

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

MANISH PRASAD

Abstract

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

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

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

Introduction

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

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

Journey of Madhushala from Khayyam to Bachchan

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Adhro par ho koi bhi ras
Jibha par lagti hala,

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

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

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

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

Scandal, Marginalization and Importance of Translation

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Status of Translation in Indian Philosophy

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

References

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

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