In the midst of my then ongoing research one day someone got a little curious about my work and popped up, “What are you translating?” Till then, a believer in the classical philosophical discourse which merely engenders a practice of “translation as subjectification”, I replied, “I’m translating original Haryanvi folk narratives into English”. My answer did satisfy the person but it lingered in me a feeling of utter dissatisfaction. The high sounding word “Original” kept resonating into my mind until I came upon the concept of a postcolonial translator. How far can my fieldwork collections, archives, printed sources be termed as “original” became a persistent question that needed to be answered.

Politics and ethics of translation have become as important as its poetics and aesthetics. The translation is as trans/intercultural as it is trans/interlingual. Let me elucidate what is meant by politics of translation before I indulge in poetics of translation.

The classical concept of representation is critiqued by Derrida, for example, who questions the very notion of an origin or an original that needs to be represented. Derrida argues that the ‘origin’ is itself dispersed, its “identity” undecidable. A representation thus does not re-present an ‘original’; rather, it represents that which is always already represented.

Thus one of the most useful insights Derrida’s work offers to post-colonials is the notion that origin is always heterogeneous, that it is not some pure, unified source of meaning or history. Suppressing the difference that is already there in the so-called origin, representation in the classical sense grounds the whole of western philosophy. This philosophy, according to Derrida, is one of ‘presence’, of the ‘absolute proximity of self-identity and of presence to oneself. Derrida claims that western philosophy tries to reappropriate ‘presence’ or the origin through notions of adequacy of representation, of
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totalization of history. “Cartesian-Hegelian history, like the structure of the sign, is conceivable only on the basis of the presence that it defers and in view of the deferred presence one intends to reappropriate’s”204 Here Derrida points to historicism’s concern with origin and “telos” and its desire to construct a totalizing narrative.

In questioning discourses of domination, not only do we need to critique representation, we also need to formulate a complex notion of “historicity”, or “effective history”205, as that from the past which is still operative in the present. The notion of effective history would help us to read against the grain.

Derrida’s critique of representation, however, is important because it suggests a questioning of the traditional notion of translation. In fact, the two problematic have always been intertwined in Derrida’s work. He has indicated more than once that “translation perhaps escapes ‘the orbit of representation’. If representation stands for the reappropriation of presence, translation emerges as the sign for what Derrida would call dissemination. We must, however, interrogate carefully the conventional concept of translation that belongs to the order of representation, adequacy, essence and truth. This is the same order under which the discourse of history functions, creating, like translation, coherent and transparent texts through the repression of difference, participating thereby in the process of colonial domination”. 206

However theory of translation, avoid being trapped in the order of representation when it uses out of necessity the concepts it critiques. Derrida would suggest that it should aim to be the kind of writing which “both marks and goes back over its mark with an undecidable stroke”,207 for this “double mark escapes the pertinence or authority of truth”, reinscribing through an inhabiting of the structures it deconstructs. The double inscription Derrida mentions has a parallel in Walter Benjamin’s strategy of citation or quotation. For Benjamin, “the historical-materialist (the critical historiographer) quotes without quotation marks in a method. This is one way of revealing the constellation a past age forms with the present without submitting to a historical continuum, to an order of origin and telos. The
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notion of a double writing can help us challenge the practices of subjectification and domination evident in histories or in translations.\textsuperscript{208}

Fanon points out that the "passionate search for a national culture which existed before the colonial era finds its legitimate reason in the anxiety shared by native intellectuals to shrink away from that western culture in which they all risk being swamped. "The attitude of the native intellectual sometimes takes on the aspect of a cult or of a religion"\textsuperscript{209} and the tendency is to forget that the creation of culture in colonized space often involves techniques and languages that are "borrowed" from the colonizer.

Now, the researcher fully comprehended the context of her present inhabited world and also the world of her collected folk narratives. Being a post-colonial translator of North Indian state i.e Haryana had been wary of essentialist anti-colonial narratives; In fact, every postcolonial translator must attempt to deconstruct their work, to show their complicity with the master-narrative of imperialism. This is a crucial task especially at a time when the myths of nationalism – secularism, democracy nationhood, citizenship – have become repressive forces in decolonized country like ours. The translator must participate in what Fanon spoke of as "a complete calling in question of the colonial situation",\textsuperscript{210} and this includes the re-examination of liberal nationalism as well as the nostalgia for lost origins, neither of which provides models for intervention or "grounds" for an ideological production that would be counter-hegemonic.

Homi Bhabha's suggestion that "state of emergency is also always a state of emergence". The state of emergency/emergence that is the post-colonial condition demands a disruptive concept of history which, by problematizing the striving for adequacy will also contribute to formulating a notion of representation/translation to account for the discrepant identities of the post-colonial 'subject'.\textsuperscript{211}

\textsuperscript{208} ibid

\textsuperscript{209} Franz Fanon.\textit{The Wretched of the Earth} (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1967).
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Derrida points out that before we know how and what to translate by representation, we must interrogate the concept of translation and of language which is so often dominated by the concept of representation or a presupposition or the desire for an invariable identity.

This is ultimately what French theorist Ricoeur intends when he describes the “ethics of translation as an interlinguistic hospitality. The world is made up of a plurality of human beings, cultures, tongues. Humanity exists in the plural mode. Which means that any legitimate form of universality must always—if the hermeneutic model of translation is observed—find its equivalent plurality. The creative tension between the universal and the plural ensures that the task of translation is an endless one, of taking up and letting go, of expressing oneself and welcoming others”. 212

Fully noting the difficulties involved in any act of translation, including the difficulty imposed by the untranslatable, Ricoeur nonetheless advocates “linguistic equivalence”—that is to say, “comparability or commensurability—as the viable way of rethinking translation’s ethos”. What is evocative about this notion of equivalence, is that equivalence is not exactly something readymade, like a preexisting or already present condition, but rather something to be produced and should be more precisely recognized as a challenge. Whether at the level of strictly linguistic or at the level of intercultural transactions, Ricoeur’s suggestion implies that equivalence, as something to strive for rather than something that has already been securely attained. In this regard, equivalence brings to mind Johannes Fabian’s well-known concept of “coevals”. Like coevalness, equivalence in this instance is not a mere assertion of temporal or spatial coexistence but a vision, one that, predictably, will be met with obstruction and sabotage at regular intervals, but that will always remain within its operating premises the fundamentals of exchange and reciprocity that underlie intercultural transactions. In his diagnosis of Conrad’s description of blackness, Achebe puts it this way:

When a writer, while pretending to record scenes, incidents and their impact is in reality engaged in inducing hypnotic stupor in his readers through a bombardment of emotive words and other forms of trickery much more has to be at stake than stylistic felicity. Conrad chose his subject well—one which has guaranteed not to put him in conflict with the psychological predisposition of his readers or raise the need for him

to contend with their resistance. He chose the role of purveyor of comforting myths.213

This role of ‘purveyor of myths’ is also the role of a type of intercultural translator, one who is worried, as Africans and Europeans, between the River Congo and the River Thames, Achebe is not exactly interested in the transfer of meanings from one language into another (as in the more literal sense of translation). His focus is rather on the ‘codes of trans evaluation between cultures’ that are implicitly set into motion even when an author is writing in a single language.

It is an acknowledge statement that every reading is an interpretation and every interpretation is a decoding of the text. Translation then needs to be considered a simultaneous process of decoding and encoding. During my process it decoded the meaning embedded in the text of the Haryanvi language, it also transferred the meaning into a coded form in the English language. Thus every translation becomes an extension of the original text, bringing a fresh appreciation to it as well as an enrichment of the target language. However, it needs to be clearly recognized that such a process is not to be viewed as a mere mechanical transference from the linguistic register to another, but as an encounter between two languages and two cultures. A whole range of latent socio-cultural responses between two linguistic registers is brought to the surface through the process of translation J. Levy, of the late Prague School states in his Art of Translation:

Translation is not a monistic composition, but an interpretation and conglomerate of two structures. On the one hand there are semantic content and the formal contour of the original, on the other hand the entire system of aesthetic features bound up with the language of translation.214

It had been thus necessary to consider the art of translating Haryanvi folk narrative as a two way process: to appreciate and assess the original text in Haryanvi dialect and then to create a fresh text in a different language in English. Susan Bassnett-McGuire, while defining the process adopts the modern approach, “first, that the surface meaning of the two, i.e. the Source Language and Target Language, will be approximately similar, and second, that the

linguistic structures of the two need to be preserved". Such a statement resonates with the idea that the process of translation is a technical skill and needs to be acquired through scientific training in the two linguistic groups, Haryanvi and English. In my case the approach though true to much of the translation work done in recent times, I have tried to keep an open mind and acknowledge the necessity to consider the specific context in which the original text exists. Apart from the attention directed to the technical skill involved, translation further involved the transference of meaning contained in Haryanvi into English keeping in mind the cultural roots of each language.

The problem of equivalence leads directly to the debate of whether translation is an Art Form or needs to be considered as a Craft. As argued earlier I, as an the translator, not only made syntactic adjustments between the English language and that of my own, but attempted to effectively communicate the semantic significance embedded in the text. Walter Benjamin states in his "The task of the Translator", that the "Source Language and the Target Language need to change to make a third. Translation is a process of transformation and renewal of something living into something dynamic and organic". He further argues, "No translation would be possible if in its ultimate essence it strove for likeness to the original. Just as fictional representation can never be a photocopy of reality and remains in the realm of imaginative recreation, similarly translation ought not to be an exacted replica of the original. It will never be a fair translation if something new has not been added to it".

This further raised the question of translatability of the Haryanvi folk narratives. All texts do not lend themselves to translation since it requires a degree of cultural interface between the two language groups. For instance, I can translate in English from my native language, and vice versa but it would be a foolish on my part to attempt to translate a text in Chinese, purely because I have not been sufficiently exposed to their linguistic register and culture. I had to take into account the subtle nuances, idiomatic expressions and tonal variations of the Haryanvi language for Syntactic equivalence.


Homi. K. Bhabha the Culture Studies critic makes an apt comment in this connection:

Cultural translation is not simply an appropriation or adaptation; it is a process through which cultures are required to revise their own systems and values, by departing from their habitual or "inbred" rules of transformation.217

But there was a second level of translation enterprise which arose out of colonial expansionism and which increasingly began to demand recognition. In nineteenth century colonial India, for instance, translation was considered one of the major forms of cultural interaction between the colonizer and the colonized. The prevalent belief was that the two could be brought close through such linguistic encounters.

Recent studies of some of these earlier translations indicate that these were often appropriations or distortions of the original texts to serve the interests of the dominant power structures operating within the country. In the Indian context the colonial agenda of translating indigenous texts was a part of a larger enterprise of Imperialism. Thus translation was taken up as a scholarly activity with the assumption of the superiority of the target language while translating into English. It was also a means of encouraging the reader to return to the original in a transformed state. Besides, the attempt was to upgrade the source language text, since it was perceived to be of a lower status.

The initial British engagement with the study of the Indian language was impelled by mercantile and commercial requirements. It was in their interest to know and learn the language for the collection of land revenue and business transactions as the natives were thought to be highly unreliable in their dealings in trade. Thus young East India Company agents were trained in local Indian and Persian languages and encouraged to read the Sanskrit texts translated in English. Some of them became extremely proficient and engaged themselves in the work of translating from the Sanskrit and Persian texts. This accounts for the patronage granted by Hastings to Sanskrit and Persian, the official court language at the time.

In the second phase of colonialism the agenda for translation was considerably changed. Translation was pursued in an organized manner and a two way process was adopted: the orientalist translation of Indian texts into English as well as those of English into

Indian languages. It was essential since the colonizers required a collaborative class to serve their purpose for administrative and economic reasons. Representations of the colonized were attempted in a manner so as to justify colonial domination. Thus the history of translation in India is very much interrelated with the idea of colonial expansionism. This was the period when certain myths regarding the orient were evolved which was to have serious repercussions on the future developments of culture and national identity of the colonized country. And translation was to play a significant role in this grand Imperial vision. However, the colonizer/colonized relationship is based on a concept of complete interdependence, one becoming completely meaningless without the other. Edward Said argues that idea of “the orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting Image, idea, personality, experience”.

A close examination of some of the translated texts of the orientalists clearly establishes the colonial implications of such translations. What becomes apparent is the desire to “purify” Indian culture and to speak on its behalf since they were unreliable interpreters of their own history and culture. Perhaps the best illustration is that of the famous/infamous Education Minutes by Macaulay, who in 1835 had claimed that, a “single shelf of European books was worth the whole literature of Indian and Arabia”.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, with the growth of confidence in its Imperial power and pride in national culture translations was no longer necessary as a means of enriching British culture nor was it required to further enhance the eroticizing the orient. Translation came to be considered a debased form of art and the translator was relegated to the position of a mere craftsman and a technician. Thus the twentieth century witnessed an obvious reaction to the idea of translation reduced to serve an ulterior purpose. The consequent shift had been to depoliticize, as it were the entire process, and approach it dispassionately as a mechanical craft, a mere transference from one linguistic structure to another with little or no reference to cultural and social history.

The attempt in recent times has been to rescue the work of translation from the restrictions imposed by the rhetoric of technical rules regarding transference from restrictions from Source Language to Target Language. What has been introduced is the concept of free
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translation. Translation is not a mere reproduction of the meaning of the source text nor a literal tendering of the syntax contained in it but an attempt to capture both with a degree of fidelity and freedom. Walter Benjamin endorsing the concept of fidelity and freedom claims:

Real translation is transparent; it does not cover the original, does not block the light, but allows the pure language, as though reinforced by its own medium, to shine upon the original more fully. 219

These writers have internalized the entire process of translation and are no longer concerned with transference from one language to another but have adopted the language of translation as their own. There is a complete fusion between the source language and the target language.

The Progressive vision of translation is to identify translation as a literary theme, a critical practice, medium of inters generational transmission and intercultural exchange, and a mode of memorializations.

The aim of translation neither domesticates nor estranges only but does both; a vital regenerative process occurs in the exchange between author, translator and reader.

The term ‘Haryanvi’, that I have consciously used might seem problematic to many, owning to their ignorance of what has been happening on this front. What I wish to convey is precisely that this language has been facing identity crisis or I should say is faced with a more rhetorical question-Is Haryanvi a language? People believe that it is no language rather a form of distorted Hindi used by inhabitants of this state. All the varieties of the language spoken by people of different regions are believed to be the distorted versions of Hindi. Ignorance is not always bliss. What the people are not realizing is the fact that their language is the repository of wealth like other recognized language having strong cultural roots. According to this researcher, this is an issue like the one faced by other regional languages or tribal languages of the nature when the state fails to give it that statutory status inspite of having a cultural roots. The problem becomes little more complicated when viewed historically taking into account the various factors behind the formation of the state of

Haryana in 1966. Let me go into a little detailed linguistic facts regarding reasons that led to the formation of state of Haryana.

The most significant linguistic movement in the north dates back to 1919. Central League was set up on December, 1919. This was followed by the formation of Shiromani Akali Dal in 1920. Started as an organization for the protection of the religious shrine, it soon became a religio-political organization, fighting for the interests of the Sikh community. By the end of 1946, communal pattern of politics was distinctively visible. On August 18th, 1947, Punjab was divided on communal lines according to Radcliffe Award. Hindus who constituted only 30% in the united Punjab became a majority recording 70% of the total population. 15% of Sikh population of un-partition Punjab now registered 30% and became the only significant minority in post-partition Punjab. Muslims were reduced to insignificant members. Migrations from newly formed Pakistan resulted in the concentration of Hindus in the south Eastern Districts and Sikhs in the Central District. This resulted in general refugee tension acquiring a communal shade, rural urban cleavages emerged amount the Sikh settled and migrant populations. Local Hindus population of region felt that the more advanced people of erstwhile Punjab exploited them.

Migrant Sikhs and majority of local Sikhs were rooted in the soil. They were peasant proprietors whose love for land is legendary. The refugee Sikhs population was the worst victim of partition. Because of easy identification, they suffered heavy losses. Large number of their sacred shrines and cultural centres were left in Punjab. The Hindu population, both refugees and original inhabitants were by and large traders. They were, with some efforts able to re-establish themselves. Their cultural roots were intact. There was Pan Hindu Culture and they could easily mesh into it. The politics of early partition days was turbulent. The landed peasantry and urban Sikhs aligned themselves with Congress. Efforts of the Akali Dal to force a political unity among Sikhs proved futile on 18th March, 1948 all the elected MLA’s a joined the Congress. However, Akali leadership outside the legislature continued a vocal struggle for the protection of Sikh identity. While the constitution of India was taking its shape. Akali Dal demanded constitutional safeguards, and recognition of Punjabi languages in Gurumukhi Script.

Punjabi written in Gurumukhi Script was to become the language of the Punjab zone, and Hindi written in Devnagri Script was to become to language of the Hindi Zone, not to retain the bilingual character of the State, it was imperative that people learnt both languages.
This formula ran in trouble. The Arya Samaj Schools refused to subscribe to it. Soon enough, Sacchar lost support, Akali disenchantment with the state widened. As a follow-up of this chain of events, on 10th October, 1949, Master Tara Singh stated, “The Sikhs have a culture different from the Hindu. Language of the Sikhs is different their traditions and histories were different, their heroes were different, their social order was different, there has no reason, why they should not claim the right of self determination for themselves”.

Master Tara Singh, by July, 1950 started demanding a separate linguistic state for people speaking Punjabi and writing in Gurumukhi Script. He also wanted internal autonomy for the province as was granted to Kashmir. Historical evidence as recorded by Harcharan Singh Bajwa, a member of the Akali Dal Working Committee from 1931 to 1960 record that demand for a linguistic state was an outcome of Dr. Ambedkar’s advise. Following suggestions are attributed to Dr. Ambedkar by certain Akali leaders.

If you had cast lots with Pakistan, you would have been a minority there. In joint Punjab, you were a minority except in two tehsils, which too were not contagious. In Eastern Punjab too you are a minority. If you clamour for a Sikh State, it will be a cry in the wilderness. Why don’t you ask for a Punjabi speaking state? Congress in committed to linguistic basis for reorganization of the states. They can defer satisfaction of this demand but they cannot oppose it for long. You can have a Sikh State in the name of Punjabi Suba.

Bajwa says this suggestion opened the path to have a de-facto Sikh State. The movement further acquired momentum because of opposition from Hindus. This resulted in the 1951 census debacle. Majority of the Punjabi speaking Hindus reported Hindi as their mother tongue. The urban Punjabi Hindu put forward their demand for a Maha Punjab comprising of territories of Punjab, PEPSU, Himachal Pradesh, Delhi and some District of Uttar Pradesh in opposition to demand for “Punjabi Suba.” However, Hindus in the South Eastern part of Punjab, now known as Haryana, were not receptive to the idea. They wanted their own separate state.

The Akali Dal submitted an eighteen page memorandum to the state reorganization commission for the demarcation of Punjab Suba. They also mobilized support of rural Sikhs. The Sikh religion was evoked as commandment for political participation. The state re-
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organisation commission rejected demands of Akali Dal. Instead a formula was proposed for the integration or Punjab, the PEPSU and Himachal Pradesh into one administrative unit. However, on the personal intervention of Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru, February, 1956, the following regional formula was proposed.

i) Himachal Pradesh to be kept out of Punjab (contrary to the SRC’s recommendation and PEPSU to be merged with the Punjab.

ii) The new State of the Punjab was to be demarcated from the Punjabi and Hindi speaking regions. Both Punjabi and Hindi were to be declared the regional languages of the State.

iii) The Punjab was to remain a bilingual State and Punjabi (in Gurumukhi Script) and Hindi (in Devnagri Script) were to be the official languages of the State.

iv) For administrative and development purposes, the two regions would have two regional committees consisting of the elected members of the Assembly (including the ministers from each region). The final decision, however case was to be taken by the State Cabinet. In case of difference in the views of the Regional Committees, the Governor was to take the final decision.

This arrangement was followed by Nehru-Master Pact. In accordance with this pact the Akali Dal merged with the Congress, on 30th September, 1956, the working committee of Akali Dal declared, “Dal would concentrate on the protection and promotion of educational, religious, cultural and economic interest of the Panthi”. But this arrangement was not satisfactory for Urban Punjabi Hindus. They felt their power was eroded. The Punjabi Hindus resisted teaching of Punjabi in Gurmukhi Script to Punjabi Hindus. Though ‘Save Hindi Agitation’ died by December 1957, Pratap Singh Kairon then Chief Minister of Punjab realized its consequences. Thus he never implemented the Regional formula. On 15th September, 1958, Master Tara Singh re-opened the demand for Punjabi Suba. The demand received legitimacy because of bifurcation for Bombay into States of Maharashtra and Gujarat.

This left Punjab as the only bilingual state. Encashing this fresh support, the Akali Dal contested Shiromani Gurudwara Prabhandak Committee (SGPC) election on the issue of Punjabi Suba’. SGPC won 132 out of 139 total seats contested. On 22nd May, 1960 a Punjabi Suba convention was held at Amritsar. The demand for a separate Punjabi speaking State in
this convention was also supported by leaders of Swantatra Party, Samykat Socialist Party (SSP), Praja Socialist Party (PSP) and freedom fighters like Saifudin Kitchloo and Pandit Sunder Lal. A formal agitation for a separate Punjabi State was launched in May 1960. After the arrest of Master Tara Singh, Fateh Singh, Vice President of Akali Dal at that time, took over the leadership. He firmly asserted that they wanted only a Punjabi Linguistic State. Whether Hindus constituted a majority or Sikhs was not their priority. Subsequently political realignments took place. Communists now supported Akalis in their demand. Congress strengthened its mass base among the rural Sikhs. Jasangh became popular with urban Hindus and a small section of urban Sikh.

The centre set-up a three members committee comprising of Y.B. Chavhan, Indira Gandhi and Mahavir Tyagi, these three members committee was assisted by 22 members parliamentary committees under the Chairmanship of Lok Sabha Speaker Hukam Singh. After the death of Shastri in January, 1966. Mrs. Gandhi convened a meeting of congress party’s working committee on 9th March, 1966. This committee passed the resolution requesting the Government to created a Punjabi speaking state. This was followed by parliamentary committee’s resolution the same lives on 18th March 1966. A Punjab State’s reorganization bill and appointment of Punjab boundary commission under the Chairmanship of Justice J.C. Shah followed these developments, the other two members of the commission were Subinal Datt and M.M. Philip. It was on 1st November 1966 that the state was finally divided into Punjab and Haryana. The state Punjab now comprised of 41% area and 55% of the total population of erstwhile Punjab. Majority of its population was now that of the Sikhs. The central Government kept its control over Chandigarh and Bhakra and Beas Dam Project. However, most of the objections of Akali leadership were met. The Sikhs constituted a majority in eight of the eleven districts.

So one can infer some important points from the above discussion that can more clearly explain why the language of Haryana has been given a step motherly treatment.

Firstly, unlike Punjab, that was formed due to strong linguistic movement, the formation of Haryana took place as a result of strong demands of Akalis for their separate state of Punjab, for right of self determination owing to their different culture one can say the people of south east of erstwhile united Punjab, which later became Haryana lacked that culture specific, language specific awareness. Though they expressed their discontent regarding their merger with any other state, reasons behind were far from being linguistic.
They have always claimed to be Hindi speaking areas and not Haryanvi speaking areas. Though Haryanvi has always been their language of daily communication especially of rural people, Hindi has acquired that status of state language.

Secondly, I would want to state that that according to State Reorganizing Commission the formation of states in India were based on linguistic lines, rooted in strong cultural roots and hence the subsequent nomenclature. If Punjabi leads to the formation of Punjab, Tamil to Tamilnadu, Oriya to Orissa, Assamese to Assam then there must have been strong reasons why the south east part of un-partioned Punjab was named as Haryana. Could it be the awareness of the people about their distinct language and identity? And if it stands true then why the status of Haryanvi language has been a matter of debate till date? Why has the state allowed to club itself as the Hindi speaking zone shadowing the already fragile existence of Haryanvi language? Can it be termed as state apathy or the indifference of the literati of Haryana?

Even though we come across a huge compendium of literature written in Haryanvi-folk songs, ‘Raginies’, folk narratives, folk dramas or ‘Sangs’, films, theater yet one still encounters balls of controversy regarding its identity and independent status! If the culture of this place has a distinct flavour of separtedness something indigenous of its own, that they claimed to have while voicing their disapproval in merging with other states, then why no serious attempt has not been taken up by the literati of this state till date?

Thirdly, the onset of urbanization has led to the disappearance of many indigenous Haryanvi words as the culture of the state has been primarily agrarian. Of late, either Hindi or a simpler Haryanvi has emerged as the shared language of communication.

Further, I would discuss broadly its various dialects and regional distribution of dialects. I would like to admit that the literati of Haryanvi have not really focused on the grammar of the language though it has a well developed language and culture.

Broadly, there are six dialects spoken in entire state of Haryana.

-Bagru—it is spoken in the regions of Hissar, Jind, Rohtak, Sonepat, Panipat, Karnal, Sirsa

-.Kaurvi—is spoken in Kurukshetra, Thanesar, Ambala, Yamunanagar

-Ahirvati is spoken in Rewari, Kosali, Mohiindergarh, Narnaul, Pataudi, Jhajjar
- Braj is spoken in Hoddal, Palwal, Ballabhgarh

- Mewati is spoken in Mewat region

After going into practice of translating these folknarratives, I would recapitulate some important aspects in theorizing translation based on my experience like what is translation, the various types and techniques in the process of translation, the question of authenticity of the translated piece and why is there any need for translating a piece in one language into a different language.

Translation is an act of presenting a text in a language other than the one in which it was originally written, in order to convey the meaning of the original text. Translation is a highly goal-oriented activity in which a translator modifies his/her technique as well as the end-product according to the needs of the user. This modification according to the needs gives rise to various types of translation like literal translation, conceptual translation, or abridged translation.

The need for translation arises when a person wishes to know something written in a language which he or she does not understand. This is the need of a reader. Alternatively, a writer might like to communicate something to persons who do not know his/her language. This is the need of the writer.

In this context, I have translated for people who are natives as well as non-natives. In either case, the lack of knowledge is a barrier to communication. Translation serves as a bridge in overcoming this barrier.

It is generally believed that an ideal translation must reproduce the full sense of the original text, omitting nothing, adding nothing. Any deviation from this norm is considered something else but not translation. This is a kind of purist approach in translation where the emphasis is on exact equivalence and on taking care of each word in the original.

Further it is also expected that a translation should not ignore the style of the original. To be able to communicate the meaning of the original text in a style similar to the original text makes translation quite a challenging test. For example, if we are translating from Haryanvi to English or vice versa, we find that the structure of both the languages is quite different. So how do we transfer the meaning in a style similar to that of the original? But there are translations which fulfill this criterion excellently. In fact, these translations also
make excellent independent reading. It is also believed that a good translation should not read like a translation at all, but seem like an original text.

To be able to fulfill this tall order, a translator has to have, to begin with, an excellent knowledge of the language from which the translation is being made. S/he must fully understand its nuances and finer aspects. A translator ought to have equal facility in the language into which s/he is translating. S/he should be able to express all the ideas of the original writer from one language to another.

There is a need to distinguish between the language from which a translation is being made and the language into which the translation is being made with the help of two technical terms. The language from which the translation is being made is called source language (SL), Haryanvi in this context and the language into which the translation is being made is called target language or receptor language (TL), English in this case.

If a translation adequately communication the message of the original and is presented in a style similar to the original, it is expected that it will make an impression on its readers which is similar to the impression made by the original on its reader. Finally, a translator may often have to make necessary adjustments in the form, content and style of the original text keeping in mind the objective of conveying the message faithfully. Additionally, S/he may have to make more such adjustments keeping in view the nature, competence and the needs of the readers.

The encounter between two languages and hence culture is fraught with danger. Unless the status between the Haryanvi language and the English language was recognized as being equal a degree of misrepresentation was bound to occur. In 1857, Edward Fitzgerald wrote the following in a letter to his friend E.B. Cowell on his translation of the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayaam: “It is an amusement to me to take what liberties I like with these Persians, who, (as I think) are not poets enough to frighten one from such excursions, and who really do want a little Art to shape them”. 6 With such an attitude to the source language and its culture one seriously wonders if justice was done to the original text. Yet Fitzgerald’s translation was immensely successful and vastly popular, and has been translated in all major languages.
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I have translated twelve Haryanvi folk narratives whose title are as follows:

Tale No.1- The story of Guru and Chela. Narrated by Bahadarmal Sharma, aged 70, district Mahendragarh.

Tale No.2- The Engagement of the Chela. Narrated by Ram Pyari, aged 62, district Kurukshetra.

Tale No.3 –The Story of a Priest and Oil Merchant. Narrated by Hari Prakash, aged 40, district Rohatk.

Tale No.4- The Story of a Brahmin and a Jat. Narrated by Gulabodevi, aged 52, district Rewari.

Tale No.5 – The Story of Buffalo. Narrated by Kantadevi, aged 47, district Panipat.

Tale No.6- The Story of Mian Mange. Narrated by Tahir, aged 38, district Mewat.

Tale No.7- The Story of an Untouchable. Narrated by Ramkhilawan, aged 46, district Karnal.

Tale No.8- The Story of Lord Shiva. Narrated by Misri, aged 72, district Sonepat.

Tale No.9- The Story of Bania. Narrated by Vivek, aged 30, district Gurgaon.

Tale No.10 – Tale of Husband and Wife. Narrated by Anmol Kumar, aged 29, district Narnaul.

Tale No.11- Tale of a Raja and Jat. Narrated by Dinesh Kumar, aged 50, district Ambala.


There are two distinct approaches available for the study of translation: The product approach and the process approach. Earlier translation exercise had focused only on the product, the finished translated work. It tried to answer the question: how far has textual material in the SL been replaced by TL equivalents? Nowadays, attention has shifted to the process through which translators produce their work. I have followed the process approach that helped me to understand the mental operations underlying the product, i.e. the translated text.

As a translator, I had to go through a process of decoding, transfer, and recoding. In fact, I had to perform three distinct roles during the act of translation-a) the role of a reader of
the original text of Haryanvi folk narrations, b) the role of the bilingual, in trying to keep the
context of the Haryanvi text intact and finding the exact expression in the English language
and c) the role of a writer of the translated text. This is to say, I had to first decode the
original Haryanvi text in order to grasp and interpret the message as a reader, transfers this
message into its structurally clear forms of a text in the English language as an effective
writer.

The term “decoding” refers to the process involved in arriving at the message coded
in the text to be translated by means of analysis and interpretation. It makes the text
intelligible and comprehensible. While the message of a text is composite whole and the
analysis of a text is a relatively complex activity the translation process provides at least three
different kinds of meaning: a) grammatical, b) connotational and. c) socio-cultural.221

The grammatical meaning refers to the meaning of a linguistic structure. It
emphasizes the relationship between different units of a language. A sentence can be
structurally (grammatically) ambiguous and thus express more than one meaning. In such a
case, one gets the semantic interpretation by relating the ambiguous sentence to different
grammatical structures. A translator has to remember that the ambiguity may be intentional or
deliberate on the part of the original teller. In such a case it is the job of the translator to
reproduce it. In cases where no structurally equivalent ambiguous structure is available in the
target language, she/he may explain the original.

The connotative meaning emphasizes the relationship between language and the
mental state of the speaker. It brings a meaning different from that of the referential content
of expression.

The socio-cultural meaning emphasizes the relationship between language and socio
cultural assumptions which lie behind any use and usage of a verbal expression.

In decoding I was concerned with different kinds of meanings. I was ,however, not
concerned with theoretical problems of semantics and mainly concerned with the
comprehension of the whole or part of the text in all its dimensions. Furthermore, as a

practitioner, I had to decide which of the different varieties of meaning have to be taken account of.

The term ‘transfer’ refers to the process involved in the transmission of the message (receive after decoding the SL-text) into the other language (TL). It requires ‘bilingual competence’ i.e., ability to understand and articulate the same message in two languages. In order to understand the process of message transference, the following facts of language must be kept in mind:

a) There is no one-to-one relationship between the grammatical and lexical units of two languages (i.e. SL and TL).

b) The grammatical and lexical structure of each language carries with it its own particular meaning.\(^{222}\)

It is because of the above two facts that I was not able to either carry-over or implant Haryanvi meanings into the English text. The following methods helped me to get over the situation:

i) Creating communicative values in the TL-text equivalent to the communicative values of the message set up in the SL-text.

ii) Preserving the invariant information of the SL text in the TL-text.\(^{223}\)

These tales could be best translated when the “communicative value” of their expressions is first understood in the Haryanvi language and the “functional equivalents” of their message is set up in the English language.

In transferring the referential content to the message, I had been concerned primarily with the structure for information. “Words and other linguistic units serve merely as vehicles for carrying the components of information”.\(^{224}\) In the transfer process the information component of the message was generally redistributed in the English Language.

\(^{222}\) Anuvad, New Delhi: Bhartiya Anuvad Parishad.

\(^{223}\) James, S, Holmes. Approaches to Translation Studies (Assen: Van Gorcum).

The following types of redistribution can be seen\textsuperscript{225}:

Complete Redistribution: This is the type in which the referential content of the message of the SL expression is completely redistributed.

Analytical Redistribution: This is the type in which the referential content of one lexical unit of the SL is redistributed over several units of the TL.

Synthetically Redistribution: This is the type in which the referential content spread over several lexical items in the SL is confined to a single item of the TL.

The above examples of the transfer process suggest that the translator does not either carry over or implant SL meanings into the TL-text. In fact, there is 'substitution' of TL meanings for SL meanings. However, transference of meaning, from one language to another is also possible. Thus, the transfer process covers in its orbit instances of 'functional substitution'\textsuperscript{226}, meaning transfer and total transfer of a linguistic unit.

The transfer process is variously named by different theorists of translation. Some have called it 'substitution process', some as 'inter-lingual transposition', and yet some as 'semiotic transformation.' Those involved with translation of literary texts view it is 'transcription.'

When I attempted "recoding" which refers to the process involved in the creation of a text in the TL with a meaning similar to that of the original text, exact translation became impossible. Since exact translation is impossible, recoding is then directed to approximate the SL-text.

The translator as a writer is confronted with at least three dichotomies-

a) The SL and TL cultures.

b) The grammar and lexicon of two languages.


c) The personalities of the two writers or the creator of the original text and the translator's own.  

Based on the relative emphasis on one component or the other of these dichotomies, one finds two major types of translation-semantic and communicative. 

In semantic type of recoding, the bias is in favor of the SL-text and the author of the original text. The translated text is more exact, literal and faithful to the original. It attempts to render it as close as the semantic and grammatical structures of the TL allow. It also tries to represent the elements of the original culture. 

In communicative type of recoding, the bias is in favor of the TL and readers of the translated text. The translation is relatively free, idiomatic and natural. An attempt is made to produce on the reader an effect as close as possible to that produced on the reader of the original. It emphasizes the communicative intent of the text in transparent style. 

The following are the three preconditions that helped to in making the recoding more functional- 

a) respect for the communicative intent of the original text , 

b) preserving the basic design purposive role or the original text, and 

c) rendering in a language and style communicable to identified readers. 

These were the broad guiding factors for me while I performed the role of a writer. The creation of a text is always directed towards the reader. The translator must render the SL text in such a way that apart from corresponding to the SL text, the translation should read like a contemporary piece of the translator (and not of the original). Amongst the range of TL expressions available, a translator tends to select the one which closely approximates to the original in referential content and is easily communicable to its readers. 


229 ibid
There are three distinct ways of making some cultural terms specific to the SL communicable to the readers for the TL. 230

Approximate expression in TL.

Expanded expression in TL.

Loan word (with foot-note).

When a reader is expected to be familiar with the socio-cultural dimensions of the meaning of text, the Approximate expression will be good enough. But if the reader is to be imparted such information the translator will opt for either Expanded expression or Loan word (with foot-note).

After the translation I tried to assess the truth-value or authenticity of that translation. Firstly, I checked whether all the important information has been communicated. Secondly, it was made sure that rewritten text did not violate any rules of grammar and usage. Lastly, it was checked whether some Para-linguistic feature-the general context, tone of the narrative, the intention and the overall communicative function of the text have been taken care of. If all the above has been satisfactorily effected, the translation will be said to have ‘truth-value’ and authenticity.

Authenticity or truth value of translation then is mainly a matter of the writer’s original intention and how effectively it gets communicated to the reader through translation. The translator’s job is too challenging if the text is literary. Perceptions and attitudes, though realized through the use of words and sentences in one language, may fail to find their exact equivalents in another language without losing part of their original or intended impact.

But it should not discourage us as potential practitioners of the art of translation. Patience and practice are other key words. In translation, one produces the closest possible natural equivalent in the translated text (TL) to the message of the original text (SL). The translator usually does so by way of creating a text for a group of readers whose language and culture differ from those of the writer and readers of the original text. This difference in

language and culture creates a serious problem for a translator. Why? Because on the one hand s/he has to take into account the form and the content of the original text (SL) and on the other, the entire system of communicative features associated with the language of the translated text (TL).

The principle of equivalence is primarily based on the basic assumption that identical structures cannot exist between two languages.

There are no exact correspondences between related linguistic items across languages, it is rather impossible to find a one-to-one correspondence between the vocabulary, grammar, style etc. of two languages. Yet each language has the potential to communicate the message that has been expressed it some other language. It is this potential of expressing the same message across languages having differing vocabulary and grammar that is exploited by a translator. Do we translate languages? No, one does not translate languages. "What one translates, is in fact, a text produced in a language. All texts are verbal sign. A verbal sign is a unity of content (meaning) and expression (medium). Translation involves producing in the TL a text equivalent to the original first, in terms of message and meaning and second in terms of expression and stylistic devices." 231

The concept of equivalence is a complex one. It has many facets. Each faced poses its own set of problems for a translator 232 such as:

a) Problem of translational equivalence.

b) Problem of loss of information and gain in meaning.

c) Problem of untranslatability.

d) Strategies for resolving the problems of untranslatability.

Since the translation-act is performed in only one direction i.e. from SL to TL and from the original text into the production of the translated text, the translation process is


characterized as a unidirectional. This unidirectionality also imposes constraints on the production process. "A translated text is not produced; instead, it is reproduced".  

To reproduce something means to make a fairly accurate copy of it. This is neither possible nor is it desirable in the field of translation because of many other factors, such as:

(changes in the medium of expression which has its own vocabulary, grammar, culture and literary conventions;

-use of interpretation i.e. a translated text is not simply produced mechanically. Rather it is an outcome of reading the original text which involves comprehension and interpretation;

-intervention of the translator's personality and the requirements of readers i.e. each translator has his/her own set of readers for whose consumption the translated text is reproduced.

It is obvious from the above that in reproducing a text, a translator is not merely changing the outward appearance of a verbal object (text). Yet a translator is supposed to reproduce a text which in form and content is similar to the original text. Is this similarity which infuses a sense of identity between two dissimilar objects in a bilingual reader? It would be interesting to find out: What makes it to establish identity between to non-identical texts (SL and TL)? Answers to these questions rest on the principle of equivalence. The concept of 'equivalence' is crucial to the process of reproduction involved in translation.

A text is said to be reproduced in the TL through translation when it serves as a natural equivalent to the form and content of the original text.

What does equivalence mean? Does is mean 'identical'? No 'equivalent' does not mean 'identical'. Two or more things are said to be identical when they are exactly the same in every detail. "The phenomenon of equivalence can occur between two non-identical objects when they show similarity in respect of size, function or value. Verbal objects (a word, sentence and text) can be said to possess properties of size, function and value. Their size can be measured either in terms of the numbers of syllables (or syllabic weight), words or sentences. Their functional properties can be explained in terms of semantic and..." 

---

grammatical features. Value of verbal objects can be ascertained in terms of their communicative significance.\textsuperscript{234}

Two verbal objects are said to be equivalent in meaning when they show similarity in semantic representation. Synonymous expressions of a language are true examples of equivalence is meaning. Two verbal objects are said to be equivalent in grammar they show similarity in structural (functional) organization. Two verbal objects are said to be equivalent in communicative value when they show similarity in the function of the message conveyed in a specified situation.

In the “translational equivalence”, there are two languages (SL and TL) and two texts (original and translated) involved in the process. “A translational equivalent is a TL text that has the same size, representation (grammatical or semantic), and/or communicative value as the SL-text”.\textsuperscript{235}

The term “translational equivalence” is an empirical phenomenon. It is discovered by comparing original and translated texts. It is rare to find a translational equivalence in TL that has the same property as the original SL-text in every aspect i.e. size, function and communicative value. One can however, establish formal correspondence between the two texts on any one level of language organization.

The “formal correspondence” approach fails to consider the “text” as an organic whole. It also fails to set-up any hierarchy (i.e. priority) amongst various feature involved in establishing equivalence i.e. priority order between size grammatical structure, semantic representation and communicative value.

It is within the overall perspective of linguistic theory and translation practice that the principle of equivalence and its problems can be best understood and identified if one moves step by step from the conceptual to the operational aspect of the “principle of equivalence” and the notion of “translational equivalence”.

1) Translation consists in producing translational equivalence (TL-text) to the original (SL-text). This means that the TL-text as a whole should be made equivalent to the SL-text.

\textsuperscript{234} E.A. Nida and Charles R. Taber, \textit{The Theory and Practice of Translation} (Leiden: E.J.Bill, 1974).

2) Being a verbal sign, text have two interlocking aspects: content (meaning and message) and expression (means and medium). Content is what a text as a verbal sign denotes and conveys (i.e.) and expression is the denoter. Translation is made possible on account of the twofold relation of content i.e. two expression as carrier of the same content.

3) Meaning is a property of a language and therefore it is closely tied up with its verbal signs. It cannot be transferred from one language to another. Meaning being specific to a language is also closely related to its expression cannot be made a common property of two verbal signs belonging to two languages (SL and TL).

4) In translation an attempt is made to make the closest possible equivalence to elements belonging to both the expression and content aspect of the original text. But in cases of conflict it is the content aspect which gets priority over expression. In translation, their value can be changed provided this change is directed to achieving its goal i.e. equivalence in meaning.

No two languages are exactly similar in their vocabulary and grammar. It is this non-similarity between two languages which is the root cause for loose and gain in the translation process. One can make two expressions belonging to two languages equivalent on the basis of grammatical function, semantic representation or communicative value. Even so there are many other facets of the expression which are either lost or their distinctions leveled in the process of translation.

Loss (of information) is the result of under-translation. It takes place when the translational equivalent refers to the generalize concept of the message of the original text. The more the message is generalized, the more is the loss in information content. Some of the ways by which the meaning and message of a verbal sign can be generalized:

Synonyms have the same the nearly the same cognitive meaning. One should remember that in a language absolute synonyms are rare. Synonyms may refer to the same object or action, but as an independent word they may specify something more than its core or cognitive meaning. Words have different kinds of meaning. When the meaning is centered around the intellectual or structurally functional aspect of an expression, it is called cognitive. Contrary to this, when it is associated with interpersonal relations, socio situations or cultural values, it is referred to as social meaning.236

Loss takes place in the translation when expressions of SL having socio-cultural meaning are replaced by words in TL that fail to indicate such a meanings. There are many socio-cultural events which are performed by members of one speech community in one way and by members of another speech community in a different way. In order to avoid transposing the cultural details of the TL on the translated text, a translator often reproduces the concept in a more generalized frame of reference.

Gain (in information and style) is the result of over-translation. It takes place when the translational equivalence refers to a more specific aspect of the original message. The more the message is made particularistic, the more is the gain in information content. The phenomenon of 'gain' in translation can be viewed from an entirely different perspective. A shift in the translated object can enhance its quality since the translator can at times enrich or clarify. Polysemous words also have a similar characteristic—they add to the imprecision but facilitate communication efficiency.

The concept of “loss and gain” can be viewed in terms of the semantic range of verbal objects. “Two words belonging to two languages (SL and TL) may refer to the same referential object, but they still differ in the semantic range that they cover or in the implicit meaning that they suggest.” 237

Translation is communication of a special kind. By means of translation one communicates information about the relevant objects contained in the original text. A translator creates a parallel text. This new text is produced in and through a language (TL) which is different in its organizational power of representing linguistic and extra-linguistic reality. By “untranslatability” it means:238

a) Linguistic and non-linguistic elements of the original text (SL) which are absent from the target language and culture (TL).

b) Non-communication of the information about the functionally relevant elements of the original text to the reader of the translated text.

---


Linguistic Untranslatability

One may find items concerning natural ecology like flora and fauna, and material culture like dress, food, utensils etc. present in the living conditions of the users of one language (SL) but missing from the conditions of living of some other language (TL). Words referring to such items become untranslatable.239

Ambiguity created intentionally in the original text by means of polysemous words is another instance of lexical untranslatability.

Cultural untranslatability

Language and culture are inextricably interwoven. It is difficult to isolate one from the other. one may find in one language situational features that are functionally relevant to the cultural artifact of its society. Cultural untranslatability occurs in cases when cultural features functionally significant for the SL text are completely absent from the culture of which the TL is a part. It deals with cultural values of an artifact, social institutions specific to a given culture, religious practices, customs, traditions etc

Here are various methods to solve the problem of untranslatability.

Periphrasis (Circumlocution or roundabout way of speaking)240

By adopting this strategy a translator tries to convey some of the information of the source culture in the TL by way of rewording the untranslatable expressions.

Loan translation

This is the strategy by which a translator conveys from, style and meaning of the original expression by adopting word-for-word or literal translation. While such a strategy makes the translation faithful to the SL, it creates an awkward style in the TL.

Substitution

This is the strategy adopted by a translator in reader-oriented communicative translation. It aims at replacing the untranslatable items by the nearest possible expressions available in the TA. A lot of information is thus lost in the translation process.

Expressive Creation

In this strategy the translator’s ingenuity is involved in making statements of meaning involved in untranslatable items in order to show the values with which people of the source culture live. A flow of culturally motivated semantic features from Haryanvi and other India languages into English through this strategy has nativized English in a substantial way.

It is true that the substitution strategy makes the translated text smoother, clearer and more direct, but it fails to give any kind of socio-cultural information of the SL to its readers. Contrary to this, borrowing and loan-translation strategies fill the cultural and lexical gaps but make the TL text more concentrated and less fluent in comprehension. "The periphrasis strategy creatively employed by a translator or expressive creativity duly contextualized can serve as a golden-mean between totally literal and exclusively free types of translation".241

I come to conclude from where I began. The politics and the poetics of translation are becoming more pointed and pronounced with each passing day. As a post colonial translator of Haryanvi folk narrative into English my duty has been to perform a balancing act between language and culture. On being awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1992, Derek Walcott gave a moving speech about the people in whose name, he said, he stood. Referring to the consoling pity with which the Antilles, his homeland, have typically been regarded by travellers, Walcott offered an unyieldingly critical statement about the kind of intercultural translation that specializes in melancholia—and that, ultimately, leads to the denial of every cultural endeavor undertaken by the formerly colonized that has to be belittled as berated, as mere imitation. Walcott’s remarks seem especially perspicacious in light of our foregoing discussion. To conclude, let me cite a part of them:

These travellers carried with them the infection of their own malaise, and their prose reduced even the landscape to melancholia and self-contempt.