo! the bird is on the Wing.”

If someone compares the line of Herrick’s “And this Same flower that smiles today, tomorrow will be dying” with the following line of Fitzgerald, Bachchan writes, one would find that they appear in the exact manner – “The Flower that once had blown forever dies”. Fitzgerald has replaced ‘today’ and ‘tomorrow’ with ‘once’ and ‘forever’. In the Rubaiyat “We Phantom Figures come and go”, Bachchan finds the echo of Milton’s “come and trip it as you go”. In the same way for him, “Ah...what boots it to repeat” resonances Milton’s famous line from *Lycidas* - “Alas what boots it with uncessant care to tend”. Bachchan says that “Nor all thy Piety nor wit Shall lure it back” of Fitzgerald is taken from Dryden’s poem with the same meaning and context “Not wit, nor piety could fate prevent” Following the lines of Keats “Still wouldst thou sing, and I have ears in vain” Fitzgerald emulates thus:

“How oft hereafter rising shall she look  
Through the same Garden after me – in vain.

Thus in this way we can note that Fitzgerald’s *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* appears as veridical knowledge for Bachchan to translate.

The picture of Omar Khayyam which is drawn by Fitzgerald is not of a happy person. The writer of Rubaiyat, Bachchan writes in his preface to *Khayyam ki Madhushala*, is such a man who has seen the dreams of his time shattering

under the great crisis of science and religion. In the Rubaiyat there is a cry of suffocating soul. In other words Rubaiyat is a song of human's weakness and sadness towards life. Bachchan further argues, is it possible that one is human but is never sad in life? If not always, but at some point of life one have to pass through such a stage and during that time the thoughts of Omar Khayyam will start appealing.

However, the veridicality of testimony of SLT in translation depends on the knowledge of the translator whose source has to be other than testimony, especially – perception and inference. A translator has his/her own social dimension, an external world which makes his “memory disposition”. This memory disposition provides knowledge perception which is either illusionary, that involves taking something to be what it is not, a seeing or perceiving it through a “misplaced” qualifier; or veridical, which gives a complete and true knowledge. It is a known fact that when we try to understand a foreign language we start to translate it in our mother tongue. But understanding the surface meaning of a poem is the easiest part for Bachchan. The inner meaning can be understood when the past experience and maturity of life finds its replica in the text.

Perception is primarily a concept-free process. These concepts are features of the world as impressed upon the mind or self which is based upon our previous experiences. As we can note in the case of Bachchan where the great pre-independence crisis of freedom finds its replica in the *Rubaiyat* of Fitzgerald which was itself an expression of the Victorian crisis as described above. To understand the SLT through perception a translator has to care about two things specially. Awareness of the object [SLT] is only quasi-propositional in the first moment and at the second has its content filled out to

become means whereby an individual [translator] is ascertained to have a certain character, to be a certain kind of substance or to possess a universal or an action. The feeling of Rubaiyat found its echo in Bachchan when he was a student in the university. In 1930 he participated in the Satyagraha movement and left his university. This took Bachchan to such a mental situation that there become an emotive attachment between him and Rubaiyat. Each and every Rubaiyat appeared as it was written for him. And from here he started to translate. In brief this was the reason behind the translation of Fitzgerald's *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* as *Khayyam ki Madhushala*.

Translation is not only a re-production of knowledge of SLT, but also a new production of knowledge. However, there always remains a gap between SLT and TLT. The original writer's intension is a causal factor relevant for certification by the reader/translator. It is believed in Indian Philosophy that Bhartrhari proposed that words have no meaning outside the context of the sentences, which is the basic semantic unit. The original writer's intension "tatparya" in some cases involves a second power of words, the power (sakti) to express meaning indirectly. Thus the translator can understand the original writer's intension sometimes by contextual clues through inference. Therefore, it seems that if, for Fitzgerald the Persian poetry of Omar Khayyam is a way of expressing his disharmony against Victorian crisis, for Bachchan his *Khayyam ki Madhushala* is an attempt to come out of the pre-independence crisis.

Priye aa baitho mere paas,  
Suno mat kya kehta vidwan,  
Yahaan nisshit kewal yeh baat,  
Ki hota jivan ka awsaan.



Yahaan nisshit kewal yeh baat,  
Aur sab jhoot aur nirmul;  
Suman jo aaj gya hai such,  
Sakega woh na kabhi fir phool. (Bachchan, 2014, 14)

In Bachchan's translation of Rubaiyat, the lover asks his beloved to come and sit with him. He requests her not to hear what the scholars say about this world, because the only universal truth is that life ends. Whatever else is said by the scholars in context of life is false and has no value in it. The only truth is that flower which dies once can never blossom again in its life. In the same way Fitzgerald in his Rubaiyat speaks about the ending of life. His Omar Khayyam also says that life ends which can be read in relation to the Victorian crisis as stated earlier. The only difference is that the beloved is present as implied listener in Fitzgerald, and in Bachchan she is addressed directly. Thus the knowledge produced in Target Language Text can stand parallel to Source Language Text. Therefore, if translation stands as equivalent to Original Text there cannot be a question of scandal of translation.

Although *Khayyam ki Madhushala* does provide the space to come out of the pre-independent crisis, yet it seems insufficient for Bachchan. With the spirit of epicurean he wanted to cross that stage of crisis. The perception and inference, these two knowledge sources which helped him in translating *Khayyam ki Madhushala*, now started questioning the veridicality of his own translation as *sabda pramana*. In his essay "Problems of Translation" (1960), Bachchan writes that for translating the famous literatures of the world it is more important for a translator that there must be an emotive relation with it. When Fitzgerald translated Omar Khayyam he was deeply involved with the feelings of Rubaiyat. Words are just a vehicle, not the real essence. The real essence is the

thoughts and perceptions which are behind it. As a reversed perception Bachchan puts forward, that every original creation is a translation, a translation of cognitions, thoughts and feelings through words. When a translator reaches the subtle feelings breaking the textual grid of words and from that level tries to express it in the translator's own tongue then only a translation appears as original. Probably, this led to the transcreation of *Bachchan ki Madhushala* from the earlier translations which worked as inspirations for it. Harish Trivedi pointed out that "if Bachchan's *Madhushala* is at all translation, it is translation as rewriting, as Andre Lefevere has called it, or translation as 'new writing', as Sujit Mukherjee has named it in the Indian literary context"(Bassnett and Trivedi 1999: 8). Bachchan's *Madhushala* seeks to find all happiness and satisfaction that people have dreamt during the 1930s. For Bachchan, his wine can keep people away from the fear of future and the sadness of the past. His *Madhushala* can keep people free from all pain, selfishness and struggles. The reality of human life is very harsh and cruel. Therefore, his *Madhushala* can help to keep one aloof from the reality of life. This can produce the seed of happiness, newness and freshness.

Noted Indian philosophers of the present time Bimal Krishna Matilal has with all authority pointed out in his now celebrated essay the "Impossibility of translation in Indian Philosophical tradition". For if we think that translation is something of a process which in a new language and culture try to invoke the meaning produced by certain syntactical structures in a different tongue and may be of a different culture, this shall never be materialized. Meaning is not like the Derridian "Logos", something fixed and standing outside the system which seems to be dependent on its existence. In Indian philosophy meaning is inseparable from language, and

therefore in a new language one must look for a new meaning altogether. This is what we can find in the context of Bachchan's *Madhushala*. He writes that translation must not appear as translation, it should appear as original. This is only possible when the focus shall be in the appreciation of the splendidly in the use of words. One cannot be a successful translator if he considers words simply in their coarse forms and on the level of dictionary meaning as something ultimate.

But does it mean that the age old tradition of translation in Indian language, of the epics, puranas, and all sorts of other texts, from Sanskrit to the vernaculars and vice-versa have been blinded of the philosophical position explained by Matilal? In fact, in Indian translation traditions, the transfer of meaning from one language system to another seem inferior to the production of new meaning creation in new situations, in new system, which may stand as equivalent to the older meaning. This particular search for equivalent provides the translator a status not below the original writer, translation is not a marginalized activity, it is another form of creation. Matilal noted in his essay: "If we take Bhartrhari's view of language and meaning seriously, we have to say that there cannot be a real transference of the pure *signified* or the 'virgin' meaning of the text into another, for this may be based upon the rather widespread but wrong presumption that meaning can stand in isolated glory apart from the (original) text itself. The very idea that meaning, thought or 'What is said', is isolated from the speech or the text seems repugnant to Bhartrhari's holistic conception of language. Hence the so-called translation in the sense of 'transfer' of thought from one garb to another seems impossible in this theory" (Matilal 2000: 122).

A text as a testimonial evidence may be translated into another language, but the question would automatically pop up whether this new text could still be considered as a knowledge source, an another piece of testimonial evidence, a sabda pramana? Matilal, in his essay, talks about tolerating capacity in a given situation, decided by the reactions mostly of the readers for whom it is done. In his words: “It is a matter of common knowledge that a translator may deliberately or unconsciously choose the translational forms or expressions, in order to create the intended result, and within certain limits this choice may become tolerable. If it is intolerable the translation is bad. We can decide that the translation is bad or distorted to the extent it becomes intolerable (123). As far as the amount of tolerability is concerned, at present Bachchan’s *Madhushala* has become a product of consumerist society. It is one of the most readable poetic collections of the Indian Literature. The poetic masterpiece often can be found in the libraries and book stalls in almost every corner of India. Moreover, it can be accessed more conveniently and easily in the social websites and You Tube and one can listen to it in the voice of his son Amitabh Bachchan and many others. This sufficiently proves how far Bachchan’s translation has been tolerated.

This paper is just an endeavour on my part to show the future possibilities for the readers to explore the deep grounding and essence translation could have in creating knowledge. Fitzgerald’s Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam worked as inspiration for Bachchan through which he was able to speak his own thoughts and feelings, which was deeply drizzling in his pre-independence crisis. The Victorian crisis present in Fitzgerald’s Rubaiyat, provided the ultimate inspiration and thus Bachchan was able to relate his own pre-independence crisis with it. Although the two translator’s crisis were different from one-another, Bachchan’s particularly got

its way of expression only through the cluster of mystical images of Omar Khayyam's wine, wine-bearer and cup. And as a result of this mystical association and emotive link with Fitzgerald's *Madhushala* in a different context appeared as a trans-creation. As far as the status of *Madhushala* is concerned, I have stated in my paper, how it led to the founding ground for 'Kavi Samelan'. It became a voice for every Indian specially the youth. Bachchan writes in his essay "Me and My Madhushala"(1946), when the first time he recited the poems in 1935 in Banaras Hindu University, he was forced by the students to read more and he had to recite all 135 poems of *Madhushala* randomly. It certainly worked as a forerunner for the Indians to come out of the pre-independence crisis with a dream of independence and humanism. In other words, when the nationalists were trying to make their nation free from all crises, Bachchan's *Madhushala* sowed the grains of new hope, especially when they were burning under the crisis of 1930s. In this way one may note, what important role can a translator and his/her translation play. But then, can we imagine what would be the negative impact if the stigma of Scandal and marginalisation remains inbuilt in translation?

## References

- Ashcroft, Bill. 2012. Introduction: Spaces of Utopia. *Spaces of Utopia: An Electronic Journal*, 2(1), 1-17.
- Bachchan, Harivansh Rai. 2001. *Bachchna ki Madhushala*, New Delhi: Hindi Pocket Books Private Limited.
- Bachchan, Harivansh Rai. 2006. *Bachchan Rachnawali* vol. 4- 6. New Delhi: Rajkamal Prakashan.
- Bachchan, Harivansh Rai. 2014. *Khyyam ki Madhushala*. Delhi: Rajpal and Sons.
- Bassnett, Susan, and Trivedi, Harish (eds.) 1999. *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

- Blamires, Harry. 2009. *A History of Literary Criticism*. New Delhi: Macmillan Publishers India Ltd.
- Devy, G. N. 2009. *The G.N. Devy Reader*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan Private Limited.
- Grossman, Edith. 2011. *Why translation Matters*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan Private Limited.
- Maine, George. F. (ed.) 2000. *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*. New Delhi: Rupa & Co.
- Matilal, Bimal Krishna. 2001. *The Word and the World: India's Contribution to the study of Language*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence. (ed.) 2000. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Seyed-Gohrab, A. A. (ed.) 2012. *The Great Umar Khayyam: A Global Reception of the Rubaiyat*. Rapenburg: Leiden University Press.

\*\*\*

# The Holy Register: Its Equivalence and Strategies

MATTHEW PRATTIPATI

## Abstract

*Lexical gaps pose an insurmountable problem before a translator who deals with two languages which are distanced by unbridgeable cultural differences. The present paper focuses on how certain techniques can be applied to ameliorate the word level problems posed by the non-correspondence of words and meanings between English and Telugu while translating religious texts. This paper puts forth a set of parameters for overcoming such problems.*

**Keywords:** The Holy Bible, Translation, God, Holy Spirit, Temple, Telugu Translators and Equivalence

## Introduction

This is an attempt to analyse the issues related to the great tradition of translation that one comes across while rendering the literary texts especially, of the religious genre into a target language. Translating is the process of transferring knowledge conveyed through source language texts. But translating religious text needs utmost care, attention, rigour and unflinching devotion to the work. It requires profound scholarship, unquestioned knowledge of two languages and the noble traditions of two different religious philosophies. The Telugu Bible translation has a vital span of about two hundred sixty

five years of translation tradition and even today the tradition continues.

In this paper, I would like to focus on the word level assessment of the Holy register in general and the concepts in particular. It is built on the translational dynamics of three concepts namely:

1. The God (Old & New Testaments (NT<sub>1</sub>))
2. The Holy Spirit (New Testament) (NT<sub>6</sub>) and
3. The Temple (New Testament) (NT<sub>7</sub>)

The translators involved in this are native, non-native individuals and also some Christian institutions. For instance, Augustus Des Granges, William Carey, Edward Pritchett, John Gordon and John Hay are non-native translators. The native translators are Gudipati Venkatachalam, Father D. Thomas, Kondaviti Venkatakavi, Father Pudato Jojayya, G.R. Lorne and the Christian institutions are Madras Auxiliary Bible Society, Addison & co., Madras, Bible Society of India and World Bible Translation Centre, Bangalore etc.

The scheme of this paper is a four dimensional evaluation of every linguistic item that comprises word in terms of its form, function, meaning and also there is a strategy for checking out its equivalence. For the present study, the English (Revised Standard Version) Bible is used as the source text.

## **Objectives**

The objective of this paper is to test the equivalent terms for some of the holy registers translated from the English Bible into Telugu. The source language under study is claimed to be Hebrew, Greek and Latin. In the case of only one translation, it



is Latin. The Protestant, Catholic and other translations (whichever may come under the particular period) are also taken for examination. The study has incorporated altogether twenty-nine specimens: nineteen from the New Testament (NT) and ten from the Old Testament (OT). The translation works into the target language (Telugu) span over a period of nearly two hundred years (1812 to 1993).

The primary focus of this study is to justify the equivalence of some Holy Registers by calculating their frequency of use. The judgment is based on sociolinguistic, semantic, linguistic and equivalence theory of translation. It is an impressionistic study, whose result reflects subjectivity as well as some degree of objectivity.

Altogether 33 parameters are created which are spread over 4 broad areas: formal aspects, functional aspects, semantic aspects and equivalence theory of translations. Each aspect includes stable broad parameters, for instance, formal aspect takes care of morphological structure of the word, whether it is simple, complex, compound or derivative. As for example, the term *guDi* refers to the simple word 'temple', *mandiramu* for complex, *deewaalayamu* for compound and *aalayamu* for derivative. The derived term refers to the terms of Sanskrit origin. All the parameters are given in the chart. The second one is the functional aspect, in this there are five broad areas namely (i) language specific (ii) frequency of usage (TL Oriented) (iii) Religious load (conceptual) (iv) classes of identification and finally (v) the class of users (TL Oriented); each of these five categories were again divided into three more subcategories. In the language specific category, we have three subcategories, which indicate whether the translator had retained the SL or created a TL word or borrowed word from any other language. For instance *genesisu* is the best

example of retaining the SL word Genesis where the translator has incorporated the SL word genesis and nativised it.

In the case of TL word, for the concept ‘Temple’ the translator has used the native term *guDi* which gives the same meaning. And there are some words like *spiritu saanktu* (NT<sub>19</sub>) for the concept ‘The Holy Spirit’ and for the concept of God/yihuhu/NT<sub>2</sub>/yehoowaa/NT<sub>11</sub> = YHWH were given in TL text where these translated words are borrowed from Latin and Hebrew, respectively.

### **Frequency of Use (TL Oriented)**

As Genesis and St. Luke are my points of concentration, I have taken a given sentence out of nineteen translated versions of the New Testaments (NT) and the other ten versions of the Old Testament (OT) and found out the frequency of use of a given word in a particular sentence. For example see 4.1. where the term *deewuDu* refers to God is used by fourteen translators, which takes the highest number of occurrences in the OT and NT. *Prabhuwu* refers to Lord is the other term that is used by nine translators which takes the medial position. The words like *karta*, *sarveSwaruDu*, *yahoovaa* God are used by some translators.

**Religious Load (Conceptual):** In the case of religious load, according to the flow chart, one should see whether the translated concept is a concept or adopted according to the nature of the TL or it is borrowed from a foreign tongue. For example, *baptiismamu* refers to Baptism is very much SL oriented. And in the case of *diivena* means blessing is very much in accordance with the native rendering. The term *spiritu saanktu* (see 4.2) means the Holy Spirit is a borrowed word from the Latin.

**The Class of Identification:** In this category, we have three labels personal, social and general, where the identity of the translated word is directed towards the personal or its social relevance or towards its generic nature respectively. Apart from that, they also reveal the translator's discerning capacity in terms of his attachment to the social stratification and economic factors. The example for the label person is *iiswaruDu* means God which indicates + masculine + human.

The word 'slave woman' is a social entity which carries certain amount of social significance so the category social incorporates in itself the different layers and segments of the socio-economic stratification. The translated words for 'slave woman' are *daasi* (OT<sub>2</sub>-7, 9, 10), *baanisa* (OT-8). The category general indicates the particular preference of the translator for a general term for a conceptual word. For example, for the concept 'custom', one of the translators (NT11) has used a general word *idiwarakumalleene* means 'like earlier'. None of the translators has used accurate term and appreciated the term *aachaaram* for the concept 'custom'.

**Class of Users (TL Oriented):** This category consists of three sub-categories: educated, uneducated and common to all. This particular category and its sub-categories indicate the kinds of users who are prone to use various kinds of translated conceptual words. For example, the word '*pratibimbamu*' means image, is found in the usage of educated people and *aakaaramu* meaning image and *pooli(ka)* meaning image are found in the usage of uneducated and common users.

**Semantic Aspects:** In this area, one has seven subcategories of various ranges of their semantic use and preference. Firstly, they indicate whether a concept is retained

as it is or slightly modified or any loss of meaning has taken place, or any descriptive analysis is given; in case the concept could not be retained as it is. Secondly, they indicate whether the concept signifies its primary meaning or secondary applied meaning or it is bound by any specific context. The appended chart No. III gives the examples for the above mentioned categories.

**Equivalence:** This aspect is based on the theories of Catford, Savory, Nida, Newmark and others. There is a sharp contrast among the aspects which they have discussed namely, formal, functional, semantic and equivalence. I deal with the equivalence here. The subcategories reflect the internal subtle difference which is very much essential to be considered for religious text translation. These sub-categories of equivalence are bound to the translation theories. These sub-categories of equivalence also indicate whether the word is formal or dynamic, free or bound, partial or complete in its sense. Finally, the last category “irrelevant” refers to the inadequacy of knowledge of the translator that made misrepresentation of the concept and such translated words are considered as “irrelevant” words. For example, for the concept of God, *deewuDu* is the formal equivalent term and *iiswaruDu* is dynamic equivalent and *karta* is a general term, used as an equivalent. And *Yahoowa* is also borrowed from Hebrew used in the translations. This also indicates that the equivalence used is complete or partial or retained its intended meaning in totality or out of ignorance; the translators used inadequate terms in the TL.

For the concept of temple, *guDi* gives the complete meaning and *mandiram* gives the partial meaning in Telugu. In case of God, the meaning *iiswaruDu* is partial, where the source language religious load is not found, but in the case of

*deewuDu*, the meaning is complete where it handles both the SL and TL religious loads.

### **Use of the Chart:**

1. The parameters of the chart are valuable in a number of ways especially for the translators and critics or evaluators.
2. The elaborate parameters will be very useful for translating Biblical literature as well as any other literary works. On the basis of the chart or by using the parameters stated, one can test, evaluate and judge the holy registers as well as other lexical items that come into existence and struggle for their acceptance within any language. One can also assert the appropriate equivalent terms, so that they are easily acceptable, widely used and consequently language is enriched. so that indirectly this chart aims at enrichment of any language by incorporating and giving stability to the terms once created and used in the body of its literature.

### **EXPLANATION OF THE CONCEPTS**

#### **THE GOD; (Genesis 1: 6, St. Luke 1:6)**

<i>iiswaruDu</i>	(OT:1)
<i>deewuDu</i>	(OT: 2-10), (NT: 12, 13, 15, 17, 18)
<i>karta</i>	(NT: 1-3)
<i>yihuwa</i>	(NT:2)
<i>Prabhuwu</i>	(NT: 4-8, 10, 14, 16 )
<i>sarveeswaruDu</i>	(NT: 9)

*yahoowa* (NT: 11)

*eelinavaaru* (NT: 19)

1. *IiswaruDu* is a concept of God, which does evoke the sense of God perceived in Christianity. *Karta* is also Hindu concept of creator; hence, the scope of God cannot be limited to a creator. The terms *Prabhuwu* and *eelinawaaru* are frequently attached with the King or Lord or Master, which attaches reverential social status more than divinity. The Catholic Jargon *eelinawaaru* also refers to Bishop. Although the term ‘*sarveeswaruDu*’ is an equivalent to Almighty, it does not replace the sense of God in the target language.

2. For the concept of God the NT translators (2,11) translate as *Yihuwu* and *Yahowa*. Keeping the concept of God in mind, the Telugu Bible translators go back to the original source language(s) like Hebrew (and Greek), and borrow directly the concept ‘YahWeh’ (YHWH) with slight phonetic variation. If we consider God as a simple word, *deewuDu* is more appropriate.

### **THE HOLY SPIRIT<sup>1</sup> (St. Luke 2:26) (NT)**

*parisuddha aatma* (NT: 1)

*dharmaatmuDu* (NT:2)

*parisuddhaatma* (NT: 3-10, 14, 16)

*iiswarateejassu* (NT:11)

*pavitraatma* (NT:12, 13, 15, 17, 18)

*spiritu saanktu* (NT:19)

1. One of the NT translators (2) uses the word *dharmaatmuDu* for the concept of the Holy Spirit. It has more social appearance and relevance than the religious load, which the term Holy Spirit has. Besides this, *dharmaatmuDu* is + human, and whereas the Holy Spirit is – human<sup>1</sup>, so the word *dharmaatmuDu* is quite opposite to the concept of the Holy Spirit.

2. The concept of *iiswarateejassu* (11) is used for the Holy Spirit. It carries the target language culture and religious load more than the source language religious load. *Iiswarateejassu* belongs to the Hindu religious world, whereas the Holy Spirit is purely a Christian concept.

3. And another translator (19) of NT, borrows from Latin. *Sanctus Spiritus* as *Spiritu saanktu*, which carries the same meaning of the Holy Spirit.

4. Among the translated terms for the word ‘Holy Spirit- *parisuddha aatma* (difference of sandhi variation) and *pavitraatma* are somewhat closer to the concept of source language. When we come to the term, ‘*parisuddha aatma*’, the addition of emphatic prefix “*pari*” to the term “*suddha aatma*” sounds more pedantic and more obscure, which cannot be equated with the term *pavitraatma* that is more acceptable and easier and equivalent to the term Holy Spirit.

**THE TEMPLE:** St. Luke2: 46 (NT)

*Manddiramu* (NT:1)

<i>Mandiramu</i>	(NT:16)
<i>guDi</i>	(NT:2,4-8)
<i>deewalam</i>	(NT:13, 15)
<i>deewaalayamu</i>	(NT: 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19)
<i>aalayam</i>	(NT:11)

Mandiram is a sacred place for the Hindus which requires the association of some deity (God/Goddess). For example, Krishnamandir, Jain mandir etc. Between *mandiramu* and *mandiram*, the first one is of classical variety of writing and the latter one is of modern variety. *Manddiramu* belongs to the old form of writing system and also has stylistic variations like *granathika* of that time. At present we are using *wyaavahaarika* (spoken variety), as *Mandiram* belongs to *wyaavahaarika* style. There is no change in basic meaning.

Though *aalayam* denotes the concept of temple, it is not widely used and it always carries the Hindu religious load by mostly taking the prefixes like *raama*, *siva* and *mantra* where they all are made compounds like *raamaalayam*, *sivaalayam* and *mantraalayam* respectively. So it is far from being the nearest equivalent to the term temple.

The term '*deewaalayam*' evokes the picture of a pious Hindu place where any God may be instituted, and above all this term is descriptive. The term *deewaalayamu* belongs to *graanthika* style and *deewaalayam* belongs to *wyaawahaarika*.

Some of the translators use native term *guDi* for the term temple as an equivalent which is more acceptable when compared to others. All other words derived from Sanskrit, except *guDi*, are the suitable equivalents for the term temple.



## **Findings**

The study reveals that the act of translation is motivated by a desire to transfer the message as perfectly as possible. But, the translators are conditioned by time, space, education, social norms, cultural background, linguistic competence and the knowledge of the target language culture. Due to this reason, there is no uniformity in the selection and the use of lexical items discussed under the study. All the varieties discussed above indicate the fact that the target language readers are confused in the different versions of translation. Consequently, the language stability and its standardization become slow and difficult.

From this experience, one has to learn a big lesson that for the sake of uniformity, the easy access to the translation, some authentic body or authority should regulate, guide and enhance such translation works, which urgently demands the preparation of bilingual dictionary through which a whole range of more appropriate terms will be presented and popularized to maintain uniformity.

## **Note**

1. Yet, it is also held that the Holy Spirit is + human, basing on the Trinitarian concept of the Holy Bible, where the attributes of the Jesus Christ, who is + human and a part of the Trinity are very much applicable to the Holy Spirit and the Father God as well.

## **References**

Catford. J. C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Matthew Prattipati

- Lutfipjur – Saedi, K. 1988. *Literature in Translation*, ed. by Pramod Taigeri and S.B. Verma. Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
- Newmark, P. 1981. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Newmark, P. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. 1961. *Bible Translating*. London: United Bible Societies.
- Nida, E. A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nida, E. A. and Taber C. R. 1974. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nida, E. A. 1984. *Signs, Sense, Translation*. Cape Town: The Bible Society of South Africa.
- Savory, T. 1968. *The Art of Translation*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Subramanian, K. 1988. *Translation as Synthesis*, ed by K. Karunakaran, M. Jayakumar. New Delhi: Bahri Publications.

\* This paper was presented in 24<sup>th</sup> All India Dravidian Linguistic Conference and revised. I thank Prof. William Bright, Prof. James R. Daniel for their valuable comments on the earlier draft.







# Should the Translator Ask: Woman, What have I to do with You?

LEVIN MARY JACOB

## Abstract

*This study problematizes the translating of the Bible into Malayalam by engaging in a comparative analysis of three Malayalam translations of select passages from the Gospel according to John. Surveying these texts from the subject position of woman and an informed reader, the study tries to understand the gender nuances embedded with translated texts. The attempt is to voice the silences within the texts by intervening the text using grammar, vocabulary and meaning as indicators of patriarchal traces and gender asymmetries.*

**Keywords:** Translation, Translator, the Bible, Gender, Woman, Patriarchy, Lexicon

## Introduction

Considered as one of the widely translated text, the *Bible* exists in many languages as translations of translations. Translation becomes the most distinctive mode through which the Bible is made available for those who are not the speakers of Hebrew or Greek (the two languages in which the text has originally been written). Thus, in many languages, translated versions of the *Bible* attain prominence over the original, making it a prospective area of research in Translation Studies.

This paper is part of an investigation to understand the gender issues involved in the Malayalam translations of the *Bible*. Mary Phil Korsak, in her study of the gender issues involved in translation of the Bible posits that, "... the history of the Bible itself is the history of texts created and revised in patriarchal settings, promoting male images and values and demoting female images and values" (Korsak 2002: 132). Here, I engage in a comparative analysis through a textual reading of the three Malayalam translations of the Bible to understand how different versions "accentuate or mitigate an androcentric bias which is characteristic of the source text" (ibid.). Among the four gospels, Gospel According to John has the most number of passages which involve women or speak about them. Through a close reading of the female images and values used in the translation of Gospel according to John, the paper attempts to understand the attitude of the translated texts towards women.

## **Methodology**

In this study, I will present a few ideas on how gender differences and power relations are produced in the translation of the *Bible* into Malayalam. Four events are selected from Gospel according to John for the analysis. The criteria for the selection of the events and the passages that narrate these events (in the Bible) are as follows:

- i. Conversation between Jesus (man) and woman (John 2: 1-10 the wedding at Cana; John 20: 11-18 Jesus appears to Mary Magdalene after his resurrection from the dead).
- ii. Conversation on woman by man (John 4: 1-41 Jesus and the Samaritan woman).

- iii. Conversation implying gendered positions.  
(John 12: 1-11 Mary anoints Jesus at Bethany).

The translations selected for the discussion are Gundert's Bible (G), Sathyvedapusthakam (S) and Puthiya Niyaman: Aadhunika Vivarthanam (P).

Originally published between 1841 and 1886, Gundert's Bible is translated in the dialect of Northern Malabar region of Kerala. With the objective of proselytization of the indigenous people, the text was translated by Herman Gundert of the Basal Evangelical Lutheran Mission of Tellicherry, Kerala. Gundert's Bible translation is commented for its contribution to the growth of Malayalam language as it was also an attempt to rescue the target text from the influence of Sanskrit that dominated the written Malayalam. I use Gundert's Bible, republished in 1992 for the study.

Published by the Bible Society of India, *Sathyavedapusthakam* has neither a preface and nor any information on the date of publication. However, this text is one of the oldest publications of the Malayalam Bible still in wide circulation. In the preface to Gundert's Bible, Sacriah Zacariah notes that Sathyavedapusthakam was published in the beginning of the twentieth century and Gundert's Bible was one of the texts used as a model for the translation.

*Puthiya Niyaman: Aadhunika Vivarthanam* (New Testament: The Modern Translation) published around 1980, is prepared for "modern" readers of the Bible. It sets a target oriented approach to the Bible privileging "meaning" over "word" and attempts to prepare a modern Bible for the contemporary readers.



In this paper, I will look into those gender specificities involved in the translation of the *Bible* that give rise to gender asymmetries, creates hierarchies, binaries and power relations within the Target Text (TT). Based on Korsak's view, the study is executed through the analysis and comparison of the lexical choices of the translators "that reveals significant consequences for gender issues" (Korsak 2002: 139). I use Malayalam – English Dictionary published by DC Books in order to provide meaning of words from Malayalam to English. I also refer to King James Version (KJV) to give the English translation of the select verses. Also note that all the three versions were translated under evangelical mission and therefore impact the analysis.

### **A Note on the Prefaces of the Selected Texts**

The prefaces to the three versions accept translation as a means through which Word reaches the reader and the believer. In order to attain the equivalence with the original Bible, these prefaces claim a faithful rendering of the Source Text (ST) so that the Word (of God) is not lost in translation. Thus, these versions accept the authority of God through their attempt to be faithful to their original. This acceptance of the authority of God and authorial original attributes sacrality to the text- raising the text as morally authorial.

### **Reading the Idea of Woman: An Analysis of the Rendering of the Word Γυναίκα as *sthree***

In this section, I will analyse how the idea of woman is formed within the various translations. In all the three versions of Gospel according to John, woman is referred as *sthree*. The first instance where the word *sthree* is used is in John 2: 1-10. The portion narrates the story of Jesus turning water into wine.

Turning water into wine is the first miracle Jesus performs during the wedding at Cana and it marks the beginning of Jesus' ministry on earth. In John 2: 4-5, Jesus' mother Mary informs him that the wine is over and he answers: "Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come" (KJV). Given below is the translation of the verse into Malayalam:

1) S: Yesu avalode: Sthreeye ennikkum ninakkum thammil enthu? Ente nabhika ithuvare vannittilla ennu parnju.

Sthree = woman, nee = You, thammil = between each other; Jesus said unto her, Woman, what have I to do with you? My hour has not yet come. [my translation]

G: Sthreeye, enikkum ninakkum enthe? Ente nabhika vannittilla ennu paranju.

Sthree = woman, nee = You; Jesus said unto her: Woman, what have you and I have to do? My hour has not yet come. [my translation]

P: Amme, ithil enikkum ammakum enthu karyam? Enthe समयam ithuvareyum aayittila." amme = mother; ennikkum = me; Mother, what do you and I have to do with this? My time has not yet come [my translation]

The word Γυνάικα (woman) from the (Greek) ST is rendered *sthree* in the first two versions (*Sathyavedapusthakam* and Gundert's Bible). *Sthree* signifies a woman/wife/the female of the human species. The usage of the word *sthree* in the first two versions is due to the literal rendering of Γυνάικα

(woman) from the (Greek) ST. The sentence is further intensified with the usage of the pronoun *nee* (you). Etiquettes of the target culture do not permit mother to be addressed as *sthree*. It is considered as impolite and immodest. The context of the conversation also nullifies the possibility of a hostile comment that might have led Jesus address his mother as *nee*. The selection of words *sthree* and *nee* allow the connotative meaning to surface in TT: that Jesus is now released from the bondage of his mortal mother Mary, reducing her to the status of a female among the human species and raises Jesus up the divine pedestal.

The usage of the preposition *thammil* (between each other, among) in the first version (*Sathyavedapusthakam*) further modifies the question allowing the reader of the translation to reconsider the relationship itself. Intensifying the distance between the mother and the son, the rendering of the word *thammil* in the sentence can be read as a moment where the mother becomes an agency for the son to enter the world; in other words, motherhood becomes a mere instrument for the divine power to enter the world.

On the contrary, *Puthiya Niyamam* (the third version) translates Γοναίκα as *amma* (one of the variants for the word ‘mother’) thereby addressing Mary as mother. This sentence is indicative of the respect the son has for his mother. However, it does not suggest the divine power of the Son. It is possible that the translator delays the information regarding the divine power of Jesus until the next sentence. This translation can be assumed to be oriented towards the target culture by following the etiquettes in the target culture unlike other two translations.

In John 4: 27, *sthree* is used again. Disciples were surprised to see Jesus talking to the Samaritan woman: “And

upon this came his disciples, and marvelled that he talked with the woman: yet no man said, What seekest thou? or, Why talkest thou with her?” (KJV).

2) S: Sthriyode samsaarikayaal aashchariyapettu  
Talking to (a) woman astonished them [my translation]

G: Sthriyode samsaarikayaal aashchariyapettu  
Talking to (a) woman astonished them [my translation]

P: Oru sthriyode samsaarikayaal aashchariyapettu  
Oru = a/one; Talking to a woman astonished them  
[my translation]

Jesus meets the Samaritan woman during a halt in Sychar, Samaria. His disciples had gone into the town to buy food. On their return, they were surprised to find him talking to the Samaritan woman. The texts do not substantiate the reason for their surprise. In the first two versions, the noun *sthree* (woman) is rendered without a determiner (*aa/oru* – the/that) attaching an arbitrariness to the identity of the woman. It is likely to imply that Jesus talking to any woman surprised the disciple.

On the other hand, the third version uses the determiner *oru* (a) indicative of particularity to the woman’s identity: that the disciples were not surprised because Jesus was not talking to any woman, but a Samaritan woman who was considered to be inferior to a Jew. Communication between the two are restricted by the societal norms. Samaritan woman herself expresses this as a concern to Jesus in the preceding verse – John 4: 9: “Then saith the woman of Samaria unto him, How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans” (KJV). In the third version, the third version is suggestive of the caste intricacies involved in the source

culture with use of the determiner. On the contrary, the first and the second version do not clarify whether it is the gender of the individual (whom Jesus was talking to) or any other reasons that caused wonder among disciples.

## **Lexical Choices and the Creation of Binaries and Hierarchies**

This section reflects on how choice of words can lead to the creation of gender differences through creating binaries and hierarchies in the TT. It is also a reflection on how lexical choices create differences in meaning and thus give rise to varied readings/interpretations.

John 20: 11-18 narrates the first incident that takes place after his resurrection. On the third day after crucifixion, Jesus resurrects from death. Jesus appears to Mary Magdalene who visited his tomb early in the morning. She becomes the first one to know that Jesus rose from death. Mary in disbelief tries to touch Jesus. But, Jesus does not let her ‘touch’ her and says in John 20: 17a: “Touch me not...” (KJV). The following are the response of Jesus to Mary as presented in the three versions:

- 3) S: Enne thodaruthu  
thoduka = touch; Do not touch me [my translation]
- G: Enne pidichukollala  
pidikkuka = hold/grasp; Do not hold me [my translation]
- P: Enne thadanju nirthathirukkuka  
Thadanju nirthathirukkuka = not to obstruct/not to stop; Do not obstruct me [my translation]

Note that debates on the notion of ‘touch’ are a matter of debate in the ST also. The debate is further intensified as the conversation takes place between Jesus and a woman. Therefore, it is interesting to note how the ‘notion of touch’ is being translated in the TTs and how it attains meaning in the target language and culture. All the three versions use three distinct verbs in them to indicate the action of Mary Magdalene towards Jesus. In the first version, the verb *thoduka* (touch) imply that Mary Magdalene tried to touch Jesus while second version uses the verb *pididkkuka* (hold/grasp) to indicate that it was an act of holding. The third version takes a different stand by choosing the phrase *pidchu nirthuka* (to stop/obstruct). These verbal distinctions give rise to three kinds of meanings.

In the first version, Mary Magdalene tries to touch Jesus which is stopped by Jesus through his response to her: “Do not touch.” The second version uses the word *pidichukollalla* (not to hold/grasp). *Pidikkuka* also implies an act of a person coming into contact with another body. However, it is suggestive of grasping somebody by force or to merely hold somebody. Both the version is suggestive of the possibility that Mary Magdalene might have tried to feel Jesus’ body out of disbelief or in a shock of seeing what is unexpected. The third version, using the word *thadanju nithathirikkuka* (not to obstruct/not to stop) deviates from the first two versions. It does not indicate an act- touching/holding. On the contrary, in this version, Jesus asks Mary Magdalene not to stop or obstruct him from what he intends to do – to complete his mission on earth before Jesus’ ascension to heaven. While the first two versions refer to Mary’s action as touch, third version gives an impression of an obstruction to Jesus’ intentions.

It is important to note that the first two versions have significant consequences on the target language and culture. *Thouduka* (touch) as translated in the first version is a loaded term. It does not exist in the target culture as a mere action of touch. Touch attains its significance in the context of target culture where touchable-untouchable binary leads to the social stratification. It signifies pollution of a body and its surroundings if it comes into contact with an ‘inferior’ body. In this context, translator’s choice of the word becomes challenging. The query is on the translator’s choice of the word *thodaruthu* (not to touch) to voice Jesus’ response to Mary. An interpretation of the first version is likely to imply a binary notion of sacred (Jesus) and profane (woman). A profane cannot touch the sacred. The resurrected Jesus Christ is above all mortals that a profane woman cannot touch him. Her touch will pollute him. A possible explanation that connects well with the sentence that follows verse in analysis: John 20: 17b – “for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God” (KJV). Although, *pidichukollala* is not used with the same level of intensity of the first, it still implies that Mary Magdalene tries to feel the body of the Jesus.

The third version avoids the confusion that exists in the first two by bringing in a different concept to refer to the situation. The translator diverts the attention (of the reader) from Mary Magdalene’s action of touch to Jesus’ action. Translator voices Mary Magdalene’s action through Jesus as ‘obstructing’. The differences of the lexical choices give rise to differences in meanings. This portion of John 20:17 is a fine example of how translator’s voice is heard in a translated text – how s/he intervenes through her reading/interpretation of the original.

John 12: 2, provides another instance of varied translations, a result of translators' choices of words. Jesus attends a dinner that is arranged for him and his disciples at Lazarus' house at Bethany six days before the Passover. Lazarus was raised from death by Jesus, another miracle that Jesus performs. John 12:2 explains the role of Martha, sister of Lazarus, at the dinner: "There they made him a supper; and Martha served: Lazarus was one of them who sat at the table with him (KJV).

4) S: Martha shushrusha cheythu

Shushrusha = serve; Martha served [my translation]

G: Martha shushrusha cheythu

Shushrusha = serve; Martha served [my translation]

P: Martha atithikale paricharichu

Atithikale = the guests, paricharichu = attended on;

Martha attended (on) the guest. [my translation]

While the first two versions use *shushrusha* (to serve), the third version uses *paricharanam* (to attend) to translate Martha's participation in hosting a feast for Jesus and his disciple at her house in John 12: 2. The word *shushrusha* is derived from two words – *shrotham* and *iccha*. It signifies the desire to listen. The desire to listen is central to the act of *shushrusha*. The two versions hint the eagerness of Martha to serve Jesus and other guests. On the other hand, *paricharanam* stands for service which is provided willingly or unwillingly. It can be imposed on the subject. It is more of a duty than a service. Therefore, Puthiya Niyamam suggests the duty endowed on Martha. This implies the possibility of merely reducing Martha's role to a duty/norm, the translator fails to bring in the idea of a female host who chose to serve Jesus and other guests at her home.



Significance in differences of the words *paricharanam* and *shushrusha* (the verb forms) can further be explained with two other instances from the John's Gospel. After Jesus' mother Mary informs Jesus that house has run out of wine at the wedding at Cana, she instructs the servants to follow Jesus' instruction. John 2: 5 records the conversation between Mary and the aids/servants at the wedding. She asks the servants to follow Jesus' instructions: "His mother saith unto the servants, whatsoever he saith unto you, do it" (KJV).

5) S: Avante amma shushrushakarode: avan ningalodu parayunnathu cheyvin.

shushrushakar = the one who serves/helps/servants, parayunnatu = tell; His mother to the servants: Do what he tells you to do. [my translation]

G: Avante amma shushrushakarode: avan ningalodu enthu kalppichaalum athu cheyuvin.

shushrushakar = the one who serves/helps/servants, kalppichaal = order; His mother to the servants: Do what he orders to you. [my translation]

P: Yeshuvinte amma paricharakarode: "yeshu parayunnathu enthayalum athu ningal cheyuka" ennu paranju.

Paricharakar = servants, parayunnathu = tell; Jesus' mother Mary to the servants: "Do whatever he orders you to do" [my translation]

Servants have been translated as *shushrushakar* (helpers/servants) and *paricharakar* (servants). If *shushrusha* largely depends on one's willingness to serve, *paricharanam* is more of a duty. Thus, *paricharakar* and *bhruthyanmar* are servants while *shushrushakar* can be servants or anybody who is willing to serve the guests at the wedding. In the target culture, a work of a Christian priest is represented as *shushrusha*. Though *shushrushakar* and *paricharakar* signify work, the latter creates a group of people whose duty is to serve while the former does not.

Likewise, *parayunnathu* and *kalppichaal* are words used in the versions to indicate Jesus' instructions. But two words connote two different meanings. If *parayunnathu* is to say, *kalppichaal* is to order. Gundert's Bible uses *kalppichaal* while the other two versions use the word *parayuka*. The word *parayuka* can be used to indicate one to one interaction between individuals. Contrary to that, *kalpikkuka* is indicative of asymmetrical power relations between individuals. Perhaps, the translator could have used *nirdeshangal* (directions/instruction) as an equivalent. Dissecting the usage of the word *kalppichaal* in the sentence reveals translator attributes authority to Jesus which is voiced through Mary.

## Conclusion

With gender as the focus of the paper, I have presented the possible consequences of the translated text on the target language and culture. The primary concern of my study is to understand how the *Bible*, a text that formed within a patriarchal setting performs within the target culture which is yet another case of a patriarchal setting. In other words, the study was to understand the effect of the Bible as a target text on the language and the socio-cultural space of Kerala.

The study seeks to create awareness on gendered nature of the translated texts. The investigation based on three Malayalam translations of the Bible puts language under test by surveying the lexical choices of the translators of the select texts and investigates how a word and the meaning it creates within the TT give rise to gender differences within the text. The first section of the analysis has attempted to study the construction of 'woman' as an idea within the text by problematizing the word *sthree*. The second section looks into the problem of lexical choices that have created binaries and hierarchies. Here, I have demonstrated how lexical choices are capable of creating binaries and hierarchical positions.

It also looks into the role of a translator as an interpreter. It is already understood that a perfect equivalence is impossible. The differences in translations of the select verses in the three versions are to be seen as a case to understand translation as a space that allows modifications, mutations and/or the transformation of the original. Therefore, such a space can also allow the possibility of modification of biblical texts in Malayalam to meet the changing perspectives of and on the women in the society.

## References

- Gundert, Herman. 1992. Bible. Kottayam: D. C. Books.  
Puthiya Niyamam: Aadhunika Vivarthanam 1980, Bangalore: Bible Society of India.  
Sathyavedapusthakam (nd), Bangalore: Bible Society of India.  
Korsak, Mary Phil. 2002. Translating the Bible: Bible Translation and Gender Issues. Bible on the Threshold of Twenty-First Century: Authority, Reception, Culture and Religion, ed. by Athalya Brenner and Jan Willem van Henten. New York: Sheffield Academic Press.

\*\*\*

# Interviews

## An Interview with Shyam Ranganathan

*ABDUL HALIM*

Shyam Ranganathan (hereafter **SR**) teaches introduction to philosophy, critical reasoning, ethics, political philosophy, Asian philosophy, the philosophy of religion and the philosophy of language in the York University, Toronto. He has a research specialization in a Non-Western tradition of philosophy—namely South Asian philosophy, especially Indian moral philosophy. Abdul Halim (hereafter **AH**) is an assistant editor of the *Translation Today* who interviews Shyam Ranganathan.

**AH:** Translation and Interpreting Studies have made significant advances ever since they became formal disciplines. How do you see the current trends in Translation & Interpreting Studies?

**SR:** Since I first started working on this in my dissertation (15 years ago), I started noticing a trend in academic views about translation and interpretation that were not restricted to the interdisciplinary fields of Translation and Interpreting Studies. I found it in the Analytic philosophy literature, the Continental philosophy literature, the Translation Studies literature, as well as the writings and assumptions of Indologists who claimed to be studying Indian philosophy. I now think that this trend is just as old as the Western tradition itself. This is the trend of identifying propositional content—the stuff to be preserved in translation—as linguistic meaning. This is often associated with the linguistic turn in recent Continental and Analytic philosophy but it goes back to the Greek idea of *logos*: one word for thought, opinion, reason and word. This is the most basic commitment of the Western

tradition and something that started to jump out of the literature at me as I read more and more of it. This tradition has a problem. The meanings of our languages are historically varied owing to their respective histories. This is unavoidable. Assume the orthodox view in the literature that the literal meaning of an expression in a language is its systematic or basic use or role in the language. Even *syntactic* differences across languages will produce semantic differences on this account. If thought and what is to be preserved in translation is linguistic meaning, then the *mere fact* of linguistic differences dooms translation for we have no guarantee that languages will be semantically alike enough to facilitate translation on this account. And there is a paradox: the more dissimilar languages are, and the more we require translation, the less we are likely to be able to translate on this account. The problem here just is the idea that it is the linguistic meaning that translation is supposed to be devoted to, as though accuracy in translation is about preserving linguistic meaning. The one positive matter that I note about Translation and Interpreting Studies literature is an often disciplined distinction between translation and interpretation. Philosophers tend not to draw this *important* distinction. But clearly there is a difference. To translate is to preserve something deep (thought) through changes in semiotic resources so that the outcome has to be the same as the original—in the deep propositional sense—though superficially it is not. Interpretation is about explaining what someone else says (hence, simultaneous interpretation is not translation). So this is one area where people outside of philosophy in Translation and Interpretation Studies working on these issues are leaps and bounds ahead of conventional Western philosophers who, whether in the Analytic or Continental traditions, routinely confuse interpretation and translation. But thinking about the difference is useful for it helps us pry apart the *semantic preserving* project of

translation with the *explanatory* function of interpretation. A good translation does not *explain* the original: it is rather the same work, composed with differing materials. A good interpretation *explains* the original, and it might even do so with the same materials.

**AH:** Two of your publications “*Philosophy of Language, Translation Theory and a Third Way in Semantics*” and “*An Archimedean Point for Philosophy*” and your own doctoral thesis “*Translating Evaluative Discourse: The Semantics of Thick and Thin Concepts*” have dialectically investigated all the parameters set by the philosophers of language and translation theorists in Translation Studies. Could you please explicate the gap between the theoretical postulations and the practical act of translation?

**SR:** Well, I think the contrast is probably between good theory and bad theory, for if one employs good theory then one’s practice will be good, and if one employs bad theory, then one’s practice will be bad. But there is a way in which I can understand that there is a gap between theory (conventional theory) and practice, in so far as *actual* translators (and certainly the good ones) tend not to follow the advice of most philosophers and theorists of translation. The dominant position in the Western tradition is that meaning and thought is linguistic so to translate a text accurately requires that we pair up words and sentences across languages with the same meaning, for this is the only way to preserve the thoughts expressed in the original text. And given the historical reality of linguistic difference, this is impossible exactly when we need it. Indeed, we can even identify a paradox that arises on the basis of this account of translation: the more similar languages are, the more easily translatable they are, the less we require translation for the more inter-intelligible they are. The

less similar languages, the more require translation for the less inter-intelligible they are, but the less easily are such languages translatable. The problem it seems to me is the expectation that we should be proceeding by preserving linguistic meaning. This is exactly what good translators do not worry about. They *re-create* a work in a new medium, and just as we would re-create a sculpture or painting with a new medium, we do not judge the accuracy of the resulting product in terms of its one to one correspondence on the microscopic level. A sculpture made of pebbles and one made of pasta shells can express the same form and even appear identical holistically, but that is macroscopic, and it is not reducible to the similitude of corresponding parts. So good translators are after that total recreation, and to do that, you have to give up the idea that we translate by matching words and sentences, as though reproducing a sculpture with pasta means that we have to match pieces of pasta with pieces of stone in the original. But this entails something important: translation is not about linguistics. It is not at all about understanding the similarity of words and sentences across languages. You have to be able to discern the *form* of the original text and have the artistic facility to recreate this form with differing resources. There's such a thing as getting this re-creation right and wrong: that's objective, macroscopically. It is a very nerdy idea of translation that suggests that it's a kind of been counting, where one has to be worried about the minutia.

**AH:** As your writings reflect, language is not the primary bearer of meaning and in support of your argument you have proposed a text-type conception of semantics. How would you reflect on a translation theory which could address the issues of translation encompassing all the academic disciplines? And what would be the semantic expansion of meaning making process in translation?



**SR:** When I originally formulated my argument I thought the idea of a text-type was perfect. However, it only puts off a question: how do we individuate types? I used to claim that they were merely institutional practices and this is true, but this invites the challenge that there can be differing institutions for every type and evidence of this is that within a discipline, parties disagree and each party to the disagreement has their own idea of what the type is. This problem can be solved by identifying the type with disciplinarity. And this is actually an Indian theory: yoga. It was a pure coincidence that as I was working on my dissertation on translation theory I took up the task of translating the *Yoga Sūtra*. And then I had to work on the *Yoga Sūtra* as a historian of philosophy for another several years before I started to understand its relevance. But the idea of yoga in the Indian tradition and especially in *Patanjali* is the idea of a practice that we can undertake from differing perspectives. So we individuate the yoga then as this continuity as we change our position in the world. Then, differing practices will allow us to triangulate on differing objects of inquiry. This is why we distinguish disciplines in higher learning, such as the difference between the empirical sciences, mathematics, philosophy, literature, history etc. In each case we have a differing kind of practice that makes tracking common objects from differing (theoretical) vantages possible. This is why disciplinarity is the foundation of knowledge: it allows us to conduct research into objects of interest from competing vantages. It follows from this that *disagreements* within a discipline are par for course, and not evidence that we have more than one discipline at play. Really the discipline is what makes the disagreement possible in the first place for it allows us to take up contrary positions relative to objects of controversy. If we were to really follow the Western tradition and identify the topic of inquiry as logos, linguistics would be the only discipline and every kind of

research would be some version of linguistics. Some philosophers have fantasized about this. Hilary Putnam did this in his famous “Meaning of Meaning”—he claimed that every discipline represents the division of linguistic labour. Physicists would be trying to figure out what our physical terms mean. Biologists would be trying to figure out what our biological terms mean, so on and so forth. But it is implausible. It is implausible because we can conduct the same inquiry (physics, literary criticism etc.) as we change the language we employ: one can do physics in English and in Hindi and in Mandarin. We can do literary criticism in these languages too. These are not the same languages and they are three differing languages. Yet, the topic of investigation does not change merely because the language we use to talk about it changes. Rather, we know we are in the realm of a discipline *because* we use differing linguistic and cultural resources to talk about the same thing. In other words, disciplinarity allows us to transcend the provincial, parochialism of language and culture, and engage in *knowing* (*jñāna*). But if it were mere linguistics, then research into English language physical terms would be different from research into Mandarin language physical terms: change the language and one changes the topic. So English physics would be different from Mandarin physics. What allows for this continuity of research across languages is the discipline. So we ultimately have to individuate the text-type by the discipline and this allows us to identify what is essential and distinctive about types. So in other words, the disagreement within disciplines is evidence of the underlying common text type. But the text type is nothing but a semantic approach to what is basically a matter of practice: discipline. One of the implications of this line is that we must and should draw a sharp line between *translation* and *localization*. Translation concerns disciplinarity. Localization does not.

So far as the meaning making process is concerned we use meaningful devices for some text-type theoretic purpose, and this use is a textual meaning. So translation then is not the process of creating meaning so much as using differing resources to preserve textual meaning. Good translation preserves this textual meaning and is hence *uncreative*. It may seem novel to the target audience but that is an illusion that arises from them taking their vantage too seriously. If it's accurate it's not new: it preserves the original meaning. But then all translators should not look upon their task as making something new. However, if the idea of "semantic expansion" could mean something like the introduction of a new idea or theory into a target culture, then translation—good translation—can achieve this as a matter of course.

**AH:** While most of the theorists have described the problem of translation from functionalist perspectives that is useful mainly for literary translation, what approach would you like to propose for the translators who take up all kinds of translation? And what should be semantic aspects of text-type features for determinate translation and how non-text-type features could be preserved in translation?

**SR:** Functionalism I take it is the idea that the meaning of what is said is the effect it has on its audience, and functionalism in translation is the idea that an accurate translation is equality in effect to the original, though it may be different literally. I do think this is implausible. The people who make a case for such a theory do not translate philosophy, logic, mathematics, or science. They usually base their case on poetry, and literature. It is plausible to think that the accuracy of a poetic translation is to be judged by the similitude of emotional response to the reader relative to the original and translation. It is *implausible* —absolutely implausible— to

employ the same standard for the translation of philosophy, mathematics or science. And those who insist upon functionalism never use examples from philosophy, science or mathematics: they typically stick to examples from literature.

But there is a bigger picture.

In every case, the translator is faced with a choice: what type should I employ in translation? I say this is a choice because texts themselves are ambiguous, and as the process of translation is one of preserving an integral meaning to a work in translation (usually the propositional content, which seems to me to be the same as the holistic significance) you have to choose. And the results will be uneven: sometimes you get it right, and sometimes you do not. If I try to translate excellent poetry as mathematics, I likely will end up with nothing that counts as an accurate translation for the original text will likely be devoid of math. Yet I have to choose a text-type in translation because I have to choose what is to be the priority in the process of translation (recreating the form of the original with differing materials). When translating Plato, I can choose to read and translate him as a dramatist first, or a philosopher first. If I choose drama as my type, I treat the philosophical elements as subsidiary to the dramatic aspects, and the resulting translation could succeed if it creates a target text with the same dramatic virtues that subordinate philosophical virtues in the same way. But what translated bit of philosophy serves this dramatic purpose may not at all be the same as the philosophical arguments in the original. For instance, if the philosophy in the original served to articulate some conservative position and the conservatism was somehow essential to appreciating the dramatic components, then a good dramatic translation will have to rely upon some conservative philosophy from the target culture to serve the same purpose—

and this may be very different philosophy from what is found in the source culture. If I choose to translate Plato as philosophy, then I treat the dramatic components of his dialogues as supporting his philosophical aims, which means that as I translate these dramatic components, I will subordinate them to the philosophy in the same way, but this might mean that the drama in the target text looks different than the drama in the source text. If a pun or joke is essential to making a point in an argument, the translated joke or pun has to make sense to the target audience, and this may be a very different joke or pun from the original.

But in each case, I am avoiding the functionalist approach for I am abandoning the idea that translatable content is to be measured purely in terms of its effect on their audiences. I am choosing a type, and then subordinating other features of the texts to the main type.

**AH:** Since the publication of James S. Holmes' article "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" the discipline of Translation Studies has taken mainly two recognizable turns namely linguistic and cultural. How far these two trends in translation have contributed to address the actual problem of translation? Do you see any (in) adequacies in them?

**SR:** I am not entirely sure I understand the difference. I know that people draw a distinction between linguistic and cultural approaches. I suppose in some sense the linguistic is the more traditional approach where translatable content is defined as literal meaning (the systematic or basic role of an expression in a language), while the cultural approach is a bit more like the functionalist approach. This time we are invited to be reflective about the effect that translation has. But as this approach reduces the *significance* of a text to its cultural effect,

it is not so different from the linguistic approach as the linguistic approach also reduces the significance of a text to a crucial cultural factor: language. And hence they share an inadequacy of trying to understand translation by way of matters that are peculiar to cultures. The worse pressure that this creates is to look for similarities where there are none. For if we have to identify the translatable content of a text with some cultural factor, then we are pressurized to find something similar in the target culture that can function as the translation and the result is confabulation. Really, the problem is that these approaches do not specify an independent measure of translational success: in each case, the standard is reduced to the vary languages or cultures that we are trying to mediate by translation.

**AH:** Analytical and continental philosophers of language are sceptical in describing the phenomena of translation. They observe that translation is indeterminate and incommensurable. Nevertheless, translation is taking place all around the globe. What ideological factors may be motivating it?

**SR:** These philosophers are faithful to the Western tradition, which going back to the Greek idea of *logos*, holds that thought content is linguistic. So if you really believe that, and you are also aware of the reality of linguistic difference, then you have no choice but to decide that translation is beset by problems of incommensurability or problems of indeterminacy. Just to be clear, I take it that incommensurability is the problem of finding one to one – correlates across languages, and differing languages will hence be to varying degrees, incommensurable. “Indeterminacy” is a term that Quine made famous and in his case it meant that even when we have all the relevant empirical data we may be unable to decide between alternative translations, where the

alternative translations are not translations of each other. But this too is assured on the linguistic paradigm for we are speaking about trying to match up incommensurable things—the meaning of expressions defined by their role in their respective languages. So indeed, the empirical data is not going to help and we may have good reason for choosing translations that are not themselves translations of each other.

**AH:** You specialize in analytical philosophy but you are writing from non-Western perspectives. Could you offer some ideas about the Western notion of translation vis-à-vis *anuvāad*, the Indian tradition including the boundary of translation terminologies used in both the traditions and cultures?

**SR:** So this is a question I find difficult to answer because I have never thought about translation as a question of terminology. So I have never really paid much attention to what Indians might have called what Westerners call translation. I have been far more impressed by the importance of Indian philosophy and Indian philosophies to solving problems. So for instance, the distinction between Two Truths, in the Indian tradition, seems pertinent to translation. One kind of truth, the conventional truth, would apply to categories of language and cultural distinctions, while the Ultimate Truth pertains to the reality of the matter. Good translations preserve the Ultimate Truth of a text, so to speak, while trading Conventional Truths. That is a good way to approximate the issue of translation—far better than trying to understand it as preserving culture or linguistic meaning. Another Indian idea that I think is essential to understanding translation is the idea of disciplinarity, or yoga, as I noted earlier. It is perhaps easier for Indian philosophers to make sense of translation for they have wrestled with the idea of continuity despite change (often with respect to questions of personal identity) than Western

philosophers have. Indian philosophers have often accepted the reality of change and have asked the question: what makes me the same over time? That's basic to translation. So to the extent that Indian ideas of continuity of identity allow for change, they allow us a way to think about translation. A healthy life, where we preserve ourselves despite change is a kind of exercise in translation. Buddhists hold this is impossible in the big picture: dependency and change wins. But I think the idea of disciplinarity and Yoga associated with the "Hindu" tradition allows something else: for sure it's possible and it has to do with disciplinarity. I am the same person I used to be not because microscopically I am the same now as I used to be, but relative to the practice of being me, I am the same, macroscopically. Now existentially the problem for ethics is that we don't usually succeed: at some point it seems that by any account of the practice of me, I've changed beyond recognition and at that point I'm dead. Yet, this is not an objection to Yoga for so long as I have a criterion for what it is to be the same macroscopically while I change microscopically I have a way to adjudicate good translations of me over time relative to bad translations.

**AH:** Many scholars have interpreted translation as a site of knowledge creation and dissemination. How do you reflect upon this view?

**SR:** Well, when we link translation to text types and these to disciplines, then indeed, translation is about the creation and dissemination of knowledge in so far as disciplines are sites of knowledge creation and dissemination.

**AH:** Every translation has problems of its own, and a good translation depends on the correct understanding of the subject matter. What would be the correct methods which



could be generalized to all kinds of translation?

**SR:** Great question! Again, I think I have already answered the question. (A) We have to first choose a type, and then (B) subordinate the other elements of a text to the type. This allows us an understanding of the original text relative to the type, which we may call the *work*. And then (C) we reproduce a *work* that is equivalent to the original text with new target resources.

**AH:** Like there is no manual for guiding a writer, there is an overall absence of a manual to guide the translators at various stages of translating a text. All these depend on the correct understanding of a translator/writer of the issues concerned. How can it be achieved and will there be possibly a manifesto of translation like the Communist Manifesto?

**SR:** I think that a manual could be written. You would have to specify the various steps such as (A), (B) and (C) above and perhaps address common confusions. But this manual would not be the Quinian type envisioned in *Word and Object*, which is a kind of concordance that will allow anyone to translate a text, even if they do not understand the target, source languages, *and even* if they do not appreciate the relevant type.

\*\*\*

# An Interview with Douglas Robinson

ADITYA KUMAR PANDA

Douglas Robinson (hereafter **DR**) is a Chair Professor of English at Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong. He is a well-known scholar in the field of Translation Studies. Aditya Kumar Panda, (hereafter **AKP**) an assistant editor of *Translation Today*, interviews Douglas Robinson.

**AKP:** George Steiner's *After Babel* influenced you in the early years of your university life that you had admitted in an interview. How did it impact upon you?

**DR:** I had been translating for almost ten years when I happened upon *After Babel* in our university library (in Tampere, Finland). I had been thinking that I might like to read and write about translation, and wondered what had been written about it—and after getting frustrated with a lot of pedestrian scholarship on our library shelves, I found Steiner's book, and read it avidly, cover to cover. Then I bought it, and read it again, and marked it up. It was thrilling to me! Steiner gave me a useful overview of the translation scholarship that he himself valued—especially the German Romantic tradition—and that struck a chord with me as well; he was a sensitive reader of literature and philosophy, and brought to his task a hermeneutical sensibility, which I immediately embraced; but what I especially valued was the force of his personality, which exploded off the page. I took him on as my mentor in the field of Translation Studies, as I was just beginning to explore it.

**AKP:** Before *The Translator's Turn*, you wrote a bilingual monograph that you did not publish. Later, you transformed it

into The Translator's Turn. How did you write *The Translator's Turn*? How was it received at that time, when the field of Translation Studies was still evolving?

**DR:** I think I would say I didn't so much "transform" that bilingual monograph, "Kääntämisen kääntöpiirit/*The Tropics of Translation*," as cannibalize it. *The Translator's Turn* was a very different kind of book. "KK/TT" was a stylistic experiment: I wrote it in English, then translated it into Finnish, and while I was translating it, I kept rethinking my arguments for a Finnish audience, which ended up pulling the arguments in new directions. Sometimes the Finnish would veer off from the English for 8-10 pages at a time, before I was able to bring it back into alignment with the English. I used the tensions between the English and the Finnish to comment on the nature of translation too—a kind of running meta-commentary. None of that was possible once I decided to get rid of the Finnish and create *The Translator's Turn*. So that felt like a loss.

Also, the tropics of translation formed the whole of "KK/TT," and only the second half of *The Translator's Turn*. I had to work up the somatics (Chapter 1) and dialogics (Chapter 2) from scratch. That was exciting, of course: I'd been working on the somatics of language for several years by 1988, the year when I began writing *Turn*, had given two conference talks on it, but had never written up my ideas; and I had been exposed to Bakhtin in my Ph.D. program 6-7 years earlier, and become obsessed with him (and still am). Rather than just doing Bakhtin in Chapter 2, though, I decided I would work up to him, starting with Augustine in the last three sections of Chapter 1, and moving through Luther, Goethe, and Buber before letting Bakhtin burst onto the scene. That became my first foray into the history of thinking about translation; at

the time I was also teaching that history in the Translation Studies Department at the University of Tampere, and, since there was no anthology available back then, I spent a week at the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., one summer collecting photocopies. That eventually became my anthology, *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*, which I wrote in 1992-1993, but didn't manage to publish until 1997.

I should say, too, that I had quite radical ideas about academic writing in the mid-1980s—I wanted to revolutionize academic discourse, with numbered notes, epistolary form, dialogue, etc.—but it became increasingly clear that my experiments were simply not publishable, and, with considerable reluctance, I began to move back in the direction of more conventional writing styles. *The Translator's Turn* was my first “sellout”—that's how it felt back then—my first attempt to write in a somewhat innovative voice that still looked and felt more or less like traditional academic discourse. The resulting popularizing tone, and maybe the insouciance, or even flippancy, was a big part of what irritated the major established translation scholars at the time—but also what made it a big hit among younger, more radical, and perhaps more peripheral translator-scholars. I heard stories about people touting the book excitedly at conferences as the only translation theory anyone would ever need to read; I also heard of people summarizing it as saying “translators don't need to think, they only need to feel.” That was a bit frustrating! (I write about this in a recent article: “The Somatics of Tone and the Tone of Somatics: *The Translator's Turn* Revisited.” *TIS: Translation and Interpreting Studies* 10.2: 299-319.)

**AKP:** You develop ideas from many disciplines. You have used ideas from Philosophy and Neurology in your Somatic Theory that has a certain degree of intricacies. You have also got theoretical somatic underpinnings in Confucian thoughts. How is it that the Chinese scholars understand your Somatic theory better than the Westerners do?

**DR:** When I moved to Hong Kong in 2010, I wanted to familiarize myself with Chinese philosophy, and someone recommended I begin with Mengzi (Mencius). So I got D.C. Lau's 1970 translation and began reading, and was astonished to find that he knew things about somatic theory that I had been struggling to articulate for more than two decades. So I immersed myself in it, reading as many translations as I could find and laboriously comparing the key passages with the Chinese original—and the more I learned, the more excited I became. This truly was transformative! As I began talking to Chinese audiences about my somatic theory, and building bridges to Mengzi (and later Laozi), I found that they had absolutely no difficulty understanding me. In the West, my talks on the somatics of language and translation always tended to be met with stunned silence; my Chinese audiences engaged me intelligently from the start. Why? I wondered. Gradually I figured out why: 心 *xin*, which is a pictographic representation of the human heart, is also commonly translated (by Chinese people with good English) as “mind.” Mengzi says that the heart thinks—in the sense that the heart guides the mind in decision-making. The heart-becoming-mind (as I came to translate it) is the source of all ethical growth in Chinese culture. As a result, Chinese people are not inclined to think of feeling as a random bodily disturbance that distorts thought. Feeling occupies a respected position in the philosophical underpinnings of Chinese culture. (The only way a Chinese person might be inclined to assume that my discussion of

somatics in *The Translator's Turn* meant that the translator only needs to feel, not think, would be if s/he had been raised in the West.)

**AKP:** You discussed a new approach to translation that draws neither from Linguistics nor from literary studies in your introduction to *Translation and Empire*. Why do you think the approaches from Linguistics and Literary studies are inadequate in the study of translation? How far is the new approach arising out of Anthropology, Ethnography and Colonial Studies adequate to study translation?

**DR:** I'm not sure I would draw stable boundaries between approaches that are "adequate" and "inadequate" to the study of translation. If you're interested in textual equivalence, a linguistic approach might well be adequate. If you're interested in literary or scholarly history, a literary approach might be adequate. But obviously if you're studying the role translation has played in the history of empire, you need something more. (My scholarship tends to be problem-driven: whatever is needed to explore a given problem is fair game. I don't set disciplinary boundaries in advance.) And the way that worked was that Anthony Pym asked me to write the book as a user-friendly introduction to postcolonial translation theory—which meant covering the emergence of postcolonial translation studies out of cultural anthropology and ethnography.

**AKP:** The study of translation is no longer limited to the age-old debate of 'word for word' or 'sense for sense' translation or whether it is faithful or not. The later part of the 20th century witnessed the emerging critical approaches to what a translation is. Translation is becoming a phenomenon more of socio-cultural forces. Starting from Zohar's Polysystem theory to Lefevere's concept of translation as

rewriting has redefined what a translation is. You have also said in *Who Translates?: Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason* that translating is writing. Could you limit the boundary of what a translation is? If not, how would you define it?

**DR:** Again, I'm not particularly interested in setting boundaries. I'm much more interested in crossing them. For the three decades of my TS career to date, I've been drawn to Gideon Toury's pragmatic definition of translation as whatever people call a translation. In my most recent book, *Translationality* (Routledge, 2017), I track what I call "translationality" through a convoluted literary history involving adaptation, rewriting, translation, pretend translation, and so on, as a dynamic of historical *change*. Instead of starting with things that stay the same, I say, let's start with things that change—and allow ourselves to notice that *everything* changes.

**AKP:** To study a translation, one must translate first, to teach about translation one must translate first. As you have rightly said in the introductory chapter of *Becoming a Translator* that 'there is no substitute for practical experience — to learn how to translate one must translate, translate, translate'. How much of theory is required in training a translator? What should be the pedagogic method in a translators' training programme?

**DR:** I don't have answers to those two questions. I've never been trained as a translator! And I only began thinking theoretically about translation, as I mentioned earlier, after I'd been translating for ten years. I've taught translation theory to undergraduates several times—I teach it here in Hong Kong—and one of the questions I keep getting my students to think

about, and talk about, is how useful this is. Each is required to do a presentation applying a given theory to a practical translation situation, and to involve the other students in deciding about its value. I do think that theory can be a useful shortcut—it can help novice translators broaden their understanding of what translation is, early on, so that they don't just lock into a single narrow conception (like “translation is an exact reproduction of the source text,” which is true of technical translation but not of advertising translation, etc.) and find themselves unable to respond flexibly to job offers outside their comfort zone.

I would say also, of course, that university study should always consist of both theory and practice—testing practice with theory, and testing theory with practice, in a kind of virtuous cycle. That means that, regardless of any practical use to which future translators might put theory, it has an important place in any university TS curriculum. What professional translators will need to know on the job is not the only consideration.

**AKP:** A translator, a socio-cultural entity, cannot control his act of translation as only he is not translating but there are factors that may influence him/her in the process of translation. How would you view a translator's subjectivity in the process of translation?

**DR:** I'm not sure it's possible to generalize. My book *Who Translates?* is subtitled *Translator Subjectivities Beyond Reason* for a good reason! I'm not even sure I know my own translator-subjectivity. I like thinking about it, and I built *Becoming a Translator* around a series of attempts to trigger and organize memory and creativity, through dramatization and visualization; probably my assumptions about the



translator's subjectivity figure into everything I write about translation. But I'm still not sure about it.

**AKP:** Why is Venuti's conception of foreignizing translation inadequate? Could you please explain the 'friendly amendments' to Venuti's concept that you have proposed in your book *Translation and the Problem of Sway*?

**DR:** That's too big a subject! I've been picking at foreignization for twenty years, over and over. *Translation and the Problem of Sway* was indeed my first foray into a rethinking of foreignization, through the study of *ostranenie/Verfremdung* that I did in *Estrangement and the Somatics of Literature* (2008); but then came *Schleiermacher's Icoses* (2013), *Critical Translation Studies* (2017: 10-11), and *Aleksis Kivi and/as World Literature* (2017: 156-60). I did a quickie summary of my various takes on foreignization in my new book, *Translationality* (2017: 144-48); perhaps readers can read that instead?

**AKP:** What is the Dao of Translation? How do you apply Daoist thoughts to the study of translation?

**DR:** Well, that was the question! I thought there must be a way, but wasn't sure what it would be. The book (*The Dao of Translation: An East-West Dialogue*, 2015) had its beginning in an endnote I wrote in *Semiotranslating Peirce* (2016) about Ritva Hartama-Heinonen's 2008 dissertation on abductive translation: the footnote first swelled to ten pages, then to twenty, and just kept on growing until I had to split it off and turn it into a separate book. In that original footnote I observed that Hartama-Heinonen's mystical notion that the translator should not translate—should not do anything at all—but rather should sit back and let the sign translate itself was a bit like the

Daoist notion of 無爲 *wuwei*, which literally means “without acting.” I knew that Laozi didn’t actually mean “without acting”; I’d read about the concept, and his actual notion of minimal interference; but I didn’t really know enough about it to do anything with this association I drew between Hartama-Heinonen’s mystical abduction and Daoism—especially given that Hartama-Heinonen gave no explicit sign of knowing or caring about Daoism. She called her approach Peircean and Romantic, and in fact it seemed more Romantic than Peircean to me; and I knew that the German and English Romantics, and the American Transcendentalists (who influenced Peirce) were all avid readers of the ancient Confucian and Daoist classics. But I didn’t know what to do with all that until I read Roger Ames and David Hall’s “philosophical translation” of the 道德經 *Daodejing*, in which they claimed, persuasively, that what they called the “*wu* forms”—*wuwei*, but also 無知 *wuzhi* (not knowing), 無欲 *wuyu* (not desiring), 無心 *wuxin* “not feeling”—were not so much about *not doing* a thing, as they were about the *habitualization* of the doing of that thing, so that it *felt* as if one was not doing it.

Then the idea came to me: Hartama-Heinonen attacked my use of Peirce in *Becoming a Translator*, accusing me of celebrating the “hardening” of the translator’s professional habits; but in fact what the translator’s habit achieved was precisely that *wuwei* that she seemed (without the word) to be celebrating. Because the translator’s skill is habitualized, it *feels* as if s/he is not translating—as if the text were somehow translating itself. So that became the argument in the book—fleshed out with more readings of Peirce on habit and the commends, Saussure from his posthumous notes, Bourdieu, and so on.

**AKP:** One could witness many turns in the study of translation like linguistic, pragmatic and cultural. You talked about an inter-civilizational turn in the study of translation. Could you please explain about this turn?

**DR:** It's a response to the seething I've begun to feel in Western translation scholars, and even in one Chinese colleague, about this whole issue of Eurocentrism—whether Translation Studies as a field is Eurocentric. I think it's pretty obvious that it is, or has been; but the idea agitates a lot of people. What I wanted to suggest in *Exorcising Translation: Towards an Intercivilizational Turn*, was that this tension around Eurocentrism vs. Sinocentrism, etc., is actually the birth pangs of a new Turn, namely, one that recognizes and embraces the global differences and dialogues that (ideally should) make up the field (or any field). Drawing on Sakai Naoki's notion of cfiguration, I argue that Orientalism and Occidentalism, Eurocentrism and other -centrisms, are actually not so much "centred" anywhere as they are cfigurative interactions that work across power differentials to constitute civilizational "identities." The fact that the West has had more global power than the East for the last few centuries has made the various cfigurative regimes *feel* like a -centrism; but the West is not really the center. It's just (so far) the stronger partner in a dialogue, or a lot of dialogues.

**AKP:** How do you visualize the future of Translation Studies as an academic discipline?

**DR:** No idea, sorry. I have no crystal ball, and am not in the habit of predicting the future!

\*\*\*

# **Book Review**

# What is Cultural Translation?

SARAH MAITLAND

**Maitland, Sarah. 2017. *What is Cultural Translation?*. London & New York: Bloomsbury Academic.**

Reviewed by *ARBINA PHONGLO*

Cultural translation is a post-colonial evolving concept with its academic debut in 1985. Therefore, it is no wonder that Sara Maitland's *What is Cultural Translation* echoes post-colonial theory and challenges the supremacy of a particular culture, which eventually results in rejecting the primacy of a text.

The writer intends to convey two things through this text – 1. In-depth definition of the concept of cultural translation and 2. Relevance of translation in a global society infused with diversity. Many critics have talked extensively about the second one as we live in an increasingly globalized world where the cultural borders are not a strict enclosure. However, regarding ‘the in depth definition’ of the concept of cultural translation, Maitland’s work does not justify her intention or claim. It is only in the chapter five, which is the last chapter, the term ‘Cultural Translation’ figures with adequate assurance for the reader.

The whole text is based on Ricoeur’s hermeneutic philosophy which calls for the interpretive method. Ricoeur figures constantly in this text and cultural translation is seen as representing the “practical outworking” of his theorization. Though Maitland quotes Ricoeur and bases his arguments on his theory, she aims at a different target. His theory was aimed

at personal and social transformation whereas her approach is towards cultural translation. It is critical and seeks to identify the limits of human understanding and to disclose and combat oppression.

Maitland further borrows from a few other theorists, for example, Benjamin, who is known for his rejection of the primacy of original text and placing importance on the storyteller's understanding. This highlights the increasing significance of a translator.

As the text deals with cultural translation, it has also drawn from the field of Anthropology by bringing in Talal Asad, who talked about "the critical distance between the anthropologists and the people written about." Homi K. Bhabha's idea on migration which results in colonial encounter, cultural difference and contestation, is further mentioned in support of the need for cultural translation.

All these shift our attention to the concept of 'orientalism' created by the West. The writer deliberately brings in theorists to make a ground for the relevance of cultural translation in this post-colonial and post-modern world and in the process, succeeds to an extent. She wants the reader to understand the powerful academic game and how the West writes about the Non-Western countries. She tries to create awareness or say, a shift in paradigm for which cultural translation suits the purpose.

This text also focusses on the role of the translator as a vital agent and discusses the complexity associated with the work of a translator. The primacy of the text is unacceptable and therefore, the pressure for extracting or anticipating the 'meaning' is placed on the writer's cognition. Maitland brings

to the notice of the reader the primary dialectics which exist between translator-quo-reader and text-for-translator.

The concentration of this text is on the first category of translation given by Roman Jakobson, that is, inter-lingual translation. The other two categories, intra-lingual and inter-semiotic are therefore, neither the concern nor mentioned in the text.

Basically, the argument of the text is that cultural translation starts from a quest of understanding and it also criticizes the metaphorical extension of translation. The writer tries to resolve the ambiguity surrounding the concept and theory of cultural translation by offering certain practical parameters to be followed. However, she has not neglected the problems of cultural translation in her work and has dedicatedly highlighted them.

Maitland through this book has aimed at establishing the urgency of cultural translation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century academic world. Due to the prevalence of division in ideologies, division on the basis of immigration, etc. the political situation and the co-existing cultures in different countries around the world strongly action the relevance of cultural translation. According to the author, living in a world of different prevailing ideologies, translation “serves as the means both to advance and to contest meaning.” She furthers the argument for the crucial role of cultural translation in the critique of ideology.

Cultural translation is simply not a translation, it is a creation. As an act of creation, the key areas which surfaces in this text are interpretation, rejection of primacy, distanciation appropriation and contestation. These key areas successfully

debunk the concept of ethnocentrism and ushers the reader into a world of cultural relativism.

One of the concerns raised by the writer is the validation of cultural translation when it comes to appropriation. But this concern gives rise to a contradiction to the whole idea of cultural translation which does not profess the dominance or validation of any one culture or meaning or idea.

The effort of the writer can be profoundly seen in developing and contributing to the concept of cultural translation by drawing examples from various fields – online media, TV Literature, current affairs and so on. The presence of long quotations in this text, which appear frequently cripples and overshadows the writer's substance. There is, however, no doubt that these quotations contribute to the enhancement of the writer's argument.

Many other theorists have contributed to the idea of cultural translation, to name a few: Pym, Conway and Sturge. Sara Maitland's work is exemplary not in a pioneering sense but in giving a concrete understanding to the concept of cultural translation and substantiating it. She has put forward the pressing need of cultural translation and calls it "the transformation of the very fabric of culture itself".

In this era of globalization, contrary it may sound, localization is given much importance in translation. There is an emerging need to appeal to the target audience's world view and connect with them. Cultural translation aims at transforming the knowledge from one culture to another and has its own struggles in the process. It struggles as all the cultures in the world are not homogeneous, yet there is a requirement to locate and situate in a particular culture.



This task, therefore, can neither succumb to imitation nor rid itself of subjectivity. Maitland highlights this unavoidable element in this book and says, "...every understanding in the world is interpretive. We cannot stand outside the subjectivity of our embodiment."

In dealing and understanding these problematic underpinnings in Cultural Translation, Sara Maitland's text may offer a translator/reader an overview and deep investigation into the realm of Cultural Translation. She presents cultural translation as a medium not only for transference of knowledge but also a tool heavily equipped to re-write constructed identities in one's own distinct understanding or worldview.

\*\*\*

## **Seven Thousand Ways to Listen: Staying Close to What is Sacred**

**Nepo, Mark. 2012. *Seven Thousand Ways to Listen: Staying Close to What is Sacred*. London & New York: Simon & Schuster Publication.**

Reviewed by **ROZY SAMEJA PATEL**

The seven thousand ways to listen is sort of easy, conversational and probing book. It takes you to a journey within. In this book, the writer unearths some of the delicacies of feeling and emotions that in the process of living we are getting detached with. Those elements being our own inner world, something starts stirring in our mind with reference to different meditative poses and reflective aspects that the writer floats. It is a different take on sensibilities. It is highly spiritual amassing insights from world religions. Still mainly it manages to underline humanity as biggest.

I personally believe that silence is the best thing in this world. And listening comes near to it because it propels the silence. In noise also there is a silence. And silence is melodious! But in our limited strife for sound and silence and sound silence: we need an art of listening to unravel hidden symphony of things. That is equivalent to deciphering pre-ordained patterns of destiny. Nevertheless, this book is about neither of those. It is on contrary a complete inside-out perspective from within to beyond. It would not be an exaggeration if I write that listening is first and foremost exercise for a linguist. Hence the book which I am going to review titled '*Seven Thousand Ways to Listen*'. It is a chapter by chapter unrevealing of beautiful nuances of nature along

with some very sacred but humane philosophies that can translate our mundane lives into some reverberating life!

Translation is an underplay of reading-perceiving-brainstorming-writing-rereading-repairing-sampling-and then again doing the same cycle of reading- and so on and so forth. This pattern is very stimulating to one's brain. Apart from being scholastic, this process is sensory- meaning it involves more than one basic sense. If it were just reading then eye and mind coordination would have been sufficed. But translation requires much more diligence than this. It requires doing-undoing-redoing-undoing the redoing and then starting afresh. It is like a time series on a scale where numerical keep changing as per combinations and combinations keep varying because of numerical. In translation also words and expressions are like those numerical and combination in time series analysis. Each word to a linguist gives so many distinctive meanings and representations. It is like opening of a Pandora in infinity. That is why perhaps semantics and syntactic. In simple parlance, linguists or non-linguists, each one is strives for expressions. Now along with word and its infinite possibility of meanings, an additional twist to desired expression opens up a new wide array of altogether different probabilities.

So far everything is quite a pretty little jugglery of words in mind. A typical exercise for aptness and justification happens while one selects a word-expression combo out of the infinite probabilities. The real power play happens when those mere arrangements of words are uttered mentally or verbally and the sound of that utterance is getting slowly swirled in mind and in mouth. Very culinary type, isn't it? But aren't we trying to cook and concoct a new recipe out of old ingredients while we are translating? If you are smiling.... that takes some

burden off my chest. Meaning something fruitful shall come from this recipe also. Pun intended!

Sorry for digressing but my point is that we should take the feel and flavor of the actual sound aloud of the write up as a final patch test. That means translation is not just verbal exercise but an audio as well. At this juncture I would like to float a theory that all those who speak well are essentially better listeners. It is universal theory in academia and my personal belief also. Good writers are most of the times excellent speakers and that again boils down to their innate or cultivated abilities of listening. And better listeners are unarguably best translators because listening gives them hang and pang of each language in which they work.

Ours is an era of paradoxes and oxymorons, of virtual reality and of real virtues, of parallel living and parallel world. By and large, it boils down to a theory and anti-theory. Maybe the contemplation gets much more clearly if theory of comparisons and theory of contrast are imbued. Same way this arena of especially last decade has been dominated by such cosmic paradoxes. Where in at one hand clone-engineering and at another actual humane insights are being increasingly sought. May be the technology has failed to transpire comfort levels mentally. Yes this era has been extremely uncomfortable one. Not physically of course if we discount some ill-intentioned violence on humanity.

If we go on probing further we come to realize that we have been really in easy in our minds. Not to mention that the amount of uneasiness has gradually increased. From the inception also there was a feeling of uneasiness which gave raise to doubts and then ultimately to discoveries. But those theories of evolution have long been done and dusted. What I am attempting to put forward is realization and acceptance of

that age old feeling of uneasiness that has been increasingly done in this decade.

The writer, Mark Nepo is a master craftsman of unearthing that uneasiness beneath and tendering it an ethereal beyond. He captures those illusive feelings so correctly that manifestation from reader's point of view becomes as surreal as a fantasy and as hard hitting as a fact. That is why perhaps his first and an award winning book is called '*The Awakening*'!

It is a refreshing take on otherwise mystic and spiritual exposure that humanity have had so far. It takes you into depth of being and onto soaring heights of vision at one go. Sometimes I tell my students that they do not have to be serious for learning or teaching serious subjects. Probably Mark Nepo was there in my class (needless to say it's a PJ!) because he does the same. At the cost of being flippant, I want to say that sounding frivolous is not too bad provided that it retains the write-up in lighter mode which is much more communicative. Of course, Mark Nepo is an authority to impart very intellectual broodings with feather light touch.

Another break-through that this concept book has done is it has connected to reader at some inexplicable level. Moreover some younger generations have got instant connect to this book. Otherwise concepts as such are written most of the times while keeping a mature or sometimes over-mature target audience in mind. Quite contrary to that, '7000 ways to listen' radically gels through a mass of all ages and all walks of life. And if this much was not enough, let me tell you that this book is one of those rare books that has after-life. Yes for sure! It is a book which stays by the bed-side of almost every second reader propelling one to re-read and rediscovers the

latent wonders of universal designs. It propels the likes of scholars, psychologists, humanitarians to practise some of the concepts of the book to add value to life and life to values. I won't mind admitting that it gives a 'Deja-vu' kind of feeling in the reader. That probably gives it a repeat value. It is, on and on, a deeply magnetic book written on some very uneasy ephemeral experiences. But unflinchingly makes those, by the end, much more easily acceptable!

The book is originally panned out in 3 sections and 38 sub-sections. Those 3 sections are called: I. The Work of Being II. The Work of Being Human, III. The Work of Love.

\*\*\*

# Translation

## **An Astonishing Method of Torture**

**Vismayajanakavada Himseya Kramavu (Kannada) by Kerur Vasudevacharya**

*Translated into English by S. JAYASRINIVASA RAO*

Valentine Digby, relaxing in a lounge chair after lunch, was smoking a Havana cigar and appeared to be lost in thoughts. He sat watching the fragrant smoke of the cigar as it made rings and swirled upwards like the wavy hair of a maiden. At that moment, a melodious voice was heard singing, “*Your presence makes my heart rejoice and sing.*” And as the voice came closer, Digby saw the singer, sat up startled, and exclaimed, “Diana!”

The lovely Diana placed her delicate hands on the young man’s shoulder in a playful manner and asked with a coquettish smile, “Valentine, I thought you’d come home for breakfast today morning. I tired myself out waiting for you. Where have you been?”

Digby got up from his chair, held Diana’s hand and made her sit on the featherbed and said, “Diana, forgive me for this unbecoming behaviour today. As I have to leave for England soon, I was busy making arrangements.”

Taking advantage of this situation, Diana pulled Valentine gently towards her and making him sit next to her, “One shouldn’t trust men at all,” she said. This should have sounded like an objection, if it was not for the loving smile, and her arms around his shoulders in a manner that suggested an impending kiss and an embrace.



Diana was a beautiful lady with a radiant complexion. Though thirty or thirty-two years old, she was lively and poised, making her look twenty to anyone who knew not her real age. Her clothes were expensive and jewellery was beautifully crafted. A grape vine shaped clasp studded with sparkling stones arrested her dark locks. A strand of pearls with a shining diamond pendant dropped from her divine neck and adorned her décolletage. A ruby encrusted ring glittering like a live ember gave a rare lustre to her elegant hand. A mere glance from this fish-eyed beauty was enough to split open the hardest of men's hearts. Her lips which were red like the ripe Bimba fruit made boys and young men gaze at them unblinkingly as if they were filled with ambrosia. The dulcet tones of her voice, which would put even the cuckoo's voice to shame, and her delightful conversation, would enthuse even the simplest of people and make them sing her praises. When a lady of such charm smiles and speaks with such love, Valentine could only ask in a low subdued voice, "What is my fault?" as he sat leaning against her.

"What can I say? You cruel young man! You capture the heart of a poor woman and then decide to go far away across the seas forever. What about me?"

Valentine kissed the lovely lady's red lips passionately, smiled and said softly, "Diana, I am a poor man. If I have to be a husband of a charming lady like you and fulfill all your wishes, I need to have the wealth of Kubera. I would be a traitor to your beauty if I am not able to adorn every limb of yours with pearls, diamonds, and jewels."

"Dear, though it is an offence in our society for a woman to explicitly spell out her wish, can my heart be quiet when you decide to leave me and go thousands of miles away across

the seas?” said Diana dabbing her tear filled eyes with her handkerchief.

Valentine was overwhelmed. He forgot all resolutions he had made earlier, embraced Diana with ardour and drained her lips of all the accumulated nectar.

“Diana, I have always been enamoured of your beauty. But I am still a poor man, aren’t I? If god blesses me in my endeavour, I will become the richest among the rich in the coming months. Please be patient till then, don’t be so distressed,” Valentine assured her with his guileless words.

“Valentine, my late husband Edward Campbell met a watery grave within two months of our getting married and left me in widowed grief. I have inherited his considerable wealth. What if you are not wealthy? We can live in happiness as a married couple, can’t we? Anyway, what is this endeavour of yours that you talk about?”

“There are some forests in Brazil that have inexhaustible reserves of gold. I have a map of that region.”

“Oh! Really?” exclaimed Diana in surprise. “Valentine, you haven’t told me about this! I guessed that there was something like this on your mind. Where is that map?”

“I can’t show it to you yet. If people get to know that there is gold in such a place, I, who discovered this, would be left behind and crooks would make away with all the gold.”

“Is that so? But, why are you leaving for England now?” asked Diana, as she sat down and coyly leaned her face against his shoulder.

“If I have to arrange for machines and tools, chemical laboratories, and coolies for the mining work in the gold fields, I need a lot of money. The Forbes Bank in London has limitless money. If I explain my plan to the bank officials and obtain money from them, the forest in Brazil could become a large town filled with factories, workshops, and homes of coolies and traders. After that, I am the king there. And you, the loving wife of the king Valentine Digby, will shine radiantly like the moonstone at the centre of a golden girdle.”

“I am indeed blessed, dear Valentine! I hope your words come true and your dreams are fulfilled. If you have to go to London, don’t go alone. I will send my late husband’s friend, George Campbell, along with you. He is an expert in chemistry and I hear, he has set up a chemical laboratory in London. Let him go with you. He’ll be out of my hair for a while and you’ll have some company during your journey.”

After conversing for a while, Diana took valentine Digby’s leave and went home.

\*\*\*\*\*

Valentine Digby reached London and met with Sir Arthur Russell, the Chairman of Forbes Bank. He spoke in detail about his plans with Sir Arthur and showed him the map and a sample of the gold ore. Sir Arthur took the opinion of a well-known geologist in London, approved of Digby’s plans and agreed to lend him the money. As Digby was an intelligent,

humble, and industrious young man, Sir Arthur Russell felt a lot of affection for him.

Since a new company had to be set up and new machines manufactured, Digby needed some time for this and decided to stay on in London for some more months. As he was the chairman of a potentially profitable company, he soon became a well-known figure in London. Rich people, entrepreneurs, mothers of young unmarried girls, all made their way to Digby's door and many became his friends.

One day, as Digby returned home after a stroll, the postman handed him some letters. Digby looked at the letters cursorily and kept them aside, except for one, which he read with great concentration, sat with his head down and looked deeply worried. Sir Arthur Russell saw Digby in this state and asked, "Why, has the contents of that letter caused you distress, Digby?" Digby smiled sadly and without replying handed over the letter to Sir Arthur Russell.

To,  
*Mr Valentine Digby*  
London

*The fact that a lady named Diana Campbell is your friend is common knowledge in Brazil. Keeping friendship aside, it is rumoured that she has enticed you into falling in love with her and is ready to remarry and has agreed to marry you. There would be no reason to write this letter if Diana really intends to marry you. Where is the rule which says that the husband must be older than his wife? Even though Diana is older to you by four or five years, you could have lived a happy life in the company of a*

*wife who is wise to the ways of the world. But Diana has no desire to marry you. All her love abides in George Campbell. Diana's husband Edward Campbell died suddenly. People believe that Diana poisoned him. It is also believed that George Campbell himself prepared the poison and gave it to Diana. Whatever the facts are, I feel strongly that for your own good you should be vigilant and not be hoodwinked by this capricious lady.*

*Do you have the map of the gold mines with you? It looks like the time has come for you give up your life for the gold mines. Diana has sworn to steal the map away from you by hook or crook and it is three days since she has arrived from America for this purpose. Please be on your guard, or else you will be defrauded and lose everything. Beware!*

*I myself have arrived from America only two days ago.*

– A. B. C.

Sir Arthur read the letter, smiled and asked, “So, you have got yourself entangled in Diana’s love? According to this letter her activities appear suspicious, is it true?”

“Impossible! Diana is a good-natured beautiful lady. A jealous woman or a wicked man appears to have written this letter.” Though Digby looked calm when he said this, his mind was filled with apprehension.

“Shall I hand over this letter to the investigative officers and seek their opinion?” asked Sir Arthur.

“That won’t be necessary. It is a sin to suspect a virtuous woman who is willing to surrender all her wealth and wants to marry me.”

The conversation did not proceed further. In the meanwhile, Diana had sent word to her beloved Valentine Digby that she had arrived in London and also the directions to the house where she was residing with a request to come and meet her. Valentine Digby hastened to her house. Their union was a display of extravagant pleasure. Diana rushed to embrace him with tears of joy and he hugged and kissed her.

“Diana, would you be able to guess what kind of vile person could have written this letter?” asked Digby as he showed her the letter that was signed *A. B. C.*

Diana read the letter once, twice, three times, knitted her brows, frowned, thought for a while, smiled, looked at Digby and asked, “Valentine, would you forgive me if I told you I have done something wrong?”

“My queen of love, I wouldn’t want to know what you have done, I have forgiven you,” reassured Digby as he placed his hand on her shoulder and shook her chins affectionately and smiled.

“Dear, I wanted to read your mind and so I asked one of my maids to write this letter. Now, is there any reason why you won’t forgive me?” asked the clever and charming Diana and gazed at his face in eager anticipation of an answer.

Hugs and kisses were his only response. “Darling, you wanted to read my mind using the same methods that would shatter somebody’s heart? Despite this, I have forgiven you,” said Digby, repeating his earlier words.

Diana was staying in the same large house that George Campbell had rented. Campbell's business in chemicals was flourishing. Bottles of sulphuric acid were stocked in one part of the house, in another part were bottles of nitric acid, fruit salt lay in a heap in a corner, Sanatogen was being prepared in a room, jars of cod liver were to be seen in the corridor; a number of similar ingredients were to be seen all around the house. Digby appreciated George Campbell's confidence and praised his industrious spirit.

"This is not all. I have captured air and have distilled it into a liquid and stored that in huge vats. This is being carried out in the cellar below. In the same place, we are conducting experiments to create amazing chemicals using electrical power," said Campbell swelling with pride.

"I am so happy for you, George! Diana, didn't you say you'd offer me tea?" enquired Digby, "Come, let's go."

"Aha! Why this haste? You wouldn't want to marry both mother and daughter together, would you?" taunted Diana.

"What are you saying, Diana?"

"Don't I know that you tried to win Amelia's love some years back?"

"It's true, so what? It was only because I used to visit your house to woo Amelia that I managed to gain your love. I was searching for gold and found a diamond. No harm done at all, I must say," said Digby as he pulled Diana towards him and held her in his embrace.

Amelia served tea to her stepmother and Digby, and stood watching their intimacy with growing misery. Diana gnashed her teeth in anger when she saw her stepdaughter watching

them. Valentine spoke to Amelia in an affectionate manner, and took their leave and left for his house.

\*\*\*\*\*

Digby was very happy. He had no time to relax, not even for a second. The tailor had come with new clothes and Digby tried out coats and trousers. The jeweller was showing him rings set with sparkling stones. Many such traders were offering him a variety of things. Digby spoke with them cheerfully. Today, he would agree to anything anyone said.

“Valentine Digby, why are you in such a happy mood today?” asked Sir Arthur Russell, smiling.

“My good fortune appears to be smiling on me. Sir Arthur, you have played a significant role in my good fortune, would I desist from telling you the reason for my happiness?”

“When will you tell me? What is all this preamble for?”

“George Campbell’s letter has arrived today. He says, my beloved Diana desires we discuss our wedding plans today. That’s why I am so excited.”

“I am so glad! May god fulfil all your desires,” said Sir Arthur Russell and warmly shook Digby’s hand.

While Valentine Digby was reading a newspaper and relaxing after lunch, a servant came in and handed him a letter.



*Charing Cross*  
*No. 157*

*Dear Digby,*

*I had no alternative but to write this letter. You might feel that what I have written is exaggerated. Despite this, I hope you would act in a rational manner. You have been invited to this house today evening, haven't you? Please don't come to this house. If you come here today, you will be in danger. George Campbell and my stepmother, Diana Campbell, have together hatched a plot to take away your life as well as the map from your possession. I feel bashful in admitting that I was at one point of time favourably disposed towards you. I have to admit this now due to circumstances beyond one's control. It is with this affection in mind that I am writing this letter to you. You are surely going to lose your life tonight. That is why I implore you, please decline today's invitation and forget about coming over to our house. Please do not succumb to desire.*

*Yours sincerely,*  
*Amelia Campbell*

Digby sat stunned on reading this letter. All the pleasant thoughts that were swirling around in his mind were fading away into a fog of alarm and fear.

“Is it possible that Diana has written this letter too? But, why on a happy day like today? Did Amelia write this? Why ‘did,’ isn't it clear from the signature that Amelia has written this letter. But I just can't make myself believe that Diana can

be a killer.” With all these thoughts and worries swarming in his head, Digby fell asleep.

It was the time in the evening when office workers, clerks, officers, servants, and others finish their work for the day and like cattle released from their yokes, with the feeling that they had managed to survive the day, troop home happily. They walk to their respective homes, partake of some refreshment, wear fresh clothes, and set out to enjoy the cool evening breeze. Sir Arthur Russell too set out with his wife in a fine carriage to enjoy the evening. While people were enjoying their evening outside home, Digby was lying all alone in bed totally weighed down with conflicting thoughts.

At this very moment, walked in Diana wearing dazzling clothes and sparkling jewels, with a charming smile that could drive away all despondency from one’s thoughts. She called out to Valentine in her melodious voice and came close to his cot. When she saw him tossing around in misery, she was startled and cried out, “Valentine! Valentine dear!! What’s the matter?”

Just as a man being chased by a tiger feels relieved on seeing an armed saviour and says, “Thank god, I’m saved,” Digby felt relieved on seeing Diana, as if half his worries had already been driven away. He sat up with alacrity and said, “Come Diana, you have come at the right time,” and made some space for her to sit on the cot.

Like a kind lady who would console a sorrowful young boy by running her hand affectionately over his forehead, Diana put an arm around Digby’s shoulders and caressed his chest with the other hand and asked, “What’s the matter, darling? I thought you’d be in high spirits and thus came down

to be in your pleasant company. What has happened to you? Are you in two minds about getting married to me?"

"Sweetheart, if I were to refuse you, I would be negating my own life. Why should you harbour such dreadful doubts?" asked Valentine twirling her curly hair around his finger.

"Take your hands off me!" Diana exclaimed in mock anger. "You lie," she said and pulled away from Valentine.

Defeated, Digby held her in his arms and made promises and gave her assurances and pledged to marry her. At this, Diana got up, went over to the cupboard and took out a bottle of sweet-smelling wine and coyly poured it into a glass and cajoled Valentine into drinking it.

Valentine got tipsy after two glasses of wine. Diana put him in a hansom and took him to Hyde Park for a walk. While strolling in the park, Diana, very tactfully, was able to clear Digby's mind of many doubts that he earlier had.

As soon as he returned home, Digby changed into an elegant dress, took his Malabar cane with the golden handle and got ready to leave for Diana's house. As he was leaving, Sir Arthur Russel saw him, stopped him and asked, "My dear man, where are you off to at Dinner time? Where did you get this renewed enthusiasm from? When I saw you in the afternoon, you were crushed with worry. What had happened to you then?"

"I do not have the time to particularly discuss the issue in detail now. But, I will show you the letter that caused me such distress. Diana has since repudiated the claims made in this letter to my satisfaction," said Digby and took out the letter from his pocket and showed it to Sir Arthur.

Sir Arthur Russell read the letter, took Digby's arm and made Digby sit beside him, and said, "Valentine, as suggested in this letter, what is the harm if you do not go to her house tonight? You tell me that Diana is deeply in love with you. What you two have planned for today can happen tomorrow, can't it?"

"Sir Arthur, you surely would have fallen in love with a lady at some point of time in your life? How can I break Diana's heart? Moreover, I feel it is a sin to believe that there is something sinister in her love. Please forgive me if I have to transgress your orders in this case."

"Please do as you wish, but, please do not consume any intoxicant there. Once your task is completed, come back immediately without wasting your time," advised Sir Arthur, overcome with concern and affection for this young man.

Digby agreed to abide by Sir Arthur's counsel and set out. The moment Digby left, Sir Arthur telephoned the crime investigator Sherlock Holmes and summoned him. Sir Arthur explained the entire matter to Holmes and handed over the two letters that Digby had received.

Holmes thought for a moment and said he would do his utmost to save Digby's life and left in a hurry to make arrangements.

At around 10 o' clock that night, the police laid siege on house no. 157 in Charing Cross. The police cordon was so dense that even a kitten wouldn't have been able to pass through. No creature could come out of the house either. Digby had informed that he would certainly be out of that

house before 12 o' clock. It was past midnight now and Digby hadn't come out yet.

Fearing that Digby was in danger, Sherlock went straight to the main door and started kicking it.

“Who is that, creating this commotion at this late hour and disturbing our sleep with such audacity?” asked Diana in anger, but the voice was as sweet as a cuckoo's.

“Has a gentleman named Valentine Digby come to this house?” asked Sherlock.

“Valentine Digby! Who is he? Why would he come here? I don't even know anybody named Digby,” said the lady from inside.

“How is that possible? I have seen Digby entering this house with my own eyes. My name is Sherlock Holmes.”

“Sherlock Holmes!” exclaimed Diana and opened the door. “What brings you here? Please come inside,” said Diana courteously.

Sherlock went inside the house and sat on a chair and asked, “Madam Diana, hasn't Digby come here? I saw him entering this very same house.”

“No, he hasn't come here. You could look around the house if you wish. Why are you so anxious about him? Has he committed any crime?” asked Diana.

Sherlock was astonished at her hypocrisy, and said with a smile, “He hasn't committed any crime. Since many people

have seen him going into this house and have said so, I will search this house thoroughly. I hope you won't object."

"Of course, not! It is only a matter of losing sleep for a couple of hours," She said sarcastically.

Along with a group of policemen, Sherlock and Watson entered the house and started searching all the rooms. They searched the main hall, kitchen, bathrooms, and backyard; opened cupboards and boxes; rolled up mattresses. There was no sign of Digby anywhere. They looked for secret places under the floor by jumping on the floor at various spots. Tired and frustrated, they descended to the cellar. What do they see there? Sherlock was astonished. He took out a thick Havana cigar, lit it and stood there smoking and looked around perplexed. Sherlock smoked a few cigars in rapid succession, relaxed, and walked slowly towards a large brass mortar. He put his hand in it and saw that there was flour like substance. He took a pinch and smelled it. He smelled it once more and extended his hand towards Watson. Watson too smelled it and said, "This looks like some animal substance." As soon as he heard Watson's observation, Sherlock started laughing hysterically. Nothing could stop Holmes' laughter. "Why are you laughing like this, Holmes?" asked Watson. Holmes continued laughing. "I hope it is not some kind of powder that induces madness in humans," speculated Watson and smelled the powder again. At this Sherlock said, "Doctor, this is not a madness inducing powder, but if you know what powder this is, you would become mad too."

Sherlock lit another cigar, sat on a chair, leaned back comfortably, and started explaining: "Doctor, look here, here is a vat filled with a liquid distilled out of air. You are aware that if rabbits and such animals are killed and thrown into this

liquid, their bodies solidify and become like shiny sugar crystals or resins and it becomes easier to crush them into a powder. Similarly, can't human bodies be put into this liquid too and crushed?"

As soon as he heard this, Watson started jumping up and down like a madman. "I got it Sherlock, the powder in this mortar is the remains of a human body. Undoubtedly. Could it be that Valentine Digby was killed and his body was pounded and made into a powder like this?"

"Without a doubt. But we don't have evidence to prove that these people had killed Digby and ground his body. They killed Digby and put the body into the liquid made out of air kept in that vat. Then they took the body out, put it in that mortar shaped like a trough, and crushed it into a powder. They put the powder into that leather tube lying there and with the help of a machine scattered the powder into the air. If we continue to search this house any longer, I fear the tree will break and fall on all of us. As beautiful Diana as is to the eye, she is an evil and a cruel woman too. Valentine Digby was caught in her deception and died a pointless death. Here's a woman who defeated even me!

\*\*\*

## Resurrection

*Punorutthan (Bangla) by JATIN BALA*  
*Translated into English by MRINMOY PRAMANICK*

People of B. G. colony look at Atul Mistri when he walks in his own rhythm. It seems people cannot refuse to take notice of Atul Mistri's walk. His body is like a thin, dry, old bamboo stick. Like a skeleton. Strong wrist, long hands and little bended legs. It seems he throws those legs in every step and walks like an aimed arrow. He is like a smooth skin *Pnakal* fish staying in a muddy water of pond. A bunch of black and white deep curly hair on his head - a loose torn full sleeve shirt on his body. Fifty-years old Atul Mistri is a poor peasant. He is a *Namashudra*. The Mistri surname is an extra word. He is one among the hundred crores people of India who pray to mother-Earth for livelihood.

Forcefully, people made colony after demolishing the temporary refugee camps. Each family gets too small space to live and it was given by rationing. Atul Mistri has been refused from many places and at last he left his shack beside the rail line when he got a small piece of land to stay. He made a hut with mud walls, covered with red mud tiles at B. G. Colony. It is his great fortune. Fug and dark area, looks like a fat human being, no colour, no shape; though better than that dirty shack which was made of waste plastic covers.

He had to walk a long way for thirty-five years. His life is full with interesting and unbelievable narratives as fairy tales are. His life is as overstrung as a detective story. It filled with many dramatic conflicts and tensions. His surname is Mistri but nothing is there what he had not to do for livelihood. Once



he went to commit suicide but failed. Attraction towards his family brought him back to the slum.

His daily life went through tremendous labour, hard work and uncertainty of future. He is a victim of partition, religious fundamentalism and caste system. Not only he, but also crores of Indians who had to leave their parents' land once. After having suffered with all these hazards, Atul Mistri is still alive! Strange! Strange! Leaving all these tiredness of life, he owned all the strength to live, he is changed - he, he himself did it.

Consciousness to resist, to protest, a step towards a strong move, changes a human being. You have to know it, as eternal truth. Experiences make a life as the life of a human being should be. Human being! Atul feels immense pleasure to think about this word. There are thousands of rhythms in this word.

The man, the man is an eternal truth. Breaking the cover of a seed and becoming a tree, becoming a human being, achieving a life, a complete life. Everything is there inside the man, everything is for human being. He cannot control himself, and his heart floats into the tears of eyes, the old memories break his landscape of mind like a storm.

Our land is made of alluvial soil. Black, ash coloured clayey soil. Whatever colour it may be, it is our mother, mother earth. So I did not see any other land. I have loved this soil. This is my mother. There is no comparison of mother's beauty. This land seems to me like that. So, when mother land is divided, it cries, it gets pain and we too. Heart is divided. I have bloodshed. I have bloodshed of my brothers.

## **Hanging Bait from Hook**

Bongaon to Sealdah, lakhs of people are homeless, staying in slums, in kennels. They are living every moment fighting with death. Rootless, aimless, foodless people! They do not have shape, do not have beauty, they have only open mouths. Hunger! Hunger makes a human being inhuman. A man kills another because of hunger. These slums are really jungles. Jungles of the man.

Man-eater, ferocious animals are moving here and there freely in this jungle. Tigers, lions, leopard, poisonous snakes and many more. Each moment needs a conscious step. Poor men are often killed by these animals. They will eat your bones and flesh. If you do not believe my words, ask somebody else. Ananda Mandal who came back from Dandakaranya-Pilvit, was saying these. Atul Mistri can understand that the story is true. He can see in the dark, a living creature appears in skeleton, from heath, infertile, grim land. The last local train, blowing its whistle, left for Bongaon, long ago. Maya did not come back home. Tension makes him impatient. Maya is the daughter of Aloka and Atul Mistri. What happened to her! Who knows! Maya is damsel, beautiful. Parents become unrest, walking mindlessly, sometimes becoming like stone in fear, cursing their fate. Atul Mistri is going out of kennel in the dark. Alok sat on the entrance of it. Atul Mistri cannot think about his fate. What will happen to his daughter! Dark galley and narrow lanes beside the rail lines. Atul stumbles on the dark way. Somehow he controls himself from falling down.

Slowly and silently she goes back to the kennel. Suddenly she gets shock after seeing a dark-shaped shadow. She calls in a loud voice with fear, 'who? Who? Who is there?' 'Me, me',

Atul Mistri says. Maya recognises the voice and asks with anxiety, ‘why are you here? What are you doing?’

Atul was tensed too out of breath, he replied, ‘I was waiting for you’. He stopped because he could not able to speak continuously. He was anxious and worried.

‘For me? In this night? Why?’ Maya was so surprised.

I had to tell you something important. I was thinking to tell you but I could not. Atul expels a deep breath. It seems echoed.

‘You could have said it in the morning’, Maya hid her sorrow and said in a normal tone. ‘Yes, I could have told. But you are always busy. Atul tried to hide his ransacked mind but he failed. Atul sat on a cement pedestal near to his kennel and said Maya in an unrest voice, ‘sit here’. Maya becomes irritated though she said, ‘no, it is okay, you please tell me’.

Atul Mistri looks for words. He is a man having no destination. It seems his inside is facing a continuous bleeding from old wounds. His unorganized words reflect his inner world, “I am a broken man, failed everywhere. An agony of my life struggle burns me, I am rootless, moving here and there, from one camp to another, stayed in slums, I broke stones, I had to dig soil for livelihood. I am tired after back-breaking work. I am just floating on the river of life. Your *Ma* says it very correctly, ‘I am a man who does not possess any meaning’. I do not have any value. It is my mistake, I married your *Ma*, gave birth to you. There is no limit of my guilt”. It seems he has to take immense effort to talk, something is resisting his voice. Atul is sweating. He is taking long breath. “*Ma*, please do not go for any work tomorrow onwards, you

please be here at home. I will go to dig stone-soil. You stay at home *Ma*, stay at home”.

Bitter voice of Maya came out with anxiety, ‘you are waiting here to say all these, at this night’? Atul tries to stand, his legs are weak. ‘No, no, not because of that. You are growing now, if you are late to return home, we become very much tensed. All the bad thoughts dig our heart. I cannot bear with this anymore’.

Maya can understand what her father means. Maya needs to make him understand. Life struggle! Endless struggle makes this man faithless towards life. What is his fault? He is still alive, that is enough. Maya resists her anger. She knows when hunger eats your nerves; you have to eat the bait, though you know bait is hanging from a hook. It is a living truth.

Young Maya demurred at the beginning. She hesitated to see herself as a commodity of male sexual desire. She felt it is an insult to womanhood. Hunger made her cry several times. Human being can insult its’ soul or humanity only because of getting some food to live. Maya knows the difference between to live and to live without food. She realised it very particularly.

Tensed Aloka sits like a stone. Her twenty-year old son is in jail for last three months because of false charge. She always feels burning sensation. Her children are still alive with so many hazards. If they leave her now, make her alone, how she will accept it. Tears fall from her eyes. How unfortunate is her life! Her husband, her daughter and her son. Where they will be lost, who knows! If one leaves the home, whether s/he comes back again! Her heart cries.

Maya crosses the light darkness and stands in front of their kennel. Aloka reaches to the heaven, she jumps on her daughter and ask where she was still this midnight. Maya rejects her mother's emotions with a bitter sound. She comes out from Aloka's arms. She saw a broken face in the dim light. She looked at her Ma with an irritation. Aloka is surprised. Her lips are wounded, it is bleeding. She tastes her own blood. She realised her own blood which is there in her daughter's vein, is floating with some other current...

### **Another World Behind...**

Myakrel Work Site Camp. Anil Ghatak was telling, "*Babumoshai* How much you pay for us, why do you kill me slowly? It is better to shoot us. You will not be punished and we will be free forever'. Atul Mistri was strong then. He could speak too. *Namashudra* never dies easily. He added, 'who divides motherland only to get pleasure of power, sends us to the forest of Dandakaranya they are posterity of Mirzafar. The chair of Delhi is much more favorite than greater patriotism'".

Those great people who were behind the Dandakaranya plan did not have to go there. They did not get any chance to enjoy extreme political power also. Only they had punished *Namashudras*. Atul Mistri could not tell all these things that day but he organized the labours of Myakrel Work Site and called for a strike.

Shyamal Mukherjee who was one of the masters to send people in Dandakaranya was looking that scenario. Small yellow coloured tents, narrow lane full of stones, jungles and ferocious animals. They sent people here to be died, to be killed. Whose conspiracy is this?

There was only one tube well for thousands of families. No way to preserve rain water. Tents were in worst condition. At the time of raining, people had to take shelter under the tree. Government takes care of animals in zoo but they did not show sympathy towards the refugees. Motherland is wounded and many poisonous insects are moving there.

Shyamal Mukherjee, accompanied by many others came towards the tents, ‘who is Nikhil Biswas?’ He asked it in bitter voice. Weak Nikhil Biswas became tired to reach to Shyamal Mukherjee, after a long breathing, he asked, ‘what happened?’ ‘As if you will be seating for indefinite hunger strike’, Shyamal Mukherjee asked sarcastically. “There is nothing to call for hunger strike, we are hungry. I get twenty rupees per month and you take the money. You have said that we will get subsidy, but when? My stomach does not listen to anything”. Shyamal Mukherjee was about to move. Three four refugees came and told him, “Please listen to some other stories. There is a scarcity of water, stool is overflowing from the latrine, and tents are already torn. There is no limit of complains. If you want to kill us please do it on our motherland. Why are you killing us in this natural jail?”

Shyamal Mukherjee, Dasharath Mitra, Abinash Chatterjee looked at each other. One among refugees shouted, ‘workers came to repair tube well and tents, you people sent them back’. People started asking together, ‘what happened? No answer? Why? Tell us’.

These masters of refugees shouted at them and started to show their power verbally. There is no other way for these refugees. They have to live. All the men, women, children came and hold masters’ legs and requested again and again to earn their right to live. But who cares! Shyamal Mukherjee,

Haren Chakraborty, Madhusudan Dasgupta became angry, lower caste people touched their feet. Shyamal Mukherjee said, 'you should not do this. I am trying to afford best for you people'. Someone from the crowd spoke, 'you have done a lot for us. Next time you please come to see our dead bodies'. Shyamal Mukherjee took his jeep and said in a cruel voice, 'whether you want or not I have to come to visit you. I have taken your responsibility'. Crowd said, 'yes you do that we will not dig stones in the name of soil. If you are able to offer us food and shelter, please give otherwise we will go back to Sealdah station. At least we can survive there'. Shyamal Mukherjee looked at other members and said in English, 'some political provocation is going behind this; we have nothing to do for these people, let us go. They are eating our nerves.'

Jeep rushed towards Jagdalpur on national high way. Atul Mistri looked at red dust in the air and cursed his fate. Bengalis are doing harm to Bengalis, cold blood, well planned. A plan, so well, so organized, which includes three states: Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa. Atul Mistri could not realise it initially. Now it is very much clear to him, division of society based on caste. He opened the mask of the society. Once who had helped Radcliff to draw the line now they are killing *Rajputs* of Bengal, *Namasudras*, otherwise they will not achieve the taste of power of Delhi. Atul Mistri still can hear those words of dream, 'there is no sufficient land for cultivation, no ladders, cows, seeds, if you go there, you will be given all these'. Showing the balloons of hope they were brought here in Dandakaranya, from the fertile land of the Padma River, the Meghna River and the Ariyal to here on the dead land.

Atul Mistri took shelter in a reception centre near to India-Bangladesh border when he first came to India. After that he

stayed in many small centres in Barnpur, Bongaon. It is a thirty five years old story but written in blood. Name, profession, family members, original dress, everything were written on a piece of yellow paper. Masters stamped a number on his forehead, registration card number. That yellow paper with government seal was everything. That was only identity and gate pass to get ration, loan everything.

Now Atul Mistri can see the cruelty of caste system which is written on his palm. Higher caste refugees were given land, shelter and jobs. Their own people were there to offer them all the comforts. Lower caste people, peasants, they lost their land and everything else as soon as they lose it. There was no space for them in West Bengal, hence, they were sent to Dandakaranya. Many people died on the road. Much more people were died because of hunger than the riots. Those, who were still alive in Dandakaranya, nobody could kill them, they came back to West Bengal, took shelter beside the rail lines, high ways. Atul Mistri is one among them, who is still alive combating the death. Atul Mistri cannot think any more, his eyes are full of tears.

Stomach does not listen to anyone, has to fulfill its own demand. Again, another conspiracy. Swapan Mistri, Atul Mistris's son. Biren Moitra made him a hired murderer by showing greed of money. His parents did not know where he used to go every night. Aloka noticed changes in his behavior. He did not have to wait for more. He engaged with wagon breaking group. Now he has been caught and he is sent to jail. Upper caste Hindus had used him to make profit in wrong way. Casteism is such a thing which moves in a circle. It always chases. A question hits Atul's mind, the weak always be under the feet of upper caste! He looks for answer but does not get.



## **Resurrection of Existence**

A hut and a small piece of land make a family. Red tiles made of burned mud make the roof of the hut. People from exile start their new life. This is not a complete life but this is not earned excluding anyone. Life teaches chapters after chapters. Atul Mistri had seen many things, he observed, he realized. Now he searches the truth in his life, from his living experiences, from his earned experiences. Sometimes, he gets it.

The man is not bad, bad is that darkness which covers human being. Life can be reorganized. This realization makes Atul the first inhabitant of the new world. Not a single life, he finds many lives within him.

Looking at the darkness, Aloka was thinking about her past. She can remember the incident of their marriage. She went to a marriage ceremony and Atul brought her to a dark place and aggressively asked her, 'tell me whether you will marry me, I will send my father to your home'. Aloka was ashamed of herself, she tried to unbind her, but Atul held her with arms. Atul chafed, clutched Aloka's breast with all his strength. Aloka was dying of insult. She tried a lot to go away from Atul but she could not. Atul's warm breath was touching her face, neck and breast. Atul shouted, 'where are you going, answer me and go'. In the mean time someone reached there, so Atul had to free Aloka. 'Monday is a good day. We will decide about marriage on that day', Atul Said.

After seeing this situation of her children, Aloka discovers her husband in a new world. After such a long time her heart is crying badly for Atul. Every family takes special care of husbands because husbands earn money for livelihood. Aloka

thinks that man is tired to walk such a long way of his life, his health is weak, black hair turns into white, eyes are sunken, cheeks are only covered with skin, and suddenly he becomes old. Oh god! Aloka's heart cries.

Aloka can remember the words. It will be there in her mind forever. Once Atul was so emotional that he was shaking, 'ah! How beautiful you are! Do you like me?' Aloka just smiled. She did not reply. There was no need of that. The man hugged her and said, 'why are you afraid? I am your husband, is not it? You, you will be my children's mother'. Aloka found a new world in the word mother.

Since then, none of the worst they had to face could break their relation. Aloka has expended herself with Atul in every single step of their life. She has been with Atul like a shadow. She is his comrade of every single moment, every single struggle of their life. What you believe is truth. This is the principal *Mantra* of life. If you believe this you can overcome all the hazards of life.

Atul Mistri found a solid soil under his feet- only a piece of land. There is no better living than the one with the thought that all the souls as one and all the souls as one's friend. What I want, crores of other people also want the same. This is the social justice. Every soul is equal, no caste, no colour, no gender discrimination- the Man, only one word. Atul can hold whole world in his palm. He is the source of all the power. He removes all the darkness of his mind, looks at human being with a complete vision. He gets pleasure in watching the people. All the men are in his eyes. New panchayat promotes him. All souls are within him, all human beings.

His son returns home from jail- as if coming from thousands of mile and stands in front of his father and says, “I have come. This is my resurrection. Nobody can use me in wrong way. Who is my friend? Who is my enemy? I can see that like a day light. Forgive me, please forgive me *Baap*. I have found the truth of life in human being. His words do not get completed...”

Thousands of people of B.G. Colony are around Atul’s house. Tomorrow is his daughter’s marriage; they are celebrating bachelor rituals today. We have found a fresh air of life, an air that refreshes, the house brightening with lights it removes all the darkness. Atul Mistri goes ahead, as if he wants to say to the crowd about the truth of life. His eyes are so living. His milky white hair reflects a peace among the people gathered there. The man is eternal. The man cannot die.

The good moment of marriage approaches. Atul meets the guests with a smiling face. Man hugs man. Everybody asks, ‘where bride’s father is, please come finish the *Kanyasampradan*’.

Many things happen to life. Human being forgets those. This is the eternal truth.

Young Maya is covered with red *Cheli*. Marriage ceremony is done. Bride and groom kiss each other.

Aloka and Atul Mistri gets unbound happiness, tears cannot be resisted!

## Note

Original story *Punorutthan* (Bangla) written by Jatin Bala.

Translated into English by Mrinmoy Pramanick

Jatin Bala, is a prominent author of Bangla Dalit Literature. Some of his writings have been translated in different collections and anthologies. He was born in Parhiyali, Manirampur, in the Jessore district of the then East Pakistan on 5<sup>th</sup> May, 1949. He wrote several short stories, novels, plays, poetry and his autobiographical novel *Shekhar Chnera Jiban*.

\*\*\*

# **Annotated Bibliography**

## **An Annotated Bibliography of Translation Studies Books Published in 2017**

*DEEPA V.*

**Albir, Amparo Hurtado (ed.). 2017. *Researching Translation Competence by PACTE Group*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.**

This book is an outcome of the Translation Competence (TC) research conducted by the research group, Process in the Acquisition of Translation Competence and Evaluation (PACTE) formed in 1997 to investigate the Acquisition of TC, its characteristics, to develop and test instruments to measure TC and so on. It is argued that TC is qualitatively different from bilingual competence which is empirically tested through comparing foreign language teachers and professional translators using cognitive and textual methods. This work also incorporates the study of the acquisition of TC in trainee translators analysing translators in six language pairs came under study: English-Spanish, German-Spanish, French-Spanish, English-Catalan, German-Catalan, French-Catalan.

**Borodo, Michal; House, Juliane; and Wojciech, Wachowski (eds.). 2017. *Moving Texts, Migrating People and Minority Languages*. Singapore: Springer.**

This volume brings together different perspectives on the issue of translation, migration, diaspora and minority languages and identity shared in the First International Translingua conference held in Poland in 2015. This book is divided into three parts that discuss minority language and multilingualism, migration and movement. Some of the chapters conceive translation in a broad and metaphorical sense. Translation is

not only perceived as a linguistic transfer from one language into another but as a form of linguistic and cultural expression, negotiation and transformation resulting from the tensions between conflicting identities.

**Camus, C Carmen; Castro, G Cristina; and Julia T. Williams Camus (eds.) 2017. *Translation, Ideology and Gender*. United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars publishing.**

This edited volume is a fruitful outcome of the first international conference on “Translation, Ideology and Gender” that took place in Santander in November 2015. This book has three sections each focusing on a specific topic. This work sheds light on a less explored area within Gender and Translation Studies such as gender issues in translating scientific discourse especially health discourse, women writing, censorship, reception under the repressive Spanish regime, gender policies and identity issues in magazines and so on.

**Ciocca, Rossella and Srivastava, Neelam. (eds.) 2017. *Indian Literature and the World: Multilingualism, Translation and the Public Sphere*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan Publication.**

In this edited volume, Rossella and Neelam offers a fresh take on contemporary Indian writing. They ascertain the need to approach Indian literature, which is multilingual, translational, comparative, located and internationalist, from a different perspective. It departs from the traditional central periphery model as well as the post-colonial theoretical approaches which have always tended to focus mostly on Indian English writings ignoring the myriad cultural and linguistic varieties that contemporary Indian writing encompasses. The concept of

Deepa V.

the public sphere is used as their analytical framework to analyse the specificities of the Indian literary and cultural spheres.

**Chesterman, Andrew. 2017. *Reflections on Translation Theory: Selected Papers from 1993-2014*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.**

This book offers a collection of 28 papers that attempt a conceptual analysis of various basic concepts and ideas in translation theory and methodology. These papers are grouped under nine thematic sections. Each section focuses on basic and general issues within Translation Studies such as norms, hypotheses, similarities and differences, “universals”, descriptive and prescriptive factors. Various concepts like causality and explanations, translation ethics, and the sociological turn are elucidated with examples.

**Desjardins, Renee. 2017. *Translation and Social media: In Theory, in Training and in Professional Practice*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan Publication.**

Renee explores in detail the connection and interaction between online social media (OSM) and translation. He discusses the challenges, its scope and relevance, its impact on translation theory, training and practice. He analyses the way OSM affects human communicational behaviour and also translation from how translators translate to the content and language of translation on these social platforms. OSM is also becoming a platform for significant activist and social movements gain which makes it a crucial source for social media studies. It is argued that the digital age demands a new approach to translation training programmes with an



integration of OSM literacy and competency which can provide new visibility to translators.

**Hatab, Wafa Abu. 2017. *Translation across Time and Space*. United Kingdom: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.**

This work contains papers by renowned scholars from across the globe addressing issues of translation in a variety of languages like Arabic, Greek, French etc., and cultures. These studies explore various aspects of translation such as translator's visibility and invisibility in literary translation, pragmatic issues in literary translation while translating culture specific concepts such as politeness, gender, body part idiom, challenges involved in translating political texts, the professionalization process of interpreting and the issue of diglossia and interpreting in courtrooms.

**Jimenez-Crespo, Miguel A. 2017. *Crowdsourcing and Online Collaborative Translations: Expanding the Limits of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.**

This work gives an overview of crowdsourcing and collaborative translation- its origin, definitions, typologies and existing research trends- and critically engages with its revolutionary implications for translation theory and practice and also with its influence on other areas of Translation Studies such as translation training, cognitive translatology, corpus based Translation Studies, and so on. It also takes into consideration the challenges posed by these novel platforms and practices for translation. Looking at these phenomena from various perspectives such as text linguistic approach, sociological approach etc., the author ascertains the significance of these developments to Translation Studies.

**Laviosa, Sara; Pagano, Adriana; Hannu Kemppanen, and Meng Ji. 2017. *Textual and Contextual Analysis in Empirical Translation Studies*. Singapore: Springer.**

This work discusses the significance of integrating various research methods; corpus-based, corpus-assisted, corpus-oriented or corpus-driven methods in empirical translation studies by demonstrating through the papers how quantitative and qualitative analysis of corpus data can throw light onto the dynamics of translation activities and products in particular social and cultural backgrounds. This book covers latest empirical findings of Translation Studies in Europe, Latin America and the Asia-Pacific. It attempts to bridge the gap between corpus-based textual analysis and analysis of socio-cultural contexts in corpus translation research and proposes that the gap can be closed by exploring novel quantitative methods adapted from related fields of enquiry.

**Rehana Mubarak-Aberer. 2017. *Translating Politeness Across Englishes: The Princess and the Pea*. New York: Peter Lang.**

The author analyses the way politeness is translated into English. Politeness being an abstract and culture specific concept, author argues that translation is the prerequisite for politeness research and polite communication. Since it is culture specific, it is hypothesized that human beings with similar lingua-cultural biographies are more likely to share patterns of perceiving and realizing politeness in English than are individuals with diverging lingua-cultural biographies. This hypothesis is tested through an empirical analysis of politeness in written communication using a multiple choice survey in fictitious customer-support communication contexts

and through analysing messages sent to and from customer support accounts on the social networking platform Twitter.

**Reznikova, Zhanna. 2017. *Studying Animal Languages Without Translation: An Insight from Ants*. Switzerland: Springer.**

In this book, the author discusses the various methods developed to study animal communication and its results and highlights a conceptually distinct approach that is based on ideas of information theory which attempts to study a language and evaluates its capabilities through measuring the rate of information transmission. The experimental paradigm, the methodology, its scope and significance are illustrated through the experiments on ants. While most studies on animal communication try to decipher animal language through intermediary artificial languages thus translating their linguistic skills into adopted human languages, this work attempts to study about their natural communication system.

**Schwieter, John W.; and Ferreira, Aline (eds.). 2017. *The Handbook of Translation and Cognition*. New Jersey: Wiley Blackwell.**

The Handbook of Translation and Cognition provides a comprehensive and critical overview of translation and interpretation studies and its interaction with cognitive studies. It discusses the existing theories, ongoing research in translation and cognition, various methodologies adopted for these researches and so on by bringing together contributions from international experts affiliated with institutions and research centres in 18 countries. This handbook has six sections, each section focussing on specific aspects like theory, methodology, characteristics of translators and workplace and

Deepa V.

issues of competence, training and interpreting. The concluding chapter also discusses the future of Cognitive Translation Studies- its scope, relevance and further possible research in these areas.

**Summers, Caroline. 2017. *Examining Text and Authorship in Translation*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan Publication.**

In this work, Caroline Summers explores the role played by various institutional agents in the reconstruction of authorship in the target culture through translation which is distinct from the 'original' authorship in the source culture. From the selection of texts to translation, circulation and its approval by the target readership, all these contribute to a new understanding and imagining of a writer's identity. Taking Christa Wolf, a noted German writer as a case study, Summers looks at how unequal exchange of translation poses challenge to the authority of source language or source account of the author when it is received by a more powerful target language. Summers combines Foucault's notion of authorship with a sociological theory of narrative and looks at authorship as a social narrative constructed through various discursive frameworks.

**Sutter, Gert De; Lefer, Marie Aude; and Delaere, Isabelle (eds.). 2017. *Empirical Translation Studies: New Methodological and Theoretical Traditions*. Germany: De Gruyter Mouton**

This volume explores the concept of translational behaviour within the framework of empirical translation studies. It aims to bring together advanced quantitative research based on large corpora that can provide evidence for the effect of factors on

translational behaviour and to analyse how other methods from related fields can improve the descriptive and explanatory accuracy of corpus based results. Each chapter in this volume addresses issues that can affect translational behaviours like the issue semasiological salience, language mediation, machine intervention, interplay between text register and translation method and the differences in SL and TL typology.

To be continued in the next issue...

\*\*\*

## Contributors

**ABDUL HALIM** is working as a resource person at the National Translation Mission, CIIL, Mysore. He is an assistant editor of the Translation Today. His areas of specialization are Women Studies, translation and literary theory.

E-mail: rahi[DOT]halim[AT]gmail[DOT]com

**ADITYA KUMAR PANDA** is working at the National Translation Mission, CIIL, Mysore. He does research in the field of Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching. Please visit his papers here: <https://ciil.academia.edu/AdityaKumarpanda>

E-mail: panda[DOT]aditya[AT]yahoo[DOT]com

**ARBINA PHONGLO** is a Ph.D. scholar at the Department of English, Pondicherry University, Puducherry. Her areas of interest are literature and exploring the rich regional literary works of India.

Email: arbi[DOT]phongs[AT]gmail[DOT]com

**DEEPA V.** is a doctoral student at the Centre for Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies, University of Hyderabad. Her areas of interest include translation and modernity, Cultural Studies, Gender Studies and Postcolonial Studies.

E-mail: 4deepav[AT]gmail[DOT]com

**DOUGLAS ROBINSON** is a Chair Professor of English at Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong. He has worked significantly in the areas related to Literary Studies, Language Studies, Translation Studies, Postcolonial Studies, rhetoric, and philosophy of mind and language. He has applied Somatic and performative theories to translation. He has immensely contributed to the field of Translation Studies. More details

regarding his research and contributions in the form of articles and books can be accessed at this link:

<http://arts.hkbu.edu.hk/stafflist/artd/robinson.html>

E-mail: robinson[AT]hkbu[DOT]edu[DOT]hk

**KRUPA SHAH** is a doctoral fellow in Translation Studies at the Department of Humanities & Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology, Gandhinagar. Her doctoral work looks at the short story in early twentieth century Gujarat as a narrative context to examine social debates on caste, language and women's issues.

E-mail: krupa[DOT]s[AT]iitgn[DOT]ac[DOT]in

**LEVIN MARY JACOB** is a research scholar at the Centre for Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies, the University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad. Her areas of interests include translation, travel, gender, language and religion. Her research explores the work of European women missionaries among the native women of Kerala during the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

E-mail: levinmjacob[AT]gmail[DOT]com

**MANISH PRASAD** is a research scholar at the Department of English, Kazi Nazrul University, Asansol, West Bengal. His area of research is postcolonial translation: theory and practice.

E-mail: 19coolmanishprasad[AT]gmail[DOT]com

**MRINMOY PRAMANICK** is an assistant professor at the Department of Comparative Indian Language and Literature, University of Calcutta. He did a doctoral research in the area of Inter-semiotic translation and Translation Historiography from the University of Hyderabad. He is also a practicing translator in Bengali, English and Hindi.

E-mail: pathchala[AT]gmail[DOT]com

**MATTHEW PRATTIPATI** is currently working as a chief resource person at the National Translation Mission, CIIL, Mysore. He is a Ph.D. in Bible translations from the University of Hyderabad. His areas of interest include Bible translation, language technology and training translators.

E-mail: pmatthewntm[AT]gmail[DOT]com

**ROZY SAMEJA PATEL** is the Head of the Department, Center of Humanities and Development, Uka Tarsadia University, Bardoli, Gujarat. She is a visiting faculty in many premier institutes. Her specialization is management: Human Resource and Potential Development, Personality Development and Grooming. She is also on the board of All India Radio and has substantiated voice modulation theories in various languages.

E-mail: rozy[DOT]patel[AT]utu[DOT]ac[DOT]in

**SUPRIYA BANERJEE** is working as a resource person for English language at Rabindra Bharati University, Kolkata and is pursuing her Ph.D. in Comparative Literature at Visva Bharati, Shantiniketan.

E-mail: supriyabnrj4[AT]gmail[DOT]com

**S. JAYASRINIVASA RAO** is a professor of English at the Department of Humanities and Sciences in Aurora's Scientific and Technological Institute, Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Hyderabad. He translates from Kannada to English. He has translated a novel, poems, stories, and articles for the anthology *Steel Nibs are Sprouting: New Dalit Writing from South India*.

E-mail: esjeisiri[DOT]row[AT]gmail[DOT]com

**SHYAM RANGANATHAN** is a professor of Philosophy at the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies, York



University. He specialises in the South Asian Philosophy and his recent research focuses on moral theory across traditions. He has published many books and research papers in the field of Philosophy.

E-mail: shyamr[AT]yorku[DOT]ca

# Translation Today

Please find enclosed herewith a demand draft for INR / USD / EURO / POUND..... as my / our subscription for one year / three years of Translation Today.

Name.....

Profession.....

Address.....

.....

.....

.....Pin

Phone:

e-mail:

Signature & Date.....

## ***SUBSCRIPTION DETAILS***

Individuals (in India)

### **INDIA**

One year Subscription : INR 500 (for 2 issues)

Three years Subscription : INR 1500 (for 6 issues)

### **Individuals OVERSEAS**

One year Subscription : USD \$100/EURO 80/£ 60 (for 2 issues)

Three years Subscription : USD \$300/EURO 240/£ 180 (for 6 issues)

### ***Institutions (in India)***

One year Subscription : INR 1000 (for 2 issues)

Three years Subscription : INR 2500 (for 6 issues)

### **Institutions OVERSEAS**

One year Subscription : USD \$120/EURO100/£80(for 2issues)

Three years Subscription : USD \$360/EURO300/£240(for 6 issues)

Payment has to be made by Demand Draft in favour of Assistant Director (Admn), CIIL (Translation Today) payable at Mysuru and should be posted to the following address:

### **Asst. Director (Admn),**

Central Institute of Indian Languages, Hunsur Road, Manasagangotri, Mysuru – 570006, INDIA

Please write Translation Today Subscription on the back side of the DD.

\* Postal charges will be levied extra.

Articles submitted for consideration of the Board will have to be in English. Translation Today will seriously consider the possibility of publishing material in Indian languages, or a multilingual edition of the journal in future. There is no size-limit on articles except that they may preferably be within 40K to avoid slow downloading for the electronic version. Articles should, however, be preferably and optimally between 2000 and 3000 words in length for the print-based version. Unpublished contributions will be preferred. While submitting pieces already published elsewhere, the author must mention the fact as well as get permission to reproduce the same. The submission should be by e-mail. Please use .doc or .txt format. Graphics could be in JPEG, GIF, Photoshop or BMP format. All articles should carry a 100-word abstract and a short bio-note of the contributor.

### **Style and conventions**

The journal prefers American Psychological Association (APA) style/LSA style. Diagrams and figures should be suitable for photographic/scanner reproduction. Drawings should be in black font. Lettering should be of draughtsman standard and large enough to remain legible where the figure requires reduction in size. Tables should be typed on separate sheets.

### **Author's Benefit**

All the contributors from India would receive a complimentary copy (print) of the journal and overseas contributors would receive an e-copy of the journal.

### **Reviewing System**

The Translation Today follows double-blind peer-review policy. At first, the received paper is reviewed by the editors. If the editors find the paper suitable for the journal qualitatively, then the paper is sent to the experts who review the paper based on the guidelines of the Translation Today. The decision of accepting a paper for publication depends on the review report. Please see the Review Response Sheet in the NTM website.

### **Publication Fee**

The Translation Today does not charge any processing charges or publication fees.

### **Copyrights**

Copyrights for the articles/translations/book reviews are retained by the National Translation Mission, Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore.

### **Plagiarism**

Though all submissions are put on rigorous plagiarism check, the responsibility of originality of content rests with the concerned authors. A paper found with plagiarized content (major or minor) will not be considered for reviewing or publication.

### **Open Access Policy**

For the wider dissemination of knowledge, all published articles of the Translation Today are freely accessible online. The back volumes of the print edition are also available on payment.

### **Disclaimer**

The views expressed in the articles are solely that of the authors and the editors or members of the Editorial Board are in no way responsible.

## In this Issue

### Editorial

*TARIQ KHAN*.....i

### Articles

- Shape-Shifting Sources and Illusory Targets: Jhaverchand Meghani and Saurashtrani Rasdhar  
*KRUPA SHAH*.....01
- Ambapali's Verse in Therigatha: Trajectories and Transformations  
*SUPRIYA BANERJEE*.....15
- Enigma of Translation and Indian Philosophy: A Reading of Harivansh Rai Bachchan's Madhushala  
*MANISH PRASAD*.....26
- The Holy Register: Its Equivalence and Strategies  
*MATTHEW PRATTIPATI*.....51
- Should the Translator Ask: Woman, What have I to do with You?  
*LEVIN MARY JACOB*.....66

### Interviews

- An Interview with Shyam Ranganathan  
*ABDUL HALIM*.....81
- An Interview with Douglas Robinson  
*ADITYA KUMAR PANDA*.....94

### Book Review

- What is Cultural Translation? By Sarah Maitland  
*ARBINA PHONGLO*.....105
- Seven Thousand Ways to Listen: Staying Close to What is Sacred By Mark Nepo  
*ROZY SAMEJA PATEL*.....110

### Translations

- An Astonishing Method of Torture By Kerur Vasudevacharya  
*S. JAYASRINIVASA RAO*.....116
- Resurrection By Jatin Bala  
*MRINMOY PRAMANICK*.....132

### Annotated Bibliography

- An Annotated Bibliography of Translation Studies Books Published in 2017  
*DEEPA V.*.....146

**Contributors**.....154