Socrates and Satyagraha in South Africa: A Critical Study of M.K. Gandhi's Translation of Plato's Apology

NIDHI J. MAKWANA

Abstract

M.K. Gandhi published a translation of Plato's *Apology* in Gujarati as *Ek Satyavir ni Katha* in his self-edited newspaper *Indian Opinion* in six instalments. The last instalment was published on 9 May 1908 (CWMG vol.8: 217). This translation played a vital part in Gandhi's first Satyagraha in South Africa. Gandhi's translation is ideologically loaded and provides counter-texts that both challenged imperial domination and provided themes and forms for the development of postcolonial debates and new senses of identity. In addition to his politics, Gandhi encounters several issues as a translator, especially with cultural equivalents, translating rhetoric speech and references to Greek culture, society and gods. This paper compares target and source texts and also explores the impact of this translation on the Gujarati community in South Africa and on Gandhi.

Keywords: Gandhi, Socrates, Passive Resistance, Translation Studies, Paratext, Refraction.

Introduction

The paper aims at a close, comparative study of M.K. Gandhi's Gujarati translation of Plato's *Apology* as *Ek Satya Vir ni Katha*. The objective of this paper is to explore the correlation and impact of text on Gandhi's passive resistance and his Satyagraha in South Africa. The methodological framework includes a broader understanding of the discipline of Translation Studies with specific reference to Genette Gérard's paratextuality and André Lefevere's theory of refraction for a systematic study of translated texts concerning language, culture, and society. Gandhi encounters several issues as a translator, especially with cultural equivalents and the task of neutralising the societal references of 399 BCE Greek societies to 19th century Gujarati community.

The dialogue known as Plato's *Apology* or *Apology of Socrates* was penned in classical Greek, right after the trial of Socrates around 399 BCE. Apology is by no means an "apology" in our modern understanding of the word. The name of the dialogue derives from the Greek "apologia," which translates as a defence or a speech made in defence (Merriam-Webster 2023).

It is important to note that Gandhi doesn't acquire any knowledge of the Greek language; therefore, he might have chosen the English translation of Plato's *Apology* (Vasunia 2013: 8). During Gandhi's stay in South Africa in 1907, he and the Indian community organised opposition against the Asiatic Registration Law (the Black Act). On 10 January 1908, Gandhi was sent to Johannesburg's prison, where he was issued Plato's *Apology*'s English translation by Henry Cary from the prison's library (Gandhi 1928:104). Later the same year, Gandhi published his rendering of *Apology* in Gujarati as *Ek Satyavir ni Katha* in his self-edited journal *Indian Opinion* in six instalments. The last instalment was published on 9 May 1908 (CWMG vol.8: 217). This paper aims to study the translation of Henry Cary's *Defence and Death of Socrates* in Gujarati by M.K. Gandhi as *Ek Satya Vir Ni Katha* through theories of Translation Studies.

Since this paper explores the translation of a classical text, it becomes essential to have an overview of the English translational practice of Greek/Latin classical texts. Translations of

ancient Greek and Latin texts offer deeper insights into the major issues of Translation Studies (Baker 1998: 34). These translations of classical texts symbolise a lifeline for original texts to circulate beyond its literary system. Additionally, it classifies the impact and influence on the study of languages (Baker 1998: 35). These classical texts have been ideologically loaded, and their translations have been used to consolidate ideas and extend and liberate them.

The ideological use of the classical text's translations can be seen in the works of John Dryden (1631-1700) and Alexander Pope (1688-1744), British poets of the 17th & 18th centuries. Dryden and Pope translated Virgil and Homer into English; these translations contributed to the debate of originality in translation and became canonical literary works in themselves (Baker 1998: 35). Dryden and Pope's translations question the prevalent belief of originality in Translation Studies; both rewrote the classical text in accordance with the need for receiving system. These translations of Dryden are a critique of the contemporary politics of Britain (Poole & Maule 1995). This is an example of the capacity and influence of translated classical texts to influence ideas, ideals, and identity in contemporary politics and knowledge.

Moreover, it is significant to note that besides English being the most potent, prominent language, it is subaltern to the intellectual and cultural status of the classical languages. Paradoxically, in imperial and postcolonial contexts, the appropriation of classical literature and ideas in education systems has provided counter-texts that both challenged imperial domination and provided themes and forms for the development of postcolonial debates and new senses of identity (Budelmann 2005: 128).

There is a considerable amount of literature on the relationship between Socrates and Gandhi; most of these works deal with philosophical similarities between them. However, there is very little known about Gandhi's translation of Plato's *Apology*. Many studies published on Socrates and Gandhi's art of dying, such as Ramin Jahanbegloo (2019), indicated that for Gandhi and Socrates, the art of dying was public policy, as a public act, an act of publicising one's will to be free. Similarly, Pheroz Vasunia (2007) talks about dying as self-sacrifice and dying as an act of heroic nationalism. Furthermore, Vasunia also provided the historical context of Gandhi's translation of *Apology*, but there is little focus on the translation itself. This paper is different from above stated works in terms of the methodological framework and focuses more on readers than the impact of translation on the translator. Therefore, it is vital to study and analyse texts with implacable translation theories. As mentioned earlier, the paper will follow the methodologies of Gérard Genette's paratextuality in translation and André Lefevere's theory of refraction.

A significant figure in French academia Gérard Genette has published almost twenty essays that made immense contributions to literary criticism and aesthetics. Genette, in his work *Palimpsestes* (1982), analyses the type of transcendence as intertextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality, architextuality and paratextuality. These taxonomies of Genette illustrate the interrelationships and interconnections between text and other texts; each taxonomy explains one or another kind of influences or interconnections that helps in the transformation of text. Among these taxonomies, paratextuality binds the text, such as a title, a subtitle, a preface, an illustration, terminal notes, and a book cover. Further, Genette argues that paratext contributes to the text and conveys the authorial intentions (Kathryn 2018: 9-11).

Since paratext can be part of both original and translated texts, Genette discusses the interest in paratextual elements that goes back to the earliest days of Translation Studies as a separate discipline. Translators' preferences have been included in the study of reflections on translation in the context of efforts to establish translation studies as a discipline. The most widely studied type of paratext is the translator's preface and epitextual material, such as the translator's memoirs (Kathryn 2018: 26). The study of paratextual and epitextual materials is vital in translation studies, particularly for this research. Since Gandhi was a prominent public figure of the 20th century, he often studied every aspect of his life with microscopic lenses. It is also significant that his translated texts were part of his Satyagraha; thus, his choices as a translator became the contributing factors. In Genette's conception, paratext and epitext are not only contributions but essential elements; these elements are to be studied as a text. Thus, an analysis of translation also combines analysis of its paratexts and epitexts as research elements. It is essential to note that this paper only analyses paratext in Gandhi's translation. However, it is not wise to limit the study of paratexts to research purposes only; since it is an "undefined zone" waiting to be filled with interpretations by potential readers of it (Kathryn 2018: 9).

Gandhi's translation of *Apology* in Gujarati has two essential paratextual elements, representing the translator's intention behind the translation. The first paratext is Gandhi's prayer titled "Socrates ni Ishwarprathna" and the second is the preface to the translation. Gandhi's narration of prayer and preface is suggestive; it has several references to contemporary political movements in South Africa and India.

The first paratextual element is Gandhi's prayer titled "Socrates ni Ishwarprathna" before writing the preface to his translation. In this prayer, Gandhi mentioned that this is a historical tale of Socrates's ethical and moral ideals. The purpose behind stating the background of Athens and the tale of Socrates is an intentional act, as Gandhi's readers are unaware of the historical and philosophical importance of Socrates. Also, Gandhi prayed to God that we should get the courage to die for Truth, like Socrates. Genette's conception of paratexts are contributing factor in creating the meaning of the text; Gandhi's plea for courage from God poses the question to readers to be courageous against colonial oppression. In this prayer, Gandhi used three words for God; he addressed God as *Prabhu, Khuda* and *Parmeshwar* (Gandhi 1925:1). The use of three equivalents for God suggests that he wanted his readers to connect to their faith in God; thus, Gandhi's God is not only Hindu God, Greek god, Muslim *Khuda* or Christian Christ but a universal God. At the end of this prayer, Gandhi signs his name with the designation as an editor of *Indian Opinion.*

The second paratextual element is Gandhi's preface to *Ek Satya Vir ni Katha.* Gandhi narrates the background of Athens and its politics and the life of Socrates. Gandhi started with a critique of Athens's state of public administration and how some people in the administration itself corrupted it. This introduction to a translation is crucial because Gandhi's readers do not know Greek mythology or who Socrates was. Thus, Gandhi mentioned the critical rule of the Athenian constitution that regulates everyone to follow the religion suggested by Athens's constitution. It is also noteworthy that Gandhi was sent to jail for opposing The Asiatic Registration Act of 1906, which is derogatory in nature towards Indians (CWMG Vol. 7: 16). Thus, Gandhi specifically stated the Athenian rule of religion, for his readers. Socrates was accused of corrupting the youth of Athens by asking them questions about the corruption of the state and religion, according to several court judges (Gandhi 1925:2). Similarly, Gandhi was asking questions to his readers of *Indian Opinion* on the deceitful treatment of states towards Asiatic in South Africa.

Moreover, Gandhi elaborates that Socrates was given the death penalty; before drinking poison (hemlock), Socrates gave a speech on life, corruption, and truth. The speech is recorded by Socrates's student, friend, and relative Plato for future generations to read (Gandhi 1925:1). In his preface to the translation of *Apology*, Gandhi glorifies the death of Socrates. The choice of words used by Gandhi glorifies Socrates' death; for example, Poison is *Sharbat* (a drink of water and sugar) and drinking *Sharbat* (poison) with *Rang; Rang* here is used as honour and celebration (Gandhi 1925:2). Gandhi, in this part of the preface, wants his readers to be courageous and empowered like Socrates to resist authoritarianism. Evidently, Gandhi's intentions are conveyed by his choice of words. Further, Gandhi writes that Socrates is celebrated worldwide for his fearlessness and teachings.

The primary signification of the study of these paratextual elements is the translator's intentions; Gandhi, in his preface to his Gujarati translation of *Apology,* mentioned that this translation is not a word-to-word translation but a summary of the text known by the Arabic word *Turjumo* (Gandhi 1925:3). *Turjumo* is the act of translating, removing or transferring and also an act of rendering into another language; interpretation (Oxford Urdu-English Dictionary 2014). Significantly, Gandhi's translation is sense-for-sense rewriting in Gujarati.

The message in Gandhi's preface for his readers conveys the intention of the translator behind the translation of *Apology* as a political act to inspire people to fight for their rights. The second important observation of the preface is a message for South African and Indian readers that there is a need to do many good works to ease the pain of colonial oppression over India and South Africa. And to do such works, one should learn to live and die like Socrates. Gandhi elaborates that it is not an easy way to achieve *Swaraj,* for that one should fight vices within the society and external evils. Then and only then will we get freedom from British / Imperial oppression and establish *Swaraj* (Gandhi 1925: 3). Further, Gandhi honoured Socrates with a *Satyagrahi.* It is essential to notice that this was Gandhi's first use of *Satyagrahi.* At last, Gandhi defined his objectives behind the translation of Socrates's speech to influence readers to fight against colonialism's unjust, untruth and unfair rule (Gandhi 1925: 3).

The study of two paratextual elements makes a strong case for Gandhi's intentions behind the translation. It is essential to note that Henry Cary was a professional translator who worked in several magazines and translated Dante's blank verses into English. Cary was also an archdeacon (a senior clergy position) (Cary 1847: 23). Unlike Gandhi, Cary had no ideological intention behind the translation but the translation itself. Unlike Cary, Gandhi's Gujarati translation of *Apology* had political and ideological meaning.

Gandhi published this translation of *Apology* in *Indian opinion*; therefore, it is essential to look at the readership of this newspaper, which would help to define Gandhi's readership of translated work. The newspaper was published in Gujarati, Hindi, Tamil, and English; the newspaper aimed to create communication between colonisers and colonised, between Europeans and Indians, and between rich and poor (Hofmeyr 2013: 4-5). He didn't just write against the authority but also point out the weaknesses of Indian & Indian communities. This newspaper's circulation was among 400 to 600 people, Gujarati merchant class and educated English (Hofmeyr 2013: 65). Gandhi defined his readers and wrote; accordingly, this was not business or profession but social work; hence, his prime focus was on the reader and their education.

An American translation theorist André Lefevere proposes the theory of refraction in his essay, 'Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature' (1982). The concept of Refraction in physics, literature and translation are similar to one another.

Refraction in Physics refers to the deflection of light when it travels from one medium to another. For instance, when a pencil is placed in a glass; half-filled with water, the light bends around the pencil as the light cannot travel as quickly in water as it does in the air; hence, making the pencil look crooked in the water. Similarly, Lefevere refers to the text in a new cultural system with physics' notion of bent pencil, as it deviates from the original text while entering a new system. Refraction in the context of translation is the adaptation of literature for different audiences and it also reflects on the acceptance of the adapted work. Refraction essentially naturalises the diverse cultures of source texts for the target audience (Lefevere 1986:4). A systematic approach to literature uses the following assumptions, according to Lefevere, literature is a system embedded in the environment of a culture or society. Further, it is essential to note that acceptance of foreign writers or texts depend upon the need of receiving system hence the work of literature is adapted or refracted in accordance with cultural establishments inside the receiving system.

It is also essential to notice that Henry Cary's *Apology* refracted from the Greek/ Latin version of the *Apology*. The *Apology* is also a refraction of the oral speech of Socrates narrated by Plato. Similarly, this paper studies refraction in Gandhi's Gujarati translation of *Apology*. André Lefevere, in his theory of refraction, suggested tools to analyse the factors of refraction in the literary system. Gandhi's translation is not a word-to-word translation, as he mentioned in the preface that it is rendering. Therefore, Lefevere's refraction theory is preferred to study and analyse such translation since it proposed several tools for close analysis of text and external factors affecting the translator.

According to Lefevere, refraction can be studied by analysing the main three factors of "The Literary System". The literary system consists of three essential elements: 1. Patronage, 2. Poetics 3. Language.

1. Patronage consists of three components: An ideological one (literature should not be allowed to get too far and step out of for the other systems in a given society), an economic one (the patron assures the writer's livelihood) and the status component (the writer achieves a specific position in society). These three components of patronage in refraction work by comparing source text, target text and author of the target text. (Lefevere 1982: 6).

In Lefevere's literary system, the first factor, patronage, is discussed, which consists of components like ideology, economy and status of the translator based on his work in the other system. An ideology for Gandhi to translate is an opportunity for him to introduce his readers to the idea of passive resistance and Truth. Since the translator's ideology and economy are independent of one another, the ideological and economic components are not entangled (Lefevere 1982: 6). Gandhi brought a critical political and spiritual angle to the translation by depicting the horror of an unjust political system. The close study of this exclusion and inclusion reveals the ideology of translation. For example, in Cary's version, there are three main accusers against Socrates, Mellitus is angry on behalf of politicians, Anytus is mad on behalf of poets and artisans, and Lycon is mad on behalf of rhetoricians (Cary 1905/2004: 5). Interestingly, Gandhi only mentioned only Mellitus as an accuser in his translation. Including accuser Mellitus, representing politicians, reveals Gandhi's ideology behind translation. Further, Gandhi's intentions behind translation can also be studied in the preface and prayer of the Gujarati translation of Gandhi. Thus, it reveals the translator's political ideology behind the translation.

The second component of patronage is status, which helps the translator gain status in society. Apart from Gandhi's ideological stand, it did help Gandhi to gain status in the community as an

editor of the newspaper and an activist who translated *Apology* from the jail of Johannesburg. However, the status as a component in Lefevere's system shares mutual relations; on the one hand, Gandhi gained political, social, and literary status by translating classical Greek text into Gujarati. On the other hand, classical Greek text gained new readership in the target language.

2. A poetics is a code of behaviour; it consists of an inventory component which focuses on the invention of something new through the translation of the text. The inventory consists of elements like genres, symbolism, characters, and prototypical situations in translation; these elements appear with innovative themes that have never been explored in the target culture. A translator might also add a few characters to make the plot more acceptable as needed for a target audience (Lefevere 1982: 9). The function of poetics is to focus on ideas and societies in which translation is being presented. Lefevere stated, "Literature produced for obvious commercial reasons will tend to be as conservative, in terms of poetics, as literature produced for obviously ideological reasons (propaganda)." In Gandhi's case, his translations were propagandised for ideological reasons. Gandhi invented many Gujarati equivalents to translate Cary's English version into Gujarati; significantly, Gandhi used the word Satyavadi for the speaker of Truth for the first time.

Gandhi used several Gujarati equivalents for gods in his translation, such as *Khuda, Prabhu, Parmeshwar* and *Dev* (Gandhi 1925:11). It is noticed that these equivalents were used simultaneously, providing options for readers to choose from. This implies that Gandhi was trying to universalise the idea of God; he wanted his readers to connect with God of their faith. Socrates was charged with the allegation that he didn't believe in a Greek god or no god. So, whenever Socrates was saying god, he might have had an idea of Greek gods more than any other gods. Gandhi's readers were not only Hindu but also Muslim and Christian, as Gandhi had a diverse readership for his newspaper (Hofymry 2013: 4).

As mentioned earlier in the readership of *Indian Opinion* that Gandhi's readers were Gujarati and Indians living in South Africa; most of them didn't possess knowledge of Greek Gods, society, or mythology. Thus, Gandhi had to exclude all references related to the source culture to make the translation more acceptable for the target audience. Gandhi used only one name of the accuser, Mellitus, while he excluded poet Antyus and his party.

In Cary's version, the first allegation on Socrates made by a comic poet Aristophanes accuses Socrates of flying in the air like some supernatural element. While in Gandhi's translation, Mellitus accused Socrates of walking in the air (Cary 1905/2004: 4). Gandhi decided to omit that reference to Aristophanes as it is difficult for his reader to decode that cultural reference. Impressively, Gandhi used the Sanskrit equivalent 'Mahajan' for senet. Mahajan means Mahā = Great, and Jána means men, which is a council made of the great head of a tribe or caste' (Merriam-Webster Dictionary).

The second allegation against Socrates was that he took money in return for his teaching, and Socrates believed that there was nothing wrong with getting money in return for knowledge. For Socrates, teaching is an honourable pursuit (Cary 1905/2004: 4). Cary, in his version, gives examples of great teachers of Athens who instructed their fellow citizens and how citizens admired teachers by providing money and honour (Cary 1905/2004: 4). Later, Cary translates the example Socrates gave about a teacher named Parian and a student named Callias, son of Hipponicus. But Gandhi left out the entire passage and just narrated the opinion of Socrates on teaching as a pursuit.

Later, Socrates arrogantly stated that even our gods have said that Socrates is wiser than our gods. It is essential to note that human wisdom is believed to be wiser than gods in Greek culture. (Cary 1905/2004: 5). This sentence doesn't make sense if a reader doesn't know a reference to Chæropho / Oracle (also known as Chiron, who is also referred to as "wisest and justest of all centaurs"), who went to Delphi (Oracle is the placed in Delphi, also believed to the centre of the world) and asked the god that if there was anyone wiser than I (Cary 1905/2004: 5). Instead of narrating the complexity of Greek mythology, Gandhi omitted the primary reference to it and stated the moral without the story. Thus, it is difficult for Gandhi's readers to convince themselves with Gandhi's translated statement that "Socrates is wiser than God, and also our god has said it" (Gandhi 1925: 6). Whereas, in Cary's version, Socrates appears more convincing as he references the Chæropho to make a case that human wisdom is greater than gods. Gandhi's translation of this passage appears lousy since it has no cultural, lingual or mythical reference to the source text.

In Cary's version, Socrates went to politicians, poets, prophets, seers, and artisans to ask them questions about life and knowledge (Cary 1905/2004: 5). But Gandhi's Socrates went to politicians, poets and artisans only. Gandhi cannot convey to his reader a poet or a politician from a different culture and society. However, Gandhi's Socrates sounds wiser than Cary's. Gandhi summarised two passages of Cary in his translation as one passage and said, *'Je Manas potanu agyan jane chhe te, ae agyan ne nahi Jannar karta gyani chhe'* (Gandhi 1925: 7). In Cary's translation, a discussion on wisdom appears degrading even after a long narration.

In the English version of Cary, Socrates asked Mellitus to swear on the name of Jupiter, while in Gandhi's Gujarati translation, there is no mention of Jupiter. Mellitus accuses Socrates of not believing in the moon and sun gods. In reply to this allegation, Socrates took the example of Anaxagoras, a Greek philosopher of nature and discovered the cosmology of the actual cause of eclipses (Cary 1905/2004: 9). Gandhi, in his translation, translated the statement but excluded references to cosmology and Anaxagoras. Similarly, In Cary's version, there is an argument that demons are some gods; demons are children of gods, Sons of gods (Cary 1905/2004: 11). This argument makes sense in Cary and Socrates's religion, but in Gandhi's religion, there is no idea that Satan or a demon god does exist. Thus, Gandhi did not translate the statement he could not understand or relate to.

Gandhi includes references to the Trojan war, a famous tale. Gandhi narrated the story of a demigod (a mortal raised to divine rank/ half-god and a half-human), Hector and Patroclus and uttered that death is ultimate whether it is just or unjust (Cary 1905/2004: 11). The Trojan War tale is known to many readers. Gandhi; thus, he mentioned it (Gandhi 1925:12). Further, Cary's Socrates addressed his student Crito, Plato, Apollodorus and Paralus that if he corrupted them as Antyus and Mellitus accused, they should come forward and speak the truth (Cary 1905/2004: 12). In contrast, Gandhi excluded all these conversions in his translated text.

At last, Socrates lost the voting by three votes, and he was given a choice to pay the fine penalty or the death penalty. Socrates felt that he was too old to live by paying the fine penalty as there would be nothing left for his sons and their boys. Hence Socrates chose the death penalty while saying that death will take me to a better place (Hades: The underworld, which is located beneath the depths of the ocean), where all legends like true judges Minos and Rhadamanthus also poets like Homer, Orpheus, and Hesiod lays after receiving unjust deaths (Cary 1905/2004: 13). Similarly, Gandhi glorifies death by illustrating the Hindu tradition of 'karma yoga' and 'dharma yoga', where people will be punished for their actions and sent to *swarg (lok)* or *nark (lok)*

(Gandhi 1925: 21). For Gandhi's reader, Hades is entirely out of context; therefore, he rendered this passage according to the need of receiving system.

According to Lefevere, the degree of translation acceptance depends upon the receiving system's need. Hence, every work of literature or translation is adapted or refracted according to the cultural establishment inside the receiving system. The use and exclusion of poetic constraints such as prototypical characters, situations and cultural symbols produced the new narrative and story in Gandhi's translation of Cary's *Apology*.

3. A final constraint in the literary system of Lefevere is language. A natural language which is consisted of a work of literature is written on both as formal sides of language and the pragmatic side, also to study the language that reflects culture. Gandhi encoded several features of the source culture, such as customs, laws, and social conditions in specific lexical items for which receptor culture has no equivalents. The translation is one of the activities which expand linguistic options through the transfer and import of terms, words, and phrases, which leaves a mark on the lexical texture of the target culture.

The use of language in Gandhi's translation was for Gujaratis/ Indians living in South Africa; these readers of Gandhi were merchants and labourers. Gandhi was aware that Socrates might know many things, but he didn't know the formal language of the court; Socrates also confessed that in the beginning. Therefore, Gandhi chooses to write a translation of *Apology* in informal language or the commoner's language. Gandhi's language was not for the masses but for a selected class. Gandhi's narrative is short and precise since he stated in his preface that this translation is *Tarjumo*. The critical aspect of writing is a visible pattern of Socrates's method of rhetoric (questions) in Cary's translation. In Gandhi's Gujarati translation, this effective and signature method was absent, also called the method of Elenchus. It is noteworthy that Socrates' rhetoric is different from the rhetoric of Sophists; Socrates' rhetoric enlightens people and provides a temptation to think. Cary's translation followed the narrative pattern of arguments open to interpretations. However, Gandhi's Gujarati version omitted the signature narrative techniques of Socrates' rhetorics.

In the Gujarati translation, Gandhi omitted this communication and Socrates' questioned based speech. Gandhi's narrative is not as extensive as Cary's; Gandhi took "saar" (summary) of Cary's version and translated it into a more sincere Gujarati language for his readers, which holds the essence of the source text but not the style. Gandhi followed the dialogue structure between Socrates and Mellitus, similar to Cary's English version. But Gandhi's dialogues are short, while Cary's dialogues hold the sentiments of Socrates at length (Cary 1905/2004: 7-11 & Gandhi 1925: 8-9). Another observation about Cary's narrative is that whenever he translated the accusations against Socrates, it was quoted in the accuser's words, while Gandhi avoided that. Gandhi's language was of Gujaratis living in South Africa, it is not formal, but his language followed a structure of the oral form of speech. In Gandhi's narrative, there was no necessity for flowery or formal language as long as he could convey his ideas to his readers. It is also noteworthy that Socrates says my language is not a language of court at the beginning of his speech, as he does not understand that. Similarly, for Gandhi, language was a medium of communication.

During the 19th century, the Gujarati language had problems with the vast variety of Gujarati orthography (*jodani*); even Gandhi faced the issue with orthography while translating *Apology* (CWMG vol. 10: 203). Gandhi used spellings closer to his language dialect rather than standard ones. For example, he used *Mohat* as an equivalent for death rather than *Mot*; here, *Mot* is the

standard spelling of *Mohat*. Throughout his translation, the issue of correct spelling is visible. However, there were several attempts to standardise Gujarati spelling by Narmadashankar Labhshankar's work *Narmakosh* (1873) and Gujarat Vernacular Society's journal *Buddhiprakash* (1885). Despite that, the Gujarati spelling system standardisation is yet to be accomplished (Isaka 2002: 1-19). Later, in the 1920s, Gandhi took the initiative for an extensive Gujarati dictionary with the engagement of Gujarat Vidyapith; this dictionary is known as *Jodanikosh,* published in 1929 (Sebastian 2009: 95). Gandhi as a translator, was aware of the limitations of the target language, as he faced issues of cultural equivalence and spelling structure like any other translator.

At last, Gandhi and Cary both narrate Socrates's acceptance of death. Gandhi's Socrates is more spiritual, while Cary's Socrates is rational, political, and ethical. Gandhi's translation removes the cultural and religious complexities of Cary's *Apology,* as he did not translate Greek mythical and cultural references as Cary did. Still, Gandhi translates Socrates' central arguments with his political message to stand against unjust in society and state. Gandhi refracts his idea of death and spirituality prominently, while Cary's English translation is more about ethics and morals in politics. Gandhi's Socrates is supercilious about his ideals, while Cary's Socrates appears more rational. Interestingly, Gandhi uses several equivalents for God in Gujarati as *Prabhu*, *Khuda* and *Ishwar*. There is an explanation behind the simultaneous use of two or more equivalents for God; Gandhi wanted his readers to connect with their faith in God (God of their faith); Muslims in India often use the word *Khuda* for *Allah* and *Ishwar*, *Parmeshwar* and *Prabhu* used by Hindus (Gandhi 1925: 6, 8, 11, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23). Whenever Gandhi translated God, he universalised God as one and wanted his reader to feel the same way. This use of equivalents can also exemplify Gandhi's efforts for Hindu-Muslim unity. Gandhi freed Socrates's god (Greek gods) and Cary's God (Christ) as a universal God.

The arguments mentioned above in patronage, poetics, and language show that Gandhi was not attempting word-to-word translation; instead, he was rendering the text in Gujarati. Gandhi's choice of title in Gujarati is suggestive; indeed, Gandhi could have chosen any title which followed the rule of literal translation, but he did not. Instead, Gandhi chooses the title *Ek Satya Vir ni Katha* ('Story of a True Soldier' or 'Story of a Soldier of Truth'). The choice of title signifies that Socrates was not famous in the eastern world as he was in the western world. Thus, Gandhi decided to choose a title by the characteristics of Socrates rather than choosing the name of Socrates. Also, the title of the Gujarati translation is refracted according to the need of the receiving system.

Gandhi's refraction of *Apology* was translated with the cultural, political, and social situation of his time; it became a literary text that influenced Indian political thoughts. Gandhi translated democracy as a phrase rather than using Gujarati equivalents such as *lokshahi* or *Prajatantra*. Gandhi's readers never had democracy, and most of them were unaware of the idea of democracy; hence Gandhi used the phrase to explain the word democracy as *"aamnu (prajanu) Rajya"* (Gandhi 1908: 18). Gandhi encoded several features of the source culture, such as customs, laws, and social conditions in specific lexical items for which receptor culture has no equivalents. The translation is one of the activities which expand linguistic options through the transfer and import of terms, words, and phrases, which leave a mark on the lexical texture of the target culture.

Gandhi issued and read Henry Cary's *Apology* from Johannesburg's prison library when he was sent to jail on 10th January 1908 for organising opposition against Asiatic Registration Act (The Black Act). The resistance to The Asiatic Registration Act was Gandhi's first opposition against

colonial rule, the first time Gandhi used the word *Satyagraha* to describe his struggle. There is an interesting story behind how Gandhi came up with the Gujarati equivalence Satyagraha for his unique passive resistance. In his autobiography, in the chapter 'The Birth of Satyagraha', "*The principle called Satyagraha came into being before that name was invented. Indeed when it was born, I could not say what it was. In Gujarati, also we used the English phrase 'passive resistance' to describe it. "It was clear that the Indians must coin a new word to designate their struggle. But I could not for the life of me find out a new name and therefore offered a nominal prize through Indian Opinion to the reader who made the best suggestion on the subject. As a result, Maganlal Gandhi coined 'Sadagraha' (Sat=truth, Agraha=firmness) and won the prize. But to make it clearer, I changed the word to 'Satyagraha', which has since become current in Gujarati as a designation for the struggle*" (Gandhi 1928: 178). This passage illustrates the importance of equivalence for Gandhi in translation and his efforts to find equivalence.

The prevalent interpretation of Satyagraha is 'passive resistance', mainly interpreted with political connotations on a struggle between colonisers and colonised. Despite that, Satyagraha is about self-determination with non-violent techniques; it is about changing the hearts and minds of people rather than forceful revolution (Iyer 1973). It is also notable that Satyagraha derived from theological tenets of Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism, which describe the purpose of life as to search for *Satya* with *Ahimsa* (Shurud 2019:140). Thus, it is ardours to distinguish the meaning of Satyagraha with only concepts of politics, spirituality or philosophy. Hence in his later years, Gandhi realised and said, "Satyagraha differs from Passive Resistance as the North Pole from the South" (Gandhi 1920: 5).

Gandhi, a translator, was a passive resister, and his translations were passive resistance. However, in Gandhi's 'thinking', this idea of passive resistance differs from Socrates' or Tolstoy's idea of passive resistance. Altogether, his passive resistance was part of his brief thinking of Satyagraha, compile of philosophy, spirituality, and politics. According to Gandhi, Socrates opposed Athens's court and corrupt system through passive resistance. Socrates accepted the death penalty, refused to pay a fine, and even refused to escape when Crito offered. Gandhi urged his readers in the preface to live and die like Socrates, who stood by the Truth; as a result, he was gifted with the death penalty. Socrates accepted death with glory with passive resistance and stood by Truth.

Conclusion

The paper effectively identifies significant observations through a close and comparative study of both translations, outlines the translator's intention behind translation, the choices of inclusion and exclusion of source culture references and the choice of equivalents were based on the need of the receiving system. Gandhi, in his preface and prayer, stated that this translation is *Turjumo*; also, his political intention behind the translation. The study of Gandhi's translation through Lefevere's refraction illustrates Gandhi's patronage as an ideological one. The patronage of Gandhi is ideological as an Indian activist in South Africa, who resisted colonial oppression, and it also highlights the politics of his translated text. Further, poetics illuminates that Gandhi naturalises the Greek culture and mythical references of source texts for the target audience. At last, the use of language and equivalents demonstrated by Gandhi's readers, Gandhi's translation excluded narrative techniques of Socrates' rhetorics and avoided fermented language. Gandhi's choice of equivalents drew immense attention since he translated God with several equivalents and coined a phrase for democracy in Gujarati. There are satisfactory findings to state that Gandhi's transition of Cary's *Apology* was refraction rather than the literal translation.

This paper also highlights the political importance of this translation since Gandhi's translation of Plato's *Apology was* banned by the British government on the charge of sedition, along with Hind Swaraj and Gandhi's translation of Mustafa Kamal Pasha's speech in Gujarati. Gandhi's translation of Plato's *Apology* in Gujarati was an act of the ideological use of the classical text's translations, as seen in the works of Dryden and Pope. This is an example of the capacity and influence of translated classical texts to influence ideas, ideals, and identity in contemporary politics and knowledge. Gandhi's translation contributes new insight to the postcolonial debate, which counters imperial domination and provides a new form of identity for Indians.

References

BATCHELOR, KATHRYN. 2018. Genette's Concept of the Paratext and its Development across Disciplines. In Kathryn Batchelor (ed.), *Translation and Paratexts.* 11-17.

BUDELMANN, FELIX. 2005. *Greek Tragedies in West African Adaptations*. *The Cambridge Classical Journal*, 50. 118-146. Doi:10.1017/S0068673500001036.

CARY, HENRY FRANCIS. 2017. Memoir of the Rev. Henry Francis Cary, M. A., Translator of Dante: With His Literary Journal and Letters 1. Andesite Press.

CARY, HENRY. 2004. *Apology, Crito and Phaebo of Socrates*. Gutenberg Project: London. Accessed online: https://www.gutenberg.org/files/13726/13726-h/13726-h.htm.

GANDHI, M. K. 1925. *Ek Satya Vir ni Katha*. Mumbai: Bhagini Samaj Gyan Mandir.

GANDHI, M. K. 1928. *Satyagraha in South Africa* (V. G. Desai, Trans.). Madras: S. Ganesan Publisher.

GANDHI, M. K. 1919. Young India 1919-1922. Ahmedabad: Navjivan Press.

GANDHI, M. K. 1908. *Ek Satya Vir ni Katha*. Mumbai: Bhagini Samaj Gyan Mandir.

PUBLICATION DIVISION, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. 2003. *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi* Vol. 1 to 99. New Delhi: Publication Division, Government of India.

GANDHI, MOHANDAS K. 1927. *An Autobiography, or The Story of My Experiment with Truth* (Mahadev Desai, Trans.). Ahemdabad: Navjivan Publishing House. Accessed online: https://www.gandhiheritageportal.org/mahatma-gandhi-books/the-story-of-my-experiments-with-truth-volume-one#page/1/mode/2up

HALL, EDITH & PHIROZE VASUNIA. (eds.). 2010. *India, Greece, and Rome*, 1757-2007. London: Institute of the Classical Tradition.

HOFMEYR, ISABEL. 2013. *Gandhi's Printing Press: Experiments in Slow Reading*. Cambridge & Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

ISAKA, RIHO. 2002. Language and Dominance: The Debates over the Gujarati Language in the Late Nineteenth Century, South Asia. *Journal of South Asian Studies,* 25(1). 1 – 19.

IYER, RAGHAVAN. 1973. *The Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi.* New York: Oxford University Press.

LEFEVERE, ANDRÉ. 1982. Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, System and Refraction in a Theory of Literature. *Modern Language Studies* 12. 3-20.

MERRIAM-WEBSTER. (n.d.). Mahajan. In Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary. Accessed online on 18 Jan, 2023: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mahajan.

SEBASTIAN, V. 2009. Gandhi and the Standardisation of Gujarati. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 44(31). 94-101.

SKARIA, AJAY. 2010. Living by Dying. In Anand Pandian & Daud Ali (eds.), *Ethical Life in South Asia*. 211–31.

SUHRUD, TRIDIP. (ed.). 2019. *The Power of Nonviolent Resistance*. Penguin Books: New Delhi.

VASUNIA, PHIROZE. 2007. *Epilogue: Gandhi, Nehru, Socrates.* In Edith Hall & Amanda Wrigley (eds.), *The Classics and Colonial India*. London: Oxford University Press.

Disclaimer:

Please take note that there are limited numbers of references exploring Gandhi's Gujarati translation of Plato's 'Apology'. This paper tries to understand the role of Gandhi as a translator, an underexplored arena in Gandhian Studies. Since it is a developing area of research, the readers may find that a limited literature review is available on this subject.

About the author:

Nidhi J. Makwana is a PhD Scholar at the School of Liberal Studies at Pandit Deendayal Energy University, Gandhinagar. She received her MPhil in English Literature from Saurashtra University, Rajkot. Her research interest includes Translation Studies and Gandhian Studies, she has presented her research at International and National conferences and published her works in academic journals.