

TRANSCENDING HER-SELF: ON RE-READING SELECTED TRANSLATIONS OF MALAYALI FEMINIST AUTOBIOGRAPHIES

Divya. N.

Abstract

Translating the self is an intricate process as 'writing the self'. This paper intends to explore the multiple aspects involved in translating the feminine self in the selected Malayalam feminist autobiographies. It chooses to analyse the multiple aspects involve in the trans-creation of the feminist self in an alien language through various methods and approaches. The paper purports to address this study through an analysis of the two translated autobiographies of C.K.Janu and Nalini Jameela. It intends to perform a detailed analysis of the selected texts, accentuating on the role of the translator and the translation in correlation to the translated.

Key words: Autobiography, Gender, Language, Subjectivity, Translator.

Translation has facilitated new approaches in reading and interpretation. The awareness of the "liquid fixity" of languages has made transitions from one language to another easier. Writing their self has never been a unique phenomenon for the Malayali women. The earlier Malayali feminist autobiographies and life-writings have demonstrated multiple dimensions of self writing. Translating the already translated self into an alien language formulates new exploratory subjective perspectives. Scrutinizing the translations of the feminist autobiographies becomes vital for comprehending and overcoming the secondary position ascribed

to women and translation in the subjective representations. This analysis becomes significant in reading the assorted approaches to women and translation. In fact, "Both feminism and translation are concerned by the way <<secondariness>> comes to defined and canonized; both are tools for a critical understanding of difference as it is represented in language" (Simon 1996: 8).

This paper purports to examine and analyse selected translations of Malayali women life-writings. It proposes to explore the translated autobiographies, Janu's *Mother Forest: The Unfinished Story* (Janu: 2004) and Jameela's *The Autobiography of a Sex-Worker* (Jameela: 2007). It intends to validate these translations of the Malayali women life-writings on linguistic, social and cultural backgrounds.

The subaltern feminist life-writing as a genre had indeed been on the evolutionary path. The historical evolution of the representation of the female self consciousness had contributed to linguistic empowerment through self writing. A woman may tell her life "in what she chooses to call an autobiography; she may tell it in what she chooses to call fiction; a biographer, woman or man, may write a biography, or the woman may write her own life in advance of living it" (Helibrun 2008:11).

The 'trials and tribulations' encountered by the docile subaltern women has fostered their resistant urges through self-expression. "Autobiography, as a genre of writing, has formed an important site of feminist engagement with dominant theories of the self" (Devika 2006: 1675).

Feminist autobiographies have become spaces where the woman constantly endeavours for self expression through multiple narrative strategies. "Selfhood in life writing is thus understood as a narrative performance and the text often exhibits the writer's process of self-awareness and struggle for self-representation through narrative structure itself" (Davis 2005: 42). The translators and the authors of the selected texts reflect their employment

of diverse narrative approaches in articulating the female lives. The autobiography of Jameela deviates between her past and present while Janu's autobiography is compartmentalised into her childhood and politically active adulthood.

Writing and translating the female self, involves engraving the body and the soul of the female protagonists. Both the acts indulge in constructing the subjectivity of women "through the inscription of an interior and an anterior" involving the body and the psyche (Stanton 1987:14). The authors of the chosen feminine autobiographies have disclosed their bodily experiences in conjunction with the individual countenance. They explicate incidents of sexual molestation and harassment. Jameela reminisces her experience of molestation at the age of 13 from a man named Ittamash, who "tried to put his hand inside" her blouse (Jameela 2007:14). Janu recounts that when she "saw different sorts of men wearing Shirts and Dhotis" she realised that she "had to walk keeping a safe distance from them" (Janu 2004:7). The translated narratives in fact discourse on the prevalence of the "safe-distance" between men and women in the third world nations.

Transcribing and Transforming Her-Self :

Women have always elucidated and explicated their selves through life-writing. However translating one-self from one language into another involves a bilingual interpolation of the already mediated self. The target language reifies and re-constructs the self of the source language. This section explores the repercussions and the aspects in the differential translated rendering in an alien language. It aspires to look into the construction of linguistic, cultural and gender nuances associated with translation.

Janu's *Mother Forest* reflects and resonate the deplorable life story of adivasi women while Jameela's *The Autobiography of a Sex Worker* depicts the life story of a sex worker and her

experiences with the society. Initially the two selected texts assume the position of translated oral retellings. Hence they could be accorded the status of being double-translated.

The metamorphosis from self control to self expression characterises these works. The authors no longer succumb to the societal pressures of censorship associated with the inscribing of their life stories. The texts portray them as equipped to confront any societal, political and religious ostracism associated with their autobiographies.

The translated autobiographical versions render a distinct self from the native renderings. The linguistic ramifications of the autobiographies construct a dialectics of double representation of the already mediated self of the author. It primarily initiates a psychological conversation between the inscriber and the author, followed by an unconscious empirical interaction between the author and the translator. Consequently the authorial self becomes twice mediated and interpolated between the contours of the two languages as the authors delineate their unique experience of being translated.

The dynamics of the altered semantic and semiotic dimensions of the target language simultaneously entails a new mobility and fixity to the translated text. The translated self becomes more mobile due to the redemption from the constraints of the native linguistic environment. The new critical parlance of the target language restricts the innate freedom of expression associated with the native registers of kinship terms and idiolects. However appropriated and adapted translation, retaining the native expressions, indeed dilutes this complex representational logic to a certain extent.

Voicing the Feminine in the Global Language

Translating the autobiography becomes a passionate experience for the protagonists just as writing the self. All the

protagonists in the autobiographies have indeed articulated their inherent and innate desire for a global linguistic podium to voice their concerns.

The translated autobiographies of Janu and Jameela enunciate their aspirations for transforming their life-writings into a new linguistic landscape. The desire and determination of Jameela and Janu to translate their autobiographies into English parallels Sister Jesme's conviction to expound her life and experiences in the self-translated work *Amen: The Autobiography of a Nun*. Their yearning for a global linguistic venue reverberates Sister Jesme's words that "Though the book was first published in Malayalam, I had initially written it in English and I wanted it to be published in that language" (Jesme 2009: vii). Analogous to Sister Jesme's endeavour, the translated autobiographies of Janu and Jameela targets a 'global readership.' They evince the desire of the authors for a universal audience, who are competent and adept enough to comprehend their life experiences, redefining their individuality and personality.

In fact, translated autobiography becomes a method of ascertaining one's identity, explicating the feminine self before the larger readership. Jameela and Janu furnish their hopes in penning down a successful autobiography. "For Jameela, a successful autobiography was her way of establishing herself as a public person, while testifying to the oppression of sex workers in public" (Devika 2007: xii). Elsewhere Jameela remarks that, "Let me also tell you that the struggle to get this story written the way I wanted it written, and to get it into the public eye, has been as intense as any in my whole life" (Jameela 2007:179).

The desire for collective reform at the backdrop of individual life histories distinguishes the texts. Janu and Jameela explicates their desire to transcend the societal barriers and defeat the escalating prurient interests of a particular societal section through their life stories. The protagonists attributes the purpose of self-writing, being consigned by the motives of social

and political reform. However, despite their obstinacy to employ the autobiographies as tools of societal reformation, the authors reinstate their desire to avoid hurting anyone. They claim to choose imaginary names in their life-writings. The approach of Janu and Jameela is analogous to Sister Jesme's opinion that "So that the book should in no way hurt those inside the *iron curtain*, unlike in an autobiography, I have purposely used fictitious names" (Jesme 2009:vii).

The urge to dismantle the masculine hegemony in the public sphere characterises the translated works. Despite being classified as autobiographies the chosen texts become community biographies, claiming affinity and alliance with the life stories of many women.

They explicate the prevailing political and social atmosphere of that time. "Awareness that the subject of autobiography, politicised as it is, also remains fully mediated by discourse has alerted feminists to ways in which discursive position and material or historical location are mutually implicated in autobiography" (Devika 2006:1675).

The protagonists aspire that their translated life writing would aid in inducing increased transparency and female emancipation in the societal and political matters. The purpose of the autobiographies of Jameela and Janu involves generating awareness "to enable society to have a peep into the panoramic but veiled ocean, like the seashell that holds a few drops of sea water" (Jesme 2009:vii). They assume accountability to expose the societal malpractices, reflecting their hatred towards collective suppression and hypocrisy.

Detailed accounts of emotional and physical struggle accompany Jameela's and Janu's portrayal of the political and the communal aspects. Their 'life-representations' dissolve the demarcation between the political and the personal. Janu's translated life story depicting the existence and struggles of the

adivasi women, in close association with the forest, diffuses the binary divides between the nature and the culture. According to Janu “no one knows the forest like we do, the forest is mother to us, more than a mother because she never abandons us”(Janu 2004:5).

Analogous to Janu’s portrayal, Jameela’s narrative liquidates the division between the public and the private. She opines that her story would assist in legitimizing the sex work. Self writing and translating becomes self empowerment. The desire for positioning the narrative of the “other” in the universal framework ascertains the feminine self-telling and writing.

Translating autobiographies become a kaleidoscopic trans-creation of female lives, mediated in the ‘bilingual interface.’ They reflect the desire of the protagonists to achieve a holistic self that is simultaneously singular and in unison with the society. The transference of the written self from one language to another liberates the feminine memory from the patriarchal prejudices. It becomes a method of emotional healing. The protagonists reflect the truth that “writing provides a cathartic relief and a space for self-reflection”(Jesme 2009: xi).

The societal labelling as deviant or transgressing women have indeed inspired the ‘multi-layered’ self- inscribing of these women. In the chosen autobiographies, “The female “I” was thus not simply a texture woven of various selves; its threads, its lifelines, came from and extended to others. By that token, this “I” represented a denial of a notion essential to the phallogocentric order: the totalized self-contained subject present-to-itself”(Stanton 1987: 16). In short, the translated autobiographies furnish an emotionally articulated feminine self.

The imposed moral inferiority of the protagonists triggers societal censorship. The autobiographies of Janu and Jameela delineate the societal and religious censorship faced by them. Analogous to the translated autobiographies of Baby Kamble

and Bama, the narratives reflect and ponder on the sufferings of subaltern women.

The translated stories of Janu and Jameela foreground the chasm between ideology and truth. They reveal the disparity between the real and the ideological construct of women. Various instances in the life stories of Jameela and Janu elucidates the discrepancy between the societal expectation of women and their lived experiences. According to Satchidanandan "The autobiographies of Pandita Ramabai, Kanan Devi, Shirin Madam, Hamsa Wadekar, Anandi Bai Karve, Durga Khote, Amrita Pritam, Ajeet Cour, Kamala Das, Malika Amar Sheikh, C. K. Janu, Nalini Jameela and others reveal the dichotomy between the ideological constructions of women and their actual life-histories"(Satchidanandan 2010:8).

The translations of these women have erased the earlier Keralite assumption of autobiography as a primary genre belonging to the dominant upper caste women. The translated narratives depict the significance and hegemony accorded to the dominant domesticated family woman in the Kerala scenario. They bear testimony to the treatment accorded to the working and the dalit/ezhava women. Jameela reminisces the caste hierarchy in Kerala as "The people who worked at the clay mine were either Dalits, and poor Ezhavas like me, or Christians. Nairs and Nambutiris did not do this work" (Jameela 2007:15). Her autobiography delineates the discrimination she and her friends faced when Kunhikkavu, a Nair woman, joined them in clay mine. According to her till Kunhikkavu "came, my friends and I used to get our tea before everyone else. This changed, and so did some other daily practices. Don't touch the pitcher with your lips while drinking water, they'd say, Kunhikkavu has to drink from the same vessel!" (Jameela 2007:16). Akin to Jameela's rendering, Janu's autobiography expositis the discriminations encountered by her as a Dalit woman. Jameela in her autobiography states her Ezhava origin while Janu states about her Adiyar community. Janu prefers to use the term Adivasis meaning the early occupants instead of

Dalit. They record the dissatisfaction of the protagonists with the societal hierarchy.

The translated narratives explicate the multiple praxis of dislocation in their encountering of the caste and gender discrimination. The two authors delineate numerous instances of caste and gender discrimination. They assist in reframing the existing position of the subaltern women. Janu and Jameela expounds the prejudiced treatment accorded to women in terms of caste and sub caste. According to Janu "in those days for our people the only thing that mattered was the jenmi" (Janu 2004:15).

The translated narratives elaborate on the prevalent discourses of chastity and 'sexual morality' in the gender discourses. They elucidate the individual negotiations on liberty and expression due to the 'moral sedimentation' of the society. Sex and body becomes not choices but rather impositions.

Janu depicts the deplorable plight of the adiyar women, silenced through the social idiom of sanctification. She explains the rituals observed in association with puberty. According to her, "in our community there were certain rituals when girls reach puberty. we had to remain indoors out of sight for three full days. later old women and elders would conduct some rituals" (Janu 2004:20). Akin to Janu's depiction, Nalini Jameela quotes several instances during which she suffered ignominy and ostracism as a woman and a sex worker. The incidents quoted in the autobiographies become instances of revisiting the marginalised body. The narratives expose the double standards of society that accord social and public legitimacy to women through an 'honourable' silencing.

In fact, the translations of J.Devika and Ravishanker aids in deconstructing the recurring representational tropes of the 'respected woman' in the Kerala public sphere. The works become an endeavour proclaiming the necessity for deflection from the conventional and acknowledged restrictions.

Between the Translator and the Feminine Self.

Translation of an autobiography facilitates a conversation between the author and the translator. It entails an interpretative relationship between the translator and the reader.

Every translation endeavour is born from a sense of affinity, alliance and empathy between the translator and the reader. Both the translators have recognised their deep interest in the concerned works.

The translator's note in the autobiographies of Jameela and Janu manifests the empathetic and sympathetic affiliation between the translator and the reader. J.Devika explicates her "decision to translate the book-made in the spirit of friendship" while Ravi Shanker registers his admiration and adoration for the individuality of Janu (Jameela 2007: xxi).

Ravi Shanker acknowledges Janu as a strong woman in the context of "the singular nature of her mission and the almost solitary position that she holds" (Shanker 2004: x). J.Devika remarks that "As a feminist historian, I was initially attracted to Jameela's challenge to entrenched gender ideals in Kerala, the history of which I have traced in my own work. But as a feminist I was drawn to her remarkable combination of skills: a remarkable ability to argue rationally, and an uncanny eye for analogy and metaphor, all drawn from the ordinary materials of everyday life" (Devika 2007: xix-xx). The translator's note in the autobiographies reflects the optimism and enthusiasm of the protagonists.

The translated autobiographies entail a double retrospection, facilitating a revisiting of the past in the bilingual mode of narration. They create a new dialectics of linguistic and gender significations, resurrecting the past of the individual, so as to dismantle and disengage it from the established constructs.

The translators register their difficulties in translating the authorial juxtaposition of the past, present and the future in the autobiographies of Jameela and Janu. According to Devika, Jameela's "trick of discussing past events in the present tense was, however, difficult to retain. Also, while Jameela follows a broadly linear narrative, she often digresses into the past, and moves into the future" (Devika 2007: xx).

Analogous to Devika's foreword, Ravi Shanker in his "Translator's Note" also comments that Bhaskaran's narration of Janu's life story "as if she were speaking it" possessed a challenge for him as a translator (Shanker 2004: xi). He elucidates the typological approaches adopted in translation to contribute authenticity to the native spoken language. According to him "The upper cases in the first chapter, in a sea of lower cases are used to indicate the stresses in Janu's spoken language" (Shanker 2004: xii). He expositis that during the initial course of the translation he "experimented with a form that roughly translated . . . as 'most of the toiling we did only in the rice fields'" employing a unique form of English (Shanker 2004: xi). He delineates even the minute aspects involved in his translation endeavour. In his translator's note Ravi Shanker states that he "used the simplest language possible, keeping the flow of the language close to the Malayalam that rolled off Janu's tongue" (Shanker 2004:xii).

However compared to Jameela's autobiography, Janu's autobiography is clearly compartmentalised into her early formative and later active years. Ravi Shanker's translation endeavour explicates on how this thematic divide has led to a linguistic approach. According to him "The first chapter was treated differently from the second, because I felt it was closer to Janu's inner world, while the second was more polemical and belonged to the outer world"(Shanker 2004:ibid). Akin to Ravi Shanker's observation, as a translator Devika states in the interview appended in Jameela's autobiography about her and Jameela's feelings that the last chapter "was weak in many ways" (Devika 2007: 177). "As she herself mentions in the interview appended,

the last chapter is not really a last chapter at all" (Devika 2007: xx).

The acknowledgement of the significance of the rhetoric summates further dimensions to the translations. The struggle to sustain the nuances and intricacies of the source language in the target language emphasising on the spoken language and the native dialects renders an intense proximity between the author, the translator and the text.

Transference from one language to another has always facilitated the intricacies and nuances of feminine subjectivity. Janu and Jameela attempt to intensify their confrontation with the patriarchal matrix through translation that facilitates a global access. The translator's opinion has indeed rendered multiple dimensions on the feminine subjectivity in the narratives. The translated autobiographies of Janu and Jameela become instances of double retrieval of the individual self. Their observations indeed bear testimony to the enduring and the fighting spirit of the protagonists.

The translated life stories of Jameela and Janu are bestowed with glossaries explicating the regional expressions including kinship terms, sociolects and idiolects. The acknowledgement that the climate and the landscape of one language differ from another has obviously culminated in this lexicon. Devika and Ravi Shanker have indeed expressed the difficulties they encountered in the course of the translation. They have elucidated their attempts to reiterate the colloquial expressions. According to Ravi Shanker "Janu throughout the text, describes herself or her society in the first person as 'nammal' a word that, in Malayalam, is used for both 'I' and 'We.' I had to settle for using 'I' or 'We', as the context demanded. This is the one compromise I had to make with great reluctance, perhaps sacrificing accuracy for clarity (Shanker 2004:xi). Devika in her "Translator's Foreword" remarks that "As a translator, I struggled to retain the complexities of the argument-in which a neoliberal political language often jostled for space with contrary positions- as well as Jameela's personal

writing style”(Devika 2007:xx). Akin to Ravi Shanker’s explication, Devika too delineates her difficulty in translating and preserving the colloquial expressions and idioms innate in Jameela’s words. The translators emphasize their preferences for the linguistic nuances and gender specific utterances. Ravi Shanker exclaims that he “wanted to retain the flavour of Janu’s intonation and the sing-song nature of her speech in the translation” while Devika reinstates her preference for the inherent and innate expressions. (Shanker 2004: xi). According to Devika, during the process of translation she became aware of the fact that “Jameela’s meandering , casually conversational manner, her method of suddenly bringing the ironic laughter of resistance right into the middle of descriptions of shocking oppression, had to be transferred carefully” (Devika 2007:xx).

The translators have consciously restricted themselves from the “snobbish” attempts to sanitize and sanctify the language of autobiographies, in the global paradigm of English language. They have maintained the credibility and authenticity of the narrations. In fact, linguistic honesty makes these translations remarkable and distinguishing.

An eclectic combination of colloquial usages in Malayalam language with English aids the linguistic culmination of these subaltern identities in the global level. Adherence to the colloquial and idiolect representations becomes a linguistic representational strategy for globalising the specific cultural and social idioms.

The translators have indeed acknowledged the voice of the strength apparent in the texts through the increased use and emphasis of verbs than names and nouns. Ravi Shanker explicates the intricacies in his translation as “Verbs are pronounced with greater emphasis than nouns in Janu’s language, and I attempted to capture that in English. But many well-wishers, including the writer Paul Zacharia, objected to distorting the language”(Shanker 2004: xi). Analogous to Ravi Shanker’s declaration of the strong voice in Janu’s rendering, Devika claims that in Jameela’s narration

“the constraints that shape her agency are amply visible” (Devika 2007: xix).

The translated narratives reflect the innate urge to “Transgress the elitist order of spoken language laid down by” the dominant culture and tradition (Gauthaman 2012:268). They subvert the established literary paradigms through the bold singular feminist assertions. The autobiographies of Janu and Jameela illustrate “the singular nature of her mission and the almost solitary position that she holds in” the persistent struggle for survival (Shanker 2004: x).

Translation becomes a method of reclaiming and comprehending the regional autobiographical self, through the “other” of the translator. Examining the two autobiographies, make us aware of the nuances of the translation by the ‘other’. The translator as the ‘other’ indeed faces the challenge of positioning himself/ herself within the empirical framework of the “I” of the subject. This complex representational web becomes further intricate when the translator of the “she” is a “he.” Ravi Shanker’s translation of Janu’s autobiography indeed acknowledges this experiential dilemma. Howsoever the translator’s ability to transcend the gender consciousness is indeed manifested in the nearly perfect translation. Compared to Janu’s translated autobiography, Jameela’s autobiography bears gender equivalency in exploring the linguistic nuances. The autobiographical retellings of Janu and Jameela also carry the self-intricacy inherent in the translation of the spoken language to the written discourse. Both the autobiographical narratives have male mediators. Jameela’s story is retold by I.Gopinath while Janu’s story is narrated by Bhaskaran. The rendering of the female phonocentric subjectivity is initially remoulded through the masculine written word in both the biographies. The masculine voice intervenes twice in the narration and translation of Janu’s autobiography. Jameela’s story was initially narrated by I.Gopinath. It was later translated by Devika. However her later dissatisfaction with her autobiography resulted in the subsequent revised version. Jameela in her

autobiography reinstates her reason for revision as that “The person who worked with me didn’t encourage the participation of others . . . And I hardly ever participated in shaping the story” (Jameela 2007:179). According to Jameela, Gopinath’s initial transcribing of her autobiography intervened and interpolated her- self rendering, causing dissatisfaction which lead to her reframing of the story. She elucidates the protest raised against her revised autobiography. She further expositis that “There was uproar when I decided to rewrite my book. But even when the first version came out, many thought that I- and my story- were not true. They thought this was fiction, that I wasn’t a real person” (Jameela 2007:178).According to Devika “Jameela chose to reclaim her autobiography by producing a second version which she felt was satisfactory. She risked commercial failure and public disapproval in order to ‘correct’ her image” (Devika 2007:xii). The revised version of Jameela’s autobiography translated by Devika interrogates the masculine claims of protection in I.Gopinath’s version.

Justifying her revised autobiography, Jameela reinstates that “As long as one’s life continues to offer fruitful experiences that may cast light on other people’s lives and sorrows, one should share what one can. For that reason, I will keep on telling you the story of my life” (Jameela 2007:179). Her autobiography now comprises of two editions that came out in 2005 and 2011 respectively.

The new linguistic landscape of English have indeed re-asserted and reformed the feminine identity and subjectivity. It entails a wider subjective embodiment for the protagonists. Janu and Jameela acknowledges the wide reception of their English autobiographies and the bold defiant woman image in the translations. The semiotics of the feminist self obtains a differential semantics in the syntax of the target text.

Summing up:

So far, the paper has attempted to analyse the nuances and dimensions of the selected translated autobiographies, emphasising on the process of translation. It has endeavoured to adopt a holistic approach in examining the various aspects in translation, comparing and contrasting the two texts.

The study has inferred that the translated autobiographies of Janu and Jameela re-construct their iconoclastic subjectivity. Analogous to Jameela's experience as a sex worker, Janu's societal exposure as a Dalit woman moulds her iconoclasm in the 'autobiography.' It acknowledges the fact that the chosen feminist autobiographies differ from their male counterparts in the acknowledgement that "the self/ self-creation/ and self-consciousness are profoundly different for women" (Friedman 1998:72).

The selected works have indeed enjoyed massive applause and garnered huge success in the mainstream media due to their iconoclastic nature. Their candid retelling of the feminine experience has transcended the efforts to circumscribe the female voice within the domesticated concerns.

The chosen translated feminist autobiographies documents the life of women from diverse social and economic strata. They delineate the double marginalised lives of the Malayali women at the domestic and societal spheres. They portray how historical and cultural silencing fosters the feminist urge to transcend and transform their lives. Voices of dissent and rebellion reverberate strongly in the translated life-writings. Discarding the institutional frameworks of caste, religion and domesticity the translated narratives become path-breaking literary ventures.

The major advantage secured by the proposed translations rests on the facilitation of a linguistic intervention and global discursive engagement on female emancipation. "The coherent

shaping of an individual past from a specific present viewpoint, achieved by means of introspection and memory of a special sort, wherein the self is seen as a developing entity, changing by definable stages" distinguishes these literary endeavours (Mazlish 1990:30).

Mapping the terrains of translated feminine subjectivities has indeed made the author aware of the complex dialectics of the double representation that delineates these works. The available critical acumen made the author realise that analysing feminist autobiographical translations means exploring resistance. The translated narratives represent the conflict between the singular individual self and the societal pressure. They signify the feminist urge to dismantle the envisaged traditional structures on gender. The translated autobiographies, in fact, become a canon of feminist "survival" literature, facilitating a global self articulation for women. They elucidate the truth that translation becomes a method of universally informing the individual discontent and resistance against the prevalent patriarchal hegemony emphasising the prevalence of the individual feminist self over the collective masculine self.

REFERENCES

Primary References :

- Devika, J. Translator's Foreword: Nalini Jameela writes her story. In *The Autobiography of a Sex Worker*, J.Devika, Trans. Westland Books, Chennai, 2007:xi-xxii.
- Jameela, Nalini. Chapter One. In *The Autobiography of a Sex Worker*, J.Devika, Trans. Westland Books, Chennai, 2007:1-22.
- ---, Afterword. In *The Autobiography of a Sex Worker*, J.Devika, Trans. Westland Books, Chennai, 2007:167-179.

- Janu, C.K. *Mother Forest: The Unfinished Story of C.K. Janu*. Written by Bhaskaran. N. Ravi Shanker, Trans. Women Unlimited .Kali for Women, New Delhi. 2004.
- Ravi Shanker, N. Translator's Note. In *Mother Forest: The Unfinished Story of C.K. Janu*. N. Ravi Shanker, Trans. Women Unlimited and Kali for Women., New Delhi, 2004: ix-xii.

Secondary References:

- Davis, Rocio. The Self in the Text versus the Self as Text: Asian American Autobiographical Strategies. In *Asian American Literary Studies*, G. Huang, Ed. Edinburgh University Press. Edinburgh, 2005: 41- 63.
- Devika, J. Housewife, Sex Worker and Reformer. *Economic and Political Weekly*. XLI, 17, 2006: 1675-83.
- Friedman, Susan. Women's Autobiographical Selves: Theory and Practice. In *Women, Autobiography, Theory: A Reader*, S. Smith & J. Watson, Eds. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1998: 72-82.
- Gauthaman, Raj. Dalit Protest Culture: The First Stage. In *The Oxford India Anthology of Tamil Dalit Writing*, R. Kumar & R. Azhagarasan, Eds. Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2012: 263-71.
- Heilbrun, Carolyn. *Writing a Woman's Life*. W.W. Norton & Company., New York, 2008.
- Jesme, Sister. *Amen: The Autobiography of a Nun*. Penguin Books India., New Delhi, 2009.
- Mazlish, Bruce. *The Leader, the Led, and the Psyche: Essays in Psychohistory*. Wesleyan University Press, Middletown, Ct., 1990.

- Satchidanandan, K. Reflections: Autobiography Today. *Indian literature*, 2010: 54, 2, 6-9.
- Simon, Sherry. *Gender in translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. Routledge. London and New York, 1996.
- Stanton, Domna.C. Autogynography: Is the Subject Different. In *The Female Autograph: Theory and Practice of Autobiography from the Tenth to the Twentieth Century*. D. Stanton, Ed. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1987: 3-20.