

Translation Studies in the 21st Century

Avadesh Kumar Singh

Abstract

The 21st century, known as knowledge century, demands reconsideration of disciplinary domains of knowledge like translation studies that is witnessing 'Technological Turn' after the 'Linguistic Turn' and the 'Cultural Turn'. Translation has been an age-old process and has travelled through different kinds of common sense ideologies. Its chequered history in a multilingual country like India deserves special attention. But discussion outlining the panorama of issues related with the very process of translation necessitates a thorough study of ideas related to translation and even of those myths that have shrouded the realm. The paper, in the process of doing so, examines various myths associated with translation, and strives to discuss implications of new developments on perceptions and practices of translation studies in Indian context.

Lead In:

Inappropriate it may not always be to make concluding pronouncement in the beginning itself, and substantiate it later: The 21st century is a translation century.

It would be a common place to state that the 21st century is altogether different from its preceding counterparts, for all centuries or periods are fundamentally alike, with the difference that the pace of change and the way society manages its condition and determine the character of the age. Hence it is safer to name a century after it is over, for true character is often revealed to even to the most discriminating minds after a phenomenon eclipses, and phases over.

The 19th century was the century of colonization and the clash of civilizations or knowledge systems, though it would be

erroneous to reduce it thus. Equally incorrect it would be to consider it just confluence of cultures.¹ The 20th century was the century of post/modernization and large scale processization of violence.² The centuries, preceding the 21st century, were named afterwards. The 21st century has the distinction of being named as the 'Knowledge Century' before it actually began. It should here not be construed that other centuries were not knowledge centuries. For that matter every century or society has been a knowledge century because no society can manage itself without knowledge. However, the difference in the present century is that the processing of knowledge has become faster than ever before. The exponential changes, made about by science and technology in the form of the ICT and in computational abilities, have contributed enormously to discovery and study of new cultures and their alternative modes of knowledge(s). The result is that knowledge is plural now. These knowledge(s) are in different languages. Hence, it is essential to translate at least their preeminent components to access knowledge(s), as they exist in as many languages as they exist in the world. Translation has, thus, emerged as one of the preconditions of survival in the obtaining world. The question often asked is: who would survive in this knowledge century? The answer is: only those individuals, communities and societies will survive that will learn from others, continuously. The derivative to the question is: how to learn from others, since other knowledge(s) is/are so many languages? One word that answers the question is: Translation. It offers itself as a bridge across different cultures and their knowledge systems, and their five basic aspects: acquisition of knowledge, preservation of knowledge, creation of knowledge, dissemination of knowledge and application of knowledge.

Translation by facilitating operation in these processes and aspects helps in democratisation of knowledge, for in its absence the knowledge would remain confined to a language only, or even to a class or community that would with its proficiency in translation appropriate it. It would, and already has, lead to vertical-horizontal division of the society. For instance, English has become a language of knowledge and its communication not because all knowledge(s) is/are created in English it but because it translates more than

other languages do from other knowledge producing languages. Such segments of society as do not have access to English will remain deprived of knowledge(s). If this trend continues for long, the society will get divided between knowledge haves and have-nots, leading to new forms of conflicts. Translation, thus, is needed for democratization of knowledge, social harmony and peace, and ensuring human happiness in the new world integrated by technology and economy. In brief it may be forwarded that if the 21st century is a century of knowledge(s), it is a century of translation. The importance of translation in the present age may be understood by paraphrasing William Shakespeare's philosophical dictum in *Hamlet*, "Readiness is all." If Shakespeare were alive to approximate the 21st century, particularly after many incarnations of his works in different languages of the world, he would have observed, 'Translation is all.'

Translation or/vs. 'Anuvad':

Even otherwise, translation permeates the world. The world(s) come(s) into existence with words, and wherever words are used there is translation. Without words there would be no world, and we would not be able cognizance of the world(s) or share its/their knowledge with others. Words are nothing but a translation of ideas or experiences. In this sense, every act of communication is an act of translation. In other words, the world is nothing but a construct through words which are translation of ideas. Admittedly, every human experience is located in memory and language that is the technology of acquiring, preserving, disseminating, applying and creating knowledge in the form of experience and memory. Experience precedes language. Translation facilitates the process of communication between the states of languagelessness of the experience and being linguistized.³ To translate an idea into a system of communication, human beings used different media like words, colours, sounds, and bodily movements among others, leading to the origin of different aural and visual art forms like poetry/literature, painting, music and dance among others. At this stage every individual manifestation is creative interpretative translation of the

experience—fictive, factual or both-- first and whatsoever thereafter, though those who restrict translation to linguistic transference might neither see nor recognise it as translation. It would not be wrong to rephrase the celebrated statement about the significance of word that goes into making of language, “*Jagatsarvam shabden bhasate.*” (We take cognizance of world through word.) as “*Jagatsarvam anuvaden bhasate.*” (We take cognizance of world through translation.)

The term ‘*anuvad*’, used as translation for the English term ‘translation’, demands reconsideration here. Convenience has often prevailed over concepts in the history of ideas. Consequently, concepts like ‘*anuvad*’ have suffered, as expediency and lethargy inveigled upon scholars and academicians to accept superiority of colonial terms and reduce the native terms to limited sense of the alien term. Ironical though it might seem but the fact is that ‘*anuvad*’ is a wrong translation of the word ‘translation’. The term ‘*anuvad*’ existed before the term ‘*translation*’ and even its Latin ancestral term ‘*translatus*’ and ‘*translatio*’. Panini’s *Astadhyayi* states, “*Anuvadecharanam*”. So how can it be translation of the term ‘translation’? Latin as a language did not exist then. Moreover, even the word ‘translation’ is a wrong translation of the term ‘*anuvad*’. ‘*Anuvad*’ was a knowledge transmission and pedagogical strategy of Indian tradition in which ‘*guru*’ (teacher), the transmitter of knowledge, would speak or cite something (‘*vad*’ or discourse) that would be repeated or recited by ‘*shishya*’ (disciple). The subsequent (‘*anu*’) discourse (‘*vad*’) would be called *anuvad*. That is why the tradition stated in *Jaiminiya Nyayamala*, “*Gyatasya kathanam anuvad*”. (‘*Anuvad*’ is a stating something that is already known.) It was an inclusive and comprehensive term without any hierarchical order between what is received/known/interpreted and thereafter re-stated (‘*anuvad*’). Monier-Williams had these connotations in his mind when he explained it in his dictionary, ‘*Anuvad* is saying after or again, repeating by way of explanation, explanatory repetition, or reiteration with corroboration or illustration explanatory reference to say anything already said.’ The word *anuvad* stands for repetition by way of explanation, illustration, or corroboration. It means that when a speaker demonstrates for some special purpose, a proposition

which had already been demonstrated before that is called *anuvad*. The concept and its definition were results of the oral tradition that demanded repetition of knowledge that was encapsulated in formulaic (*mantra*) form by *guru* (teacher) who would pronounce a word, phrase or sentence that would be repeated by *shishya*-s (disciples). Moreover, '*anuvad*' is inclusive, comprehensive and non-hierarchical, and unfettered by linguistic transference. It includes recitation, re-statement, commentaries and interpretation like '*vyakhyaya*', '*bhasya*', '*vivechan*', '*tika*', '*anvyaya*' and '*vartika*-s' and so on. The term translation, because of its limited reach, is not an appropriate term in Indian literary and cultural context. Translation, on the other hand, in the western sense of the term is a limited term, as it is founded on 'carrying over' or 'transference' from one linguistic system into other. Only after the advent of Post-Structuralism in the 1960s when the traditional notions of 'originality', 'genius', 'author' as the point of origin of meaning, and 'meaning' were re-defined, translation came accepted as an act of creation after Barthes's pronouncement that criticism is an act of creation.

The word '*rupantar*' is more suitable to approximate translational practices in Indian context than any other. The word '*rupantar*' literally speaking (formal transference) includes all kinds of various *roop*-s (forms)—linguistic, thematic (Rama-katha from the *Ramayana* or elsewhere or narratives from the *Mahabharata* into the same or different language without adhering strictly to language or bothering about thematic preoccupations), formal (a novel or short story into a film) and modal (a poem into a painting or a sculptor into a piece of literature or any other mode of expression) and semiotic transference and appropriation including domestication. India has, thus, been a practising ground of almost all forms of translation.

I

Myths of Translation:

The enormity of time and energy wasted in discussing what is often categorised as 'Central Issues of Translation Studies

(TS), like ‘language and culture in translation,’ ‘equivalence,’ ‘loss or gain,’ ‘untranslatability,’ ‘translation as science or art,’ and status of translation is nothing but tragic in its proportion. (Bassnett 1991, 21-44)⁴ Ironically, these were myths that were raked for too long out of prejudice or polemical interests by hierarchy infested minds. Fortunately, their reconsideration began with the demolition of the traditional concepts of text, reader, originality, genius, and authenticity, and they have been dumped in the dustbin of history of TS, though prejudices die hard. In this section we would try to reconsider them.

Translation has for long been stigmatised as secondary, derivative, parasitic and subservient activity. It was stated that those who could not become poets turned to criticism, and those could not succeed as critics became translators. This prejudice is a consequence of monotheistic civilizational mores, as it considered the authority of the author as sacred.

Most of the myths prevalent in translation studies have led to disorientation of Translation Studies (TS). The Western view of the TS is language-centric. Major thinkers like Roman Jakobson considered translation in terms of language as ‘intra-lingual,’ ‘inter-lingual’ and ‘inter-semiotic.’⁵ So did Popovik who considered translation in terms of four types of equivalence as linguistic equivalence, paradigmatic equivalence, stylistic equivalence, and textual equivalence. Translation is an act of communication, and in communication medium is at times considered more significant. However, in reality, meaning is more important than medium. Medium is not the end, the meaning is. In that case the types of translation would shift from language-centric to meaning-centric:

- I. **Literal Translation:** It may be seen in case of texts that make literal or referential use of language. Paraphrase falls in this category. In this type of translation, dictionary as a tool of translation is considered as the truest friend of a translator, as it remains in case of science, social science texts or administrative translation.

- II. Metaphorical/Suggestive Translation: Such translations in which dhvani (suggested meaning) is the focus of translation, and language is used metaphorically. This is often used successfully in poetic translation in particular and in literary translation in general. In this category, dictionary becomes a living museum of lifeless words. Even if they come into life, when people use them (words in the dictionary), it is one dimensional linear meaning, against the spiral multi-dimensional suggestion of speech or vak, of poetry or rich oral discourse.
- III. Cultural Translation: Culture attains central place in this category of translation, particularly in case of translation between culturally unrelated texts. For that matter, cultural transference remains a key component in all translational endeavours, but in this category, the receptor's culture attains centrality, and translational strategies are accordingly used. Dara Shikoh and his team of translators knew and practiced it well in the translation of the Upanishad-s as *Sirr-e-Akbar* in the mid-50s of the 17th century. Dara was conscious of the fact that despite certain similarities of monistic thought, the Upanishadic thoughts were to be served to the Persian people. Therefore, he kept it in view, and did not mind either omission of such words as were not crucial for the core of the meaning or addition of such Persian Sufi thoughts as were close to the meaning intended in the Upanishad-s. Dara's project further revealed and supported the fact that cultural translations are best attempted in a community mode. Though he was a learned scholar of Persian and Sanskrit, and loved them, but he achieved success with the community of translators who were Sanskrit Pundits, headed by Kavindra Saraswati, and Persian scholars. Kavindra, a great scholar of neo-logic (*navya nyaya*), was famed for his Persian erudition as well. When Antequetil Duperron translated Upanishad-s, *Sirr-e Akbar* became a central text and he had to straddle two horses of cultures --Persian and Indian. But for him their transference into European culture through the medium of Latin became

central. Duperron had noted that Dara had left a number of Sanskrit words untranslated, though in some case he appended explanatory notes. For instance, in Indian narratives in many languages animals like donkeys, owls and pigs are associated with negative attributes but that is not the case with Russian. So they have to be re-habilitated culturally. Also, within one culture group there are quite a few elements that change from region to region and demand their explanation, as cultural practices vary in them.

- IV. Discursive Translation: Translation in this category focuses on discourse as a unit, rather than focussing on literal, phrasal translation. It considers the written part of the spoken and spoken part of the written as complimentary and indispensable parts of focus, as in case of a discourse which is language in motion. Mahadev Desai's translation of Gandhi's autobiography *Satya na Prayogo* (The Story of My Experiments with Truth) that might be a good case to study falls under this category, and has been discussed later.

These categories would become the basis to examine and puncture a few myths or fallacies that have haunted the world of translation too long, and consumed enormous human resources.

(i) Loss in Translation:

Much energy has been wasted in the discussion of the issue of loss in translation. The loss in translation is a myth. The fact is that every act of translation is a thing of gain, not of loss. The only complaint in case of translation may be about either less gain or more gain. It modifies the tradition by joining the tradition of which the source text has already become a part. Let us suppose for a while that no translation, in case of Premchand, was even attempted, the world of non-Hindi and non-Urdu knowing people would have remained deprived of new experiences contained therein. Also, Premchand's literary fortune would have also remained restricted to his

language(s) only with limited circulation of his writings. The target language would have been deprived of his fictional art and world view manifested in his works. This loss would have been unimaginable to the author and also to the community of his non-Hindi readers who would have had no access to world in absence of translation. So, the issue of loss in translation matters only to those who do not need translation or those who are interested only academically in comparative study of two versions as a discipline. Similarly, the issue of translatability is often associated with translation whereas it is a problem of translator. Whether it is a myth or reality or both or none at all depends on the translator's competence and his commitment.

Let me reiterate it here that there is no loss in translation. The loss in translation is discussed by those who do not need translation. Let us consider an issue. Gurudev Tagore translated his poem from Bengali to English in *Gitanjali*. Those who know Bengali and English compare the poems in Bengali and their English versions. No surprise that they find English version lacking in Bengali's musicality, suppleness and density. But they forget that there is only gain. Imagine the situation what would have happened if *Gitanjali* was not at all translated? Two situations were definite: Tagore would have been confined to Bengali only, and he, Bengali and India too, might have deprived of the Noble Prize.

(ii) Is untranslatability a myth or reality?

Untranslatability is a question often posed in TS.⁶ Untranslatability is a myth. It has for long been used as an excuse for not attempting translation of a complex cultural text, for it had been suggested that poetry is what is lost in translation or what is untranslatable. In other words, the statements like these are a critical conspiracy, for untranslatability emerges as a criterion for valuing literary merit of a work. If a poem may be translated, it cannot be termed poetry. The blame falls on the poet. If certain extract of a poem cannot be translated, the blame would rest with the translator.

Untranslatability is a problem of translator but not of translation. Moreover, what is untranslatable for one translator may be translatable for others. All texts that are composed are translatable. If there is a text which is untranslatable for a translator today, it may find a more proficient translator tomorrow. Moreover, no text is fully untranslatable, certain portions often are. To negotiate these portions there are strategies at the disposal of a translator or to be devised by him or her.

Translation is a complex activity. It is so because of the nature of its instrument i.e., language. Language is a technology. It is self-reflexive and self-referential. It is the blue guitar of Wallace Stevens on which things, as they are, are changed upon. (Stevens: 165).

Gaps in translation are inevitable, as in case of all acts of writing. Gaps are no major issues, for they are prerogatives of creativity. Can there be a text with more gaps than T S Eliot's *The Wasteland*? Notwithstanding the person responsible for them - blame Ezra Pound for creating them or T S Eliot for accepting the dismembering the text, or the purpose behind them there are certain issues that cannot be glossed over. Eliot's poem, as it exists, would be incomprehensible without using mental acrobatics for connecting what appears unconnectable. These gaps have to be dealt with through reading strategies, and accept that Pound wanted to underscore disjunctions and orderlessness in modern society through structurelessness of the poem. Moreover, hypothetically speaking, if Pound had not chopped off considerable portions of the poem, the poem would have still suffered from gaps, perhaps a little less but the poem might have suffered from surfeit of stuff. Hence there are may be some who think that gaps are unbridgeable by the receivers of the translation tend to undermine the capacity of translators to bridge the gaps on their own and thereby be creative recipients of translation.

The problem of untranslatability needs to be further examined in a larger context. If certain text/s or its certain portions

are untranslatable, the problem lies in the translator's inability to understand and determine their meaning/s. A translator has to undergo this process, as s/he receives the experience, contained in the text, empathise with it and 'deconstruct' it. By deconstruction I mean close reading of the text with focus on sceptical reading that tries to find gaps, ruptures or sites of illogicalities in it. It is analytical decoding. This understanding helps in cultural richness and the writer's ability to handle it, consequently its transference into the new language i.e., organization into a new language.) Even if meanings are multiple, if multiplicity of versions is known, the meaning is determined. Once this stage is achieved, not much is left that would resist being translated. This problem may be resolved by taking to *arthanirdharan* (determination of meaning). The *arthanirdharan* and its transference into another language system, medium or form will make untranslatability a mythical proposition. In all major knowledge traditions, the issue has been discussed elaborately. The determinacy of meaning(s) by extricating it/them from *arthadoshas* (blemishes), as have been enumerated by Mammata in his *Kavya Prakasa*, make the task of determining the meaning(s) and thereafter approximating it in the target language, or to be precise in translation, less difficult and mystical.⁷ Hence, untranslatability is inherent in all acts in which language is used. Language is self-reflexive, and so is text that is made of language. Hence meanings are generated through two self-reflexive systems. Untranslatability is a myth, pedalled by those critics of/or translators who, selectively in case of translation, gloss over the nature of language and text and get inundated by meanings because they while accepting multiplicity of meanings, accept that of them at least one meaning is provisionally relevant.

(iii) The Unit of Translation:

The issue of the basic unit of translation has concerned translators to a good extent. Is it word (*varna*), phrase (*pada*), sentence (*vakya*), chapter (*prakaran*) the unit of translation? It is possible to buttress arguments in the favour of one against the other.

The word and its association with other words leading to making of phrases, sentences, paragraphs, and chapters cannot be ignored but the fact is that discourse is the object of translation. One translates discourse from one language into another. Discourse is language in action. Language in action includes oral, written, printed and virtual forms. Therefore, apart from the way discourse as a body of statements is arranged in a regular and systematic manner depends on what is performed but not articulated through written language. Thus, translation is an intra/interdiscursive activity.

Let us take the case of Gandhi's *Satyana Prayogo*. No book of historiography of translation in India can be complete without the discussion of translations by Mahatma Gandhi and translation of some of his works by Mahadevbhai Desai who was more than his personal secretary and his soul in a different body. Gandhi, as we know, wrote his autobiography in Gujarati entitled as *Satyana Prayogo*. Mahadevbhai translated it in English. Since Gandhi's life was too hectic he could not even go through it. But he did not express his dissatisfaction with the English version. It means that he did not disapprove of the translation. So who am I, if Bapu did not complain? However, those who know Gujarati would say that Mahadevbhai edited quite a bit in the process of translation. Mahadevbhai added too, quite meaningfully, wherever he thought crucial. The case needs further study, for which I would focus only on the title of *Satyana Prayogo*.

Literally translated it would have meant: *Satya*= Truth, *na*= of, *Prayogo*= experiments i.e., 'Experiments of Truth'. The disarming simplicity of Gandhi in case of the title of his autobiography, like that of his life, would have inveigled upon a naïve translator to consider it an undemanding task. But Mahadevbhai did not opt for convenient option: 'Experiments of Truth' and changed 'of' with 'with'. Rightly so because truth does not, and cannot, make experiments. The agents of experiments are human beings. The translator's change of preposition and choice was valid. He did not stop there. He added 'My' to the title which on the face of it was not needed. Why did Mahadevbhai

then add it? The fact is that no one can make experiments with truth, if it is written with capital 'T'. The monotheistic theological and philosophical traditions do not allow experiments. In Indian tradition, truth is born out of non-truth, and is always plural in reality. '*Ekam sat vipramvahudha vadanti*'. (Truth is one but wise souls speak about it in multiple ways.) Moreover, truth is of two kinds: *rit* and *sat* which means truth as value and true as fact. Truth as fact is valuable but more valuable is truth as value, for latter may save lives and serve human cause rather than slavish adherence to facts. Gandhi had contingent truth in his view. It was his privilege not to accept truths as given to him but experiment with them in the light of his personal observation and experience. Mahadevbhai's translation of the title not only does justice to Gandhi's life and vision but also leaves many philosophical interpretations peeping out of it. Ultimately, Gandhi's autobiography or story of his experiments came out.

Equally important it is to note here that a text like it may be a rich illustration of the fact that translation is a collaborative act. As Mahadevbhai Desai's 'Editor's Introduction' states, its first volume came out in 1927 and the second in 1929. It was serialised in *Young India*. Moreover, Desai had 'the benefit of Gandhi's revision'. Also it was 'carefully revised by a revered friend' who according to him, had the reputation of being an eminent English scholar. However, he had before undertaking the task had put a condition that his name should at no count be given. Moreover, the chapter XXIX-XLIII of part V were translated by Pyarelal during Mahadevbhai's absence in 1928-29 due to his participation in an agitation. Gandhi's life was shaped by many forces and sources. His autobiography or the story of his life in Gujarati, English, Hindi and many other languages exists simultaneously, as it is constructed by so many known and unknown people. The case illustrates that Mahadevbhai's succeeded in translation of the title because as a translator he focussed on discourse, and did not fall for words or phrase as units of translation.

(iv) Myth of Source Text (ST):

The institutions of translation and translator have suffered much in the history of translation due to hierarchical order, verging on binary connotations, 'Source Text' (ST) and 'Target Text' (TT), with the author as the creator. The terms like 'Source Text' (ST) and 'Target Text' (TT) also need to be reconsidered. The reality is that there is nothing like ST. How can there be 'Source Text', when there is nothing source? What was known as the source was, in fact, many texts go into the making of the so-called ST, and many texts are constructed with layers of newer meanings after the TT. Hierarchical notions such as these have dented, and they still do so, confidence of translators, hence a translator rather than worrying so much about the superiority of the ST or inferiority of TT, should focus on the practice of translation like a soldier on the border who is concerned about his duty and least inflicted by notions of superiority or inferiority of his supporters or adversaries. Translators should worry less about theoretical aspects whose knowledge may at times prove to be detrimental to translatorial enterprise. Translation has often been considered parasitic, derivative and subservient. It is parasitic, as it is dependent on the some other text for its life source or force. It is perceived to be subordinate to the text to be translated which is known as the Source Text (ST) because it would not have come into existence, had the ST not been there. It is considered inauthentic, for the ST is claimed to be authenticity. Moreover, the ST is privileged because of the false notion of originality. The monotheistic cultures consider the word of the author sacred, and disturbing it through translation challenged the authority of the author and so was considered profane.

On the surface, the above charges against translation may appear true. However, if probed deeper philosophically or ontologically, they do not hold true. The ST is a parasite in a certain way because it is not the cause but the effect or consequence. The cause of the ST lies with/in the experience or ideas and their organization or articulation through a medium that may be language,

dance, painting, or sculpture. Translation is the Succeeding Text (ST), and what has been known as the Source Text is the Preceding Text (PT) which is preceded by PTs, causal text(s) in the form of actual experience(s) or idea(s) whose traces go into the making of tangible manifested text(s). In this light the question of translation being derivative does not arise. However, people are privileged to have personal views, as the British Chinese author Guo dismissed translation as inauthentic in Jaipur Literary Festival 2014. (in the 'Report Spotlight @The Fest', *The Hindustan Times*, January 19, 2014, p.12) In the same session on translation, Mengiste, an Ethiopian American, however, thought otherwise and stated that she relied on translation to understand her native culture since she did not read her native language. (12) Both may be extreme cases but Jhumpa Lahiri was more balanced her views when she called for more power to be put in the hands of readers. "Readers should get to read what they want as widely as they want. This can happen only if publishers and translators give them access to books." (Ibid., 12)

To buttress my point let us take the case of the origin of Valmiki's *Ramayana*. The story goes that the sage went on the banks of the river Tamasa to take bath and perform morning ablutions. While he was doing so, he saw a pair of Kraunch birds (herons) in amorous play. In the meantime a hunter shot an arrow at the he-heron and killed it. The sage then saw the she-heron wailing and weeping at the death of its paramour. The sage felt the pain of the bird and forgot to offer the prayer. He was so agonized with the pain of that the *shoka* (sorrow) appeared in the form of a *shloka* in 'Anushtupa' meter which was the first composition. Valmiki used the meter in composing the *Ramayana*:

Ma nishad pratishtham tvamgamah shaswati sama

Yat kraunchmithunadavahi kamamohitam. (Valmiki *Ramayana*)

(O Hunter! May you never get fame for centuries!

For you killed the he-heron from the couple in love.)

Valmiki's was an emotional experience that disturbed the core of his existence. As a sage he was supposed to be indifferent to such quotidian acts of death by different means. He could have easily avoided the scene, for prayer was more essential for him than pitying the dead bird, and its wailing counterparts. In a way he violated the rules of his ascetic life, and cursed the hunter, and the epic records that the sage suffered from the pangs of repentance till he was freed from it by Narada and Brahma who appeared before him. Moreover, the hunter was following his dharma. He would not hunt what would he eat. On the face of it, Valmiki's act of cursing the hunter was an erroneous act. But the poet does not care for the norms and risk the social disapproval. The poet in sage stood with the lesser of the two beings, and voiced his angst against the aggressor and hunter. Ideas catalysed and shaped his experience. This idea gripped his conscience. Various processes at different levels-- experiential at organizational levels may be seen in the following manner:

1. Event: The actual event of murder of heron
2. Experience: She heron's experience of sorrow and consequent expression in its gestures
3. Experience: Valmiki as a witness to the brutal killing of the bird heron (*kronch*) while it was engaged in amorous act and the sad plight of its wailing paramour, followed by his empathy with her at the emotional level without knowing the language of the bird. The event was a text for him.
4. Articulation: Valmiki was so moved by the event in the core of his being that he could not withhold it. The journey was now from the emotional state to organizational level of the experience. Here he needed a medium, a literary form and meter. He had Sanskrit at his disposal, and chose poetry and the experience found a meter 'Anushtup' for itself. The

shloka was an interpretation of his shoka. The enormity of his experience was encapsulated in a couplet. The experience at the organizational level is mechanical a mechanical process. The medium i.e., language conditions experience. Language is like Wallace Stevens's the blue guitar on which things, as they are, are changed. The shloka was the sage poet's response to the (1) event, (2) she-heron's experience, and his own. It was an act of translation of his experience that was constituted by his interpretation and translation of the bird's experience and the state of being. The experience, its interpretation and translation would have been different, if he had empathised with the hunter.

5. Translation: Valmiki's Ramayana was a translation of the Rama-katha. The heron incident provided catalysis to the poetic talent, particularly to its organizational aspect. Later texts in the form of its reception, internalisation, and re-articulation by Indian poets and writers did not consider it a ST. (i) For Tulsidasa while composing his *Ramacharitmanasa*, Valmiki's Ramayana was among the many unnamed texts. In Tamil Kamban read Valmiki and found it lacking in sensuous elements, so composed his *Ramayana*. It was a process of reception, internalization and articulation, (ii) Translations in non-Indian languages like English and French considered Valmiki's *Ramayana* as one among the convenient versions for their translational enterprises, (iii) recreation of the *Ramayana* in various art forms in temples, films and aural and visual representations. There is nothing like ST. All texts that we know as STs are pre-texts.

Translation is an act of interpretation, and also of creation, for interpretations are consequences of generation of meanings. However, no two acts or concepts can be synonyms. Hence, there is no synonymy between translation at the level of preceding and succeeding texts. The difference between a poet and critic and the translator is that the poet has poetic licence. The critic or translator

does not have it. S/he has responsibility towards emotive experience and to its articulation in the form of the composition and also to the community and on whose behalf s/he receives the text and for whom s/he interprets and translates. Writers, critics and translator's are *sahodars* (born from the same womb). Their responsibility is towards their own emotive experience [stimulated by signs and their organization in the form of a text and the way meanings are arrived at through a process of negotiation].⁸

Polemically speaking, the 21st century is an age that celebrates inauthenticity. Shadows are the only real things in the virtual world. In a world in which everything is a shadow, why should one shadow be privileged over the other? Jean Baudrillard discussed the paradigm shift in *Simulation* (1981) when he captured the trajectory of sign in four stages: (i) sign represents a basic reality; (ii) sign distorts or misrepresents reality behind it; (iii) sign disguises the fact that there is no corresponding reality underneath; and (iv) sign bears no relation to any reality at all. Though the stages have been questioned by critics like Brooker (*Modernism/Postmodernism*, Longman, 1992, 154-15), the fact that technology had changed the concept of reality; hyper-reality is a reality which means that everything is an image, virtual image i.e., surface without depths.

Translated text is the source text for the communities in which it comes into existence through translation. All others are pre-texts. In other words all texts are source texts, as they are sources of meanings. Once the myths of ST and TT are demolished and text in whatever language is considered an ontological entity on their own, prejudices against translation will evaporate gradually, and the ancillary biased consideration of status of translation as a subservient, parasitic and derivative secondary activity subordinate to the so-called act of creation in the form of ST will fade away, as the change may be discerned in considerable measure in the 21st century.

II

With the puncturing of false myths about translation, and gradual erosion in prejudices against translation there has been

exponential proliferation of activities in the field of translation in the form of publication of various readers, encyclopaedias, anthologies, text books and histories. It would be no exaggeration to state that translation has never had so good, and still better is to follow.⁹

Translation Studies:

Translation Studies (TS) after its emergence and nomenclature in the last quarter of the 20th century, attained global extension, recognition and ascendance by the 1990s, has flourished in the following domains: Translation History, Translation Theory, Translation Practice, Translation Research and Teaching Translation.

Susan Bassnett after her *Translation Studies* in 1980 elevated its position by stating in 1993 that Translation Studies have replaced comparative literature. She had expected that translation studies could re/solve the 'crisis' in comparative literature. Much later she acknowledged that her basic intention was provocative. The reality, however, her faith was misplaced, as it could neither resolve of the 'crisis' of comparative literature, nor fulfil expectations from it.

Today, looking back at that proposition, it appears fundamentally flawed: translation studies has not developed very far at all over three decades and comparison remains at the heart of much translation studies scholarship. What I would say here were I writing the book today is that neither comparative literature nor translation studies should be seen as a discipline: rather both are methods of approaching literature, ways of reading that are mutually beneficial. (Bassnett: 2006: 6)

Bassnett is making a fundamental mistake by ignoring the fundamental truth. Disciplines are domains of knowledge in which it is systematised. That is why taxonomies of knowledge domains based on discourses keep changing from one age to another. New discourses of knowledge come into existence whenever large scale movement of humanity takes place due to different reasons--

natural, economic, political, or religious among others. It leads new contactuality that becomes the basis of comparative and translation studies. With new addition of knowledge, knowledge is re-systematised, re-categorised and rearranged. Disciplines also come and die accordingly. Translation studies or comparative literature are consequences of these processes. Contactuality causes space for dialogue between literatures, disciplines and cultures through various methods of study translation and comparison among others. Translation celebrates contactuality. It builds bridges, where it is inconceivable, even in ruins.

Translation is the foundation of comparative literature (CL). Cultural and linguistic/literary courtesy demands that they are understood studied, appreciated and compared for mutual illumination. Since it is not possible to learn all languages of the world, it is imperative to translate them in order to compare them. Hence the relation between CL and TS is integral. In the same way they i.e., CL and TS, share their premises with Interdisciplinary Studies (IS) and with Cultural Studies (CS) in many ways. H H Remak with his definition of CL in 1955 made CL interdisciplinary.¹⁰ Translation thrives on interdisciplinarity, for translation is not only the facilitator of interliterariness but also of interdisciplinarity, as translation is not limited to literatures or their comparative study but permeates all disciplines and their comparative study.

The privileging of one discipline over the other is a matter of professional positioning and argumentative limitations. TS underwent a few shifts in the last few decades. The first stage was marked by the Linguistic Turn. It was natural because language is the medium of translation, and goes into the making of translation. It was not unusual that principles governing language should govern the act and understanding of translation.

The major change in translation studies (TS) was in the form of the 'cultural turn' in TS, as was discussed by Susan Bassnett & Andre Lefevere in their book *Constructing Cultures: Essays on*

Literary Translation (1998). But this Turn too did not last for too long, as it was replaced by Technological Turn.

The Technological Turn and TS:

Technology and its devices are now integral parts of human existence and culture. In case we are asked to vacate our place in certain state of emergency, and take only three things, the cell phone will certainly be one of them in majority of cases. It may lead to leaving out of a few family members. The lap tops had already replaced lap dogs in high end societies. With every day, these apparatuses are becoming smaller and swifter. It surprises none that new subjects like ergonomics studying wo/man and machine relation attaining recognition as the innovative interdisciplinary area of study.

The first decade of the 21st century witnessed exponential change in computational processing abilities. Consequently, artificial intelligence (AI) defeated human intelligence (HT). The Singularity Project of Raymond Kurtzweill and Aubrey de Gray have proposed that the death will be dead by 2045. It speculates that the exponential faster computational processing will decode DNA and help in reversing the DNA. By doing so it would be possible to reverse the process of aging. The reversal of the process of aging would stall the process of degeneration of human organs that is the cause of death. The proposal may sound rather unrealistic and far-fetched, but it may become a reality some day. If one goes by the changes in this area, one may imagine what may be possible in MT?

These advancements in technology did not leave TS unaffected. The Cultural Turn has been followed by the Technological Turn, though it does not mean that linguistic and cultural studies have become irrelevant. However, they have lost centrality that they used to enjoy. Exponential changes in the pace of computational science and processing in particular have changed the pace of MT in case of texts that make referential use of language. With corpus building in different domains of knowledge in which MT will operate and

further replenishment in it and advancement in natural language processing in days to come it is most likely that like photocopying machine and internet cafes, there would be translation machines and cafes.

Nicolas Bourriaud discussed the impact of ICT and the fast mode of transport in the present century. In March 2009 Bourriaud, a French artist and critic, pronounced ‘the death of postmodernism’ and advent of altermodernism along with the declaration of its manifesto on the occasion of the exhibition in the Tate Arts Gallery. It was in a way extension of postmodernism which had focussed on ‘little narratives’ in place of a grand narrative. Altermodernism accepted the existence of ‘alter’ (other) modernisms or modernities. The radical changes brought about by the changes in the domains of science and ICT have revolutionised the modes of travel and communication. The Google Earth has left no corner and culture of the earth inaccessible to human curiosity. Artists and authors of today travel more than their counterparts did in human history. Consequently, a new concept of artist/author and art/text has come into existence. The new artist is seen in terms of the botanical metaphor of ivy creeper that grows wherever it is thrown. So the rootedness of the artist which was considered necessary for authenticity has become a myth, as the new artists vie for being for being ‘uprooted’, for they wish to travel to different parts of the world and share their work.¹¹ Bourriaud stated that in the age of the ICT, with so many cultures interacting among themselves there will be greater need for translation, and also for other forms like dubbing and sub-titling that will attain a place of significance in the present century, as the film would become a preferred mode of text and dissemination of knowledge. He did not add adaptation and MT for reasons, known to him.

The importance of translation and TS as a discipline of knowledge and study is discernible in the following four principles areas of operation:

(1) Translation History:

Lyne Long has proposed that following translation history provides two kinds of sights: ‘...translation principles cannot always be defined and adhered to like scientific formulae, but at times remains as flexible and as fickle as language itself.’ Moreover, the historical context allows us to build a link between past thinking about translation and contemporary strategies of translation.

Historical sense is needed. In case of translation, the focus is often on history of translation into a language and from it into other languages, history of translation of a text into other languages or in terms of tradition of translation. But to me what is important is the study of individuals (Kumarjiva, Al Manssor, Dara Shikoh among individuals) and Agra, Srinagar, Varansai and Toledo Schools/institutions of translations. In Indian context, attempts of translational historiography are yet to be undertaken, though institutions like Sahitya Akademi, Indian National Academy of Letters, have commissioned projects in Indian languages in this direction.

(2) Translation Practice:

Theory and practice are inter-related disciplines. There has been always a chasm between theory and practice. It is true about TS. This chasm, however, has never been so spacious as now particularly in TS. The views Emma Wagner who worked as the education Officer at IIT has no direct affiliation with either of the two in TS are reliable. She suggested that academic translation studies and professional translation practice should be treated as two separate industries, for they have their own priorities and constrains, production line and targets.

Many a great practioner did not know anything about translation studies, theory or history. Mahadev Desai in Gujarati, the renowned translator of Mahatma Gandhi did not have any diploma

or degree in TS. He had undaunted devotion to Gandhi and so thought of translation as the means of transmission of his message as did so many others through their interpretative studies on him.

The fact is that both of them converge at a point of market, as their priorities and constraints, production line and targets are determined by the processes of market forces.

The fact remains that theory is privileged over practice in TS. At present professional translators are hard to find whereas many wish to be translation theoreticians or scholars in India.

(3) Translation Theory:

Though theory is privileged still in academic world, and TS in India is not spared from it. The fact is that theory is inferred from practice, and not the other way round, though theory helps in shaping perceptions about translation.

There is a game of relay between practice and theory, later it influences the practice and then and thus one keeps on passing the baton to the other. The division between the two is a matter of professional convenience and ego pandering. However, TS cannot ignore it, as its practice and perceptions lend new direction to TS.

(4) Teaching Translation and Culture of Criticism of Translation:

The fact is that translation is central in all acts of teaching, for teaching essentially is an act of interpretation. Teaching a translated text is an act of simultaneous interpretation of the same message in two linguistic forms. Teaching and training translators form an integral part in TS. The derivative to it is that if translation can be studied, it may be taught too. What can be studied can be taught?

Once upon a time the questions that were being asked were 'How can translation be taught' and 'how can translation be studied?' those who regarded themselves as translators were often

contemptuous of any attempts to teach translation, while those who claimed to teach often did not translate and so had to resort to old evaluative method of setting one translation alongside another and examining both in a formalist vacuum. Now the questions have been changed. The object of study has been redefined, what is studied is text embedded within the network of both source and target cultural signs. (Bassnett & Lefevere 1990: 11-12)

In view of it, if we focus on Indian situation, we find that English classroom is a site of teaching through translation. In reality too we have been teaching much of translated texts but we have never noticed them. The literary criticism paper, for instance, is basically constituted of non-English texts. Plato, Aristotle did not write in English but in Greek. The works of Horace, Cicero and Quintilian are in Latin, which were later translated into English. Later on A W Schlegel, AC Schlegel and Schiller wrote in German, not in English. Ferdinand de Saussure, Claude Levi-Strauss, Roland Barthes, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Jean Francois Lyotart and Pierre Bourriard did not write in English but they are being prescribed and taught in English class-rooms. But nobody questions the issues of their originality nor equips ourselves with new strategies to teach them as translated texts. Why are all these questions raised in case of teaching translated texts in Indian class room? The reason is in the mind-set because these texts happen to be translations of Indian works.

Moreover, the paper entitled 'World classics' having classics from Sanskrit, Greek, Persian, Arabic, Latin, German, French, Spanish and Russian among others were translated from their languages into English. The issue of definition of classics may have come under discussion. But not the fact that they are translations, and they need to be taught differently as translated texts. We have taken them for granted as if they were written in English.

Let us accept the fact that pedagogy is a homogenizing process. However, Indian class-room is extremely diverse. The

translated texts add to the diversity of the class-room. The teacher's task is to understand this complexity, and keep in mind the interests of learners from other communities that do not have access to the culture/s discussed in the translated text.

Teaching is an act of interpretation. The difference is: (i) in teaching one has to interpret on behalf of her/his community of learners; (ii) in teaching translated text one has to interpret the translated text in relation to the source text. In a way, the translated text becomes central, though its umbilical cord with the ST remains unsevered. The teaching of translated text is a good training into the act of multiple interpretations and their comparisons. Commonplace it would be to state that translation is an act of interpretation.

Teaching is performance. It dovetails coexistence of written and oral. In case of teaching of a translated text, it becomes performance of two texts in which the games of foregrounding and backgrounding will be played and determined by the teacher. It is performance without stage, as ably discussed in a different context by R Wechsler in his book *Performing Without a Stage: The Art of Literary Translation* (1998). A teacher of a translated text has class-room as his stage with students as his spectators. But he has two scripts with the same theme but in different tongues. The performance matters, as it may obliterate the duality and lead to monism. In case the monistic attitude is not acceptable to some scholars, the source text may be considered as a co-text.

Text is a text. What difference does it make to a good teacher whether he is teaching a translated text or untranslated text? Teaching a translated text is the best way to understand it. There are two criteria to test one's understanding: If one thinks that one has understood a text, s/he should translate the text, s/he would realise how much had remained un/understood, and how was not. Also, if someone has not understood a text, s/he should translate it. It cannot be guaranteed, one would understand it completely, for complete understanding is a myth. However, it can be safely said that after translation, his

understanding would certainly be different from what it was before the translation. The reason for it is that in the process of translation one goes through the interiority of the text, its intestines, veins and arteries. The process may be painful but the product is pleasant.

Translation in a systemic and political enterprise took off in the colonial period. Karl Marx's remarks regarding the Dutch colonisers that they were traders, thieves and translators were to a good extent applicable to colonization in India as well. Trade was the legal means of appropriating others' wealth, and theft is an illegal way. Translation, as a means of appropriating intellectual wealth, became an industry in the period, and it continued thereafter. However, so much is untranslated in Indian languages and from other foreign languages into them and from them into foreign languages. Hence, teaching the course on translated texts can a good way of introducing students to the culture of translation. Like teaching a translated text, the process of translation is more interesting than the product. The product is frozen in time and space. Learners need to experience, understand and appreciate process of translation for which it is necessary that they themselves translate some pieces, though it may not necessarily be prescribed in the syllabus.¹²

Implications for Indian Translation Studies (ITS):

The implications of various developments in TS for Indian Translation Studies (ITS) may be enumerated thus:

1. Even after Susan Bassnett's disillusionment with her own statement about the death of CL, and its replacement with TS, the debate continues about the CL and TS as separate disciplines, more out of their accidental location in a discipline, and less out of conviction. Once the positions are taken, arguments are devised and adhered to in the most unprofessional manner.
2. There is a huge divide between theory and practice in TS. The faculties and academicians in TS profess to teach only, and not

practice translation. Theory is prestige in TS, as in other domains by over-sighting the fact that theories are inferred from practice. Knowing theory is no sin. However, its acolytes should not forget that just speaking about theory at the cost of practice serves neither TS nor translation theory, for theory will thrive only if it is tested in the crucible of practice, or new *contributions* and modification to theory may be made only its inferences from practice.

3. The 21st century belongs to Machine Translation (MT). V Michael Cribb's article "Machine Translation: The Alternative for the 21st Century" (TESOL Quarterly) states it in unambiguous terms. MT is a buzz term in the Departments of TS but they teach only theory of MT, and some knowledge about computational linguistics and preparing corpora. IITs, particularly IIT Mumbai and IIIT, Hyderabad and C-DAC are making consequential interventions with new research in computer technology and adopting it to MT. The Departments of TS&T that have no access to technology or are not proficient in computer technology in conventional universities are mere consumers and receivers.

4. Sahitya Akademi has intervened in the form of the translation project by preparing anthologies of articles written on translation in different Indian languages. When it gets complete, this would give a glimpse of translational practices in different Indian languages, and in the process become a foundation of research and study in translation activities.

5. Lot of translational practice is needed in India, for only a fragment of what is waiting to be translated is on the radar of TP. India needs vigorous culture of translational practice. Equal need is there for a robust culture of TC. To downright dismay of purists and traditionalists, I have maintained that in a country like India bad translation is better than no translation. Those who disapprove of certain translation and level it as bad translation need to either improve what they consider bad translation, or re-translation it. Bad translation will always take place. The culture of translation

criticism can stem the tide to certain extent. The TC, like literary or art criticism, cannot stop bad translation being attempted and even being accepted. However, it is the task of the TC that bad translations do not get established as good translation. It has started but it has to pick up yet, from review of translated texts to documentation of various kinds of translations that have taken place and their analysis and impact—social and cultural.

6. However, it should not be construed that there has been not much meaningful activity in the field of TS. For instance if I take the case of Hindi I was a little sceptical about the quantity of translation, leave aside the question of their quality. While working on the Sahitya Akademi project for writings on translation I proved to be wrong. I knew that there is certain amount of writing in Hindi but when I started working seriously I realised that there is much of it in Hindi. The quest for writings on translation revealed that even the translations into Hindi and from Hindi into other languages—Indian and foreign—have been done extensively. At the end of it, it was difficult to manage it even after arranging it in different categories of translational writing. Whatever has been done, data is scattered due to lack of institutional coordination and its enormity, perhaps.

7. ITS can prosper in and around the culture of criticism of translation. For this, we need to cultivate the culture of translation but equally necessary it is to cultivate the culture of criticism. Teaching translated texts is criticism of translation. Even at the cost of courting censure of my fellow scholars, let me state that bad translation is better than no translation. It is based on the assumption that the Gresham's Law 'Bad money drives good money out of market' does not apply in the world of literature and translation. Translation criticism cannot stop bad translation from being attempted and published too. But it should see to it that bad translation do not get established as good translation. However, translation criticism has for long been considered subservient to literary criticism. Only recently it has gained momentum. The course on Teaching translated texts

may be one of the best ways to contribute to the fledgling tradition of criticism of translation. In this the source text may be a good context. Translation research will be the natural product of translation teaching.

At the end, it needs to be stated that the present piece might turn out to be a sort of status report on TS in general and the ITS in particular. The fact is that humanity needs translation more than ever. In a country like India it is needed more than ever, for so little has been translated.

NOTES

1. That it was a century of clash of civilizations or knowledge systems, which can be gauged from the fact that about 15 percent surface of the earth was under colonization in 1800, the extent of colonization had reached to about 85 percent in 1914. It meant that about 15 percent surface of the earth controlled the rest of the world. It also connoted that a few major languages like English, Spanish, French and German interacted with about 15,000 languages and dialects that existed in the beginning of the 20th century which was not possible without translation or interpretation.]

2. The cruellest and bloodiest in human history, it witnessed two World Wars, partitions of continents and countries and multifarious conflicts. The factories for industrial production were paralleled with the killing hordes of people in a factory mode in the century. Along with the genocide of the Jews, there were many little wars that were equally devastating in human terms. The number of bombs dropped on Vietnam was more than the number of all the bombs dropped in the Second World War. Eric Hobsbawm has referred to the fact that the number of people killed in the 20th century was about 187 million which was 10 percent of the total population of the world in 1913. (For its discussion and reference please see Eric Hobsbawm, *Globalization, Democracy and Terrorism*, London: Little Brown, 2007, 15-48) The 20th century was beginning of a period

that led to a new consciousness of crises of human existence in the period of modernisation which found its manifestations in literary, artistic and cultural movements in it demanded reassessment of the century including its beginning. There is a near unanimity now that 20th century did not begin in 1901, as slaves of calendar will like us to believe. Unfettered to ticking of time in time-piece, it might be said to have begun in 1914 with the beginning of the World War I that was one of the foremost manifestations of industrialization of violence.

3. Translation, like poetry, is a prophetic act, as a translator straddles different worlds. In the Indian pantheon of gods, Saraswati is the goddess of learning but it is Narada who with his multilingual skills moves freely in/about/between/among different worlds—divine, human and nether world, and many little worlds within them. He has access to gods and goddess like Brahman, Vishnu and Shiva among others and their consorts and even demons. He speaks to the Supreme gods/goddesses, and passes on their messages to the dwellers of other worlds. Incidentally, the gods in all mythologies speak and understand classical languages, whereas common people use natural languages (prakrats/bhashas). Without translation by Narada or Hermes, the transaction between divine and human world would cease to exist. In absence of this transaction even the divine world would lose its centrality because the divine world attains supremacy only due to the existence of non-divine worlds and communication between/among them. Translation is the technology of interaction, communication and also of exhibiting, maintaining and furthering sovereignty of the omniscient power structures. To put it lightly, Narada due to his linguistic proficiency has earned the password 'Narayna, Narayana' from the inhabitants of both the worlds. He pronounces these words and enters any terrains, even restricted/prohibited ones that remain beyond the bounds of others. He accompanies distressed dwellers of the earth to the gods to plead their case for divine intervention. Narada, the translator and interpreter, facilitates the interaction. Hermes serves the same function in the Greek mythology, and so do prophets who pass on the message of God to the believers. They capture the time of one

world, carry it over and then reproduce it in different world for a new constituency. Life is understood when time, the flow of events and changes that it undergoes, is captured and realised. Thus, translation is not just after life but 'after time' or even 'time after time'. As an aside, it might be stated that Narada and Hermes may be called as the gods of translators.

4. For discussion of these issues please see Bassnett, *Translation Studies*, 1991, 21-44.

5. For the discussion of the issue please see Roman Jakobson, 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation' in R A Brower, ed. *On Translation*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1959, pp. 232-9.

6. Please see R S Pathak, "UnTranslatability: Myth or Reality?" in Avadhesh Kumar Singh, ed. *Translation: Theory and Practice*, New Delhi: Creative Books, 1996, 18-35.

7. For the discussion of 'artha' (meaning), its 'nirdharana' (determination), and kind of 'artha-dosha' (blemishes), please see Avadhesh Kumar Singh, "Words and Beyond: Questions of Meaning and Interpretation", *Revisiting Literature, Criticism and Aesthetics in India*, New Delhi: D K Printworld, 2012, pp. 17-42.

8. To examine the issue of myth of ST at the ideational level, it would be congruous to examine another case that has been discussed by Ananda Coomaraswamy in different context, while discussing the process of creation in the Indian and western traditions. According to him, the people of Croton commissioned Zeuxis to paint a figure of Helen who was an ultimate epitome of Greek beauty. Ananda Coomaraswamy mentioned that the painter stipulated to allowed to use as 'models' five of the most beautiful virgins of the city'. (Ananda Coomaraswamy, "The Art of the East and of the West", *Essays in National Idealism*, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 1987, p. 87)

Helen might have existed in reality. She must have been an epitome of beauty that would have captured imagination of people of Greece. The idea of Helen existed in the mind and consciousness of people of Greece. It then bequeathed to the people of Croton who asked Zeuxis to prepare a figure of Helen. For this purpose, when Zuexix asked for five virgin maidens as models, the idea of Helen as it was in the minds of people would have become different in the mind of Zuexix, for he might have developed it on the basis of his observation of the maidens, or her represented figure in Homer that would have into the making of the sculpted figure of Helen. Against Helen as she was, had many subsequent versions, as may be summed in the following manner:

- i. Helen as she was, as an epitome of beauty
- ii. Helen in the national psyche of the people of Greece
- iii. Helen in the psyche of Homer and her imaging in his *Illiad*
- iv. Idea of Helen in the national psyche of the people of Croton
- v. The Idea and objective as communicated to Zeuxius by the people of Croton
- vi. Zeuxius's idea of Helen and idea of Helen as he saw it in the figures of five beautiful maidens of Croton
- vii. Helen's figure re/constructed on the basis of figure by Zeuxis

Ananda Coomaraswamy speculates about a hypothetical situation. He proposes that in case an Indian artist were asked to the job Zeuxix had to he would have “demanded opportunity for meditation and mental concentration, in order that might visualise the idea of Helen in his inner consciousness, aiming rather at discovery than creation, desiring rather to draw back the veil from the face of the superwoman than to combine visible perfections by

process of intellectual selection.” (87)

- i. Helen as she was, as an epitome of beauty
- ii. Helen in the national psyche of the people of Greece
- iii. Helen in the psyche of Homer and her imaging in his *Illiad*
- iv. Idea of Helen in the national psyche of the people of Croton
- v. The Idea of Helen as received by an Indian artist
- vi. Her/His internalization of the idea through meditation over it
- vii. Her/His return from the meditative too conscious state
- viii. His re/construction of Helen

It means that there existed a text called Helen who was cause and source of experience. This emotive text was followed by ideational text which became target texts. This case also substantiates the proposition that there is no text as ST. All are the TT(s).

The moot question is: Which is the source text in both the case? Is the tangible and visible system of signs is the only text or source text? What about non-verbal texts that condition the ocular text?

If art is suggestive of experience and its idea(s), where is the question of fidelity? All figures of speech are in a way distortion of reality, if there is anything like it. Text is a system of signs--verbal or written to organise the experience.

Every text is a target text. The concept of organic text is a myth. Text is a web or net that is woven. Everything woven is hybrid

that is why it evolves. Purity would have stifled. In this case what is the source text?

Octavio Paz rightly considered all texts as being parts of a literary system that have descended from and are related to other systems. So they are 'translations of translation of translation.' He further added:

Every text is unique and, at the same time, it is the translation of another text. No text is entirely original because language itself, in its essence, is already a translation: firstly, of the non-verbal world and secondly, since every sign and every phrase is the translation of another phrase. However, this argument can be turned around without losing any of its validity: all texts are original because every translation is distinctive. Every translation, up to a certain point, is an invention and as such it constitutes a unique text. (Paz, Octavio. *Traducción: literatura y literalidad*, Barcelona: Tusquets Editor, 1971, 9)]

9. The spree of activities in translation studies as a discipline is discernible in terms of Anthologies e.g., John Biguenet (1985), Rainer Shultze (1989), Andrew Chesterman (1989), Anthologies: Andre Lefevere (1992c), Douglas Robinson (1997b and 2001). Lawrence Venuti's *Translation Studies Reader* (2000) established itself as one of the central translation Readers; and the Encyclopaedias, Guides and other resources included Mona Baker's *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies* (1998), Olive Classe's *Encyclopaedia of Literary Translation* (2000), Peter France's *Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*; Translation Studies e.g., Jeremy Munday's *Introducing Translation Studies* (2001), Basil Hatim & Jeremy Munday's *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book* (2004). The number of seminars, conferences, workshops and publication of journals is greater than ever before, as might be discerned in number of such activities being organised in different languages. Moreover, the fervid interest in new discourses like folk/oral, feminist and black/dalit, diaspora and regional/identity among others have

brought translation in centre of discussion because they being in many languages can be accessed only through translation. Moreover, technological advancements in ICT, in computational linguistics in the form of Machine Translation (MT) and free access to translation software have lent a new direction to TS in India and beyond as well.

10. Henry Remak defined CL thus: ‘Comparative Literature is the study of literature beyond the confines of one particular country, and the study of relationships between literature on the one hand, and other areas of knowledge and beliefs, such as the arts (e.g., painting, sculpture, architecture, music), philosophy, history, the social sciences (e.g., politics, economics, sociology), the sciences, religion, etc., on the other. In brief, it is the comparison of one literature with another or others, and the comparison of literature with other spheres of human expression.’ (Remak, “Comparative Literature: Its definition and Function”, in Newton Stallknecht & Horst Frenz, eds. *Comparative Literature: Method and Perspective*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois press, 1961, 3) For discussion of Comparative Literature, please see Avadhesh Kumar Singh, “(The) Future of Comparative Literary Studies”, *New Directions in Comparative Literature*, eds R Badode et al, Macmillan India, 2007, 72- 83.] With the Charles Bernheimer’s Report of ACLA in 1995, CL moved towards CS. Charles Bernheimer, ed. *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, Baltimore & London, The Johns Hopkins University, 1995.

11. For the discussion of altermodernism, please see Avadhesh Kumar Singh, “Alternative Systems of Knowledge: A Study in Process and Paradigm”, *Indian Literature*, 268, March/April, 2012, pp.216-242.

12. For discussion of teaching of translated texts with illustrations, please see my paper “Teaching Translated Texts” under publication in *Anuvad* in March 2014 issue.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Aizaz, 1994. In *Theory Classes Nations Literatures*. India: Oxford University Press. Chettri, Shreyashi (trans.). In press. *The Nation and other Poems*. Siliguri: Ekta Publications.
- Amos, F.R.R., 1973. *Early Theories of Translation*, New York: Octagon, Original published 1920.
- Barnstone, W., 1993. *The Poetics of Translation: History, Theory, Practice*, Yale: Yale University Press.
- Bassnett, S., 1980/2002. *Translation Studies*, London: Routledge, 3rd rev. edn.
- Bassnett, S. and Lefevere, A. eds., 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter.
- Bassnett, Susan & Andre Lefevere. Eds., 1998. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.
- Benjamin, A., 1989. *Translation and the Nature of Philosophy: A New Theory of Words*, London: Routledge.
- Bernheimer, C. ed. 1995. *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Chesterman, A., 1989. *Readings in Translation Theory*, Helsinki: Oy Finn Lecture Ab.
- Chesterman, A. and Wagner, E., 2002. *Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue Between the Ivory Tower and the Wordface*, Manchester: St.
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda, 1987. "The Art of the East and of the West", *Essays in National Idealism*, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

Cronin, M., 2003. *Translation and Globalization*, London: Routledge.

Delishe, J. and Woodsworth, J. eds. 1995. *Translators through History*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Derrida, J., 1985. Des tours de Babel (English and French versions, J. Graham, trans. In J. Granham ed. *Difference in Translation*, (pp. 165-207;248). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Devis, K., 2001. *Deconstruction and Translation*, Manchester: St Jerone.

France, P. ed. 2000. *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gaddis Rose, M., 1997. *Translation and Literary Criticism*, Manchester: St Jerome.

Gambier, Y. and Gottlieb, H. eds. 2001. *(Multi)media Translation*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gentzler, B., 1993/2001. *Contemporary Translation Theories*, London: Routledge; Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Golay, Bidhan, 2006. Rethinking Gorkha Identity: Outside the imperium of discourse, hegemony and history. *Peace and Democracy in South Asia*, vol. 2, nos. 1 & 2: 23-49.

Guha, Ranajit (ed.) 1982/83. *Subaltern Studies²- Writings on South Asian History and Society*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Guha, Ranajit & Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak (eds.), 1988. *Select Subaltern Studies*. New York. Oxford University Press. Kaviraj, Sudipta. 1993. *The Imaginary Institution of India*.

Jerome.Classe, O. ed. 2000. *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*, London: Fitzroy Dearborn.

Partha Chatterjee and Gyanendra Pandey (eds.), *Subaltern Studies*

vol. 7, *Writings on South Asian History and Society*. 1-39. Delhi. Oxford University Press.

Pollard, D. and Chan, S. eds. 1995. *An Encyclopedia of Translation*, Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.

Popovic, A., 1976. *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*, Edmonton: University of Alberta Department of Comparative Literature.

Reib, K., 2000. *Translation Criticism*, E.F. Rhodes, trans., Manchester: St Jerome, 1st published in 1971.

Sarkar, Sumit. 1989. The Kali Avatar of Bikrampur: A village scandal in early twentieth century Bengal. In Ranajit Guha (ed.), *Subaltern Studies vol. 6*. 1- 53. Delhi. Oxford University Press.

Shulte, R. and Biguenet, J. eds. 1992. *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, Chicago: University Chicago Press.

Shuttleworth, M. and Cowie, 1997. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*, Mahchester: St Jerome.

Singh, Avadhesh Kumar, 2012. "Alternative Systems of Knowledge: A Study in Process and Paradigm", *Indian Literature*, 268, March/April, pp.216-242.

Snell-Hornby, M., 2006. *The Turns of Translation Studies*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby, M. Pochhacker, F. and Kaindl, K. eds. 1994. *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, 1988. Can the Subaltern Speak? In Carry, Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. 24-28. London. Macmillan.

Steiner, G., 1975/1998. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steiner, T.R., 1975. *English Translation Theory 150-1800*, Assen: Van Gorcum.

Subba, Manprasad & Kumar Pradhan (trans.), 2009. *Voices from the Margin*. Siliguri: Sunchari Publications. Subba, Manprasad & Remika Thapa. 2008. *kinanra ka awazharu*. Kalimpong: Upama Publications. Thapa, Remika. 2007. *desh ra anya kavitaharu*. Namchi: Nirman Prakashan.

Trivedi, Harish & Meenakshi Mukherjee (eds.), 1996. *Interrogating Postcolonialism- Theory, Text and Context*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.

Venuti, L., 1991. *Genealogies of translation theory: Schleiermacher, TTR*. *Traduction Terminogie, Redaction 4 (2)*, 125-150.

....., 1995. *The Translators' Invisibility A History of Translation*, London: Routledge.

.....ed. 1992. *Rethinking Translation*, London: Routledge.

..... ed. 2002. *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge.

Von Flotow, L., 1997. *Translation and Gender: Translation in the 'Era of Feminism'*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Weissbort., D. & Eysteinnsson, A., 2006. *Translation: Theory and Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.