2. Translation: An Arrival

My tongue in English chains,
I return, after a generation, to you.
I am at the end
Of my dravidic tether,
Hunger for you unassuaged.¹

R Parthasarthy

“I have to build a bridge within myself between India and Europe or else I become a fragmented person.”²

Dilip Chitre

In the last chapter, I discussed the intentions and ideologies that underlay the act of translation when the British started translating Indian texts into English. The chapter also examined the psychological processes Indians experienced when they began to translate into an alien tongue. Since this chapter deals not with individual texts but with a whole body of texts in translation, processes outside the cultural-literary domain also form a part of the study here. As argued earlier, the activity of translation up to the early eighties was sporadic and lacklustre. However, after the eighties, there was an unprecedented increase in literary translations into English. This is not an a-historical phenomenon that has taken place in a vacuum, it has grown out of the material, sociological, and institutional contexts, which feed and source the production and circulation of texts. This chapter attempts to identify links and chains in the production and consumption of texts in
translation. Connections and linkages have been forged between academic developments in translation studies and contexts outside academia. The material production of books is not isolated from the institutionalization of translation studies. Institutions and means of production form a nexus. Through this chapter, I wish to arrive at these connections and point to the interdependence of theory and practice as the primary determinant underlying the tremendous importance translation activity has acquired in India today.

This chapter explores texts in translation within a social matrix.

The first section is concerned with academic contexts: theoretical shifts in translation theory. The development of new perspectives in translation theory in the West and a rigorous critique of traditional ways of looking at translation have contributed to the formation of Translation Studies. New ways of looking at translation are also creating new canons that absorb texts in translation and in turn form a nexus between academic demand and material supply. The perception of translation as a discursive, complex, political activity has had far-reaching effects on both the industry and the institutionalization of translation. How and when did "translation" cease to be a secondary, mechanical, invisible activity? The first section deals with translation theory, the rest deal with the practice of translation. The focus in the sections that follow this one will be on India—the material and social developments within India that have accelerated the production and consumption of literature in translation. Thus Section II moves beyond translation theories in the West, to the generation of texts in India. The relationship between the two is neither simple nor causal. Several social determinants germane to the Indian context have also played significant roles and these will also be
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discussed in the course of the chapter. For instance, Section II includes an overview of
the role and status of the English language in India. The acceptance of Indian Writing in
English (IWE) and Indian Literature in English Translation (ILET) are signs of the
cultural role of the English language. Section III examines that phenomenon with regard
to IWE. ILET grew as a parallel and somewhat subsidiary phenomenon to IWE. The
staggering success of IWE has contributed to the growth of ILET in more ways than one.
The changing relationship between the two is a crucial sign of the changing times. Once
the environment for receiving translations at a conceptual, cultural level has been
established, the next question relates to markets and numbers. Section IV delineates the
social patterns and trends that have created general and specific readerships for ILET.

I

Translation is one of the major ways in which literatures enter into contact and interfere
with each other and yet few literary histories in the world over ever acknowledge that
fact. India is no exception. Due to its multilingual ethos there has been a long, informal
tradition of translation in India. Cultural exchanges between the marga (major) and desi
(minor) streams have taken place largely through translation. In that sense India has, in
Devy's phrase, a "translating consciousness." However the Indian tradition of "trans­
lating" (carrying across), because of its origins in oral traditions, is relatively flexible and
fluid. A continuous straddling of different languages by its multilingual citizens has made
translation in India a familiar and everyday affair, hardly worth theorising. Very little
thought has been expended by Indian scholars on the aesthetics of translation or the place
of translated texts in literary systems. Evaluations of translations, especially from Indian languages into English, have been informed by theories from the West, and western theories of translation for a long time have been geared towards the marginalization of literary translation. This is largely because the memory of translating, in the West, has been associated with the dissemination of the Bible through the Vulgate. The connotations attached to and risks attending upon the endeavour to translate scripture made translation as a whole a self-limiting exercise in the West. Notions of 'fixity' and 'meaning' in a text made translation appear to be an inferior and parasitic activity. Devy offers the following explanation of West's indifference to translation: "In Western metaphysics translation is an exile, a fall from the origin; and the mythical exile is a metaphorical translation -- a post-Babel crisis. Given this metaphysical precondition of Western aesthetics, it is not surprising that literary translations are not accorded the same status as original works."4

When compared with the peripheral existence of translation theory in the past, the vigour and energy evident in this area in the West today (especially after Translation Studies became an independent discipline in the '80s) is phenomenal. Translation theory and practice today have become central to literary studies in the West. Departments of Translation Studies (TS) employ radically new perspectives in readings of text -in- translation. A distinguishing feature of work in TS has been the use of interdisciplinary approaches and methodologies. Since the seventies, particularly in the late eighties and early nineties, translation scholars have begun to draw heavily on methodology from other disciplines including psychology, comparative literature, literary theory,
anthropology and more recently, cultural studies. New theoretical frameworks have energized the study of translation which has been hitherto trapped in repetitive questions of whether or not to translate, whether one should remain literal and faithful to the 'original' meaning or aim at elegance in the target text? The centrality of translation studies in the West has had and continues to have an impact upon translation theory in India. The rise and growth of translation theory and practice in India have coincided with the increasing importance of translation studies abroad. I wish first to take a look at the development of theories of translation in the West. The movement of translation studies from a state of non-existence to being a crucial interdisciplinary subject today needs to be explored in a historical perspective. What relationship does translation theory today have with translation in the past? If translation is one of the most organic modes of communication, why did the discipline of translation studies not develop till twenty years ago? Are developments in translation studies today a natural or a linear outcome of a longer, haphazard history of theoretical principles in Western Europe? Answers to some of these questions throw light upon the institutionalisation of translation studies today. They also point to indirect albeit important connections between the inflow of translations into the English-speaking world and their absorption into new canons.

A comprehensive and thorough account of translation theories up to now is beyond the scope of this project. In Europe literary translation has been known since the days of ancient Rome. I have highlighted some important junctures in translation theory in the English speaking world to point to the ways in which the translator, the process of translation, and the final product have been perceived at different times. According to
Lefevere the genealogy of translation in the West begins with the dissemination of the word of God. Historically speaking, the first reference to the Bible in translation is the Septuagint. Our query begins with the first Bible in English, the Wycliffe Bible completed between 1380 and 1384. John Wycliffe believed that the Bible was part of all human life and that, therefore, even a lay person should have access to it. This marked a revolution in evangelistic as well as literary terms. On the one hand, there was an immense sense of servitude and anxiety to be faithful to the original word, on the other, the message of the Bible had to be fluid and intelligible to the common man. The religious and sensitive nature of this enterprise influenced the principles of translation for many centuries to come. In a text-based religion such as Christianity, the question of precision was central; at the same time, the aesthetic requirements of the 'vernacular' had also to be kept in mind. Hence the notions of "being faithful to the original" and not letting the wanton translator "take liberties" with the text go back to the activity of Bible translation. The translators of the Bible starting with Wycliffe's version in the fourteenth century, then William Tyndale and Erasmus thereafter, and finally the translators of St. James' version in 1611 grappled with this problem in different ways and the issue of faithfulness to the word or sense acquired different emphasis with each translator. The versions of the sixteenth century are particularly important in this regard because of the rise of Protestantism. Through the act of translation, Protestant England sought the recovery of the original spirit of Christianity. According to Bassnett, the "Renaissance Bible translators perceived both fluidity and intelligibility in the Target Language text as important criteria, but were equally concerned with the transmission of a literally accurate message. In an age when the choice of a pronoun could mean the
difference between life and condemnation to death as a heretic, precision was of central importance. Yet because Bible translation was an integral part of the upward shift in the status of the vernacular, the question of style was also vital.

The paradigms of translation formed by Bible translation continued in some form through later centuries. Opinions regarding translation, after the sixteenth century, swayed between 'literalness' and 'intelligibility.' Some shifts became discernible when Dryden offered his theory of translation. He mapped the diverse streams of translational thinking and identified three models of translation: metaphrase (word for word), paraphrase (sense for sense) and imitation (free abandon). Of the three, Dryden preferred the middle path, that is 'paraphrase' because he believed that the translator had a moral duty not just to the text but also to his reader. As a translator of Virgil's epic he says, "I have endeavoured to make Virgil speak such English as he would have spoken, if he had been born in England, and in this present age." This clearly marked a shift of priorities as texts moved from the sacred to the secular. In 1791, Alexander Tytler reacted to Dryden's middle ground or paraphrase model of translation. According to him, the translator must capture the original and complete transcript, in the style and manner of the original. Dryden's partial method of capturing the 'original' led to loose translations. It is interesting to note that though Dryden and Tytler have different stands regarding the aesthetics of translation, there is little dispute about the existence of an 'essential' original meaning. Neither is there any debate about the political implications of either model. In the following period, the Romantics pondered over the terminology of translation activity. If the poet was a 'quasi-mystical soul' who created poetry, the translator was only
working on what had already been created; therefore the translator was performing a 'mechanical' task. In the hierarchy of author, text, and translator, the translator always occupied the lowest position. The revaluation of poetry and the imagination at this time did nothing to enhance the status of the translator and translation. Shelley says "It were as wise to cast a violet into a crucible that you might discover the formal principle of its colour and odour, as to seek to transfuse from one language into another the creations of a poet. The plant must spring again from its seed, or it will bear no flower — and this is the burden of the curse of Babel." This note of resignation about translation as 'never the same as the original' stultified any investigative approach to translation theory and practice.

In the Victorian Age exercises of translation exhibit problematic tendencies especially in Rossetti and Fitzgerald. In his Preface to his translation from the early Italian poets Rossetti stated: "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." The notion of translation as 'possession' or 'ownership' is problematic. It also establishes the superiority of the target culture in identifying a piece of beauty and possessing it through translation. At the same time, the attitude of superiority did not lead Rossetti to overhaul the 'rules' of translation. Along with his Victorian contemporaries he suggested retaining the remoteness and unfamiliarity of the original instead of making concessions to the contemporary reader. On the other hand, Edward Fitzgerald's theory and practice of translation in the same age show little consideration for the original. Fitzgerald also clearly spoke from the point of view of a 'superior' culture, a white occidental culture in
more precise terms Unlike Rossetti, this knowledge led him to treat the enterprise of translating the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam in a cavalier fashion. He admitted that for him translating the Persian text was nothing more than a "gentlemanly pastime" and went on to assert. "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."11 The imagery of an indolent life in the East found circulation and unquestioning acceptance among its Western readers. The political transactions involved in the activity of translation have not been discussed in conventional theories of translation. Rossetti's attitude of adulation towards the original and Fitzgerald's cavalier approach represent specific political-stands. However, theories of translation until the eighties did not employ different tools to mark out the politics of Rossetti who translated Italians (Europeans) against the 'orientalist' translation of Fitzgerald. The ubiquitous norms of literalness and freedom created a maze of judgements that glossed over political questions. In fact the issue of faithfulness and freedom was itself rife with contradiction. As Lawrence Venuti remarks: "Canons of accuracy and fidelity are always locally defined, specific to different cultural formations at different historical moments."12

According to Bassnett, the first half of the twentieth century saw a continuation of many of the Victorian concepts of translation. Even in the twentieth century discussions continually came back to the "problem of evaluation without a solid theoretical base from which to begin such an investigation."13 Theorization about translation has for the most part taken place in prefaces, forewords or little apologetic translators' notes. The growth
and acceptance of the study of linguistics and stylistics within literary criticism paved the way for a linguistic approach to translation. The linguistic slant in translation theory generated a certain degree of 'scientisation.' Earlier, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, undue energy had been expended on deciding whether translation was an 'art' or a 'craft.' The linguistic approach, which evolved with the Russian Formalist Circle of the 1920s saw 'problems' in translation as essentially problems of language. Catford in his well-known book *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* notes: "In translation, there is substitution of TL meanings for SL meanings: not transference of TL meanings into the SL. In transference there is an implantation of SL meanings into the TL text. These two processes must be clearly differentiated in any theory of translation."¹⁴ This view takes account of cultural incompatibilities in translation and does not engage in the fruitless argument between 'fidelity' and freedom. Catford explained the cultural and linguistic incompatibility in terms of 'equivalence.' Equivalence became a key concept in translation theory and a useful tool for the analysis and understanding of language. For the first time the linguistic approaches to translation also established that translation was not a dilettante activity, that it required expertise and inwardness with both the Source and Target Languages. Translation theory at this time came under the umbrella of applied linguistics. As far the actual act of translating was concerned, the translator's subjectivity or the discursive processes involved in his/her task still remained unattended to. As has been rightly pointed out, the linguistic tools of translation were "useful as diagnostic techniques, to find out what has gone wrong in a translation, after the event, rather than as systematic aids for use during the event."¹⁵
The linguistic approaches co-existed with narrowly textual analyses, through most of the sixties. However, a very significant departure in translation theory took place in the 70s when the Tel Aviv group (under the influence of the Russian Formalists and Czech Structuralists) injected fresh insights into the understanding of translation. The chief exponents of this group were Itamar Evan-Zohar, and later, Gideon Toury. Some of the contemporary perspectives on translation even today derive substantially from Itamar Evan-Zohar's "polysystem theory" of translation. Underlying this view is a conception of literature as a system, i.e. as a hierarchically structured set of elements, which relate to and interact with each other. Evan-Zohar was mainly concerned with the absorption of translated literature into the target culture. The concept of 'system' denoted a dynamic conglomerate in which literature in translation existed sometimes on the periphery and sometimes at the centre of the target culture. This approach initiated discussion of a hitherto marginalised area of translation theory — the location and reception of a translation in relation to the wider scheme of literary forms and genres. It also broke away from the prescriptive norms of translation and made room for 'adaptations' and 'imitations' in the dynamics of polysystem. Evan-Zohar's target-oriented approach to translation paved the way for Theo Hermans' notion of translation as 'manipulation'. Hermans notes that "from the point of view of the target literature, all translation implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose." The refusal to see translation as embedded in political ideology — from the time of Bible translation up to the linguistic approaches of the twentieth century — has been stridently critiqued in the eighties. One of the contributors in Hermans' book of essays asks, "Are the literary ruptures and conflicts influenced, perhaps even occasioned and oriented by translators?"
These questions emphasize the nature of translation as a discursive and political practice.

The post-eighties critiques have completely overhauled the conventional ways of looking at translation. There is a shift of focus from an evaluative approach concerned with "What is a 'good' or 'correct' translation?" to "What does a translation do? What is the process of translation?" This shift has been called the "cultural turn in translation studies." This implies the development of a cultural perspective in translation theory whereby texts are seen to be deeply embedded in complex cultural systems. Secondly, poststructuralist thinking has initiated a radical reconsideration of the notions of an 'original' and a 'translation.' Largely through commentaries on Walter Benjamin's essay 'The Task of Translator' recuperated in deconstructionist and poststructuralist agendas, Derrida and Paul de Man refute the notion of a marked difference between an 'original' and 'translation.' According to Benjamin, a foreign text becomes original not by some intrinsic value but because it is deemed worthy of translation. Translation ensures the 'afterlife' of a text, canonises it and legitimises its fame. The poststructuralist concept of a text that is forever in motion explodes binary oppositions such as original/unoriginal, authentic/readable or literal/free. Free of this bind, translation theory today embraces multiple perspectives and has emerged, as Mona Baker the editor of the first encyclopedia of translation studies states, the discipline of the nineties.

The perspectives in translation studies today are, to some extent, legacies of the various approaches highlighted so far. At the same time there are also new developments and
alliances. The nineties have been imbued with inputs from postcolonial studies in translation. The issues of translatability and representation become acutely politicized when translation is studied in colonial and postcolonial contexts. The employment of new perspectives in translation studies is also a corollary of a reformulation in the establishment of literary studies. Like literary studies, translation studies too have lost their Eurocentric focus. The influx of texts from the ex-colonies into the English-speaking parts of the world -- either written in or translated into English -- has brought about radical changes in the process of evaluating texts in translation. Aijaz Ahmad refers to the 'archive' of translated texts under which third world texts are "borne across" or "recuperated."20 This manifests itself at various levels. From the point of view of a postcolonial translator, a "fluent" translation in English represses the subtexts of the unequal relations between the Source language and the metropolitan Target Language. The postcolonial translator, in theory at least, aims at making translation a self-reflexive activity and allows a jagged translation to foreground her own subjectivity and historicity. According to Samia Mehrez texts straddling two worlds are 'hybrid' in nature. Such hybrid texts interrupt the pure enterprise of the Anglo-American canon.21 It also allows the translator, notes bell hooks, to use the oppressor's language and turn it against itself.22 It is clear that the postcolonial possibilities of "translation as subversion" have energised the activity as well as its production. According to Niranjana, "the postcolonial desire to re-translate is linked to the desire to re-write history."23 The meaning of translation as 're-writing' brings us to the whole issue of broadening in the metaphor of translation. In the postcolonial context 'translation' is understood primarily in terms of power: it is linguistic transfer in the service of empire.
Another development in translation studies is its alliance with feminism. Sherry Simon asserts that gender studies and translation emerge out of similar institutional contexts — "Woman" and "translation" have been relegated to the same position of discursive inferiority. Women translators and theorists perceive translation as a vital site of cultural production that constructs gendered subjects. The notions of historicity and subjectivity have drawn attention to gender metaphors in translation, just as they have also raised questions about the cultural representation of the subjugated. A combination of feminist and postcolonial frameworks can be found in recent translations of Mahasweta Devi's stories from Bengali into English by Gayatri Spivak. She addresses a feminist translator and suggests that "the task of the feminist translator is to consider language as a clue to the workings of gendered agency." She sounds a note of caution against an all-embracing global feminism. She employs 'defamiliarizing' techniques to mark out the difference between an 'Alice Walker' and a 'Mahasweta Devi.' Translation in the hands of Spivak becomes a tool for a theoretical agenda, or to use Jaidev's words, "grist to the mill" or a "springboard." Spivak is aware of the discrepancy involved in resisting dominance and yet using the language of the dominant. She advocates using English and manipulating it for the purposes of translation. The reason why I refer to Spivak as a translator and theorist is because her position as a postcolonial feminist academic and translator and her employment of indigenous literature in the service of theory represents a historical juncture. Mahasweta Devi's stories come to the Western audience through the authority of Spivak's name and belie and change the notion of the 'translator's invisibility.' In a partly facetious vein, Sujit Mukherjee refers to Spivak as the
The selection, translation and circulation of certain texts; certain voices in western universities create a putative canon. I am ambivalent about the role of 'Third-World' scholars in this process of cultural representation. However, what needs to be emphasised is how Spivak's translation acts as a pivot around which postcolonial, gender and cultural studies perspectives on translation get formed. (Spivak's translation of Mahasweta Devi's stories is one of the texts prescribed in a course on "Subalterns, Tribals and the Indian subcontinent" at UC, Santa Barbara) This not only changes and expands the role of translation but also creates literary and ideological spaces for translation from the so called 'third world.'

The issue of third world texts translated into English takes us into broader areas, those of postcolonial studies and the crumbling of the canon. So far we have been tracing shifts in translation theory from within the discipline of Translation Studies. Developments in translation theory after the nineteen seventies establish the importance of translation as a complex cultural and political practice. While these developments give primacy to an activity that has, so far, been relegated to the background, there are larger developments outside Translation Studies enhancing the need for productions from non-Western cultures written in English or translated into English. I am referring to the emergence of 'postcolonial studies' and the assemblage of non-Western texts under the problematic category of 'Third World Literature.' A wide range of social and political practices outside Anglo-American universities is shaped by and has shaped what is currently called postcolonialism. The term 'postcolonial' is a matter of ongoing debate, especially because
as Ania Loomba notes, it is a temporal as well as an ideological marker. The prefix 'post' refers to chronology — the demise of colonialism. In this sense it pertains to movements for cultural decolonisation in colonies that have been officially and politically decolonised. However, oppositional discourses did exist even within the state of political colonialism. As if this did not make the term postcolonialism sufficiently confusing, it also carries the connotation of 'supplanting,' as in the replacement of the colonial by a new world order that has established unequal relationships among 'free' countries. This is not the place to tease out the various meanings that attend upon the term. For the purposes of this project, I settle for Homi Bhabha's definition which states that 'the term postcolonial is increasingly used to describe that form of social criticism that bears witness to those unequal and uneven processes of representation by which the historical experience of the once-colonized Third World comes to be framed in the West.' Intellectual approaches to postcolonialism sometimes borrow and at times contest the theories of poststructuralism and deconstructionism. By and large, the postcolonial perspective is concerned with race, gender and nation. Since it foregrounds the narratives of the once colonized countries and the historical experience of colonialism, 'nationalism' becomes the ideological imperative, generating trenchant critiques of "Anglocentricity and provincialism" in literary studies. Various studies in India and abroad 'cover' the impetus, conditions and 'effects' of postcolonial studies. My concern is not so much with the conditions that have led to the dismantling of traditional literary studies as with the contexts and spaces created for non-Western texts. This has caused what Mitchell refers to as a "shift in the balance of literary trade between the First World and the second and the third worlds." According to Mitchell, much of the theory has come from
metropolitan centres while the texts employed in the service of theoretical agendas emerge continue to emerge from the non-metropolitan ex-colonies. This does not imply that there have never before been literary exports from the East to meet the West's thirst for an exotic India. A long tradition of books written in English and translated by Indians as well as the British (some of which have been discussed in the preceding chapter) has formed the foundation of what was formerly called Indology, and later, Area Studies. However, the processes by which 'third world' texts are deployed within new theoretical and institutional grids are based on different assumptions. Cultural representations of India, of South Asia as a whole, are formed and modified through diasporic interventions. It must be noted that since the 'recuperation' and 'canonization' of postcolonial texts takes place in English-knowing centres, only those texts either written in or translated into English pass the test of being postcolonial. Loomba concludes very aptly: "The meaning of 'discourse' shrinks to 'text', and from there to 'literary text' and from there to texts written in English because that is the corpus most familiar to the critics."\textsuperscript{32} This emphasises the further expansion of English taking place in the name of postcolonialism; it appears that regional texts, resistant and subversive, will continue to be unfit for a postcolonial glance "until much more extensive translations into English from these languages have been produced."\textsuperscript{33}

Reformulations of the centre and periphery in literary studies have concurred with reigning vogues of multiculturalism and cultural diversity. 'Liberal' institutions have sought to reform curricula, so as to make them more sensitive to the contesting claims of minorities for cultural representation. Vinay Dharwadker comments on this "interplay of
material and cultural factors: The diversity of material circulating in the literary marketplace has changed the habits and expectations of buyers, creating new readerly desires and appetites. Some readers and communities, for example, respond to the diffusion of the new literatures with an all-inclusive, cosmopolitan enthusiasm. The desire for culturally diverse material, especially from non-Anglophone cultures is strengthened by processes of globalisation. Most commonly, globalisation means the removal of national boundaries as impediments to the free flow of capital, of goods, of services. However, there is another kind of globalisation: "free trade not in material products or services, but in images and information." The second kind of globalisation has enormous implications for the identities and dissemination of audio, visual and to an extent print productions. It has resulted in 'deterritorialization' of the information and knowledge available in English. The 'worlding' of English is self-evident as it remains the sole language of all knowledge distributing systems. The Internet is almost entirely in English. There is also a desire to reach as large a readership as possible.

The worldwide cultural market too accepts goods of the kind described above if they are available in English. Print/visual/aural productions in English have a sweeping access to the world market. Paranjpe notes how those who write in English, even in India, join the international community. However, not all writers in English join the international community nor does all such writing become 'cosmopolitan.' The selection and framing of texts under the new categories of postcolonialism and third-worldism are undertaken by power centres which have their own sets of imbalances. Texts that meet the norms of pluralism and cultural diversity (retaining therefore the right measure of 'local flavour')
and are available in English are potentially global products. In this way, the academic components of postcolonialism and the canon centralise Third World texts, which are further internationalized through global processes. All this has helped the success of Indian writing in English. It may well do the same for Indian Literature in English translation.

II

Global consolidations do not exist isolated from local support systems. So far we have been looking at the changed picture of translation theory and practice in the West and the inclusion of non-Western texts written or translated into English in 'new' canons. However, the bulk of the market for translated texts, in India at least, lies within the country. The market for Indian texts in English translation in the West, developing in light of some of the shifts outlined earlier, is a very promising one. The economics of translation, that is, the factors governing the publishing and selling of translated texts form the theme of the following chapter. In the sections that follow here, I wish to highlight certain not-so-tangible social contexts within India that create a positive set of circumstances for the production, circulation and reception of Indian texts in English translation.

The first link in this circuit is the English language in India. The section that follows is a summary of the development and use of English in post-independence India. India's official policy regarding English was riddled with contradictions and brought in its wake
very strong opinions for and against the retention of English. In any case, Nehruvian policies regarding language, economics and commerce in post-independence India firmly established the importance of English. English has remained central to public discourses in India and this centrality is maintained today by the advances in Information and Technology.

In 1947, the newly independent nation-state recognized the importance of English, and it was legally sanctioned by the Constitution as the associate official language. The retention of this colonial legacy in the postcolonial nation-state did not come as a surprise to many. English had come to perform several functions in India after 1900. Ahmad notes that the national intelligentsia was rooted in English education and used English for several purposes in colonial India. The new middle class formed in the nineteenth century was partly a product of education in English. This does not mean that the use of English was entirely free of cultural confrontation. However, when the country became politically free there were already huge networks of education and bureaucracy which had been formed on the basis of English. Also, India's decision, or rather the decision of the Nehruvian government, to take the path of industry and commerce rather than follow the pre-independence agrarian economy, increased the importance of English. Nehru's government recognized the importance of English as the language of the future. While the anti-English nationalists denounced English because it represented a humiliating past, the supporters of English saw it as signaling an elevating future. The position of English vacillated between these two points of view. Opinions for and against English were strong on both sides. At the same time, emotionally and politically, it was clear that
English could not become the 'national' language Hindi was named the official language. Hindi and English have since then been bound together in an unhappy and mutually undermining partnership. English and Hindi came to stand for the two camps of 'colonial-minded' elites and 'nationalists' respectively. The battle over English made its position in India very uncertain. Anti-English/Pro-Hindi sentiment from the North and anti-Hindi/Pro-English sentiment from the South underscored the problem of finding a language common and acceptable to all in India. In a move that temporarily circumvented the issue, the Constitution projected the gradual replacement of English as an instrument of the state within fifteen years after 1950. The arbitrary and half-hearted nature of this decision is captured by R.K. Narayan with characteristic irony in his story "Fifteen years." Here is an excerpt of a conversation between the English language and a judge who wants to oust English:

English: You probably picture me as a trident-bearing Rule Britannia, but actually I am a devotee of Goddess Sarasvati. I have been her most steadfast handmaid.

Judge. All that is beside the point. Even if you come in a sari with kumkum on your forehead we are going to see that you are deported. The utmost we shall allow you will be another fifteen years.

'Fifteen years from what time?' Asked the English language, at which the judge felt so confused that he ordered, 'I will not allow any more discussion on this subject,' and rose for the day.
The Constitution continued to make guarantees for the extension of English and the fifteen years time limit became a mythical category. A Report of the Official Language Commission in 1956 recommended the use of English for law-courts and in the administration of justice. The Official Language Act of 1963 allowed its use for all Union purposes. Finally, in 1967, with the amendment to the OLA, English acquired a special status in the Constitution as an "associate official language" of the Union without any time limit. The post-independence fervour for one language as the focus of national unity was clearly ebbing away. As things stand now, Government propaganda expresses support and encouragement for Hindi, but social and economic opportunities favour English. Hindi is the language of approximately 50% of the entire population. In contrast, English is the language of a very small urban minority. However even this minority in a densely populated country adds up to 25 to 30 million speakers. This minuscule fraction of the population is spread all over the country and is fully entrenched in powerful positions. It is clear that English is guarded by ideological, regional and class interests. The Judiciary, Education, Print and Visual Media and all bodies of the Central government support English. As a result, the use of Hindi has acquired a doggedness and as far as administration is concerned, it has become "ceremonial rather than communicative. The dissemination of Hindi over the years has occurred, perhaps not through government fiat, but with the help of the Hindi visual media."

One of the ways out of the Hindi-English bind along with the claims of other regional languages, was the much-touted three-language formula. According to this, three languages - the regional, the national (Hindi) and the international (English) should be
studied by every Indian school-going child. The programme was devised with a view to
privileging the regional language within a given state, teaching Hindi for national and
inter-regional communication and English for progress and scientific thought. In a
multilingual country where languages do not always correspond to ethnic or territorial
identities, this solution did not work, but remained a distant goal. It was meant to impose
an equal handicap on all learners from all regions but it only succeeded in reinforcing the
use of English.

The position of English then, as the broad sketch above shows, has been consolidated and
made permanent in India, and the period after independence has witnessed the
proliferation of English. There has been unprecedented migration and "a continental­
sized middle-class is positioned all over the country, surpassing all barriers of language
and distance." In the absence of a common language, English is the only language by
which the urban educated Indian from one region relates to urban educated person from
another. The centralising imperatives of a diverse and multilingual nation have further
reinforced the use of English at several levels. English is the language of the judiciary
and of any dialogue between the Centre and the states. In some senses, English merely
succeeds Sanskrit, Persian and Urdu as a language of prestige articulating, power and
privilege at different points in subcontinental history. Yet the authority represented by
English today has in many ways superseded the Sanskrit heritage of the pandits, not to
mention the Persian lingua franca of the Moghuls. English is not just the language of
an elite, limited to a few; it is also a language of wider communication at both national
and international levels. In this respect, the very plurality of India has accentuated the use of English. Therefore the view that English is, unlike Hindi, a "pan-Indian" language since it does not belong to any specific region and its knowledge can be taken for granted among educated circles, is gaining ground. Ahmad refers to the English-based intelligentsia in all cosmopolitan cities of the country for whom "only the literary document produced in English is a national document; all else is regional, hence minor and forgettable, so that English emerges in this imagination not as one of the Indian languages, which it undoubtedly is, but as the language of national integration and bourgeois civility."^{45}

III

Despite its steady entrenchment in the Indian polity and society, attitudes towards English have remained ambiguous—wanting it at some levels and resisting it at some others. English has been a language of public discourse over a long time. While few would deny its importance in administration (like Persian) and or its cultural elitism (like Sanskrit), the emotional relationship between Indians and English has been far from simple. There has been a long history of resistance, even among those who have used English in official matters, towards accepting English as a language of feelings and emotions. Since cultural and literary productions are considered a direct outcome of the extent to which a language permeates private zones of experience, Indian Writing in English offers an interesting measure of this phenomenon.
The steady record of Indian writing in English is also a record of our emotional relationship with the English language. Apologetic beginnings have given way to a robust (over) confidence culminating in Rushdie's claim that only English writings from India deserve attention. Hostility in India towards IWE up to the seventies, as well as IWE's current centrality in the market today are indicative of a gradual willingness to accept literary productions in English. This point needs elaboration because translations from Indian languages into English have increased parallel to the growth of IWE. The acceptance of Indian Writing in English has played a crucial role in the development of translation into English. At a time when Indian Writing in English was because of its being written in English considered 'inauthentic,' translations in English stood little chance of acceptance.

At this point, therefore, we need to examine the interrelationship between Indian writing in English and English translation. Historically speaking, ILET (Indian Literature in English Translation) was an activity subsidiary to and concurrent with IWE. The body of works in translation was neither significant nor voluminous enough to draw attention to itself as a separate body. The first academic consideration of literature in English translation was Sujit Mukherjee's *Translation as Discovery*, but it remained an isolated instance for many years. In the heyday of bellicose anti-English feeling, it did occurred to few that many Indian writers had parallel careers as writers and translators. In any case, the general view of translation as something secondary compounded with the perception of English as a language inadequate to carry the 'Indian ethos,' did not serve the cause of translation in English. If, as is generally believed, translation involves an inevitable loss,
the loss becomes more pronounced when meaning is transferred from an Indian to an alien language. As things stand now, literature in translation owes some of its acceptability and conventions to Indian Writing in English, which has had a dramatic success in the last decade and a half. At the same time literature in translation has implicit claims to 'authenticity' and 'realism,' and for that reason is being privileged, in some quarters, over Indian Writing in English. The contentious relationship between the two kinds of literary productions is still embryonic, but it appears that great possibilities are in store for Indian literature in translation.

Indian Writing in English, till as recently as the early eighties, was considered by readers and critics alike as a freakish, curious phenomenon. M.K. Naik speaks of the 'civil leer' and 'faint recognition' with which IWE was treated. Underlying this condescending attitude was the assumption that English was the coloniser's legacy and an alien language. As far as the detractors of IWE were concerned, original writing in English presupposed an emotional intimacy with an alien language (and by implication, deracination). As a corollary, this attitude implied the cultural and moral superiority of the regional literatures. When pre-independence writers like Sarojini Naidu and Sri Aurobindo wrote in English, the exercise did not draw much attention. It did not have a distinct tone and body of its own and was anyway an odd phenomenon that could not be amalgamated with the main literatures of India. In the third decade of the twentieth century, the achievement of novelists like R.K. Narayan and Mulk Raj Anand failed to create Indian audiences. The view that "as long as the vernaculars in India are ... alive it should be the aim of Indians to develop them, for writing in a foreign tongue can serve no useful
purpose", shaped much of the discussion even in the sixties and seventies. Aparna and Vinay Dharwadker note how Indian English writers and their counterparts in the Indian languages fought out a nationalistic battle in the post-colonial sphere over the place of English in literary and cultural systems, till almost the mid-seventies. In fact, till the mid-eighties, a familiar heading in most discussions and seminars on Indian writing in English was, "Why I write in English!" An Indian writer had to express apologies or offer explanations about his choice of language. Kamala Das makes a spirited defence of her choice of language.

Don't write in English, they said,
English is not your mother tongue Why not leave
Me alone, critics, friends, visiting cousins,
Every one of you? Why not let me speak in
Any language I like? The language I speak
Becomes mine, mine alone It is half English, half
Indian, funny perhaps, but it is honest,
It is as human as I am human.

Apologies and explanations have today been rendered redundant by Midnight's Children and its subsequent avatars 'Whoring after English Gods' is no longer tantamount to betraying one's identity. IWE, simply by virtue of its success in the Western world (prizes won, advances paid, reviews printed) is here to stay. The rapid growth of Indian Writing in English reflects the cultural acceptability of English and its enlarged uses in our lives.
Also, there have been profound sociological changes in India, that have determined attitudes towards English. A postcolonial generation that is not embarrassed by writing in English considers English an Indian language through use, content and right. Indian writers in English write with flair and unselfconsciousness, even with a playful intimacy. Rushdie stands like a colossus in this world. His creation of a unique English inflected by non-English tones and words has opened up possibilities for many. The process of vernacularising English initiated by Raja Rao, perhaps before his time, has been taken much farther by Amitav Ghosh, Upamanyu Chatterjee and Salman Rushdie. It has set in motion what the linguists call "liberation Linguistics," that is, the breakaway of Indian English from the British model of RP (Received Pronunciation). This has had far-reaching implications for the enterprise of writing in as well as translating into English. The 'idiom' put in place by Indian writers in English has helped the process of translating from an Indian language into English and conventions of translation have begun to change because of the intimate contact English has had with Indian languages. Translators translate with confidence, appropriating culture-specific terms and sometimes flaunting them without making concessions. "Shouldn't we question that cultural imperialism which suggests that one is worthy of being heard only if one speaks in standard English?" asks Mini Krishnan (Macmillan India). Katha, the publisher of short fiction in translation, asks its translators to retain certain culture-bound terms in the body of a text and to explain, if need be, in a glossary. Ranga Rao concludes that the "essence of creative translation is a balance of English with a good wholesome vernacular cargo." Although translating from an Indian language into English remains difficult, the task is no longer considered inhibiting. Translators, competent and professional, straddle the two
languages with ease and sophistication. A radical reconsideration of the translation process and theoretical shifts in evaluating translations, (discussed in the first section) have also played a crucial role. The critical investment and material resources funneled into translation activity globally make the relationship between translated text and the original an ambiguous and complex one. The 'translator's invisibility' will soon become an academic myth. In India specifically, the cultural acceptance of English (evident through Indian Writing in English), along with the conceptual possibility of translation, has made the latter much more rewarding.

IV

In this section I wish to focus upon the cultural and sociological modes of reception of Indian writing in English and Indian literature in English translation within India. The availability of books in English for various segments of the middle-class is both determined by and determines the specific affiliations of Indian readerships. Within India, a strong segment of scholarly opinion claims that an "authentic" expression of India rests in the literatures of the regional languages, not in Indian writing in English. Since regional literatures are available to a vast majority of the urban educated, ILET is by implication more 'authentic' than IWE. Salman Rushdie's exclusion of authors writing in regional languages from an anthology of post-independence Indian literature on the grounds of quality of literature and dearth of good translations provoked many a heated discussion. The responses to Rushdie's blithe disregard clearly showed how only by making Indian literature available in English the "hegemonic" role of IWE
If Indian literature is to play an important role in the world literary market, it is possible only through English. The Macmillan project (discussed in detail in the following chapter) was born of the editor's belief that "Indian Literature was being marginalised in many ways." A section of Indian scholars also believes that the publicity and visibility of IWE is incongruent with its ability to "portray our social and spiritual lives." In a review of texts in translation, the reviewer Radhakrishnan Nayar is of the opinion that "In Indo-Anglian fiction the viewpoint is always western; India is seen from outside and from a position of superiority." This, according to another study, is because a majority of Indo-English authors are expatriates, and even those who live in India constitute an elite. Those who write primarily in English are privileged and cosmopolitan and not in touch with grassroot reality of India. The earlier objection to the 'English' language is now directed at a related target—an urban cosmopolitanism! The vast body of 'Indian literature' stems from, we are given to understand, a 'real' Indian experience. The publisher of the Katha volumes was congratulated for "making available in English translation, the 'real' India to English readers across the world." The experience of Indian literature is conflated with the 'Indian experience'.

Reviews of texts in translation employ thickly textured words to describe the burgeoning body of texts. Terms such as 'authentic,' genuine' and 'real' evoke moral judgement, and thereby establish the moral superiority of Indian Literature (in English translation) over Indian writing in English. In terms that evoke the "noble savage" V Abdulla states that "there is no doubt that Indian writing in Indian languages have an 'earthiness' and 'an
Indian soul’ that are found lacking in what is called 'Indo-Anglian' writing."59 Another set of metaphors employed in the service of ILET evokes a sense of a fortuitous discovery. Expressions such as ‘treasure-trove,’ ‘wealth’ 'gems' and 'pearls' figure commonly in reviews and studies of literature in translation. For instance the translator and editor V. Abdulla refers to "the gems of creative writing nestling in the dark unfathomed oceans of Indian literature" brought to light through translation.60

This is not to say that authors like Mahasweta Devi, Krishna Sobti or Ananthamurthy were unfamiliar names to those who read in Indian languages -- only that the *English* language is 'discovering' them for the first time. However, in the collective consciousness of the English-speaking urban middle class, English has cast a shadow over what happens in and between other languages. The interesting thing about translation in English is that even those keen to emphasise the elitism and dominance of the English language, do not find literary production in English elitist. It is a 'golden mean' -- it is real and authentic because written in the languages of the masses and expressive of the non-metropolitan experience. At the same time, it is available in a metropolitan language. The tinge of guilt associated with English is contained within the framework of 'authenticity.' English in this context becomes a 'pan-Indian' language and not a language of the powerful few; its use here is free of cultural and political implications. The nationalists' charge that English causes a wedge between Indian languages is well and truly countered by its role as a link between Indian languages. In such a scenario, English performs the nationalistic role of bringing languages and literatures closer. Rivals have become allies -- the opposing camps of the "English elite" and the "vernacular nationalist" enter into the mutually
convenient pact of translation because translation benefits both groups. The coloniser's language, in this case, can be used to serve the colonised culture, states Satchidandan, the present secretary of the Sahitya Akademi. It must be noted that the Sahitya Akademi journal Indian Literature is in English and both Katha and Sahitya Akademi admit that direct translation from one Indian language to another is not possible without routing them through English. Through translation the 'unifying' and 'centralising' role of English is enlarged!

So far I have tried to show how ILET which began as an activity quite minor and unnoticed in the past is emerging in a central way. The moral claims attached to Indian literature and the local-global dominance of English discussed so far facilitates its very positive reception. Although the segment of intelligentsia that reviews books and makes comparisons between IWE and ILET is influential in shaping perceptions, the production and consumption of literature as a product in the market is another story. Various segments from many social levels justify through their reception the intellectual and economic cost of a literary product and 'explain' its proliferation. I now wish to turn to factors that affect the production and consumption of translations, in a more direct way.

The first significant readership is constituted by the vast body of students and teachers of literature departments in India. The impetus to translate has come largely from teachers of English. A sociology of translators published will show that some of the best-known translators have been academics such as Dilip Chitre, A.K.Ramanujan, Lakshmi Holmstrom, Tejaswini Niranjana, Susie Tharu, Harish Trivedi, and many others.
Secondly, literary curricula in many universities include texts in translation. As Trivedi says, "it has begun to figure on the agenda of political correctness."\footnote{62}

After the eighties many teachers of English in India began to articulate a sense of alienation and anger at having to teach a language and literature imposed upon them historically, as a legacy of colonialism. This phenomenon referred to as the 'crisis in English studies' generated books like Rethinking English and The Lie of the Land. Teachers of English expressed a sense of the incongruity between Indian students' everyday lives and alien western texts. Different alternatives to Anglo-American texts emerged as a result of this debate. New paradigms are still being sought and dissolved, old canons are being questioned while new ones are still being formed. However, one alternative, according to Meenakshi Mukherjee is devising "personal strategies for survival" in an atmosphere where teachers are "beset with doubt and unease about the validity and relevance of English studies."\footnote{63} She suggests the teaching of Indian texts in English translation as one of the ways out of a Eurocentric bind. There have been suggestions about making literature in translation a 'counter-literature'. Secondly, teachers of English suggest using translation as a pedagogic tool in language-learning acquisition. For the generations after independence, bilingualism has usually meant knowledge of one Indian language and English. Bilingual methods of teaching or reading news (as in Zee TV) are manifestations of this phenomenon.

These developments in academia proper derive from similar interrogations in the West as well as from some profound sociological changes within India. Both student and teacher
populations, are now, out of un/conscious choice turning to Indian texts, as opposed to previous generations to whom English texts meant only those written by standard English authors. For vast student groups formed through the democratisation of education, especially for those from non-anglicised backgrounds, British texts are alien and Indian texts are much easier to relate to, even when they are about communities different from their own. All this goes to create modes or conventions of translation in various areas and possible ways in which translations can be used. Lakshmi Holmstrom draws attention to another determinant in the proliferation of translation which she identifies as the "thrust of modern literary studies in India, and the increasing importance that is being given to comparisons and connections across the different Indic languages, and the interest in retracing and retrieving literary histories." In fact any project of comparative studies across different languages owes its substantiation and analysis to translation.

An analysis of why translations in English are more widely produced and read today also needs to take account of social demographic patterns. Migration to cities far from places of origin leads in the second generation to a loss of literacy in the mother tongue. Children of a linguistic community settled in spots far from what used to be called "the native place" can usually speak their mother tongue but they seldom learn to read it, the demands of schooling leave little time for third language acquisition. They get English, the regional language, and, in most states, Hindi as well, if, in addition, a Tamil child has to acquire Tamil, the parents have to make special arrangements. For a variety of reasons this is not always possible. When such young people want to experience the literature even of their own linguistic communities, they have to resort to English translations.
Obviously, the literature of other Indian languages will also come to them through English. Processes of urbanisation have also played a part in creating what are now called "language orphans." The move from village to the city is quite often simultaneous with that from a joint family system or community life to a nuclear family system. This shift reduces pressures on individuals which make them retain the mother tongue.

Apart from academic establishments, the general middle-class reading public finds itself caught in a postcolonial ethos which demands, simultaneously, a knowledge of English and a self-conscious Indianness. Cultural trends also shape the reading habits of large sections of society. One has only to think of cross-cultural exchanges in cuisine and textiles all over India to see signs of a cultural excitement in which literature too finds its slot. The taste for the regional and the ethnic also demands regional texts. Given the absence of a common language, this hunger for the regional can be appeased only through translated texts. For the privileged English-educated elite, it is fashionable to wear ethnic clothes, and to recover ancient Indian texts, for them also, English becomes a way to relate to an Indian inheritance.

Finally, translation enables the construction of the nation itself, apparently possible only through a 'neutral' language like English. To a vast body of general readers today, works in translation offer a picture or a framework for looking at this entity called India. While it is true that we have always, or at least since Nehru, been aware of the cultural diversity of India, it seems safe to say that the last fifteen years have witnessed a frenetic upsurge of regional images seeking to coalesce into a mosaic, a whole that is India.
Introductions to anthologies of poetry and short stories reflect the twentieth century definition of India as a rich, polylingual and multicultural country. The introduction to a Katha collection of short stories says, "There is so much diversity in Indian stories and often it is the very diversity that loops them together, sensuously, delicately, almost invisibly into something that looks whole to the outsider who does not see the woof and the warp, the brilliant colours that have been cajoled into each and every fibre by varying hands and minds." Although this refers to the stories, each story represents in the scheme of the anthology a community, a group, a language all of which, when bound together, create what we may call a 'mosaic.' In the review of a Katha collection of short stories, the reviewer Ashish Sharma informs the reader that the "Katha volumes are an accessible celebration of the Indian experience in all its diversity." This is not true of a Katha anthology alone. For instance the Macmillan series of novels states its aim to create the same sense of an 'Indian tradition.'

"Whatever our quarrels and shifting factions, all Indians know that they have a complex, stable system of values, beliefs and practices which forged long ago has never really been interrupted. Our programme of translation is an exploration of this Indian tradition which is one of humankind's most enduring attempts to create an order of existence that would make life both tolerable and meaningful." The imagery of brotherhood woven into these words here has been the stock of a 'traditional' way of looking at translation. Understanding different literatures for Indians within India is an "exploration" of the pattern in the carpet. However, translation in English also aims at Indians outside India who are increasingly forming a significant centre and market for cultural productions. Immigrant Indians in search of their linguistic
and cultural traditions take recourse to translation. The Internet has special sites of Indian literature translated into English for English-speaking audiences in India, but more especially for Indians living abroad. There is very often an equation between understanding India and reading her literature in translation. This means that such an understanding can be gained only through an English translation. In an anthology called *India. A Wealth of Diversity*, the introduction, and visual images focus, like brochures of tourism, on the fascinating mix of voices that constitute India. The project, according to the editors, is an attempt to "work it out," and "to discover what is happening in the literature, on the land and within the people in India who, as always with literature, constitute its subject and its center." The conflation of India with "Indian" and "diverse" rests on the dictum of 'unity-in-diversity.' Whether the emphasis is on the first or second form, depends upon the project and editorial priorities. With an organisation like the Sahitya Akadem which is wedded to a nationalist ideology, translation shows the civilisational unity that underlies differences. Similar concerns are voiced in Mini Krishnan's introduction cited above. However, the editors of *Women Writing in India* proceed from a theoretical stand that any homogenous definition of India conceals its fissures and heterogeneity. Translation in this case is the means that can allow a 'play of difference.' The editors claim that they have "tried, therefore, in the translations, not always successfully, to strain against the reductive and often stereotypical homogenisation involved in the process. We preferred translations that did not domesticate the work either into a pan-Indian or into a universalist mode, but demanded of the reader a translation of herself." In any case, whether it is the 'unifying' agenda of an official channel like the Sahitya Akademi, or a postcolonial and poststructuralist
agenda of 'difference,' translation comes in useful. It creates a notional image of the nation even as it questions it. The India that is created can be expressed only through English. The 'diverse' images in translation have the same framework as many other kinds of print and visual media. For instance, the Festivals of India organised for foreign countries provide Indians with a new way of regarding themselves as parts of a rich complex systems, different elements that make a whole. Similarly, *Surabhi*, one of the most successful televised programmes gave 'interesting' details about various states, each link affording pride in this newly discovered 'diversity' called India, a unity constituted of different elements. These call for representation to both, a West ever in search of the exotic, and to Indians themselves as they rediscover the variety of their cultural inheritance. In effect, English translations from different regions centralise, India's polylingualism and create a slice of 'Indian reality' that can be consumed by both India and the West.

It must be noted that translation into English has certain ideological and political implications, some of which will be addressed in the conclusion to this study. The kind of 'representation' of Indian literatures made through English translation is a highly problematic issue. A very crucial issue that should claim one's attention is the effect of English translation activity upon translations from one Indian language into another. I will return to these questions later. At the moment I wish to draw attention to another aspect of English translation which sustains its relevance and importance. The social importance of English helps enhance the regional text and its author. As someone noted recently, "There are many ways to raise the profile of bhasha literature. Translation on
a massive scale would be the first step. Thus translation is crucial not only to make, say, Gujarati writers available to non-Gujarati readers, but also because it enhances the importance of the Gujarati writers themselves. C.S.Lakshmi says, "I have been writing for many years in Tamizh, but it is only after I have been translated into English that I am invited to forums like this. So, being translated into English was actually a kind of promotion. Because, when you write only in Tamizh, they assume that you don't have anything to state. This in turn undermines any 'threatening edge' that attends upon a dominant English activity.

It is clear from the above that English translation activity meets a number of different needs. Social, historical and economic factors at the moment are favourable to the retention of English in India, and as long as that situation obtains, English translation will retain its newly acquired centrality.
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