

Translation and Beyond: Re-thinking Interdisciplinary Research in the Humanities¹

CHANDRANI CHATTERJEE

Abstract

Translation Studies is still a discipline in the making. Having undergone several transitions and transformations since the last decades of the twentieth century, the field is ever receptive to newer enquiries and experimentations. The present article attempts to explore several emerging trends and approaches in the field to suggest the possibility of identifying Translation Studies as an enabling space for interdisciplinary research in the humanities and social sciences. Increasingly, research in the social sciences and humanities programs worldwide is waking to the fact that it is impossible to work in isolation while protecting strict disciplinary boundaries. The paper identifies Translation Studies as an inclusive space that can harbour research interests across disciplines. However, to enable such a possibility there are some basic reconfigurations that are necessary for understanding and defining the scope of Translation Studies as a discipline in particular and translation as a concept in general. The present paper attempts to lay the field for similar investigations for interdisciplinary research.

Keywords: Translation Studies, Translation, Discipline, Interdisciplinary, Social Sciences and Humanities.

Situating Translation Studies

In around the mid-twentieth century, renowned translation scholars Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevre announced the ‘cultural turn’ in Translation Studies indicating the need for disciplines to join hands – in this case, they were pointing towards the merging of Cultural Studies and Translation

¹ Parts of the arguments in this article was initially formulated through a collaborative minor research project titled ‘Interrogating Interdisciplinarity’ carried out under the aegis of the Centre for Social Sciences and Humanities, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune.

Studies. This had wider implications much beyond the scope and purview of the above-mentioned disciplines alone and reaching far beyond Anthropology, Sociology, Ethnography, History, Psychology, and Philosophy to name just a few. In ‘Writing Between the Lines: For example, John Sturrock (1990) claimed in *The Language of Translation*,’ that Ethnography is no longer concerned with the description of other cultures but instead with their translation into a form comprehensible to the West (1996). In “Temporalité et traduction” (1989), Jean Laplanche uses the term *à traduire* to refer to that primordial unformed thought or image before it has been put into language (1989). In *Dissemination* (1981), Jacques Derrida states that the problem of translation is nothing less than the passage to philosophy (1989). Indeed, in this global age, translation has come to define the fragmented, post-modern human individual. In *Imaginary Homelands* (1991), Salman Rushdie famously says, “Having been borne across the world, we are translated men” (1991: 17), a statement that has been interpreted metaphorically by many cultural studies scholars, but one that we take quite literally these days. Humans can be translated just as well as texts.

Following such advances in research methodologies the present article hopes to shed further light on the interconnections between Translation Studies and other disciplines in the Social Sciences and Humanities hoping that this will open new possibilities of research across disciplines – a trans-disciplinarity of sorts that is a much-needed platform for enabling dialogues and facilitating border crossings across disciplines.

Edwin Gentzler, an eminent scholar in the field of Translation Studies and Comparative Literature is one of the major proponents of this approach. In several writings on translation, Gentzler has suggested the idea of ‘translation without

borders' and what such an approach makes possible. In an essay titled 'Translation Studies: Pre-Discipline, Discipline, Inter-Discipline and Post-Discipline' (2014) Gentzler takes a critical stock of the various shifts in Translation Studies from before it was envisioned as a discipline to what is now being understood as the 'post-disciplinary' phase. The post-disciplinary phase is further explored in the book *Translation and Rewriting in the Age of Post-Translation Studies* (2017) where Gentzler suggests the possibility of thinking of rewriting as translation and elaborates on 'post-translation studies' as the way ahead through rewritings of Shakespearean play texts in Germany and China, the many postcolonial renditions of Faust and other examples. Though the post-translation phase has drawn a lot of academic attention and debate, it is the inter-disciplinary phase that is of concern in this article. In fact, the inter-disciplinary phase in Translation Studies, as Gentzler's essay points out, remains underexplored and requires critical scholarly attention. According to Gentzler, "The first move toward interdisciplinarity in translation occurred within the field during the early 1990s, what might be called intra-disciplinary translation studies, or interdisciplinary studies within varying disciplines of translation studies. After two decades of fighting between linguistic-oriented branches and literary-oriented branches, translation studies began to coordinate and respect varied approaches. In 1988, Mary Snell-Hornby published *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* or later in an anthology edited with Franz Pöchhacker and Klaus Kaindl, *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline* (1994) combined literary, linguistic and cultural studies approaches, allowing for different types of approaches depending upon the nature of the text to be translated. For example, a literary text might allow more innovation and creativity in translation than a scientific text, in which there might be less variance and innovation [...]. Translation

suddenly had many partners and collaborators, and it was a very fruitful period. By borrowing ideas and concepts from other disciplines, translation studies scholars were able to gain great insight into additional translational phenomena, and the field experienced another boom” (Gentzler 2014).

The many well-known titles in this phase include Sherry Simon’s *Gender in Translation* (1996), *Translation and Gender* by Luise Von Flotow (1997), Douglas Robinson’s *Translation and Empire* (1997), *Translation and Minorities* edited by Lawrence Venuti (1998), *Postcolonial Translation* edited by Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, *Deconstruction and Translation* by Kathleen Davis (2001), *Translation and Religion* edited by Lynne Long (2005) among others in this ever-burgeoning field. Translation Studies continued to join hands with Ethics, Psychology, Philosophy and Media Studies leading to new scholarly publications.

In spite of this ever-expanding field and the forays made therein, translation is seldom thought of as a lens through which interdisciplinary research in the humanities can be viewed. The present article attempts to bring forth the need to create a discourse around interdisciplinary research in the humanities through translation. Thus, what I propose in this paper is not conventionally understood within the framework of translation; but my argument, like several scholars within and outside the discipline at present, is the need for witnessing and acknowledging the increasing importance of translation in our lives.

Two Instances of Reconceptualizing Translation

The Austrian-born American historian Gerda Lerner (1920-2013) in her essay ‘Living in Translation’ which forms a chapter in her 1997 book *Why History Matters* discusses her troubled relation to her first language (a variety of German spoken before the Nazi regime) and English which she learnt

after she came to the United States as a refugee in 1939 for making a livelihood. In an interesting moment, Lerner raises an important and not-so-familiar question regarding losing one's first language:

If you are forced to give up your mother tongue, what is lost? In a way, losing one's mother tongue is inconceivable—one assumes one can always return to it. But Lerner's example shows that it is not so. Language *is* not a dead body of knowledge; language changes year by year, minute by minute; it lives and grows. In order to remain adequate, it must be spoken and it must be read. When you lose your language, you lose the sound, the rhythm, the forms of your unconscious. Deep memories, resonances, and sounds of childhood come through the mother tongue—when these are missing the brain cuts off connections. Language communicates much more than literal meaning.²

Lerner's plight may seem alien to us at the outset. But having used this essay as a text to be studied for my postgraduate course in translation theory and practice I have realized that her case is similar to ours. English is somewhere between most of our first language and second language and yet more often than not for a variety of reasons we tend to forget that our first language occupies but a minuscule space in this world of languages. It seems to me that one of the age-old binaries of the 'original' and 'translation' becomes limiting when we start thinking that all languages in the world are first languages. An appreciation of the multiplicity of languages, and the modes of knowledge their syntactic and semantic structures make possible, is essential before we even begin to talk about

² Gerda Lerner. 'Living in Translation' in *Why History Matters*. p 39.

translation.³ If we agree on this, it seems to me, there will be greater freedom in exploring the ‘translational’ possibilities beyond the domain of the written and the literary to which translation still seems to be restricted.

An instance of this moving beyond the written and the literary can be seen in Rabindranath Tagore’s understanding of translation. Repeatedly in his writings both before and after the Nobel, we find Tagore commenting on his approach to translation. In *Chhinnapatra*, for example, he poses translation’s impossible choices, in this case, with the title. It could mean scattered leaves, torn-out pages, or torn-up letters. In this volume, a middle-aged Tagore is going back to a set of letters he had written between his mid-twenties and mid-thirties — most of them to a niece, who was then in her teens. He arranges fragments from these letters in a sequence that creates a delicately balanced effect of randomness. Published in 1912, a year before the Nobel, *Chhinnapatra* is an elusive mix of diary, travelogue, anthology and novella, autobiography and fiction.

In a letter of December 2, 1892, Tagore actually uses the Arabic-Bengali word for ‘translation’ — *torjoma* (rather than the more literary *onubaad*). He had gone up to visit his friend,

³ Ganesh Devy’s work on documenting, recognizing and preserving the dignity of the innumerable languages of India may be regarded as a mammoth example in that direction. To recognize and acknowledge the dignity of all languages, particularly those that have not been accorded official status, is a step towards the plural trajectories through which knowledge systems are available in the human world and yet some forms are validated through official sanctioning. To be able to engage in translations in the true sense is to be able to engage not only with languages as fixed, unchanging units, but to be engaging with humanity, the users and carriers of those languages and a plethora of contexts and situations in which such language use is imbricated. A study of languages, cultures and translations thereby would need to go beyond the written and the standardized.

the maharaja of Natore. Describing an evening stroll, he talks about the music of nature and the harmony that it creates. Here he uses the word ‘translation’ in a strikingly unconventional way, “Gazing fixedly for a long time, I think that if this silence lying wide across the Earth is not able to bear itself any longer, and cleaves to let its ur- language out suddenly, what a deep, sombre and serene music, full of beauty and pity, would be heard then, from the Earth to the realm of the stars! This is actually happening. If we sit still and try to concentrate a little, we will be able to translate the vast harmony of the world’s gathered light and colour into immense music.”

Tagore’s use of translation does not describe a linguistic operation. He uses translation as a metaphor for a mode of perception, in which the language of music is used to depict a vision of the created universe. ‘Harmony’ is the English word that Tagore also uses at this point, but written in Bengali. He does this frequently in the *Chhinnapatra* text, where one can get a sense of the voices and textures of bilingualism by making two very interesting lists: English words and phrases printed in English, and those printed in Bengali. Through this half-metaphorical, transliterated, but untranslated, use of ‘harmony’, the idea of translation is taken beyond its immediate linguistic and literary realization towards the exploration of a different kind of relationship between East and West — a theme that runs through *Chhinnapatra* like a hidden stream. Towards the end of the aforementioned letter, Tagore writes, “One can experience it anew in different ways, but how can one express it in new ways.” He is of course talking of the sunrise and sunset and the experiences in nature. However, what is striking is the untranslatability that Tagore suggests between experience and articulation, or between experience and language that communicates that experience. The incommensurability between experience and its articulation in language opens up further nuances in the field. Somewhere it

seems to me that Tagore is suggesting this dichotomy – the language of experiencing as opposed to the language of articulating and how these cannot be thought of as equivalents. In hinting at this incommensurability, Tagore’s idea of translation goes beyond equivalences and literal renderings to a more holistic possibility of envisioning translation that could move across boundaries of thought and articulation, imagination and music without hesitation. Existence of such a possibility could perhaps be looked upon as the beginnings of borderless translations – a domain of free exchange and movement across concepts, ideas, philosophies and disciplines. It seems to me that much before the interdisciplinary phase in Translation Studies, Tagore was suggesting the possibility of going beyond the commonsensical understanding of translation, as a linguistic exercise to a more universal and philosophical rendering of translation.

In fact, in a different and yet similar way, Tagore while describing his translations of *Gitanjali* keeps harping on his uncomfortable relation with English and lifts the definition of translation far from its linguistic model to a process of trans-creation, bordering on mysticism. As Rosinka Chaudhuri shows, translating a letter of Tagore written from London on May 6th, 1913, ‘You have written to me about my English translations of *Gitanjali*. How I wrote them and why people liked them so much I still cannot quite comprehend. That I cannot write English is such a plain fact that I never had the pride to ever feel ashamed of it. If anybody wrote to me in English inviting me to tea, I didn’t have the courage to even write a reply. You’re thinking perhaps that I have rid myself of the illusion [maya] today – absolutely to the contrary – that I

have written in English seems to me to be the illusion [maya].⁴

Tagore's discomfort in using the English language has been commented on and debated by several well-known scholars. However, it seems to me that not only is Tagore articulating a personal discomfort, but he is also challenging the accepted notions of translation. As evident in the letter in *Chhinnapatra*, Tagore associated translation with a larger creative phenomenon where language is but one component. The same idea seems to have been at work in the English translations of *Gitanjali* - free creative transcreations. Tagore urges us to rethink the nature and utility of translation to understand the organicity of languages. In a later work, *Bangabhasha Parichay* (1938), Tagore would evoke a continuum of language discourses connecting Bengali to Arabic, Persian and the different colloquial registers of an otherwise standardized language. It is enabling us to go back to Tagore to widen our notions of translation and the organicity of languages and literatures in the contemporary world.⁵

In fact, the idea of border crossings, be it in terms of languages, disciplines or ideas is at the core of Tagore's creative oeuvre in general. As Swati Ganguly shows us in her study of the making of Tagore's university, that Visva-Bharati may be regarded as a culmination of the essences that Tagore's life and works upheld - the necessity of going beyond the

⁴ Quoted in Rosinka Chaudhuri (ed.) *A History of Indian Poetry in English*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016. p 130.

⁵ Some of the ideas presented here in terms of the ramifications of the word and idea 'translation' as a pedagogic tool in the Indian classroom was part of an ICSSR sponsored collaborative research project on 'Popular Imaginaries and Discourses on Politics in India' (2017-2019).

narrow limitations of linguistic, cultural and intellectual boundaries.⁶

In both the above instances, translation is used as an imaginative category beyond mere transference of meaning. Gerda Lerner and Rabindranath Tagore predate what would be later known as the interdisciplinary phase in Translation Studies. However, their idea of translation as a mobile, shifting entity with possibilities of crossing conceptual and disciplinary borders is visible in the examples cited above.

Translation Studies: Towards Interdisciplinary Interfaces

The growth of Translation Studies as a separate discipline, in the western academic world, is a success story of the 1980s and yet Translation Studies continues to be a discipline in the making. This is primarily owing to the changes and innovations that the discipline has witnessed in the last few decades. Moreover, the acts of translating and translation teaching have, until fairly recently, been kept separate from ‘research’ into these and related activities. The polarization is historical and is evidence of the misleading demarcation lines that are often too readily drawn between theory and practice in many disciplines. Theory and practice are ultimately complementary and, particularly in a field such as Translation Studies, the distinction needs to be re-examined. Another obstacle in the development of Translation Studies has to do with a distinction traditionally made between linguistics and the range of disciplines within which translation is studied. This somewhat arbitrary division has been the main obstacle to the fostering of an interdisciplinary approach to the study of translation as an important form of intercultural communication. Translation Studies brings together work in a

⁶ See Swati Ganguly, *Tagore's University: A History of Visva-Bharati 1921-1961*. Permanent Black in collaboration with the New India Foundation and Ashoka University: 2022.

wide variety of fields, including linguistics, literary studies, history, anthropology, psychology, economics and many others. Translating is a multifaceted activity, and there is room for a variety of perspectives. This might conceivably be seen as the fragmentation of the discipline, but evidence points to the other way. Consider, for example, how cultural studies and text linguistics, each in its own way, have recently begun to address the issue of ideology in translation. Despite such developments, it is disappointing to encounter discussions that still want to evaluate translations on the basis of the equivalence model, primarily on the original-translation binary.

In fact, understanding the word translation in its widest sense – as a transfer, a crossing or ferrying across; and a deliberate moving away from the evaluative parameters suggested by the linguistic model of the original and the translation, where the loss is always implicated in the translation, will perhaps be the only way to come to terms with the ever-expanding notion of translation in the contemporary world. It seems to me that the more we can move beyond the strictures of the original-translation binary, the greater will be the possibility of perceiving what I have called elsewhere the ‘enabling’ aspect of translation. Translations enable certain forms of communication – the possibility of dialogues and crossovers. As Emily Apter appropriately points out, the need for cultural translation in a world that is increasingly intolerant towards the ‘other’. Current geopolitical, religious and other kinds of conflicts have thrust us into ‘the translation zone’, a highly hazardous area where mistranslation has deadly consequences. Judith Butler too evokes the concept of cultural translation in understanding political ethics. In *Conversations on the Left* Butler notes, “the very concept of universality compels an understanding of culture as a relation of exchange and a task of

translation.”⁷ Taking more seriously the task of the translator and the responsibilities of the global citizen, Butler speaks in *Precarious Life* of the way in which the subject is both constituted and transformed in the moment of contact that both solicits, and offers, recognition of others.⁸ Without translation, a transformative encounter with otherness cannot occur.

Butler is suggesting a need to revisit translation by looking at the repercussions of translations in the target culture, that explain the socio-psychological impact, and show how those imported ideas inform and contribute to many fields, including art, architecture, politics, and social policy. Translation is more than a metaphor; it is a concrete social and ideological activity that exerts an enormous impact on policies of social inclusion and exclusion. To be sure, communication problems exist, but often linguistic and cultural incommensurabilities can lead to new meanings and generate new forms. The question is not just how texts are chosen, adapted and received in any given culture, but also how people adapt, adjust, and develop in their new homes. For such an analysis, Translation Studies scholars need to go beyond their fixed set of translation methodologies and expand their repertoire of observational and analytical skills.

What I am suggesting are the several ways in which translation can become a possible point of departure and association for other disciplines, concepts and ideas that were hitherto not thought of as having any bearing on and relation to translation.

⁷ Judith Butler, "Restaging the Universal: Hegemony and the Limits of Formalism," in *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, ed. Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Žižek (London: Verso, 2000), 24-25.

⁸ Judith Butler, *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence* (London: Verso, 2004), 44. Butler briefly revisits issues of cultural translation in the context of international feminisms in *Undoing Gender* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 227-31.

Susan Bassnett indicates a similar association between translation and comparative literature. In the concluding chapter of her 1993 *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*, she remarks:

As comparative literature continues to argue about whether it can be considered as a discipline or not, translation studies state boldly that it is a discipline, and the strength and energy of work in the field worldwide seem to confirm that assertion. The time has come for a reconsideration of the relationship between comparative literature and translation studies, and for a new beginning.⁹

Since then, we have witnessed a burgeoning of interest in such a 'new beginning'. In 1999 Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi came out with *Post-colonial Translation*, an anthology of essays by authors ranging from Arrojo to Vishwanathan showing the close relationship between colonization and translation, one dominated by European appropriation and domination. The following year, Sherry Simon and Paul St-Pierre published *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era*, looking at both the dominant and imperialist forms of translation practised from the European side, and much looser, more diverse forms practised in local cultures under the shadow of global forces.

During the next two decades, many studies came in with research on cultures from the archipelagos of the Pacific to the deepest parts of central Africa, from the southern cone of South America to indigenous tribes in the far north. Nevertheless, the theory remained much the same: European Orientalizing practices vs. freer and foreignizing alternative

⁹ Susan Bassnett. *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, 1993. p 160.

practices. This often led to the problem that many postcolonial translation practices were reduced to the same. In Gayatri Spivak's words, representations of a woman in Palestine began to resemble those of a man in Taiwan! In many ways, linguistic, literary and cultural analysis is not enough. Other tools are needed, those that allow scholars to see both the textual data and, especially, that which cannot be said in textual forms because of historical and social forces.

Re-thinking Translation: Interdisciplinary Possibilities

While scholars outside the discipline are discovering translation anew culminating in research projects on *Gender and Translation* (Sherry Simon), *Cities and Translation* (Iain Chambers and Sherry Simon), *Translating Caste* and *Translating Desire* (Katha) in the recent past, there have been shifts and innovations from within the discipline itself. There are divisions among translation studies scholars regarding opening up the field to dialogues and re-conceptualizations. On the one hand, there is a need felt to broaden the boundaries and to go beyond conventional disciplinarian boundaries and yet there has been resistance towards this. However, increasingly it is being realized that it is counterproductive to limit discussions on translation to borders of disciplines. In fact, as Edwin Gentzler points out it is becoming increasingly necessary to widen the scope of the discipline, to think of translation without borders:

Studies in semiotics suggest that borders tend to be more multiple and permeable than traditionally conceived. What if we erase the border completely and rethink translation as an always ongoing process of *every* communication? Translation becomes viewed less as a speech act carried out between languages and cultures, and instead as a condition underlying the

languages and cultures upon which communication is based.¹⁰

Similarly, associations are being made with border and immigration studies, cultural and post-colonial studies, and film and new media studies – areas and disciplines hitherto not related to translation studies. Being a major proponent of such an approach, Edwin Gentzler suggests the need to open the field further to trans-disciplinary enquiries:

Whereas translation studies might best be characterized as still dominated by an empirical, scientific form of theory, in which translations are analyzed and trends, norms, and/or universals posited, theory in other parts of the world is more derived from social and literary critical theory, in which Marxist, feminist, psychoanalytical, hermeneutical, structuralist, and post-structuralist interpretive techniques are applied to translated texts. Translators follow norms, but they also consciously and unconsciously take liberties and invent, sometimes making implicit references more explicit, adding material to explain cultural references, inventing new terms, expressions, and metaphors to glean new connections, and devising evasive routes to access implications otherwise too difficult or traumatic to articulate. Those who have taken the semiotic turn in translation are well equipped to unpack the translator's imagination as it solves problems, invents, and creates. Equivalents and substitutions do exist in translation, but so too do supplements and displacements. Scholars of future must be open to subtle connotations, repressed

¹⁰ Edwin Gentzler. 2012. 'Translation without Borders', *translation: A transdisciplinary journal* <http://translation.fusp.it/articles/translation-without-borders> accessed on 15.09.2016

meanings, lost etymologies, and deep cultural and spiritual references. Increasingly, translation studies scholars will gain through collaborative opportunities and research possibilities that propose to go beyond disciplinary boundaries and investigate overlapping zones of contact and exchange.¹¹

Following Gentzler, it might not be overambitious to suggest that Translation Studies is becoming the much-needed breathing space for research in the social sciences and humanities. Any kind of interdisciplinary research would require essential epistemic shifts that are located in processes of ‘unlearning’. This ‘learning to unlearn’, is probably the most important obstacle in the path of even comprehending interdisciplinary research. It is only through a similar process of unlearning, that we can move beyond the strictures of the original-translation binary and conceive of a possibility of looking upon Translation Studies as this ever-widening and inclusive space that thrives on dialogues and border crossings. Once we have agreed on the existence of such a possibility, can there be the scope of rethinking the metaphoric implications of such re-imaginings in strengthening interdisciplinary research in the Humanities and Social Sciences?

From Lydia H. Liu’s fascinating study on the problems of translation in global circulation, we have learnt that language like any other material commodity does circulate in the global market and that the specific ways of circulation lead to meaning-making among the world’s diverse languages and societies. If language is to be understood as a material commodity and linguistic transactions, translations being one form of transaction, as processes in reconstructing and

¹¹ Ibid.

continuing language, how does the relation between language and translation work? Can the original and the translation ever be identical? Will not the spatial and temporal relocation in itself require us to think of these as separate events requiring a questioning of the very issues of originality and authenticity in translation?

In the ‘Foreword’ to the recent, 2022 compilation of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s writings on translation titled *Living Translation*, brought out by Seagull Books to mark its fortieth year of publishing, Emily Apter talks about how in Spivak’s long writing career, translation has featured as a ‘central concern of the comparative humanities’ that she practices. Spivak has written on a wide range of subjects ranging from comparative literature, subaltern studies and postcolonial theory to feminism and contemporary politics. In bringing together Spivak’s writings on translation as a book, for the first time, the editors highlight not only the importance that translation has had in Spivak’s career, but also the many ways in which translation as a concept recurs in and connects the various disciplines that Spivak writes about, and engages in, thus shaping in a way, the politics of the self and its comprehension of the world around. Apter points out towards the end of the ‘Foreword’, “There are many untranslatabilities operative in Spivak’s writings on translation, but they arguably converge in a model of concept-labor – Spivak’s signature task as a translator – that translates towards alterity; towards episteme-logics that do not yet exist.”¹²

It seems to me that Spivak’s writings on translation help us ponder once again, on the essentially interdisciplinary nature of translation as a concept and practice. In widening its

¹² Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak *Living Translation*, ed. Emily Apter et al. Kolkata: Seagull Books, 2022. p xix

horizons further to become more inclusive, in reimagining linguistic equivalences, in emphasizing differences over similarities, in resisting rigid definitions of translation and in disseminating newer ways of knowing and questioning older epistemic and pedagogical practices, it is increasingly difficult to contain Translation Studies within disciplinarian boundaries. In fact, it will not be incorrect to suggest that translation acquires new meanings in the varied contexts in which it is used. Such plurality undoubtedly enhances the repertoire of translation. As discussed above, while this widening of the field continues and newer perspectives are thrown open for understanding the relevance of translation in our lives, some basic epistemic shifts are in order. It will not be wrong to say that Translation Studies is in the process of ‘translating’ itself, creating transformations in the ways in which the concept of translation is being renewed and made available in new formats and contexts. The present essay is a humble footnote in that direction.

References

- ASAD, TALAL. 1986. The Concept of Cultural Translation. In Clifford, James. & Marcus, George E. (eds.), *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. 141-164. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- BASSNETT, SUSAN. & ANDRÉ LEFEVERE. 1990. *Translation, History, and Culture*. London & New York: Pinter Publishers.
- BASSNETT, S. & TRIVEDI, HARISH. (eds.). 1999. *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- BOURDIEU, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, (Trans. Richard Nice). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BOURDIEU, P. 1990. *In Other Words*, (Trans. Matthew Adamson). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- BOURDIEU, P. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. (Trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- CRONIN, M. 2003. *Translation and Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- GANGULY, SWATI. 2022. *Tagore's University: A History of Visva-Bharati 1921-1961*. Permanent Black, the New India Foundation and Ashoka University.
- GENTZLER, EDWIN. 2016. *Translation and Rewriting in the Age of Post-Translation Studies*. Routledge.
- GENTZLER, EDWIN. 2001. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- HERMANS, THEO. 1999. *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-Oriented Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- HOLMES, JAMES S. 1972/1988. The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. In Holmes, James S. (ed.) *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. 67-80. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- INGHILLERI, M. 2005. The Sociology of Bourdieu and the Construction of the 'Object' in Translation and Interpreting Studies. *The Translator*, 11 (2).125-145.
- LERNER, GERDA. 1997. *Why History Matters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LIU, LYDIA H. 1999. *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- PYM, ANTHONY. 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- SPIVAK, GAYATRI CHAKRAVORTY. 1981. French Feminism in an International Frame. *Yale French Studies*, 62. 154–184. Accessed online: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2929898>.

Chandrani Chatterjee

- SPIVAK, GAYATRI CHAKRAVORTY. 2000. The Politics of Translation. In Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*., London & New York: Routledge.
- SPIVAK, GAYATRI CHAKRAVORTY. 2022. Living Translation. Emily Apter et al (ed). Kolkata: Seagull Books, 2022.
- TOURY, GIDEON. 1987. *Translation Across Cultures*. New Delhi: Bahri Publications Private Limited.
- VENUTI, LAWRENCE. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London & New York: Routledge.
- VENUTI, LAWRENCE.1998. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London & New York: Routledge.
- VENUTI, LAWRENCE. (Ed.). 2000. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London & New York: Routledge.

Cite this Work:

CHATTERJEE, CHANDRANI. 2022. Translation and Beyond: Rethinking Interdisciplinary Research in the Humanities. *Translation Today*, Vol. 16(1). 1-20.
DOI: 10.46623/tt/2022.16.1.ar1