CHAPTER II

Locating Translation and Self-translation:
Practice, Theories, and Debates

Self-translation as a domain of academic inquiry is in its nascent phase and it is important to make translation studies accommodate the concerns raised about translation theory within in its domain. And in order to locate and establish the distinctness of self-translation, it is important to understand translation. This chapter, therefore, tries to understand the history, practices, theory and debates within translation studies and then discusses self-translation against this backdrop.

Etymology of Translation

According to Harper, the word “translate” comes from two Latin words, namely, “trans” meaning “across, over or beyond” which itself is believed to have come from “Imre” meaning “to cross” and “lotus” meaning “borne or carried”. This gave rise to the meaning of “translate” as “to remove from one place to another” in the fourteenth-century CE. In the mid-fourteenth century, “translation” was understood as a “work turned from one language to another” (Harper).

Translation in medieval English usage meant exhuming the body and burying it in another place (Trivedi 8). This becomes a metaphor for translation, where the code could be seen as the mud that needs to be dug out to reach the body which is the message and that message is taken out and buried in another ‘place’ or is encoded. But the metaphor also suggests that if what is translated is the message, then the translated message has materiality as it is equated with the body. However, it signifies lifelessness.
as well. It also leads to the question whether translation is merely a process of transferring meaning.

It is important to note that for the act of transferring text/meaning across two different media there are two different words in English. The word “translator” refers largely to someone working in the context of print medium. But where the translation is done orally, the person is referred to as an interpreter. Chesterton claims that English “conceptualize[s] written translation differently from oral translation” (7). Many Indian languages too have two different terms for print and oral translation. In Kannada, for example, the common term for a print translator is bhasantarakara whereas an oral translator is called dubhasi. Words similar to those of Kannada exist in many other Indo-European and Dravidian languages to refer to these two distinct linguistic acts.

In this thesis the focus is on a particular type of cultural and linguistic act of transferring meaning across languages in print medium. Therefore, the thesis engages with the word “translation”.

The Concept of Translation

In linguistics in the European tradition, translation has been predominantly understood as a process of decoding a source text (ST) and encoding it in a target text (TT). Such an encoding could be in the same language, another language or another medium in the same language or another medium in another language. Within linguistics all these transformations of the original text are treated as translations. Jakobson gives a useful framework to understand translation (138). He categorises translation into intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic translations.
“Intra-lingual translation or rewording is an interpretation of verbal sign by means of other signs of the same language (138). For example, converting a short story into a play or a poem into a prose piece would constitute intralingual translation. “Interlingual translation or translation proper is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language” (138). For example, the translation of a play from Kannada into English would qualify as interlingual translation. “Intersemiotic translation or transmutation is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign system” (138). Nagabharana’s film Naga-Mandala would qualify as an example for intersemiotic translation. Despite this categorisation, the dominant debates on translation have been around interlingual translations, to the point that they almost assume that the only translation that exists is interlingual translation.

However, there are challenges put forth to such an understanding. Scholars have argued that reading is also translation. Spivak in her “Politics of Translation” argues that translation is an intimate act of reading (370-381). This view is similar to Barthes’ view that the reader is a producer of text (“The Death of the Author”; “From Work to Text”). There are also writers like Nancy Huston who have argued that writing is also translation as it involves decoding the writer’s thought and encoding it in the medium of script (qtd. in Sigrist 199). Laura Vena takes this idea even further when she argues, “Every work of art is an act of translation”. There have also been arguments that look at translation as representation, since representation is recasting the messages of a particular code in another code of the same or some other medium (Lewis 264; Baker and Saldanha 181; Uchiyama 63; Xianbin).
Andrew Chesterton in his “Interpreting the Meaning of Translation” inquires whether translation is a universal category (3). With the help of a survey of various languages across continents, he argues that “the notion of translation has been interpreted in different ways in a number of different languages . . . [and] that not all these interpretations give the same priority to the preservation of sameness which characterizes the words denoting ‘translation’ in many modern Indo-European languages.” He concludes that translation is perhaps not a single “prototype concept” but a “cluster concept” (10).

Two observations can be made on Chesterton’s analysis. First, he takes note of the contemporary usages of words that refer to translation. But most of these words were imported into the languages he is referring to due to colonialism. Hence, the similarities or dissimilarities that he sees need to be historicised in order to make more concrete claims. Second, he looks at the terms for translation in various languages within the print culture. Even when he refers to the oral mode, he does not realise that the oral too gets shaped by the print culture. The notes made by this researcher show that in day-to-day non-state, non-trade oral contexts the terms “translator” and “interpreter” are not used frequently. Instead, the common word used for translation is “say” explaining translation in a context, as in what the other person has said in another language this person will “say” in this particular language. Chesterton misses such nuances of the usages of the terms referring to translation.

Due to the emphasis on literary translations, scholars have not looked at other domains where translation activity has been taking place. Social and natural sciences have been engaged in translating almost all their theories from English and some of the
other dominant European languages like French and German to the native languages. However, the kind of concerns raised within literary translation studies like faithfulness, interpretation differences, translatability and politics are almost completely absent in these domains.

Translation Practices

Translation practice in Europe has been traced to the pre-Cicero and Horace era the in Roman period, where translation took place from Greek to Roman (Malmkjser 1). If this is the first major instance of transition, the second significant instance occurred during the Renaissance which attempted Bible translations into German and English (3). The third instance occurred due to colonial interaction that necessitated translating works from non-European languages into European languages, and vice versa. This coincided with the rise of nation-states in Europe. The fourth instance could be located in the post-World War and Globalising world.

Each of these instances has significantly differed from its previous ones in terms of the type of texts translated and the language from and to which translation was done. In the first instance, according to Kelly, the texts the Romans translated were predominantly literary and philosophical and the translation took place from Greek to Latin (qtd. in Malmkjser 2). The second instance was of the Vernacular Bible translations from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries. While the type of text was religious, the languages involved in translation became diverse. The source languages remained Latin, Greek and Hebrew while the target languages were English and German. The third instance of translation in Europe, namely, colonialism, brought about shifts not only in texts and languages but also in its locations of translation activities.
Latin, Greek and Hebrew which acted as source languages lost their position to European languages, predominantly to English, from which texts—literary, philosophical, scientific, legal and religious—were translated to languages of the colonies. However, in this instance there were also reverse translations, especially from languages like Sanskrit and Persian from where texts were translated to dominant languages like English and German. Sir William Jones’ *Sacontcila or The Fatal Ring: An Indian Drama by Cdlidds* in 1789 and Friedrich Max Muller’s *Sacred Books of the East*, published from 1879 to 1910, are some of the prominent.

The World Wars and later globalisation which brought different languages and cultures together in conflict or collaboration also caused greater diversity in terms of source languages and target languages in translation. Bielsa and Bassnett argue that “The asymmetries of globalization and the current inequalities in the production of knowledge and information are directly mirrored in translation” (28). They point to “the number of book translations from English and into English as an indication of the power distribution in global information flows, where those at the core do the transmission and those at the periphery merely receive it” (28).

While it is common in Europe and North-American translation theories to trace translation to the Romans, there were, as Malmkjaer rightly points out, translations happening in other parts of the world much before the translation records extant among the Romans. He refers to the study of Hung and Pollard showing the presence of government officials appointed for translations during Zhou Dynasty in China in the ninth century BCE. In the Indian subcontinent, the earliest translations can be traced back to the fourth century BCE (Malmkjaer 1-2).
Translation Theories

George Steiner in his *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* divides the literature on the theory, practice, and history of translation into four periods (236). He traces the first period from statements of Cicero and Horace from around 46 BCE to the publication of Alexander Fraser Tytler’s *Essay on the Principles of Translation* in 1791. Some of the important translators of this period were Cicero, Horace, Luther, Jonson, and Dryden. According to Steiner, much of the discussions of this period spring from the practice of translation and revolve around particular texts.

The second period continues till the publication of Larbaud’s *Sous l’invocation de Saint Je’rome* in 1946. It is also characterised as a period of theory and hermeneutic enquiry with the development of a vocabulary and methodology to approach translation. The period that begins with Schleiermacher continues with Schlegel and Humboldt. Goethe, Howar, Croce, Arnold, Valery, Pound, I. A. Richards, and Benjamin, some of the prominent figures of this phase.

The beginning of the third period is identified with the publication of papers on machine translation in 1940s. The period is characterised by the introduction of structural linguistics and communication theory into the study of translation. Steiner recognises Andrzej Fedorom’s *Introduction to the Theory of Translation* as the representative text of this period.

The fourth period coexists with the third and has its origins in the early 1960s. It is characterised by “a reversion to hermeneutic, almost metaphysical inquiries, into translation and interpretation” (238). Steiner sees translation becoming a sort of contact point between the newly developing systems of knowledge and the old systems.
According to him, “Classical philology and comparative literature, lexical statistics and ethnography, the sociology of class-speech formal rhetoric, poetics, and the study of grammar are combined in an attempt to clarify the act of translation and the process of ‘life between languages’” (250-51).

Steiner talks about these four periods to understand the history of translation theories. However, Bassnett, although she finds these periods “interesting and perceptive,” feels that they “illustrate the difficulty of studying translation diachronically” (46). According to her, if the first period spans over 1700 years, the last two periods cover just thirty years. She argues that it is not possible to categorise certain theories into specific historical periods. She draws our attention to the fact that the characteristics of the first period are still apparent today “in the body of work arising from the observations and polemics of the individual translator” (46).

Differing with Steiner, Bassnett identifies different models of translation in Europe (48-78). One model is that of the Romans. Cicero and Horace are the two most important thinkers here and their model influenced the translation scenario for the next two thousand years. They discussed translation in the contexts of two important functions of a poet— human duty to spread proper reasoning and artistic ability to create poetry.

In Bible translations, Bassnett sees a second model of translation. According to her, the history of the Bible translation contains the entire history of the European culture. In CE 384 St Jerome translated the New Testament to Latin which had a deep impact on the future translators. With Renaissance, Bible translations took an interesting turn as they became an integral part of the socio-political changes in Europe.
Since the political agenda of the Bible translations was to reach the complex text of the Bible to all the people, it helped the translators take certain definite stands regarding translations. The advent of printing technology gave a new dimension to translation. Gradually, multiple translations come into place improvising and revising the previous translations.

Bassnett talks about the aims of sixteenth-century Bible translations in three categories:

1. To clarify errors arising from previous versions, due to inadequate SL manuscripts or to linguistic incompetence.
2. To produce an accessible and aesthetically satisfying vernacular style.
3. To clarify points of dogma and reduce the extent to which the scriptures were interpreted and re-presented to the lay people as the metatext. (49)

According to Edmond Cary, in France, the Renaissance was a period of “dispute between translators” (qtd. in Bassnett 55). Bassnett clarifies that according to him translation was inextricably related both to state affairs and religion. Steiner also sees a seminal role played by translation in Renaissance Europe. In this period translation grew amidst the fear of systemic collapse and shocking inventions. It created a logical connection between nationalism and religious conflict, past and present, and between different languages and traditions. It shaped the intellectual life of people of the period.

Bassnett observes that in the middle of the seventeenth century the effects of the Counter-Reformation, the conflict between absolute monarchy and the developing
Parliamentary system, and the widening of the gap between traditional Christian Humanism and science led to radical changes in the theory of literature and also in the role of translation. In the eighteenth century, according to Bassnett, the moral duty of the translator to his reader was emphasised. She argues that this dimension underwrites Dryden’s and Pope’s concept of translation. Translation theory during this period was primarily concerned with re-creating the essential spirit, soul, or nature of the work of art. However, the widespread eighteenth-century concept of the translator as painter or imitator with a moral duty both to his original subject and to his receiver did undergo a change. In the succeeding period, however, the discussions shifted towards imagination.

Bassnett observed that European Romanticism introduced new ways of thinking both in literature and translation. Rationalism was replaced by imagination. This gave emphasis to the “individual poet’s world-vision as both a metaphysical and a revolutionary ideal” (68). The affirmation of individualism stressed the notion of the freedom of the creative force which made the poet into a quasi-mystical creator, whose function, as Shelley put it in his *The Defence of Poetry*, was to create poetry that would create “anew the universe” (Shelley 104). While the purpose of literary creation was being redefined, in Europe, especially in England and Germany, a lot of questions were raised regarding the definition of translation. August Wilhelm Schlegel even said that all acts of speaking and writing were acts of translation as the nature of communication was to decode and interpret messages received. He conceived of translation as a category of thought rather than as an activity connected only with language or literature.

According to Bassnett the ideal of a great shaping spirit that transcended the everyday world and recreated the universe led to the re-evaluation of the poet’s role in
time, and to an emphasis on the rediscovery of the great writers of the past who shared a common sense of creativity. Such a notion, she says, led to the large inter-traffic of translations of critical works and of contemporary writings across the European languages. The large volume of translation in this period shifted the focus from the process of translation to the influences of translations on the target culture. However, two notions about translators still remained: one, that the translator is a creative genius in touch with the creative spirit of the original creator and the other in terms of a mechanical function of ‘making known’ a text or author (65).

According to Bassnett, Timothy Webb Shelly, an important theorist of the spirit of Romanticism, saw translation as an activity, as a “way of filling in the gaps between inspirations” (66). She points out that Shelley preferred translation that was admired for literary graces rather than for ideas. Bassnett mentions that with the shift of emphasis away from the formal processes of translation the notion of translatability to an exaggerated emphasis on technical accuracy and the resulting pedantry of later nineteenth-century translations.

Bassnett points out that Schleiermacher proposed the creation of a separate sub-language for use only in translated literature. But Dante Gabriel Rossetti declared that the translator should be subservient to the forms and language of the original. Schleiermacher’s call for a separate language for translation was shared by a number of nineteenth-century English translators like F. W. Newman, Carlyle and Morris. Newman proclaimed that the translator should retain the uniqueness of the original wherever possible.
Morris, who had translated a large number of texts from Greek and old French, tried to retain the peculiarity of the original and received a lot of critical acclaim. But his translations made no concessions to the readers. The reader was expected to deal with the work on its own terms in spite of the strangeness of the target language, and the foreignness of the society that produced the originally text.

Bassnett observes, “The need to convey the remoteness of the original in time and place is a recurrent concern of Victorian translators” (71). For example, Carlyle used elaborate Germanic structures in his translations and expressed that one needs to respect and imitate the spirit of the text and the spirit of the nation that produced it. Rossetti, in his Preface to his translations from early Italian poets observes “The only true motive for putting poetry into a fresh language must be to endow a fresh nation, as far as possible, with one more possession of beauty” (71). Bassnett sees an interesting paradox coming out of this “Schleiermacher-Carlyle-Pre-Raphaelite concept of translation” (68). On the one hand there is “immense respect... for the original” where the worth of the source text is decided by the individual writer (68). Here translation becomes an activity where the translator invites like-minded readers to share his aesthetic experience. On the other hand because they produced archaic translations only a tiny minority was able to access them, thereby rejecting the ideal of “universal literacy”. Bassnett argues that this paradox laid the foundations for the notion of translation as a minority interest.

Matthew Arnold, in his lecture On Translating Homer, advises the lay reader to put his trust in scholars, for, according to him, they alone can say whether the translation produces more or less the same effect as the original. He observes:
Let not the translator, then, trust to his notions of what the ancient Greeks would have thought of him; he will lose himself in the vague. Let him not trust what the ordinary English reader thinks of him; he will be taking the blind for his guide. Let him not trust to his own judgement of his own work; he may be misled by individual caprices. Let him ask how his work affects those who both know Greek and can appreciate poetry.

(72)

For Arnold, the target language reader must be brought to the source language text through the means of translation. Bassnett says that with the hardening of nationalistic lines and the growth of pride in a national culture, French, English or German translators, for example, no longer saw translation as a prime means of enriching their own culture. The elitist concept of culture and education embodied in this attitude was, ironically, to assist in the devaluation of translation. For, if translation were perceived as an instrument of bringing the target language reader to the source language text in the original, then, excellence of style and the translator’s own ability to write were clearly of less importance. H. W. Longfellow gave a new dimension to the question of the role of the translator wherein he restricted the translator’s function even more than that of Arnold. In his translation of Divina Comedia he defends his translation in blank verse and declares:

The only merit my book has is that it is exactly what Dante says, and not what the translator imagines he might have said if he had been an Englishman. In other words, while making it rhythmic, I have endeavoured to make it also as literal as a prose translation. In
translating Dante, something must be relinquished. Shall it be the beautiful rhyme that blossoms all along the line like a honeysuckle on the hedge? It must be, in order to retain something more precious than rhyme, namely, fidelity, truth, - the life of the hedge itself . . . . The business of a translator is to report what the author says, not to explain what he means; that is the work of the commentator. What an author says and how he says it, that is the problem of the translator. (73)

In Longfellow’s discussion, the translator is relegated to the position of a technician, neither poet nor commentator, with a clearly defined but severely limited task. In contrast to Longfellow, Edward Fitzgerald, best known for his version of The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam, declared that a text must live at all costs “with a transfusion of one’s own worst Life if one can’t retain the Original’s better” (qtd. in Bassnett 70). He is also famously known for his remark that it were better to have a live sparrow than a stuffed eagle. In other words, instead of attempting to lead the target language reader to the source language original, Fitzgerald’s work seeks to bring a version of the source language text into the target language and its culture as a living entity.

Bassnett classifies the main currents of translation typology from the age of industrial capitalism and colonial expansion up to World War I in the following manner:

1. Translation as a scholar’s activity, where the pre-eminence of the SL test is assumed de facto over any TL version.
2. Translation as a means of encouraging the intelligent reader to return to the SL original.

3. Translation as a means of helping the TL reader become the equal of what Schleiermacher called the better reader of the original, through a deliberately contrived foreignness in the TL text.

4. Translation as a means through which the translator who sees himself like Aladdin in the enchanted vaults (Rossetti’s imaginative image) offers his own pragmatic choice to the TL reader.

5. Translation as a means through which the translator seeks to upgrade the status of the SL text because it is perceived as being on a lower cultural level. (71)

Of these five categories, the first two make way for literal and pedantic translations. The last two allow the translator to translate the SL text eclectically. The third type of translation tends to produce translation filled with archaisms of form and language.

According to J. M. Cohen, the theory of Victorian translation was founded on “a fundamental error” of conveying remoteness of time and place through the use of a mock antique language. But this pedantry and archaizing adopted by many translators only contributed to setting translation apart from other literary activities and to its steady decline in status (24). Cohen feels that the method of translation in which SL text was perceived as the rough clay from which the TL product was moulded enjoyed popular success. But the debate arose as to whether his work was a translation or something else. Although archaizing has gone out of fashion, there were sound
theoretical principles for its adoption by translators. Steiner draws attention to some of the key issues in this discussion:

The proposition ‘the foreign poet would have produced such and such a text had he been writing in my language’ is a projective fabrication. It underwrites the autonomy, more exactly, the ‘meta-autonomy’ of the translation. But it does much more: it introduces an alternate existence, ‘a might have been’ or ‘is yet to come’ into the substance and historical condition of one’s own language, literature and legacy of sensibility. (351)

Bassnett sees the archaizing principle as an attempt to “‘colonize’ the past” (73). She substantiates this point by quoting Borchardt: “The circle of historical exchange of forms between nations closes in that Germany returns to the foreign object what it has learnt from it and freely improves upon” (73).

Although a lot of translation theorists like Cohen, Steiner, and Bassnett have mapped the history of translation theory starting from Horace, their attempts almost end with the nineteenth century. If Steiner ends his second period of translation history in 1946, Cohen’s study of English translators and translations ends sketchily in 1950s. So is that of Bassnett’s. When it comes to the twentieth century, none of them make significant observations about the developments in translation theories. However, Bassnett observes that “much of the discussion in English on translation in theory and practice in the first half of the twentieth century notes the continuation of many of the Victorian concepts of translation - literalness, archaizing, pedantry and the production of a text of second-rate literary merit for an elite minority” (76). But she argues that it
continually returns to the problem of evaluation without a solid theoretical base from which to begin such an investigation. She feels that the increased isolationism of British and American intellectual life, combined with the anti-theoretical developments in literary criticism, did not help to further the scientific examination of translation in English. However, to prove that the first half of the twentieth century was not a “Waste Land of English translation theory.” she cites the works of Ezra Pound, Hilaire Belloc’s Taylorian lecture On Translation given in 1931, and James McFarlane’s article “Modes of Translation” in 1953 (76).

The brief historical outline of translation theory by Cohen, Steiner, and Bassnett makes evident the fact that different concepts of translation prevailed at different times, and that the function and role of translators has radically altered. In Steiner’s words although there is a profusion of pragmatic accounts by individuals, the range of theoretical ideas remains small (Steiner 283).

To understand the developments in the latter half of the twentieth century one needs to turn to Edwin Gentzler who, in his Contemporary Translation Theories (1999), discusses the developments in the second half of the twentieth century in five sections. In the first part he discusses the method of American translation workshops and in the second, the practice of seeing translation as science. The third part dwells on early translation theories and the fourth on polysystem and in the last deconstructionist theories.

**Contemporary Translation Theories**

1960s was the seminal decade that institutionalised the study of translation studies. The impetus for this came from the institutions of higher educations in the
United States, In that decade there were a series of translation workshops that took place in the US. A plethora of translations also took place. A general feeling that translation can be taught began to establish itself. Paul Angel, the director of Creative Writer’s Workshop at Iowa University, invited the overseas writers on the grounds that one could not draw national boundaries to creative writing. National Translation Centre was set up at Texas University with the help of Ford Foundation. In the seventies, a number of other universities across the US introduced courses in translation studies. The translation publishing industry also began to flourish. The political necessity of the socially active translation in the contemporary world began to gain prominence. All this led to the development of alternate value systems and view points. Angel went to the extent of declaring “translate or perish”.

The question of whether it is possible to theorise translation was looming large in the minds of the scholars participating in these workshops. They believed that inspiration, creativity, and insights that one gains in translation were beyond the reach of rational explanation. But gradually questions began to be raised on this position as well.

Gentzler spoke about the influence of I. A. Richards on translation workshops. Richards based his translation models on communication theories which emphasised cognition. According to Pound, a text does not have a definitive meaning. A translation should reconstruct the details, words, and images (including the broken images) of the source. According to him, a translator should bring out the vivacity of the SL and not what one thinks is the meaning of the original. While presenting a theory of translation, Pound sees languages as intertwined networks. For him, words have the power to unite
people, rising above nationalities. In translation theory, one needs to pay attention to not only the historical context of the use of words by the translator but also the multiple impacts the words have in their projection. Pound uses translations effectively to question the literary norms of his time.

In his book *Literature Inside Out* (1966), Frederick Will suggests that translation can be viewed as naming, narrative imagination, and realisation. He argues that even though one may not have a good command over the source language, and does not understand certain parts, the translator can still *grasp* the energy of the original work. According to him, what makes this possible is inspiration. Using Chomskian linguistics, he argues that if one translates from surface structure to surface structure there are possibilities of mistakes and therefore one needs to translate the deep structure that makes possible the surface structure. Since the deep structures of all the languages are similar there is less scope for mistakes and translation becomes relatively easy (Gentzler 24).

In Will’s *The Knife and the Stone*, the last chapter is called “Faithful Traitors”. Since it is the energy that is translated from the source text and not the meaning as such, it is this energy and thrust that carries itself forward from time to time and from culture to culture. Will remarks that it is by being a “traitor” to certain sections of the text that the translator remains faithful to the real meaning of the source text.

In Gentzler’s opinion although the ideas that were shaped by the translation workshops did not produce logical and comprehensive theories, their *greatest* contribution to the field of translation studies lies in raising new questions. Concepts
such as ‘the invisible hand in translation’ and ‘language energy’ became important and translation theories became part of science.

The desire to have a systematic model to study translation and to translate was felt in the 1960s. Linguistics appeared as the best-suited discipline that had the necessary theoretical and linguistic components. At the same time, translation theory was deeply influenced by Chomsky’s linguistic theories and Nida’s theories on language and translation. Nida’s *Towards a Science of Translation* published in 1964 became the Bible for translators, both biblical and literary.

Nida brought in the discussion of culture in the context of transferring new ideas from one language to another. He introduced two key terms in translation—formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. According to Nida, “Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content . . . one is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language” (*Toward a Science of Translating* 159). Dynamic equivalence refers to reproduction in the target situation, the impact that the original message created.

According to Nida, translators should have complete knowledge of the source and should have an emotional bond with the original writers and the ability to recreate their language and style identically. But Gentzler asks as to how it is possible for the translator to get in touch with the source writer’s feelings.

From Translation Theory and Practice to Translation Studies

In the 1980s and 90s the academic field of translation was called Translation Theory and Practice. The title gave it the identity of a skill-based course. While
translation practice was always there, within the universities it was intended to re-shape
practice based on fresh models of translations that emerged within the structures of
university research. However, the rise of postcolonialism and poststructuralism in the
Indian Universities from the early 1990s challenged this model of theory and practice,
and began to show that translation was not merely the reproduction of a text in another
language, but an active agent in the identity formation of a nation, and gender
(Tharakeshwar; Tharu), and complicit and accomplice in the projects of imperialism
and most importantly colonialism. Both these fields claimed that translation always
took shape within certain unequal historical processes and at the same time shaped
those historical processes. This perspective of seeing translation as embedded within
larger historical processes is called translation studies. What postcolonialism and
poststructuralism offered to translation in the form of a suffix, namely, ‘studies,’ was a
‘return gaze’, gazing not from within but without.

Within the Indian academia, the outcome of the ‘turn’ has been that both the
older ways and the newer ways of engaging with translation are coexisting, each not
wanting to significantly challenge the other way of looking at translation. In Karnataka,
if Pradhan Gurudutt with his Bhashantara Kale (The Art of Translation) exists at one
end of the spectrum, Tharakeshwar with his Vasahatuhahi Mattu Bashanthara
(Colonialism and Translation) would be at the other end of the spectrum. Many state
universities in India still offer courses entitled Translation Theory and Practice, while
most central universities like Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, Hyderabad
University, Hyderabad, English and Foreign Languages University, Hyderabad and
Gandhigram Rural Institute—Deemed University, Gandhigram have shifted to the title
Translation Studies. The Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore calls the school engaged in translation as School of Literary, Cultural and Translation Studies.

This split, the resistance to ‘studies’ and embracing of ‘studies’ within academic translation discourse, which Munday identifies as existing between linguistic and cultural theorists, is not only a pan-Indian phenomenon but a Euro-North American one too. Munday draws attention to at least two translation scholars - Bassnett and Lefevere - who have been “scathingly dismissive of those working in linguistics” (190). On the other hand, Gideon Toury has been quite critical of the growing distance between linguistic and cultural approaches to translation suggesting a return to the former, in order to make ‘productive’ contribution to translation practice.

*Early Period of Translation Studies*

In the seventies if there was one model which concerned itself with language, linguistics and scientific models, there was another model which shifted to literary issues rejecting the *former* one. In 1972 James Holmes in his “The Name and Nature of Translation” suggests the appellation “translation studies” to refer to a model that is distinct from translation theories. In his article “Translation: The Focus of the Growth of Literary Knowledge” (1978), Andre Lefevere argued that the two existing models—Hermeneutic and Neo-positivist—suffer from conscious misconceptions. Holmes rejected the ‘equivalence’ concept and tried to give a new terminology to translation studies, hi his “Forms of Verse Translation and the Translation of Verse Form” (1970), drawing upon Barthes’ concept of ‘meta-criticism,’ he argued that translation did not suggest that which the source text denoted.
Scholars from the Netherlands and Belgium demanded that the focus be on translation process and not on translation theory. And they chose an inter-disciplinary approach to translation.

Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Tory from Tel Aviv University put forth the theory of polysystem. They tried to understand all systems inherent in cultural systems from high literature to popular literature. Even-Zohar showed that translated literature is a part of this system. According to him, translated literature performed different functions depending on the strength of the polysystem. He observed that these systems created a hierarchical power within them. He proclaimed that in the writing of any literary history translation played a significant role, which many people do not take note of. According to him, the literary polysystem keeps changing depending on specific situations.

Skopos theory was suggested by Hans J. Vermeer in 1970s. It is a “technical term for the aim or purpose of a translation” (Vermeer 227). Munday claims that the term included “the action of translating” (Munday 78-79). Vermeer's skopos theory or skopostheorie is significant in that it also theorises the translator and the translation process. In fact, he assigns the task of deciding “what role a source text plays in the translational action” to the translator (228).

Calling for considering translation activities as culturally significant, Toury claims that “Translatorship” amounts first and foremost to being able to play a social role, i.e. to fulfil a function allotted by a community - to the activity its practitioners and/or their products - in a way which is deemed appropriate in its own terms of reference” (205). He, therefore, rejects the idea of translation as taking place outside the
social, i.e. as the choice and work of an individual. While his position did serve to challenge the simplistic understanding of translation that existed at that time, its limitation was that it did not imagine translation taking place in hybrid and multicultural societies. Further, his theory becomes naive when read against the background of Nancy’s thesis on community as posited in his The Inoperative Community.

Deconstruction is directly related to translation. According to Derrida, deconstruction and translation are interrelated and difference is clearly visible in translation. Translation shows the difference between the signified and the signifier clearly. Almost all of Derrida’s works revolve around the possibility and impossibilities of translation. According to him, the central concern of philosophy is translation. One of the seminal works in translation studies that has used the Derridean framework of deconstruction is Tejaswini Niranjana’s Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism and the Colonial Context. Another notable work that has made a strong case for translation theory to engage with deconstruction is Peter V. Zima’s Deconstruction and Critical Theory.

Due to the influence of deconstruction, new questions arose in the realm of translation studies. They concerned themselves with problematising the earlier relationships between the source text and the target text such as considering whether the source text is dependent on translated text and its features, whether the meaning of the source text gets constructed based on the translated text, the change of identity of the source text in every instance of translation and thinking of situations prior to the source text.
Two important academic domains that shaped translations studies are postcolonial studies and feminist studies. These disciplines, with the inherent poststructural concerns, contributed significantly to shift translation from its linguistic to political orientations.

**Postcolonial Translation Studies**

Postcolonial studies perhaps disrupted the traditional approaches to translation. One of the significant contributions of postcolonialism to translation studies was to show how translation was constructed within the colonial discourse and how it was complicit in the project of colonialism (Bassnett and Trivedi; Spivak; Mranjana; Simon and St-Pierre).

Postcolonial enquiries into translation showed its links with and role in anthropology, a colonial discipline. Anthropology was essentially a tool of colonialism to gather knowledge on the colonised subjects in order to rule over them. Translation formed an important activity of this discipline to both legitimise access to local knowledge systems and cultures and codify them in manners suitable to justify and expand colonial domination (Niranjana 47-86).

Translation discourse refused to see this political angle to its activities, for such knowledge would have potentially rendered translation impossible. Simon in her Introduction to *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era* delineates the colonial role of translation:

Translations during the colonial period, . . . were an expression of the cultural power of the colonizer. Missionaries, anthropologists, learned Orientalists chose to translate the texts which corresponded to
the image of the subjugated world which they wished to construct. Translations materialized modes of interpretation whose terms were rarely questioned. . . . Colonised cultures were texts whose vast spaces were contained within the hermeneutic frames of Western knowledge. ‘Translation’ refers not only to the transfer of specific texts into European languages, but to all practices whose aim was to compact and reduce an alien reality into the terms imposed by a triumphant Western Culture.

Translation was part of the violence, then, through which the colonial subject was constructed. (10-11)

Because of such a historical complicity in the colonial project, translations of the colonial and postcolonial periods become important sites for postcolonial and feminist thinkers. Niranjana begins her work *Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism and the Colonial Context* emphasising the importance of translation for postcolonial study:

In a post-colonial context the problematic of translation becomes a significant site for raising questions of representation, power, and historicity. The context is one of contesting and contested stories attempting to account for, to recount, the asymmetry and inequality of relations between peoples, races, languages. Since the practices of subjection/subj ectification implicit in the colonial enterprise operate not merely through the coercive machinery of the imperial state but also through the discourses of philosophy, history, anthropology, philology, linguistics, and literary interpretation, the colonial ‘subject’—constructed
through technologies or practices of power/knowledge—is brought into being within multiple discourses and on multiple sites. One such site is translation. Translation as a practice shapes, and takes shape within, the asymmetrical relations of power that operate under colonialism. (1-2)

Niranjana enhances the scope of postcolonial engagement with translation as a political as well as a decolonising epistemological project. For her, translation did much more than merely translating the colonial subject in a desired manner to the coloniser as Simon suggests (12-13). Instead, she sees translation supporting the conceptual economy of a particular kind:

Conventionally, translation depends on the Western philosophical notions of reality, representation and knowledge. Reality is seen as something unproblematic, ‘out there’; knowledge involves a representation of this reality; and representation provides direct, unmediated access to a transparent reality. Classical philosophical discourse, however, does not simply engender a practice of translation that is then employed for the purposes of colonial domination; I contend that, simultaneously, translation in the colonial context produces and supports a conceptual economy that works into the discourse of Western philosophy to function as a philosopheme (a basic unit of philosophical conceptuality). (2)

Recent postcolonial enquiries have, however, raised more nuanced concerns in translation studies. Simon argues that the model of translation-as-a-tool-of-domination is only one model of translation. She draws attention to another model emanating from
India, which “is essentially oral, involves a much looser notion of the text, interacts intensely with local forms of narrative and is a reinvigorating and positive global influence... [it] is a continuous life-giving and creative process” (10).

Another important concern raised in recent postcolonial debates is questioning the unidimensional approach to translation politics. Drawing attention to the translations during the Bengal Renaissance, Simon observes, “It demonstrates the way in which translations, though undertaken as acts of colonial mimicry, though undertaken under the aegis of colonial power, can have unpredictable effects and can become stimulants to the development of national languages” (15). Questions on the translator too have become more complex with interrogations into the status and cultural mediating role of translators (13).

Feminist Translation Studies

Speaking in the European context in Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission Simon argues: “Translators and women have historically been the weaker figures in their respective hierarchies: translators are handmaidens to authors, women inferior to men” (1). She extends her argument by quoting Nicole Ward Jouve’s claim that the translator occupies a “(culturally speaking) female position” and Susanne de Lotbiniere-Harwood’s claim, “I am a translation because I am a woman” (1). Reflecting on the relationship between the patriarchal construction of both women and translation and the feminist translation practice, she observes:

Whether affirmed or denounced, the femininity of translation is a persistent historical trope. ‘Woman’ and ‘translator’ have been relegated
to the same position of discursive inferiority. The hierarchical authority of the original over the reproduction is linked with imagery of masculine and feminine; the original is considered the strong generative male, the translation the weaker and derivative female. We are not surprised to learn that the language used to describe translating dips liberally into the vocabulary of sexism, drawing on images of dominance and inferiority, fidelity and libertinage. The most persistent of these expressions, "les belles infideles," has for centuries encouraged an attitude of suspicion toward the seemly but wayward translation. (1) 

Simon identifies the task of feminist translation theory to identify and critique “the tangle of concepts which relegates both women and translation to the bottom of the social and literary ladder.” In order to achieve this, feminist translation theory inquires into “the processes through which translation has come to be ‘feminized’” (1) 

With the understanding of the process of inscribing women in translation, feminists in Europe have worked on feminist translation projects. Simon writes, “For feminist translation, fidelity is to be directed toward neither the author nor the reader, but toward the writing project—a project in which both writer and translator participate” (2). One such translator, Barbara Godard, makes out a case for manipulative translation and remarks, “The feminist translator, affirming her critical difference, her delight in interminable re-reading and re-writing, flaunts the signs of her manipulation of the text” (qtd. in Simon 12). Another translator who shares similar concerns is Susanne de Lotbiniere-Harwood she claims, “My translation practice is a political activity aimed at making language speak for women. So my signature on a translation means: this
translation has used every translation strategy to make the feminine visible in language” (qtd. in Simon 14),

In the Indian context feminist works in translation studies like Spivak’s “Politics of Translation” showed how translation played the dual role of erasing the woman in its process and constructing patriarchy. Thara in her “Empire, Nation and the Text” showed through the study of the circulation of Muddupalani’s eighteenth-century text *Radhika Santwanam* (*Appeasing Radha*) the complicity between nationalists and colonisers in erasing women from history.

**Recent Trends in Translation Studies**

In the last few decades, translation studies is increasingly adopting an interdisciplinary approach. The outcomes of translation studies are becoming useful to other disciplines. Scholars studying changes in society and culture, power relations, nationalism are turning to translation for reference and material (Anderman and Rogers). This is an outcome of a position that translations do not simply arise out of the personal inspiration of individual intellectuals or scholars but are inspired largely by social conditions and movement such as imperialism, colonialism, patriarchy, nationalism, anti-anti-colonialism.

**Indian Theory of Translation**

Arguments for Indian Theories of translation have been consistently made in the last two decades in India. Two prominent names making such a claim are K. Ayyappa Paniker and Ganesh N. Devy.

According to Ayyappa Paniker,
In the pre-colonial India ... the concept of the transference of a literary text from one Indian language to another was not confined to a literal paraphrase. Translation was not understood as a literal word-by-word rendering of the original from the source language to the target language. Most of the translation activities were concerned with Sanskrit texts on the one hand and their retellings in other Indian languages which began to mark a phenomenal growth in the Middle Ages . . . Since these translations concerned texts and languages within the same culture, deviations were not only tolerated but welcomed and encouraged too.

(39)

Panicker delves into Sanskrit and Tamil poetics and textual practices revolving around the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharatha*, primarily in Sanskrit and Tamil, and suggests that the diverse “deviating” and “subversive” translations of the two epics of India “are not translations in the orthodox or ordinary sense . . . they maintain an intertextuality - each work provoking us to think of the other texts” (44). He calls Indian translation practices, especially of the medieval period, as freer than those of the West:

When one remembers that even in the West, new translations of the Bible keep being published, centuries after the ‘authorised’ version, it behoves us to celebrate the creative freedom enjoyed by medieval Indian translations to produce viable, fully-localised texts, especially based on the *Ramayana*, the *Mahabharata* and the *Bhagavat*. (44)
But unlike Paniker’s claim there are oppositions to considering the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata* representative texts of the diverse linguistic and local communities existing in the Indian subcontinent, (Ilaiah; Prasad; Honko). Further, the West also has deviating and subversive practices around the Bible (Brown).

Devy also displays a stand against the European tradition of translation. According to him:

In Western metaphysics, translation is an exile, and an exile is a metaphorical translation - a post-Babel crisis. The multilingual, eclectic Hindu spirit, ensconced into the belief in the soul’s perpetual transition from form to form, may find it difficult to subscribe to the Western metaphysics of translation. (48)

Devy identifies three types of literary translations in the Indian context:

(i) those interested in preserving the ancient literary heritage, (ii) those interested in ‘Westernising’ Indian languages and literature, and (iii) those interested in ‘nationalising’ literature in modern Indian languages.

In correspondence with the different objectives of these three types, their modes of operation differ. (62)

Speaking of the complex negotiation required in translation theories in the Indian context, he remarks:

In a country that has had a tradition of housing numerous languages at any given time in history, and in a culture that accepts metamorphosis as the basic principle of existence, an intelligent and appropriate theory of translation becomes one of the primary needs of literary criticism. In a
country which has large and various communities of ‘translating consciousness’ and in a culture that at present thrives on literature coming in translation from all quarters of the world, theories based on anxiety about exile from the original home can cause difficulties in the self-perception. Not everything in the Western theory of translation is useless to us. Nor is everything in it useful. We need to exercise discrimination. (64)

Works of other Indian scholars on translation, namely, Saji Mathew, R. Radhakrishnan, Shantha Ramakrishan, Anisur. Rahman, S.B. Venna a Pramod Talgeri, and S.K Veima, Harish Trivedi, are either postcolonial inquiries or are works which agree on the premises faithfulness in translation.

Sachin Ketkar in his survey of translation debates in India, “Is There an ‘Indian School’ of Translation Studies?” argues that translation studies in India has largely been dominated by scholars from English Studies background and hence bring their English Studies bias to their engagements. According to him:

They are concerned with colonial history and its impact on practice and reflection on translation in India. They are chiefly concerned about what is called Indian Literature in English Translation, or Indo-English Literature. The English Studies connection of these scholars is reflected in the theorizing and the sorts of concerns typical to this church emerge everywhere in their thinking. (3)
Ketkar concludes his survey of Indian theoretical scholarship on translation studies quite pessimistically, with the observation of a divide between translation scholarship in regional languages and English.

Though useful, Ketkar’s survey has, apart from not being theoretically well-grounded, serious drawbacks. He has ignored the translation studies scholarship in the domain of gender apart from turning a blind eye to the works of Spivak, Niranjana, and Tharu which are on the circulation of texts in Bengali, Kannada and Telugu, respectively. Their contribution has offered newer frameworks for the study of translations within India and of theory.

Rhizomatic Critique of Translation

Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of rhizome provides for an useful critique of the way translation theory has grown in Europe and subsequently in the rest of the world. In their book *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Deleuze and Guattari present the idea of arborescence or the model of the tree as the predominant model for how knowledge operated in the Enlightenment/modern Western world. They argue that Western thought, shaped largely by humanism and the Enlightenment, has produced the arborescence model in art, literature and ideas. They instead suggest the model of fungus, a rhizome, which neither has a centre nor a beginning and an end.

According to Deleuze and Guattari translation theory has so far developed largely in the arborescence model. A breakaway from that would be a turn towards the rhizome. If this is not done, we may not be able to accommodate the Indian theory or non-European theories of translation. Hence, a reconception of translation theory that is not chronological or centred but rhizomatic would be detrimental.
Translation, from the beginning of translation theorisation among the Romans has hinged on the binaries, the most important binaries being writing versus translation, and writer versus translator. Within the binaries, self-translation and self-translators became grey zones as they belong to both categories and yet did not belong to either of the group. Although there were self-translators within the European context, their self-translation activity remained ‘unknown’ or rather marginalised. It is important to note that the process was not even named. The current name, namely, self-translation, does not have a history longer than one decade. The previous term, autotranslation, also did not have a longer existence.

It is difficult to apply translation theories to self-translations. Within the discourse of translation theory and practice one important assumption was that the writer and the translator are different and are separated both in time and space. It is on this ontological assumption that the whole edifice of translation was built. However, in the case of many self-translators in India, they have not seen their role as translators but as authors, as all of them freely recreate their works when they translate to another language.

Self-translation

‘Self-translation’. Even in *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers* which is the standard reference material for citation in literary studies, the translator is imagined to be someone other than the author (134, 164-5). *A Companion to Translation Studies*, published in 2007, which counts among its contributors some of the prominent names in contemporary translation studies like Pym, Bassnett and Snell-Homby, does not mention of self-translation. This shows that the area of self-translation is comparatively recent in origin and yet to be fully explored.

However, there are conferences on ‘self-translation’ being organised which is an indication that there is an increasing interest as well legitimacy being given to this area of study. For example, a recent conference held in Swansea University from 28 June to 1 July 2010 on the topic “The Author-Translator in the European Literary Tradition” had Bassnett and Venuti as the main speakers deliberating on the phenomenon of self-translation.

There have been three terminological usages to refer to self-translation—auto-translation, self-translation, and author-translation. But the most accepted term in scholarly circles is self-translation. In the first edition of Baker’s *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* published in 1998, the term that was used was auto-translation (17). However, the second edition published in 2009 switched over to the term—self-translation (257). The word ‘author-translator’ is a recent coinage. One of the recent and prominent uses of it was noticed in the conference entitled “The Author-Translator in the European Literary Tradition” organized at Swansea University. The national seminar organised by The Department of English, Jamia Milia Islamia,
New Delhi on March 13 - 14, 2008, on the issue of self-translation was called “A National Seminar on ‘Author as Translator’ India”.

Self-translation is largely a phenomenon visible in multicultural societies like UK, Canada, USA, India, Brazil, and Italy. In Europe and North America this phenomenon can be chronologically mapped as the first generation and the second generation self-translation. The first generation of self-translation was largely due to the outcome of major socio-political changes that emerged at the beginning of the last century stretching up to the end of World War II. The two prominent faces of this period were Nabokov and Beckett. Nabokov wrote in Russian and English and translated them between these two languages. Becket wrote both in English and French.

Writers like Nancy Huston from Canada could be considered the second generation writers. Huston, born in Canada, moved to the USA during her teenage and later to France. She writes in French and self-translates to English. In the countries like India and Brazil the phenomenon of self-translation is the outcome of their postcolonial existence, which has necessitated engaging with the local languages as well as the languages of the colonisers which during post-independence have become the languages of governance, of elites, and vehicles of ‘upward’ social mobility.

One of the important reasons the phenomenon of self-translation has got little attention is largely because it has been equated with bilingual writing. Grutman emphasises this reason when he writes, “Translation scholars themselves have paid little attention to the phenomenon . . . because they thought it to be more akin to bilingualism than to translation proper” (17).

*What is Self-translation?*
According to Grutman, self-translation refers “to the act of translating one’s own writings or the result of such an undertaking” (“Self-translation” 257, Self-translations can happen either in asymmetrical or symmetrical languages. Huston’s self-translations from French to English would be symmetrical. But Tagore’s self-translations would be considered an exercise between asymmetrical languages.

Self-translations can be either simultaneous, where the author produces the same text in two languages, or consecutive, i.e. prepared after the completion or publication of the text in one language (259). Grutman describes the first type as “cross-linguistic creation” (259). According to him, Beckett resorted to both modes at different stages in his career (259). Becket self-translated *Murphy*, a novel published in English before World War 11, taking the assistance of Alfred Peron a decade after *Murphy* was published.

Commenting on the social reception of self-translations, Grutman says:

It is indeed in terms of their production that self-translations strike us most as being different. A double writing process more than a two-stage reading-writing activity, they seem to give less precedence to the original, whose authority is no longer a matter of ‘status and standing’ but becomes ‘temporal in character’ (Fitch 1988:131). The distinction between original and (self) translation therefore collapses, giving way to a more flexible terminology in which both texts can be referred to as ‘variants’ or ‘versions’ of comparable status. (259)

In the existing discourse, the use of the term self-translation has been limited to interlinguistic translation. The possibilities of intersemiotic translation, i.e. a work in
two media by the same person, first created in one medium and later translated to another medium, have not yet entered the discourse. Such an entry has the potential of both undermining the existing debates in self-translation and at the same time throwing new light on cognitive and creative abilities. It is important to note the use of the word ‘writing’ in Grutman’s definition of self-translation. It is strange that while translation studies itself has broadened the definition of translation from referring to purely interlinguistic translation to including intersemiotic translation, Gratman still prefers to limit the scope of self-translation to linguistic translation.

According to Gratman there is a perceptible distinction in bilinguals, bi-lingual writers and self-translators (257). He quotes Beaujour, “bilinguals frequently shift languages without making a conscious decision to do so, polyglot and bilingual writers must deliberately decide which language to use in a given instance” (257). Further, the terms bi-lingual writer does not suggest that the person is a self-translator. Unlike a self-translator a bi-lingual might choose two different languages for two kinds of genres. For example, a bi-lingual writer may choose one language to produce literary works and another for literary scholarship. Self-translation on the other refers to the act of translation of a text from one language to another by the author of the source text.

Necessity of Studying Self-translation

The need to study self-translation, especially in the Indian context becomes important because, in the global context, research in this domain is in its nascent phase with barely a decade’s work in the field, with book-length publication coming out only in the last three years, beginning with Jan Walsh Hokenson and Marcella Munson’s The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self Translation published by St. Jerome
Publishing, Manchester, December 2007. This is the only book known so far to have been written exclusively on self-translation (Grutman 257). In India there have been a few attempts to engage with self-translations but they have not substantially contributed to theory-building in self-translation or translation studies. There are no known monographs on self-translations in India.

It is now a well-established fact that self-translation is not a random phenomenon and that there is a conscious choice of the medium of language in the context of self-translation. In the words of Grutman, the practice is systematic and not “limited to single experience” (18). What makes it important to interrogate is the fact that the phenomenon of self-translation occurs within certain socio-political and economic contexts. Further, the study of self-translation would be an important location to attempt a poststructuralist return gaze, a self-reflexivity towards the discourse of translation. A study of self-translation, therefore, can become a conduit or a medium to approach translation studies and its problematic positions.

This chapter looked at the etymology of the word “translation” and then tried to look at similar terminologies in other languages and their denotations and connotations. The chapter then dealt with the concept of translation and gave a brief overview of translation practices from the period of the Romans to the contemporary times. It discussed the theories of translation primarily through the works of Steiner and Bassnett and looked at some of the contemporary theories of translation. Thereafter it traced the shift from translation theory to translation studies. The chapter has looked at the recent debates on translation in India and found that although they had challenged the Western frameworks of translation by drawing attention to the translation practices in India
which did not adhere to the principle of faithfulness, they had done so by not looking at
the traditions of manipulative translations in Europe.

It then offered a critique of the epistemological model of translation studies
using Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of rhizome. The chapter concluded the survey of
translation theory and studies with an observation about the difficulties in applying
translation studies framework to self-translation. The following chapter deals with the
self-translation practice and theory in India.