CHAPTER III
TRANSLATION OF MODERN MALAYALAM FICTION INTO ENGLISH:
ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE TEXTS, IDENTIFYING CULTURAL AND
LINGUISTIC PROBLEMS AND THEIR SOLUTIONS

In this chapter, the following texts are subjected to detailed analysis:


The above texts are taken as samples, taking into consideration the scope and representative character of the works selected. We have *Indulekha* from the heart of the colonial times, *Marthanda Varma* from the fag end of colonial rule, *Chemmeen* to represent the typical post-colonial, Third World phase, Basheer’s *Me Grandad 'ad an Elephant!' Three Stories of Muslim Life in South India*, as the first independent and neutral translation into English and O. V. Vijayan’s *Saga of Dharmapuri*, since it marks the beginning of the era beyond modernism, heralding the strides made into the 21st century.

The above works are milestones; no one can go past them without examining their different roles. Samples from some other texts, mostly from those published during the last couple of decades, are also drawn selectively for analysis on a case by case basis. Sketches on these works and their authors and translators are provided at the end of the detailed notes on the five selected texts.
Linguistic, cultural and other problems of translation identified during the course of the analysis of the above texts are listed below — with supporting evidence by way of instances culled from the texts subjected to detailed analysis, with possible solutions, and alternate translations wherever called for — after the introductory notes on the novels and their translations. Analyses of other texts mentioned above are also made use of in the citations under individual heads of “problems of translation” provided below.

Notes:

(1). Page numbers quoted within brackets throughout the analysis of works are numbers of the pages of the T L text used for the analysis and listed in the “Works Cited” section at the end of this research thesis.

(2). Alternate translations offered by the present researcher appear within square brackets and are indicated at the end of the translated passage by the initials (TPR).

INTRODUCTORY NOTES ON THE NOVELS AND THEIR TRANSLATIONS

Indulekha

In his “Translator’s Preface” to Indulekha, Dumergue, the translator, states:

With regard to the translation itself, no one can be more painfully aware than I am myself of its many shortcomings, and I would beg those who honour me by reading it to remember, in criticizing the book itself, that the original must have suffered from the faults of the translation. In accepting, however, my due share of responsibility, I must express regret that, owing to a mistake by
which an imperfectly corrected proof was used as the "final revise," there have occurred, in the first half of the work, errors and misprints which would have disappeared on actual revision.

That the translation as a whole represents the meaning (the emphasis is that of the researcher), of the original is guaranteed by the fact that the author himself did me the favour of perusing the manuscript copy and suggesting such alterations as were necessary; but at the same time I would ask those who sit in judgment on me to bear in mind that the translation is not intended as a "crib" for the use of schools. Although I have generally adhered as closely as possible to the original, I have not hesitated to depart from the literal idiom on occasions when it would be unintelligible or discordant in English. For instance, I may mention that, as pointed out to me by an eminent orientalist, the moon in Sanskrit is masculine, and therefore it was inaccurate to call that luminary "the witching queen." But I think that, very properly, a veil would have to be drawn over the fate of the Frenchman who rendered "der mond" as "le lune," and I confess that I have neither the courage nor the wish to tamper with the gender of the "orbed maiden with white fire laden."

Of Sanskrit I am ignorant, and obtained the meaning of some of the stanzas which occur in the original from the author and of others from a Telugu Pundit through transliteration, but for the verses in which that meaning has now been reproduced I am in-
debted to my wife (pp. viii-ix).

A careful reading of “The Translator’s Preface” (a portion of which is also quoted in Chapter II) leads to the following observations, especially when we look back so far down in history.

One: The translator is certainly solicitous and genuinely concerned towards a fledgling literature of one of the many vernaculars he has come across in colonial India.

Two: He admits to his own shortcomings with humility and requests his readers not to underestimate the original, because he would have caused it damage through his faults in translation.

Three: He acknowledges that certain technical problems caused errors and misprints to be crept into the text.

Four: In those days, translation meant getting the equivalent “meaning” of the S L text in the T L text.

Five: The author believes that getting the author to approve the draft would absolve him of any or all faults in translation.

Six: In those days of faithful translation, while the translator has tried to be as close to the original as possible, he has also taken the liberty to depart from the original, according to the requirements of the T L culture (The fact that he could afford to do so, because English was the dominant language and Malayalam had to be beholden to it for the favour of getting the work translated into it, remains).

Seven: The translator asserts that the novel is not meant as study material for school children and hence is presented as it is: a work of art.
Eight: That the essential cultural difference between the Western and Eastern cultures, projected through the example of the translation of the moon as feminine in English is quite convincing.

Nine: The colonial agenda was expressed quite openly, as is evident from the remarks Dumergue makes about the usefulness of the novel to the Imperial administration for ethnographic purposes.

Ten: Cultural appropriation is facilitated through free translation of the novel. The absence of footnotes or glossary corroborates this view. The remarks about the freedom he takes and the authority with which he does it give away the translator's intent.

In this context, two things appear as inexorable verities: that, when Dumergue is translating a vernacular text into English, the imperial target language, the arbitrariness in favour of the latter comes in as something natural for him to do, or, as a sort of privilege (Once again attention is drawn to the fact that no footnotes or glossary are provided in the T L text. In other words, the original novel was sufficiently planned out to fit into the colonial agenda); that, Chandu Menon, by reading the manuscript copy and suggesting alterations, has tried to hold his own. But even he, though the author of the original, could not possibly detect all the inaccuracies and departures, and may have had to acquiesce owing to his eagerness to see the novel published in English translation and approve the T L text. The translated text is something entirely beyond him. Rather, his authorial authority over the translated text is abrogated, whether he is aware of it or not.

From the earliest work of fiction in Malayalam to get translated into English, we
are able to make this first crucial inference: translation is certainly not about getting right the meaning of the original as a whole in the target language. It is a much more complex and complicated activity.

Dumergue, Chandu Menon’s translator, was his superior officer in the Civil Service. Though a fearless and independent Sub-Judge, Chandu Menon’s use of officialese at the beginning of the letter he writes to the former is very revealing: “I respectfully beg to submit herewith a copy of my Malayalam novel for your kind acceptance and perusal.” Now, those who are in the government service or quasi-government service will find nothing amiss in the above supplication, as it is a standard wording even now. However, what is thus proved, is not the point that it is a normal thing to write like that; but, that we have not changed our colonial, subservient language at least in official use.

_Marthanda Varma_

B. K. Menon, the translator of C. V. Raman Pillai’s _Marthanda Varma_, appeals to the admirers of the great man in the most humble manner, in “In Apology,” the translator’s note that appears at the beginning of the translation, to bear with him for his act of translation as if it is some kind of transgression. He also writes about the factors that urged him to embark upon the translation into English, of such a seminal work. Says Menon in his “In Apology”:

Ever since I could read and appreciate the original _Marthanda Varma_, I have felt that the book was virtually crying for wider publicity and that due recognition had not been given to it, even though succeeding generations of readers and writers had
admitted their admiration for the same, making futile attempts to imitate its style and significance. The chaos out of which the maker of modern Travancore lifted the State, sweeping over the rebel hordes like the veritable sickle of death, the lion-like valour with which he fought his way to the throne, the hairbreadth escapes that throng the narrative, the capacity for suffering and sacrifice exhibited by the handful of loyal subjects who persevered along the path of tradition through thick and thin, lend the colour of romance to this history... (p.5).

However, the translator admits to his omissions and commissions most elaborately in the apology. Says he: "...In certain places I have had to enlarge into pages what the author of the original has conserved in a syllable. And in others, what runs into pages in the original had to be cut short as they did not seem to fit in..." Apart from mutilations referred to earlier, B. K. Menon also concedes that the linguistic and cultural elements in the original were almost totally lost in the translation.

But, when he reveals that, "I have also on my own account attempted to give a political colour to the activities of the Chiefs of the Eight Houses, a powerful body of Nair Chieftains of Travancore in the eighteenth Century, in the light of later events, in order to give a more rational interpretation to what would otherwise have been a callous crime," we are not convinced. How could he take such a liberty? Could not an explanatory note have sufficed? What was his compulsion to give such a "political colour" to the affairs of the Nair chieftains, within the body
of the novel in the translated text? We can only guess that political and social considerations of the time might have led Menon to do what he did.

So, the real inspiration for embarking upon the translation project is more political and social than literary. Menon is very explicit about it when he declares that:

"Ever since I could read and appreciate the original
Marthanda Varma, I have felt that the book was virtually crying for wider publicity and that due recognition had not been given to it.... But late as it is to begin now, I somehow feel that no more opportune moment could have been selected to proclaim the picturesque episodes that lie entwined in the history of this little state and resurrect the names of its heroes, now become almost legendary, than the immediate present, when the pleasing personality and enlightened views of the youthful Maharajah on the Gadi, has made Travancore synonymous with progress and prosperity today, both in India and outside..." (pp.5-6).

Thus, the aims and objectives of the translation project are set forth. The identification of a juncture in history where greater glory would accrue to the State of Travancore through the English translation and wide circulation of the novel depicting the heroes of the Kingdom's yester-years, appears now to be quite arbitrary and paradoxical when we look at it in retrospect; arbitrary in the sense that display of patriotism is a politically correct thing perennially and there is no need for any choice in this matter; paradoxical when one looks at it now in the light of
the historical developments of those times, like the spread of anti-monarchy cam-
paigns and the nationalist movement that were to bring about a termination of the
kingdom within the next ten years. And about the apology the translator makes:

The very act of having ventured to render into another lan-
guage, a work of such outstanding literary excellence as Mr. C. V.
Raman Pillai's *Marthanda Varma*, has perhaps made it incumbent
on me to render also an apology to the reading public. Conservative
opinion is sure to frown upon me as a poacher on sacred preserves,
an interloper who has laid unworthy hands on a brilliant masterpiece
that had stood the test of time and held its "pride of place" in
Malayalam literature for nearly half a century. Let me therefore
make peace with those whose feelings I might have wounded and
explain that mine is an act of worship, not one of violation. (p.5)

There are a great many things he must really be apologetic about; he has
certainly poached on sacred grounds and committed sacrilege, as is revealed in the
subsequent analysis of the T L text. With the present T L text it is not possible to
"make peace with those whose feelings" the translator has certainly wounded, as
the present researcher could surmise going by the extent of damage done to the
text.

However, the sway the English language held over the educated classes is
evident from B. K. Menon's decision to translate into it inspite of being aware of
his own inadequacies, although Travancore was not directly under colonial rule,
whereas Malabar was. English was certainly fashionable in those days and even
earlier; we have C. V. Raman Pillai corresponding with his Malayalee friends in
chaste English in the late nineteenth century, Changampuzha Krishna Pillai, the
great romantic poet of Malayalam, does the same thing half a century later as
eminent models. English obviously is the fancy language of accomplished person-
ages as well as that of upcoming socialites in Kerala, for more than a century now.
Translating into it is the ultimate achievement for any Malayalee writer, living or
dead--B. K. Menon's reasons for translating Marthanda Varma the way he did
seem to suggest these, besides political and social compulsions, despite his prov-
tations about reaching a wider readership.

The revealing statements the translator makes about the process of transla-
tion, about his acts of omission and commission, and the declaration of the purity
of his intentions and so on, are really valuable in the field of translation studies. He
avers that to maintain the feel of the time and place of the action in a historical
romance like Marthanda Varma, in its translation into English, a language so
dissimilar to Malayalam, it is necessary to dispense with the idea of literal or
faithful translation, and that, instead of translation, something like "transmutation"
is called for. and rue's the fact that, there exists, however, no alchemy to ensure
this. The modern idea of "transcreation" is echoed here which, as we shall see
presently, is fraught with all the problems of translation it rakes up.

B. K. Menon further reveals that he had only two options: one, to change
the names of characters and places and shift the action of the story to a distant or
even fictitious country, and admits in the same breath, that besides being contrary
to the projected aims and objectives, it would have been the worst kind of plagia-
nsni (Why then did he dwell on this possibility? Worse, why discuss this at all? However, it is a highly revealing statement regarding his attitudes and ideas on translation). The other option was a literal translation, which he had already ruled out. Now comes the middle course, which he seems to have adopted: "I had therefore to take certain liberties and use my discrimination." What is lost in the process would certainly have been the linguistic and cultural peculiarities of the original. Before attempting to list out the translator’s acts of omission and commission, attention is drawn to certain specific cases of departure from the original, admitted by the author in "In Apology."

As the translator does not claim that he has followed the original closely, the comparison of the TI text with the SL text is also executed with a view to accommodate more of the substance of the SL text, than to dwell on the nitty-gritty of words and phrases. Yet, the analysis has turned out to be fairly elaborate. The translator has already admitted in his apology that he had not been able to catch in translation the patois in which the old armoury keeper, the mad Chaannaan’s impromptu verses, Sundaram’s hybrid Tamil, and Ramanamadhom’s drunken drawl and that he has made expansions taking off from what C. V. says in a syllable, and cut away whole pages to suit the requirements of English. All these admissions resound with the translator’s confrontation with linguistic and cultural problems and his virtual failure to resolve them. It is also noted that the translator has employed a neutral language throughout, as it should be, without trying to find equivalences in the dialects of English, for the varied speech patterns of each and every character C. V. had accomplished in the SL text with superb dexterity.
There is in fact a book dedicated exclusively for the compilation of the individual variants of dialects spoken by C. V. ’s characters from his historical novels—Pratipaatram Bhaashanabhedam by N. Krishna Pillai). In this aspect also, linguistic and cultural problems have been given a short shrift in the translation. In the course of the analysis, it will also be seen whether alternate strategies can be worked out to retain the left out portions, and to present the S L text in its entirety, without causing much damage to the T L sensibility.

Certain major departures the translator made from the general narrative plan followed by the author are noted below:

a). The scheme of chapter numbering is changed. In the place of Chapter One is a “Prologue” and instead of the last chapter, there is “Conclusion.” Both changes are welcome.

b). Translations of the quatrains or couplets quoted at the beginning of the chapters are not provided. This is certainly an important miss.

c). The conversations in the original text are modelled on the dialogues in a play text. Like the stage directions and explanatory descriptions that appear within brackets in the play text, C. V. has also given minute descriptions of the emotions, facial expressions, movements and gestures of the characters, within brackets. However, in the translation, all such details are omitted throughout.

d). Culture-specific tones and expressions have been mostly sanitised from the T L text. The S L text is unique in that it abounds in proverbs, adages, dictums, idioms and phrases; the translation is a colourless English text, the likes of which we usually come across. The present researcher is not convinced that every effort
has been taken by the translator to be faithful to the original as far as possible. Two things lead to this inference: one, that the translator has done a lot of needless additions and deletions; two, he has not attempted to preserve culture-specific nuances even in possible cases. Individual cases in support of these observations are cited below, in the analysis.

e). What the translator has taken care to do is to preserve the action line of the story. The natural flow of the narrative is comparatively more in the translation than in the original, it would seem. But at what cost has this been achieved is the question. C. V. 's masterpiece, containing an entire cosmos, has been reduced to a palatable, seemingly one-dimensional, racy narrative. The freedom the translator has taken with the English language gives the text totally unintended tonal effects, which are also listed in the analysis below.

f). Confusion in terms has crept in, during the course of translation. For example, throughout the novel, two different terms such as “Kashivasi” and “Kotanki” meaning “a dweller of Kashi”, or as religious person and “as wandering fortune-teller” find one and the same equivalent word in translation: “Bhairagi.” There are a few other cases which are similar, indicated below:

Chemmeen

As already seen, Chemmeen was a huge success as a regional novel translated into English. Obviously, the book contained some hidden formula of success; this must have been one of the reasons for its instant popularity, besides the impressive translation. Says Shantha Rama Rau in her “Introduction”:

To my great delight Chemmeen is set in my favourite part of
India, an area I know well because my own family comes from close by. The tiny fishing villages of Kerala on the West Coast are among the most beautiful I have ever seen. Scalloped with sandy beaches, shaded by mop-headed coconut palms, studded with charming thatched cottages, launching the elegantly proportioned rowing boats, the Kerala villages contain a most exotic life for the tourist, the stranger, the passing traveller. A Gaugin world… (p.vii).

The picture of such an exotic idyll would capture the imagination of readers on a universal scale. But that is not all. Apart from this magic formula, its literary qualities certainly helped the book to become such a spectacular success. Narayana Menon says in his “Translator’s Note”: “Thakazhi, … tempers his realism in Chemmeen with a new romanticism. The result is that Chemmeen has the quality of a fable in which the lives, the superstitions, the inner beliefs, the traditions and the sufferings of the community of fishermen are portrayed as a way of life with a deep and significant moral.” The theme is so simple and stark, and yet lofty and universal. Comparisons can be made with the best of the world’s works depicting the struggle between sea and man, the elements conspiring to defeat him, and yet, the human spirit enduring. One readily remembers Hemingway’s The Old Man and the Sea in the context of Palani’s struggle with the big fish, the sea, and the elements of nature. Captain Ahab of Moby Dick and Chemban Kunju of Chemmeen are both deluded by extreme pride and challenge all authority.

Tracing the success-story of Chemmeen, Meenakshi Mukherjee also makes some pertinent observations:
What could be more local and particular than Thakazhi's *Chemmeen*? Yet the reader of the English version is invariably moved by what appears to be human tragedy.... At one level it is a realist novel depicting the fisher folk of the Kerala coast; at another, it achieves a mythical reality, with the sea-goddess Katalamma and the bright star Arundhati becoming elemental forces shaping human destiny... Judging by the translation, *Chemmeen* is written in a stark, unadorned but poignant style... It is artistically most successful and... the translator has so competently rendered the narrative in the most appropriate style (M. Mukherjee, 1972: 70).

*Chemmeen* is the first significant work of modern Malayalam fiction to be translated into English, after Independence. It is very interesting to note how the approaches to translation have changed in the early post-colonial period—in the selection of equivalents, in the manner of retaining culture-specific items, necessarily with the help of foot-notes, in the selection of the language, and of course, in the quiet confidence of presenting to the world something Indian.

The conversations in the novel, wherever uneducated fisherfolk are involved, are in the patois of the fishermen community in the Alappuzha-Chertala belt. It is not possible to find an equivalent to any dialect or its variant. Hence the translation of these conversations as well as the rest of the text is done in a neutral language, which was the only sensible thing to do. Unlike in *Marthanda Varma*, where the translator has used English words with varying shades of meanings connotatively and denotatively and tried his hand at free translation and
transcreation, resulting in a heavy TL text, the lightness and simplicity of the language of Chemmeen is reflected in an equally simple and light language of the TL text. Narayana Menon’s translation is mostly faithful to the original (except for the innumerable omissions) and immensely sensible; and, at the same time, it is idiomatic English. Linguistic and cultural elements are paid attention to, to a great extent, although there are some glaring omissions and usages like the classic “Pot of gold” which is quoted by generation after generation of students of translation as the perfect example of unimaginative, rank-bound, literal translation.

There are scores of other mistakes and inaccuracies. The sporadic omission of whole sections and passages found in the original tempted the present researcher to interrogate Narayana Menon’s intentions in doing so. For, these omissions do not appear to be the result of oversight. One is led to suspect that Narayana Menon has consciously made the omissions, or acquiesced with an editor’s intervention, with an eye on target language sensibilities, making the text susceptible to appropriation in the process. Because, the left out portions, which the present researcher has translated and shown separately within square brackets, are, none of them, insignificant or superfluous. The present researcher has observed a pattern in the omissions. The translator has consistently deleted details of lyrical romantic narration that appear in the novel like the branches and boughs spreading out an intrinsically and minutely woven canopy of foliage. Also deleted are descriptions and narration about side characters, keeping them delineated in sparse strokes, giving more contrast and brightness to the main protagonists, whose actions are given more importance than their words. But these left out
portions go a long way in recreating Thakazhi's culture-specific narrative style in
the original. Editing out the romantic and lyrical elements in the narrative lan-
guage of the original is clearly with a view to conform to the sensibilities of a
Western readership that appreciates a terse narrative style. He does not seem to
resort to compression or revision. Suppression of details from the S L text on a
regular basis is the most manifest problem in the translation of Chemmeen.

Whether the deletions were done by an American or at any rate Western editor and
the translator and author acquiesced over it, or were the deletions done arbitrarily
by the translator, were the first questions that arose in the mind. But the present
researcher was startled to find out that this was done by Narayana Menon himself
in consultation with Thakazhi! Sujit Mukherjee reveals: “It is now known that
Narayana Menon not only translated Chemmeen but also abridged the original and
carried out editorial revisions, with the full permission of the author with whom he
was in regular consultation while the work was in progress. A living and accessible
author ought to be consulted whenever he is in a position to read and comment on
the translated manuscript” (Mukherjee, 134-135). Does Mukherjee suggest by the
latter part of the above comments that the author has the right to suppress the S L
text, as he is the sole proprietor of the text? If that is so, Mukherjee himself has
suggested just the opposite too. Describing deprecatingly Tagore's reworking of
his own Bangla poems to present them as English poems, Mukherjee says: “Such a
view may justify the way he treated the originals – changing, chopping, re-order-
ing them – to produce the English texts. The originals were as much his own
property — for his to do what he liked with them — as the English texts which, by
being born anew, had developed separate identities” (Mukherjee, 122). If Tagore is doing it directly to his own texts, Thakazhi and Narayana Menon conspire to do it. Authorial authority turning autocratic can be witnessed here. There is yet another aspect to this. The author and translator anticipate what is palatable for the West and what is not, and delete the latter. About this too, Mukherjee has very concrete things to say vis-à-vis Tagore’s attempt at presenting his works in English to the West. Says Mukherjee:

In his earlier book on the poet’s life and works (published in 1921), Edward Thompson had complained that Rabindranath’s treatment “of his Western public has sometimes amounted to an insult to their intelligence. He has carefully selected such simple, sweet things as he appears to think they can appreciate” (p.49). Rabindranath himself gave a similar reason to his Argentinian admirer, Victoria Ocampo. While he was once her guest, he did for her benefit a line-by-line verbal translation of a Bangla poem he had just composed. She recalls: “I asked Tagore to put the English version into writing later. On the next day he gave it to me...I read the poem in his presence and could not conceal my disappointment. ‘But such and such things you read to me yesterday are not here,’ I reproached him. ‘Why did you suppress them? They were the centre, the heart of the poem.’ He replied that he thought that would not interest the Westerners”—and she ruefully observes, “Tagore had doubts as to the Westerner’s capacity of understanding Eastern thoughts” (from A Centenary Volume, pp.43-44). Such doubts become even more apparent in the volumes that followed the English Gitanjali (Mukherjee, 106).
The only consolation for us now is that Thakazhi or Narayana Menon were not alone in their anticipation, indeed solicitousness, in figuring out what would appeal to the Westerner and providing it by hook or by crook. Even the great Tagore was no exception. So, Mukherjee says that when Tagore calls his selective translation of his own Bangla works his “English works,” he is committing “perjury.” Putting out a translation which is a suppressed, selectively edited T L text before a target audience with no access to the S L text, is no less a transgression, especially when numerous translators have unsuspectingly relied on this particular English language version of the novel for translation into so many languages around the globe. The purpose of this exercise is to trim Thakazhi’s narration, cleverly making it palatable to the West. Here lies the secret of its success. And here we have the first signs of commodification, or readying a literary product, like the proverbial Chemmeen, or prawn, for export, after putting it through the due curing and cleaning processes. Globalisation was not heard of then (in 1962), but the forces of neo-colonialism, or grabbing the best from the rest of the world by the hegemonic power/powers on their own terms, had obviously begun. At what cost has this been done? What does the novel look like in its entirety in translation? To know that, a faithful translation of the novel has to be carried out incorporating all the deleted parts which have been meticulously identified and translated by the present researcher. The question raised here is this: is the author the de facto owner of his work once he has put it in the public domain by publishing it? Is it ethical to delete or suppress parts of the work while presenting it in translation, anticipating that the T L readers are unable to understand or appreciate those parts?
Or is it all done with a commercial eye, to ensure success and sales, making it a sure-hit cultural product?

The translator using his authority in such a cavalier fashion over a text is quite curious to watch. In the case of Marthanda Varma, a clear method was lacking in making the additions and deletions unlike in the case of Chemmeen. Rather than making a faithful representation in English of a very ethnic novel in Malayalam, the translator has executed a clear commodification exercise complete with wrappings and all.

However, there is no gainsaying the quality of Narayana Menon’s translation vis-a-vis the idiomatic use of the English language, projected to a target language readership, the vast majority of who does not know the SL text. Writing in 1972 about it, along with Khushwant Singh’s translation from Punjabi and Krishna Baldev Vaid’s from Hindi, Meenakshi Mukherjee has this to say:

It cannot be a mere coincidence that the translators concerned...are primarily writers or scholars in English. Not merely adequate command of the English language but sufficient practice of sophisticated writing in English is necessary for successful translation into English. The translators mentioned above are not only practised writers, they also write a language that is alive and contemporary. Such capable translators are rare exceptions (M. Mukherjee, 1972: 69).

After analysing the text in depth and in detail, the present researcher differs from the above opinion. The TL text of Chemmeen made available to the world is
a highly manipulated, edited and doctored one. Making the translation eminently readable and racy - at the cost of the narrative marvel of the original, through deletions, suppressions, and mutilations, as proved below presenting hard evidence - Narayana Menon and Thakazhi got away with it.

*Chinmen* has been subjected to a very detailed analysis for two reasons: one, this was the first Malayalam novel that captured the imagination of the world. Therefore the mechanics of its translation, and its standing vis-à-vis the original, the points of departure from the S.L. text, the way linguistic and cultural problems were handled and settled and so on would be of great interest. Two, this is the path-breaking novel in translation that showed the way for the succeeding success stories. Most of the translation strategies adopted in it — including both the mostly-faithful-to the original approach and omissions/deletions, compressions, paraphrasing, dilutions and so on adopted selectively -- were followed by subsequent translators. To interrogate the strategy of free-translation adopted to facilitate appropriation by hegemonic cultures, especially in the back-drop of the globalisation of culture we are witnessing now, we have to understand the processes that were at work, in this pioneering text.

*Me Grandad 'ad an Elephant!': Three Stories of Muslim Life in South India.*

*Childhood Friend*

This is a very slim volume of 75 pages published in 1944. Even now this book remains one of the best-loved novels in Malayalam. Basheer began writing it in English during his wanderings. That fragment in English was the basis for the Malayalam book. Basheer has said that if the completed manuscript were to be
published as it was, it would run into more than 500 pages. This is a very revealing statement. We subsequently learn that this manuscript was subjected to constant revision and chiselling for over five years and is reduced to less than one-sixth of its original length. This is the secret of Basheer’s art. Basheer himself has revealed that more than ninety-five percent of it is autobiographical. And this is his first major work. A lesser mortal would have certainly hurried it through publication, especially after getting cent percent endorsement from the greatest of the literary critics of the times—M. P. Paul. But Basheer would never do such a thing. He waited patiently till he was satisfied with the work. And this work rightly got the highest critical acclaim any work got till date. M. P. Paul wrote: “Childhood Friend is a page torn out from life. Blood oozes from its edges. Some feel acute phobia and revulsion when seeing warm blood. They may even faint. Such people should read this book cautiously....” Paul’s swipe was at the academic critics of those times who clung to age-old canons and suppressed any genuine creative voice. Basheer had to put up with such critics throughout his life—critics who would not base their criticism on the work, but on the religion, caste or community of the writer.

*Childhood Friend* is uncommonly beautiful and pure. It is not stained by carnal love or any material consideration of its protagonists. Its beauty consists in its incandescent expressiveness. The hero’s love for the heroine is unwavering throughout—both when she is a pretty young girl and when she has lost all her charm and is a skeleton-like apparition. Majid and Suhra are capable of love only. Poverty, the real villain of the piece, strikes down both the hero and the heroine.
Reflects Majid. "Poverty is a dreadful disease. It destroys the body, the mind and the soul" (p.31). The state of Majid’s mind after he gets to know about Suhra’s death, through his mother’s letter, is described below:

For a while Majid was stunned.

It was as if all had become silent.

The world was full of emptiness.

No! Nothing had happened to the world. The hubbub in the town was still there.

The sun was shining. The wind was blowing. It was just that Majid was soaked in perspiration that had come out through all the pores of his skin. There was no help left. Had life then lost its meaning?

Majid began once again to wash the dishes and stack them carefully. Where would his parents and his sisters go?

Suhra! (p.49).

Realism of the rarest kind is witnessed here. This pure flame blazed forth, at a time when all sorts of twisting and turning plots placing heroes and villains in out of the world situations seriously compromised the art of realist fiction in Malayalam. This was also the time when committed literature failed to look at humankind as a whole. What this little book established in Malayalam literature is not surpassed till date. *Childhood Friend* established Basheer firmly as a great writer.

*Me Grandad ‘ad an Elephant!’* is a work based more on imagination than
historical facts. This is the work Basheer used to put in reformative content for the upliftment of the Muslim community. This novel contains basic information even for the lay reader which will help distinguish true Islam from the Islam professed by narrow-minded, ignorant adherents. He tries to tell what Islam really means and also as to what potential it has in the hands of bigoted practitioners. Basheer says that the Grandad's elephant stands for the past glory and the present gloom of the Muslim community. Vanity, ignorance, and intolerance are on Basheer's hit-list in this work. As a refreshing change from the poignant tragedy of Childhood Friend, this novel is a hilarious comedy with a strong lyrical content. No one can help feeling the fondest love for the heroine, Kunjupattumma. Though the characters of Nisar Ahmed and Aisha occasionally turn into mouthpieces for reform propaganda, this can be overlooked against their counterpoints, Vattanadima and Kunjutachumma, who are the real autobiographical characters inhabiting Basheer's novel. This one single work is perhaps the most successful novel in Malayalam, having sold over one hundred thousand copies.

Pattumma's Goat:

This particular Basheer novel is unlike all others in many respects. First, this is the only one of his works that has not been corrected at all after the first draft was over. It is entirely autobiographical, as far as the characters are concerned. Fiction enters the scene only in the action. Then it has got the seemingly dubious distinction of getting written in a mental asylum. Basheer wrote this rare masterpiece while under the ministrations of the Ayurvedic physician specialising in mental diseases, Sri P. C. Govindan Nair, in his Vallappuzha Nursing Home,
near Trichur, while recuperating from a bout of madness. Articulating all these facts and especially the way he felt as his sanity was ebbing away, he has left a rare record for posterity in his “Introduction” to *Pattumma’s Goat*:

I completed the story *Pattumma’s Goat* on 27th April 1954. I thought I would copy it out and publish it with an introduction. Days passed by as I kept it off till tomorrow.

Five years!

Up to now I have not copied out the story. Almost all that I have published before this, I have written and rewritten more than once. This is coming out without being copied, without any corrections, but just as I wrote it. I read it through and did not feel it should be corrected or copied. It is a gay story. Still, when I wrote it, I was burning all over. I must forget the pain of the past. Write! So the mind....

***

Yes...at that time my mind...like a tiny island that is starting to sink into a bottomless ocean ...I don’t know whether that makes any sense or not. Anyway the mind gets drowned in darkness filled with frightful dreams. I myself am the mind. When I look up there is only a small patch of light. Oh God! Where am I? What is true? What is false? Light!...Light.... I want only light. But... darkness filled with terrible dreams...is approaching from all the eight directions, roaring and booming.
Will I drown in this forever?

***

No! I won’t let my life be thrown into disarray. I must get well! Gathering all the strength I have, I must make a powerful effort!

Goodness! Keep the attention only on that! Concentration! Let it be kept on that...that pinpoint. The mind...the mind...is breaking up into hundreds of thousands of pieces of darkness...In each of those pieces...what is it that I see and hear?

***

Don’t lose your reason; find out the cause. Everything has a cause. Courage...courage to try to find out. Superstition is comfortable. If you take refuge in that...! This is nothing like that. All the beliefs you now have—from childhood...from days gone by...from before history began—analyse them all, and accept only what is good. Evil is a sickness. If you treat it, you can cure it. There is no sickness that you cannot cure. If you think there is one, it is through ignorance; never make ignorance a permanent abode.

When you think properly, what is actually wrong here?

***

Nothing. Turbulent thoughts. Sleepless nights. Hardworking days. I loathed the days, the nights, the work, the place and everything. No food, no sleep; just dreams. Nothing but fear.

That’s how I came under the treatment of P. C. Govindan Nair....

***

It was during this period of treatment that I wrote the story....

***

Pattumma’s Goat... is not just a story. All the characters in it are still living, by the grace of God; I mentioned before that it is five years since I wrote it. Many new characters have come into being since then. You must remember that this is the story of my family (pp.124-131).

R. E. Asher, the eminent linguist and translator of ‘Me Grandad ‘ad an Elephant!’: Three Stories of Muslim Life In South India, considers Basheer as “a literary figure who stands apart from his contemporaries.” He also feels that the three novels presented in the book “are very different, having in common little more than their Kerala Muslim setting.” Citing statements of Basheer in a volume of reminiscences, Asher further clarifies that Basheer has made a conscious attempt in the course of his literary career to produce an Islamic literature in Malayalam. Whatever Asher means by Islamic literature, and the way Basheer is supposed to have consciously gone about creating one, are open to discussion. No one who is intimately involved with Malayalam literature will acknowledge the existence of any separate Hindu, Christian or Islamic literature in Malayalam. Modern Malayalam literature has been synonymous with liberal intellectual practice. Though some identify the influence of dominant groups (class or caste or
coterie) in literature, as in any other sphere, the separate existence of caste or
religion-based literature is unheard of in Malayalam. Such considerations were
never part of the Malayalam literary canon. We can safely assume that Asher
meant only well by raising this somewhat ambiguous issue, because earlier in the
Introduction he characterises Kerala Muslims as unique, and remarks, citing a 16th
century historian, that they had peacefully settled in Kerala as early as during the
lifetime of Prophet Muhammad, by virtue of the conversion of Cheraman Perumal.
He also highlights Basheer’s efforts at reforming the Muslims through enlighten-
ing them. Now Asher makes a very interesting statement, which indirectly points
to one of the possible motives in translating Basheer. He says that Basheer’s
writing being Islamic literature does not mean that it “will hold no attraction for
non-Muslims. It is part of the appeal of his work that what is to most of us a rather
exotic background helps rather than hinders our appreciation of the universality of
the emotions he depicts.” It is a fair enough statement, albeit quite revealing. The
“most of us” Asher mentions is the target audience, and the “exotic appeal of
Muslim life in South India” has been, among many other considerations, one of the
most compelling, that led Asher to choose the three novels of Basheer for transla-
tion into English as a single volume, in the UNESCO Indian series. Achamma
Coilparampil Chandersekaran, about whom biographical details are missing in this
volume referred to, is the co-translator. It has to be surmised that her role would
have been mostly to advise Asher specially on culture-specific points, as no men-
tion is seen made about her role in the translation process.

As in the case of Chemmeen, recently acquired insights into post-colonial
translation provide us new vantage points from which we can now have glimpses into some hitherto unnoticed aspects of the present translation of Basheer's works. However, all said and done, one has to concede that this translation stands out as the most original, undiluted, objective, unbiased and balanced of all translations of modern Malayalam fiction into English hitherto looked into. The translators do not suffer from the anxiety to explain Basheer to the West and paraphrase his works in the guise of translation, unlike what Dumergue or more conspicuously, B. K. Menon did with the respective authors they translated. Neither did they attempt at selective editing of the originals, pruning them to make them "presentable" to the West, like Narayana Menon did with Chemmeen. In short, Asher has consciously resisted the temptation to appropriate the works for Western readers. Whatever slips they make in this regard can be viewed as made in spite of themselves.

About the translation, detailed notes have been offered within the "Introduction," under a separate heading which have by now acquired the status of basic texts in translation practice, for explaining in a unique way linguistic and cultural problems are handled in this work. A relevant portion is quoted below:

"...There is little overlap in Malayalam between the set of kinship terms used by Muslims and those used by other communities. Part of the special flavour of Basheer's stories for a Malayali reader lies in his use of bapa as a term of address and reference for "father" and umma for "mother." It has seemed to us best to keep this in almost all cases. We have been rather sparing in the use of upuppa for "grandfather" and have used English equivalents for all"
other terms but one, and this only in one story. The reason for the exception is that one of the turns of the plot of ‘Me Grandad ‘ad an Elephant!’ only makes sense if Aisha is seen to be using the exclusively Muslim term ikkakka to refer to her “elder brother” (p.ix).

However, looking at the translation now, after twenty-two years, one wishes the translator had retained all the kinship terms and forms of addresses as they were; it would have given more character to the text. In the analysis it has been observed that at least in the forms of address, the initial letter of the words should have been made in the upper case. This is one of the very few instances of diluting the original linguistic status of the S L text.

At the end of the analysis of all the selected novels, this text turned out to be the one with the least number of problems. Except in a couple of instances of possible deletions of original material (it could even be additions by Basheer in his latest copy, the Collected Works, published by D. C. Books, Kottayam, in 1992), all were linguistic problems.

The Saga of Dharmapuri

O. V. Vijayan is easily one of the foremost among the most accomplished creative writers of India. With his first novel, Khasakkinie Itihasam (available in Vijayan’s own English translation as Legends of Khasak), his niche in the world of modern Malayalam fiction was established beyond dispute. Dharmapuranam, the second novel, translated into English as Saga of Dharmapuri, again by Vijayan himself, shows him in his iconoclastic, anti-aestheticist best, treating political and philosophical issues in the realm of fiction using the techniques seeming obscenity
and scripture. His later works, *Gurusagaram*, translated by Ramesh Menon and the author as *Infinity of Grace, Pravachakante Vazhi, Thalamurakal*, several novellas and collections of short fiction, made him progress on the road to greater literary achievements. It will not be an exaggeration to say that the Malayalee sensibility was formed and controlled to a great extent by Vijayan’s works ever since his first novel came out nearly four decades ago.

Vijayan’s role as the translator of his own works has set a precedent that is being emulated by many other writers, like Paul Zacharia, now. However, no one else has matched the degree of success Vijayan has achieved in this area. Vijayan, thus becomes an interesting case study in the field of translation of modern Malayalam fiction.

The book under detailed analysis below, *The Saga of Dharmapuri*, is a landmark in the history of modern India fiction. Says K. P. Appan, the veteran Malayalam critic in his study of the novel appended to the Malayalam (Kottayam, D. C. Books, 1987) edition of the book:

|Vijayan saw the decay of the government and the political leadership as the tragic predicament that looms large over history. This artist, who is a keen watcher of history was filled with rage, sorrow and humour in equal measure, by this sight. What the novelist does is, laugh in grief and rage, standing in this complex frame of mind and watch the star-crossed course of history. Then he faces the stinking wounds of history through obscene analysis and scatological outpourings. Obscenity is used here as the most rampant technique for this purpose. It is not a titillating theme, but
a shocking strategy of expression. When the muck of politics expresses itself as decadent lust, the subject and narrative become one. The narrative itself becomes the message...Language here becomes a mirror that reflects the artist’s erotic dreams about history.... (TPR) (p.253).]

In the present case, the author himself being the translator, he can claim the legitimacy of authorial authority for any departures he has made from the original, although the politics of this has to be interrogated. What remains mainly then is the question whether he has rendered his own work into a kind of creative language. There maybe multiple opinions on this count, but no one would dispute the fact that Vijayan can handle his English in a masterly way. However questions such as whether the author is the dictator of his own words, whether he has imprisoned his own words whom he can set at liberty at will or whether he has any right to curtail the autonomy of the text with regard to generation of meaning once he has launched it in the Source Language can be asked and debated upon. However, in the “Author’s Note” he admits to “the difficulty of translating a novel when the resonances are different, and the languages are far removed from each other as cultural experiences” (Vijayan 1987:8). He however feels that “... the barriers are not insurmountable, only it takes much more effort and expertise than when one is dealing with languages that are more closely related” (Vijayan, 1987: 8).

Lalitambika Antarjanam (1909-1985), acknowledged by literary historians as one of the great proponents of the Malayalam short fiction, along with Kesava Dev, Thakazhi, Basheer, and Ponkunnam Varkey, is also acknowledged as a great pioneer of women’s writing in Kerala, along with K. Saraswathi Amma, and later

Dr. Kamala Surayya (formerly known as Kamala Das, eminent poet in English and as Madhavikkutty, eminent fiction writer in Malayalam) is an equally or more important writer, known for her own translations of her works of fiction.

*My Story*, when it first came out as *Ente Katha* in Malayalam serialised in a weekly journal four decades ago, kicked up a furore owing to the candour with which it was written: of course, the work was self-confessedly autobiographical, and is categorised as such when published in book form in 1973. However, there were also descriptions of it being a string of fantasies induced by the drugs administered to her when she was on the brink of death following a serious bout of heart disease. M. P. Narayana Pillai categorically stated in his articles serialised in *Samakalika Malayalam Weekly* in 1997, just before his death, that her involved descriptions of extra-marital affairs were largely a figment of her imagination. She herself has said so in several interviews. However, the English translation by herself, *My Story* brought out by Sterling Paperbacks, New Delhi, also termed it an autobiography. Two collections of her brilliant Malayalam short stories in English translation, *Padmavti, the Harlot and Other Stories* translated by herself and published by Sterling Paperbacks (1992) and *Sandal Trees and Other Stories*, translated by V. C. Harris and C. K. Muhammad Ummar, and published by Disha Books, (1995) occupy a unique position, affording the non-Malayalee reader a glimpse into the fictional world of the most favourite Indian English poet of suc-
ceeding generations.

Another important Malayalam fiction-writer, Paul Zacharia followed in Vijayan’s footsteps in translating his own stories. Several of his stories in Bhaskara Pattelar and Other Stories brought out by Affiliated East-West Press, Chennai, in 1994, Reflections of a Hen in Her Last Hour and Other Stories, published by Penguin India in 1999, have been translated by himself.

M. T. Vasudevan Nair, the veteran of romantic realism, occupies a unique place in Malayalam fiction. With his hold on the popular imagination through his iconoclastic heroes and anti-heroes, especially of the Naalukettu type of novels, and short-fiction, M. T., as he is popularly known, has been spanning Malayalam literature almost for half a century now. His films belonging to the “parallel” variety and mainstream have won many accolades, including the national award, and placed him on a high pedestal in the minds of literature-lovers. His winning the Jnanpith award was the crowning glory of an illustrious career.

V. Abdulla has translated a number of novels and short stories of M. T. In the 1991 collection, Catching the Elephant and Other Stories, M. T. ’s celebrated stories like “Catching the Elephant,” “The Enemy” and “Kuttiyedathi” are included. The other important translations of M. T. Vasudevan Nair’s works that came out during the last decade are, Second Turn, (Trans. P. K. Ravindranath, Macmillan India, 1997), Mist/Creature of Darkness Trans. V. M. Prameela/ Saraswathy Menon, Disha Books, 1997) Kaalam (Trans. Gita Krishnankutty, Dish Books, 1998) and Demonseed and Other Stories (Trans. V. Abdulla and Gita Krishnankutty, Penguin, 1998). Indeed, a considerable corpus of works by such an
That M. T. Vasudevan Nair’s Second Turn... is a rereading/rewriting of Mahabharata is an obvious fact; what is not so obvious is the fact that, like all such rereadings/rewritings, Second Turn also rests on certain subtle ironies and lacunae. In the Author’s Note appended to the original Malayalam novel and included in this translation as a kind of foreword, M. T. Vasudevan Nair writes: “I have not changed the framework of the story put together by the first Vyasa, Krishnadwaipayana. The basis for the liberties I have taken is his silence on some portions. I have read between his lines and expanded on his pregnant silences.”

... The pregnant silences... are clearly meant for later writers to work on... M. T. Vasudevan Nair would see himself as one of those “belated” writers -- Krishnadwaipayana’s illustrious successors, including, in the present century, the likes of K. M. Munshi and V. S. Khandekar... and in Kerala, Kuttikrishna Marar, P. K. Balakrishnan and others -- who have reimagined and retexualised the Mahabharata in a thousand ways.

The irony here is that for a Malayali reader, M. T. Vasudevan Nair himself... is a typical example of the kind of writer who would, throughout his oeuvre, leave a lot of things unsaid, who would punctuate his own texts with a series of “pregnant silences,” and
who, at the end of the day, would be fondly remembered as the one who successfully carved out a textual space for the impossible articulation of silence (p.vii).

_Arab Gold_, written jointly by M T Vasudevan Nair and N. P. Muhammad, is an early work, depicting the world of smuggling and crime in a literary creation. Translated by P. K. Ravindranath, the work captures a world lost to Malayalam literature—a world of heady adventure and fast life, much before these became familiar and fashionable.

M. Mukundan’s magnum opus, _Mayyazhippuzhayude Theerangalil_ (translated as _On the Banks of the Mayyazhi_ by Gita Krishnankutty, Affiliated East-West, Chennai, 1997; rpt. 1999) is a rich contribution in this area. Mukundan, the leading light of the modernist upsurge in Malayalam fiction in the sixties, is the foremost among Malayalam fiction writers. His other important works, _Delhi, Hariyavanthi Musalavannu, Deivathinte Vikruthikal, Radha Radha Mathram, Kesavanthe Vilapangal, Nrittam_, and others have attracted serious critical studies. Penguin India has announced the publication of the translation of _Deivathinte Vikrithikal_.

Anand’s fiction is different from other Malayalam writers’ in two ways: his locales, characters and action are far removed from Kerala, and set in some other part of the country; his Malayalam is not the flowery, idiomatic, lyrical type that one usually encounters in the language of Malayalam fiction. He writes in a quaintly ‘foreign’ sort of language, deeply meditative or philosophical and resonating with a sense of history or antiquity. Remarks Udaya Kumar in his study, “Anand and the Poetics of Incompleteness,” appended to Vyusa and Vighneswara:

...instead of an “authentic,” resonant Malayalam it (Anand’s first novel, Alkoottam -- The Crowd) used a Malayalam which sounded like a translation from another language.

Anand can rightly be seen as having created a new poetics out of this sense of translatedness. In his novels, the conversations and inner thoughts of characters located outside Kerala are articulated in a Malayalam which bears a certain unspecified trace of foreignness in its idiom. However, this inflection of estrangement does not remain confined to the language of characters. It escapes the boundaries between characters, slowly infiltrates the language of narration and description, and gradually pervades the entire body of the novel. This seemingly translated language does not point to any determinate original--the original is no more than alluded to, and that too obliquely and incompletely, through a gesture that the novels make towards themselves... Anand’s novels often make use
of syntactic forms, passive constructions and locutions which are grammatically acceptable and yet non-idiomatic in Malayalam, invoking the idea of a compositional strategy which makes use of sentence structures from another language....

This unusual status of Anand’s originals pose complex problems for his translators. While translating Anand, especially into English, it is easy to fall prey to the temptation to recover the syntax of a hidden original, and to reproduce the undisturbed felicity of an untranslated text. This goes against the very orientation of Anand’s work. It is Anand’s originals which style themselves as translations. What calls out for recognition and repetition in their translations is the gesture made by the originals to announce and acknowledge their translatedness. This situation is different from that of a “resistant” translation which interrupts the smoothness of its textual surface in order to remind its readers that they are reading a translation, and not an original (pp.135-137).

Anand’s novel The Death Certificate translated by Gita Krishnankutty, bear testimony to the above observations. Except for serially numbering, in lieu of chapters, the untitled and unnumbered stretches of text Anand leaves in the original separated by pauses, Gita Krishnankutty has not caused much change to the S L text, it would seem. She has caught the tone of the author’s Malayalam. The translation is least “resistant.” There is not much by way of linguistic and cultural peculiarities that stand in the way of the translator.
Malayattoor Ramakrishnan (1927-1997) occupies a special place in the world of Malayalam fiction. He will be remembered as a writer who was a man of the world too, unlike many academic, “literary” kind of writers. Perhaps his long stint in the IAS would have given him sufficient insight into the world of power and achievement, which many aspiring “successful” individuals in the world of literature hanker after, and given him enough material for his ironic, witty and satirical works. Roots is an autographical work, perhaps his best. V. Abdulla’s translation is very involved and fluent.

Some works by the above authors also have been scanned in addition to the five titles subjected to detailed analysis, and the findings catalogued under different heads of “problems of translation.”

CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION--

CULTURAL PROBLEMS:

CULTURAL APPROPRIATION

The post-colonial experience is one fraught with the obsessive urge to assert the nation’s identity, as we have seen during the past half-century. Beginning with the “pride” the people of each language-based State of the Indian Union takes in their own language and literature, and ending at language chauvinism, at times even virulent and violent, and crowning it all with the obsession of creating a “national language and literature,” the Indian post-coloniality vis-à-vis language and literature is a very touchy subject. Yet, we have opened ourselves to the opportunities offered in the lands of the erstwhile colonisers, and the neo-colonisers (as the so-called masters of globalisation can be described) and are dazzled by their
success and material riches. This has given birth to an ambivalent attitude towards
the English language – at once one of hatred, being the language of the ex-colonial
masters and of admiration, as the language of power that ensures success. The
dutifully patriotic middle-class young man religiously speaks and writes Hindi, or
the regional language, at the same time watching with envy and longing the life-
style of the successful city-boy who has empowered himself with the English
language. English, for Indians had long ceased to be the language of the ex-
colonisers; it was a language that went far beyond the pale of Anglo-Saxon ascen-
dancy and ushered in the age of the unipolar world. Globalisation practically
became a game in which the masters and bookmakers controlled the play to their
advantage. Free market became a free-play of market forces among unequal part-
ners, the most powerful among them having all the say. The advent of the Internet
brought with it, its own hegemony; English was re-consecrated as the international
lingua franca, which empowers the individual. The tyranny of English is already
there on the scene; the number of people taking crash-courses in the language is
increasing day by day. Translation of regional language literatures into English in
this context resembles the meticulous cleaning, airtight packing and exporting of
super-quality cashew or prawn. The hegemonic culture will get hold of all the best
things from all parts of the world as Americans proudly tell any visitor to the
States. Our colonial past has provided us with a ready processing and packaging
centre; we certainly have a way with our English and are quality conscious
enough. Exporting our cultural items as commodities, or finished cultural products
has been happening before our very eyes; most of us have taken it as a mark of the
level of success we have achieved. This longing for success and recognition abroad is seen all the more in the field of literature, especially fiction. In the wake of the recent boom of Indian English novels, engendered by some authors drawing huge advances from multinational publishers, there are thousands of aspiring best-seller writers ready with their manuscripts inundating the doors of such publishing houses. The regional writers of fiction who get their works translated competently and published by one of these publishers are also falling in line into this queue, albeit using the guise of the good old ideal of “universalism.” Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi say that,

... it is an understandable urge for simple self-assertion which in a large measure accounts for the great translation boom currently on in India in which any number of Indians have taken it upon themselves to translate works of Indian literature, both ancient and modern, into English, to show the world (including anglophone Indians) that such works do exist (Bassnett and Trivedi, 1999: 11-12).

The above point of view of the present researcher may seem a little harsh, but looking at the scene of literary translation into English after Independence that is heavily biased in favour of the hegemonic language, one has to necessarily strike a balance somewhere. What Tejaswini Niranjana says about the post-colonial translator becomes relevant in this context:

The post-colonial translator must be wary of essentialist anti-colonialist narratives; in fact, s/he must attempt to deconstruct them,
to show their complicity with the master-narrative of imperialism. This is a crucial task, especially at a time when the myths of nationalism — secularism, tradition, nationhood, and citizenship — are invoked to suppress heterogeneity in a decolonising country like India. The translator must participate in what Fanon spoke of as a “complete calling in question of the colonial situation,” and this includes the re-examination of liberal nationalism as well as the nostalgia of interventionist practice... The state of emergency/emergence that is the post-colonial condition demands a disruptive concept of history that, by problematising the striving for adequatio in the ways shown by Derrida, de Man, and Benjamin, will also contribute to formulating a notion of representation/translation to account for the discrepant identities of the post-colonial “subject” (Niranjana, 167-168).

One may find that balance here. Along with this, K. Satchidanandan’s words of caution, “post-colonial perspectives in translation foreground the asymmetrical relationships between cultures encoded in literary texts,” (Satchidanandan, 13) may be kept in mind.

Piotr Kuhiwczak, even while trying to undermine the theory of appropriation, vis-à-vis Milan Kundera’s approach to the translation of his novel *The Joke*, has to concede this much:

Indeed, the theory of appropriation is a much more attractive proposition than the ageing theory of progress, which tells us that
civilization, despite its temporary lapses, tends towards a final
goal—an earthly paradise, a New Jerusalem, or a perfect association
of free individuals.... The theory of appropriation resuscitates a
clear vision of reality and a belief in binary oppositions, since it
assumes that if there is a gain, there must be a concomitant loss
(Kuhiwczak, 1990: 119).

Appropriation of our literature as an exotic cultural product by the hege-
monic Western culture is placed in perspective in this backdrop. Cultural appro-
priation on the literary front becomes easy when we become ready to offer free
translations shorn of all cultural contents, or at least watered down to suit interna-
tional taste-buds. Finding unequal equivalences in the target language (e. g. trans-
lating “Kamadeva” as “Cupid”) is another strategy of appropriation. Unlike what
Tejaswini Niranjana proposes, instead of trying to “contribute to formulating a
notion of representation/translation to account for the discrepant identities of the
post-colonial subject,” most of the translators of modern Malayalam fiction in the
post-colonial era tried to create texts to suit the taste of the West.

This programme had begun in this country very early in the colonial times,
alongside the plundering of the riches. They had translated the important texts
found in the colony for a number of reasons that were mostly extra-literary, like
ethnographical, anthropological or other interests. Almost all the translators
believed in the superiority of their own language, and most of them thought the
literatures they translated from were crude. What happens now is a continuation of
this process in many ways; whatever exotic fare is in demand abroad has to be
processed to suit their taste; and whatever is thorny by way of linguistic and cultural specificities found in it has to be removed.

English translations of crucial texts of modern Malayalam fiction beginning from a work that came out during the period beginning at the height of the colonial times in late nineteenth century and others spanning over the post-colonial period and into the twenty-first century, some of which were subjected to detailed analysis and some looked into as stated above, have yielded sufficient evidence supporting the above postulations of the present researcher. They are listed below, and possible corrective measures suggested, by way of finding better equivalents or even proposing alternate translation.

*Indulekh*</n>  

Scanning the novel cover to cover, the following instances of exhibiting colonial superiority, indulging in paraphrasing, explanatory additions and finding unequal equivalences are sighted and solutions offered in each individual case:

1). On page two, line one, the translation runs, “I will now tell my readers something of his character and person.” But in the original, the same line, literally is, [“Now, I’ll describe him briefly” (TPR).] Addition by the translator is noted.

2). At the bottom of the same page, a sentence begins on the last but one line that reads, “His flowing locks, when loosened from the knot in which they were usually tied according to the Malayalee custom, hung down to his knees.” Literally the same sentence should read, [“If Madhavan’s body is to be measured, one can do so till his knees, with his extremely attractive long hair reaching down to that part of the body” (TPR).] Addition and paraphrasing by the translator are to
be taken note of as evidence of the facile way in which such liberties are taken.

Dumergue’s statement in his “Translator’s Preface” that he translated this novel out of ethnographic concerns—to get to know more about the customs and behavioural patterns of the Imperial subjects of Malabar, a district of the Madras Presidency has to be taken into account. What he does here is a kind of report, when he mentions, “...according to Malayalaee custom... (p.2).”

3). On page five, line four, the word used as equivalent of the Malayalam expression, “gurutvakkedu” is “insubordination,” which is clearly an officialese expression. “Irreverence” or “disrespect” could have been a better word. This is a case of colonial jargon getting into the translation (p.5).

4). On page nine first paragraph, fourth and fifth lines read thus: “...draped her limbs in the usual Malayalee fashion....” This is an addition, explaining native culture to Imperial masters as well as to TL readers as already noted above (p.9).

5). In the next paragraph, third line, there is a mention of “one of the Kilimanur Chieftains.” In the original, it is “a rajah of Kilimanur” which was perfectly in keeping with the vocabulary of the Raj era, and should have been retained. In the original the rajah “ascends to heaven” whereas in the translation he simply “died.” In the word “raja,” the idea of “kingship” is implied, whereas, in the English word “chieftain,” a colonial mindset about the Indian ruling classes of rank is mildly inherent (p.9).

6). In the second paragraph on page 12, lines three and four, we read, “...is given to any lady of a Nair family...” This is not in the original, and is clearly an addition out of ethnographic concerns (p.12).
7). In the second paragraph on page 13 the last two lines read,

"...Madhavan’s courtship, and I therefore venture on a slight digression from my
story." Here, “Madhavan’s courtship” is entirely an addition, introducing a West-
ern concept for the benefit of the T L readers. Once again, an attempt at improving
upon the original is detected here.

“A slight digression” should actually be, [ “I’ll give an explicatory narra-
tion of related past history” (TPR)] as found in the original (p.13).

8). On page 14, line 21 and page 15, line five, and throughout the rest of the
text the word “Malabar” is used against “Malayalam,” the original word used.
“Malayalam” is used by Chandu Menon, meaning the land where the language
Malayalam is spoken, or, in other words, the entire Kerala. The word, “Bhoomi
Malayalam” is also used in common speech, in the same sense. “Malabar” is but a
part of Kerala. Although Travancore, Cochin and Malabar were three separate
States, the translator was already aware of the idea of one single region where
Malayalam is spoken, as revealed in the “Translator’s Preface” quoted in the
previous Chapter. It has to be inferred that the translator is sticking to “Malabar,”
the district under his direct administration as a part of the Madras Presidency, (as
is obvious from his use of the word in his “Translator’s Preface”) in places where
the culture and customs of the whole of Kerala is discussed in the S L text refer-
ring to the territory as “Malayalam.” The translator’s “Malabar” is not obviously
the whole of Kerala, referred to as the “Malabar Coast” in earlier European writing
and what Chandu Menon implied by his use of the word “Malayalam.” Here, the
translator ceases to be and the colonial administrator takes over (p.14).
9). In line 18, there is the statement, “Then try Sanskrit and read Bharthruhari.” In the original, it is simply, [“Then read Bharthruhari” (TPR).] It is clearly a case of explanatory addition.

This and many more additions mentioned above are aimed at avoiding footnotes and glossary, ensuring smooth reading. It is amazing that this relatively recent strategy developed in translation was actually employed by Dumergue more than a century ago, ironically owing to the compulsions of cultural politics during the colonial times. The translator could afford to take any amount of liberty with the text during those times, catering entirely to the readers of the hegemonic language.

10). Paragraph three on page 28 reads: “But you forget,” replied Indulekha, “women are soft and yielding, women are cowards....” However, in the original it is simply, [“Aren’t women meek—cowardly?” (TPR)] (p.28).

11). In the last but one paragraph on page 40, we read, “Good gracious! You are very complimentary....” However, the nearest translation of the original will read, [“Damn me! With your exceedingly beautiful words...” (TPR).]

12). The section beginning on page 40, last paragraph, reads thus: “Let us pause and consider what Madhavan meant by saying that in Malabar women do not practice the virtue of fidelity. Madhavan’s remarks were bitter, for in Malabar, just as in other countries, the women who cherish this virtue are innumerable,” is not there in the original; it is obviously an explanatory addition, aimed at explaining a cultural situation from the ethnographic point of view (p.40).

13). Once again, to go back to the present researcher’s argument about the
translator's use of the word, "Malabar" and the original author's idea of Kerala, attention is drawn to lines six and seven on page 41. The word, "Kerala," used by Chandu Menon in the original as naturally as he uses the word "Malayalam" and replacing the latter, is translated by Dumergue as the "Land of Palms," in a most literal manner. Obviously Dumergue was not concerned with the whole of Kerala, whereas Chandu Menon always thought of Kerala as one single entity culturally and linguistically. (if not politically). The politics of colonialism overshadowing linguistic and cultural identities even by the choice of terminology by the translator is interesting to note (p.41).

14). On page 48, the first line begins: "My darling, my true, my only love." However, in the original it is, "O my husband, the lord of my life..." It is obvious that Chandu Menon, when he says that the lovers had already performed "antakkaranavivaham" (marriage of their conscience) what he means is that for all practical purposes they had married each other spiritually, and thus, it is normal for Indulekha to call Madhavan her husband. But for Dumergue, whose legalistic understanding of the status of the relationship between the couple -- that they are not legally married -- must have inhibited him from using the word, "husband," when, in actual fact, the Malayalam word, "bharthavu" has only one meaning, that is, "husband." Later in the novel, on page 357 in the last paragraph, ninth line, the same word is properly translated as "husband," in the place where Indulekha shouts the word in terror, in the aftermath of a nightmare. Again, the fact that Indulekha had called out "my husband," is reiterated by her mother on page 359, line ten, and the same is confirmed, explained and defended by Indulekha, elabo-
rately in the paragraph, on the lines of the argument the present researcher has already put forward. This is again a case of the legal expert taking over from the translator explaining the technicality of the relationship to the T L readership.

15). On page 60, paragraph four, we find, “As soon as the meal was over, Govinda Panikar, taking his son inside the house, embraced him and, kissing his head, said: ”

In the original it goes like this: “As soon as lunch was over, Govinda Panikar called his son into the interior of the house, sat him down on his lap and kissed him on the crown of his head” (TPR). In the place of this typical expression of affection a father has for a son in our culture, the purely Western “embrace” comes in. While Dumergue seems to be shy to place Madhavan, a grown up young man, in his father’s lap, he doesn’t mind an embrace. The problem in interpreting a culture-specific gesture to the T L text readers is to be noted.

16). On page 297, lines 12 and 16, the phrase “a regular Damayanti” appears in the place of “Damayanti thanne” in the original that can be correctly translated as “a veritable Damayanti” in English (p.297).

17). On page 367, paragraphs one, two, three and four are not found in the original. It is an obvious case of interpolation, for reasons best known to Dumergue. It seems the translator must have felt that the ending should portray better articulation by the heroine and the hero, as “round characters.”

18). What appears on pages 368 to 370 in the translation are not found in the original, except for the mention that Madhavan secured entry into the Civil Service. All else, including the children of Indulekha and Madhavan, are additions.
In the original there is mention only of Indulekha and Madhavan taking Madhavan’s parents to Madras along with them and settling down there and living happily ever after. For some reason, perhaps to justify and/or explain certain points raised by the author, like the necessity for Indian women to learn English to emancipate themselves and find ways of self-empowerment, the translator has added more than two pages to the original novel. And there is a strong appeal to those women of Malabar who do not know English to read progressive books in Malayalam to obtain the next-best results. It is fine, as a final message. But the ending of the novel suffers grievously in the area of its architectonics, by this crude thrust of propaganda. There is no way of knowing whether Chandu Menon cleared this part of the translation, especially because this portion is written in the First Person Singular, making references to the “Preface” the author wrote to the novel. That such an accomplished translation, in spite of the many shortcomings, should end like this, points to the compulsions of colonial times, and especially of having one’s own superior officer, that too an Englishman, as the translator of one’s work (pp.367-370).

*Chemmeen*

All instances quoted under the heading “Problems of Power” below, with regard to *Chemmeen*—instances in which the translator has either suppressed S L matter through compression or omission or misrepresentation so as to produce a text easily acceptable to a foreign target audience, will come under the heading “Appropriation” also. However, in order to avoid repetition, they are not listed here.
On page 262 second paragraph, there is a mention of the “women of Malabar” in the place of “women of Kerala” in the original. Unlike Dumergue, B. K. Menon was under no obligation to use the word “Malabar.” And yet he has done so, revealing the colonial influence of those times.

FREE TRANSLATION LEADING TO APPROPRIATION

One of the main points of contention among practitioners of literary translation is whether translation should be “free” or “literal.” Those who are advocates of “free translation” go to the extent of demanding “transcreation” of the SL text, completely abrogating authorial authority. Luckily, most of such texts happen to be in the public domain, to the relief of ardent proponents of “transcreation” like P. Lal. On the other hand, literal translation that is a virtue in translating scientific treatises and factual prose kills the soul of a poem or a story, because for literature or any kind of imaginative writing, connotative meanings, echoes, innuendoes, dhwani and so on are more relevant than the denotative meaning of words. Hence, a creative translation is called for in such cases. A. K. Ramanujan has put it beautifully, expressing the dilemma of a creative translator:

...a translator is an ‘artist on oath.’ He has a double allegiance, indeed several double allegiances. All too familiar with the rigors and pleasures of reading a text and making another, caught between the need to express himself and the need to represent another, moving between two halves of one brain, he has to use both to get close to the “originals. . .” (Poems of Love and War, 296-7).
In the case of novels, disturbing the architectonics of the original will lay a
great responsibility on the translator: that of supporting the roof-structure with his
bare back, if he so much as dares to touch any one of the stone pillars. And that is
exactly what B. K. Menon does in the case of the translation of C. V. Raman
Pillai's masterpiece, *Marthanda Varma*. B. K. Menon does take apart the novel;
but putting it back in the original shape is obviously much beyond him; and the
pity is that he knew what he was doing, as is evident from his statement in "In
Apology," quoted above.

If Milan Kundera, writing fifty-six years later, in 1992, can be quoted with
"retrospective effect," his observations in this regard are highly valid. Kundera in
his "Author’s Note" at the beginning of the Fifth version of the English translation
of his novel, *The Joke*, dwells on the harrowing time he had at the hands of his
translators. After *The Joke* went through three English editions which were some-
how unacceptable to him, Michael Henry Heim — who gained Kundera’s confi-
dence by sympathetically translating and publishing the portions deleted from the
previous editions – was entrusted with translating the work faithfully. As Kundera
had absolute faith in him, the former did not insist on checking the manuscript, as
was his wont, of the proposed fourth version. And so the book came out in 1982.
However, when Aaron Asher, his editor at Harper & Row, proposed in 1990 that
the book should be republished, Kundera, gripped by a sudden suspicion, insisted
that he must go through the text before it went to the press. Says Kundera:

...from the start of Part Three, I had the increasingly strong impres-
sion that what I read was not my text: often the words were remote
from what I had written; the syntax differed too; there was inaccuracy in all the reflective passages; irony had been transformed into satire; unusual turns of phrase had been obliterated; the distinctive voices of the characters-narrators had been altered to the extent of altering their personalities.... I was all the more unhappy because I did not believe that it was a matter of incompetence on the translator's part, or carelessness or ill will: no; in good conscience he produced the kind of translation that one might call *translation-adaptation* (adaptation to the taste of the time and of the country for which it is intended, to the taste, in the final analysis, of the translator). Is this current, normal practice? It's possible. But unacceptable. Unacceptable to me (Kundera, 1992: ix-x).

Kundera is lucky in the sense that he is still alive to make an intervention whenever necessary. However, poor C. V. Raman Pillai was not when B. K. Menon chose to translate him.

Instances of free translation spotted during the course of the detailed analysis of the aforesaid novels are quoted below, with possible corrective suggestions and alternate translations in certain cases.

*Indulekha*

1). The last three lines of the paragraph describing Indulekha's breasts read in the S L text literally thus: [About this time, her breasts had begun to turn really heavy. Which young man who watches those steadily expanding twin globes—those golden pots—can control himself? Who is capable of describing the beauty
of this exquisitely enchanting Indulekha? (TPR) ] Dumergue’s translation simply states: “At the time of which I write, she was most alluringly developed and her bosom rivalled the purest gold, but it would be impossible for any pen to do justice to the countless charms which united in making Indulekha a peerless beauty.”

Certainly vital details are missing. The “golden pots” describe the shape and complexion of her breasts, whereas “her bosom rivalled the purest gold” only gives an indication of the colour. And the appeal her physiognomy held for any potential young voyeur, described by Chandu Menon, — following either the convention of describing the heroine in the epics and classical works, or, in traditional temple iconography and sculpture, or, further, to refer to more recent times, after the good old Venmony fashion — is blurred by the sanitised version of Dumergue who catered to contemporary British sensibilities obviously influenced by Victorian morality. Of course, this is a case of intervention by the hegemonic language culture, effecting a free translation devoid of the cultural contours of the original.

2). Page 9, third paragraph in the S L text would read:

[ I certainly admit here that it is totally impossible for me to describe the exhilaration, rapture, yearning, craze, desire passion, and heart-burn induced in men upon seeing Indulekha’s golden complexion, pearl-like teeth, coral lips, her eyes that rendered the dark koovalam flower subservient to them, her face that spread its radiant beauty like the red lotus flower, her dense, dark tresses, heavy breasts and the most slender waist (TPR).]

Again, the author is following the conventional “naayikavarnanam” here.
But Dumergue compresses this crucial paragraph and attaches it to the end of the previous paragraph, thus: "I am fain here to confess that none can describe the joy, the ecstasy, the raptures of those who, spell-bound with delight, beheld her golden complexion, pearly teeth and coral lips, her eyes that shamed the blue-black water-lily, her glossy black hair and slender waist." Sadly, the "heavy breasts" are cut away. These are examples of applying the quality of understatement of the T L culture, in the place of the exuberance of description found in the S L culture. This is obviously to suit the taste of the readers of the T L text as already seen. An example of the cultural problem of appropriation by the T L culture is found here.

3). The translation of the Sanskrit verses from *Sakuntalam* that appear in the novel is not provided in the S L text. What is given is a transliteration in Malayalam. The text follows the convention of quoting from Sanskrit as a matter of course, as is wont even now (Something similar takes place in the "Translator’s Preface," a part of which is quoted above, in which two French words are quoted taking it for granted that the meaning of those words are ordinarily understood by the readers). However, in the T L text, the Sanskrit texts are also given in translation, for arranging which the translator has taken a lot of trouble. Although the verses read smoothly in English, it is a rather liberally free translation. For example, "Madana" is translated as "Cupid," and the word is repeated throughout the text as an equivalent wherever words like "Madana" "Manmata" "Maara" or "Kamadeva" are used (pp. 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 31). The later translators of Malayalam verses into English have followed this example, and until recently, this abject subservience of English literature to Greek and Roman mythology used to
be shamelessly aped by our translators. For instance, several translations of Malayalam poems found in the anthology, *Indian Poetry Today* Vol. IV, edited by K. Ayyappa Paniker and brought out by Indian Council for Cultural Relations, New Delhi. Free translation rubbing off the rough edges of the original for the benefit of the privileged target language reader who is in no position to understand the nuances of the original is evident here. One has to reach the rather inevitable conclusion that translation is possible only between unequal languages.

4). On page 22, line 18, the word “veena” is translated as “lute.” This kind of unlikely equivalence was repeatedly used by subsequent translators, bringing in questions of cultural hegemony and appropriation through free translation as in the case of “Cupid,” as already seen (p.22).

5). On page 60, fifth paragraph, line seven, a mention is made of “Fate” in the place of the word “Brahmadevan” in the original. “Creator” would have been a word closest to the original. Cultural appropriation inherent in free translation is to be noted (p.60).

6). In the second paragraph on page 50, in line eight, there is mention of “rosary of the same precious metal round his neck,” in the place of [“the gold-studded rudraksha beads around his neck” (TPR).] in the original. Dilution of cultural content through inaccuracy in translation in this case is to be noted (p.50).

7). On page 66, last line, in the place of “Kali Yuga” in the original, appears, “the perverted age.” It is an obvious glossing over of a culture-specific term, in favour of the readers of the language of the centre. Cultural appropriation is evident (p.66).
8). On page 81, third paragraph, first line, the manner of a Sudra addressing a Nambudiri Brahmin, “Thirumanassu” literally meaning “Your Holy Self”, is plainly translated as “you.” However, in the fifth paragraph, it has become “Your reverence.” The variation is to be noted. This is an example of free translation and cultural appropriation (p.81).

9). On page 92, last paragraph, the Sanskrit word “Sakteyam,” meaning a tantric rite in the Sakti (Goddess) way, has been translated as “mystic orgies” in three different places. Obviously to avoid a glossary, this exercise has nevertheless effaced any cultural “rough surface” the translated text would provide. This is a typical case of free translation for the purpose of cultural appropriation (p.92).

10). On page 100, fourth paragraph, fourth line there appears a phrase “to unite herself” in the place of the word “Sambandham” in the S L text. This is a most grievous case of dilution, as the original word is loaded with meanings and connotations related to culture, anthropology and sociology. “Sambandham” is the word that describes the conjugal union of a Nambudiri male with a woman of a lesser caste, most commonly a Nair. The Nambudiri in most cases will be an “Apfan,” or, one who is forbidden to marry from his own caste and whose elder brother is privileged to marry from the same caste—to perform “veli,” in other words, — and rule as the patriarch of the Mana. Suri Nambudiripad, the mock-hero of this novel, is one such much-married, much Sambandham-making, lecher. All this is glossed over in the lame phrase, “to unite himself.” Free translation and cultural dilution leading to cultural appropriation is to be noted here (p.100).

11). On page 105, there is mention of Nala, but no gloss is provided, plac-
ing the Nala-Damayanti episode before the TL readers. Lack of sensitivity on the part of the translator towards SL cultural moorings is exhibited here (p.105).

12). Several usages like “Amriteth” for “meal” used in deferential language in the case of Nambudiris, “punyakshayam” which roughly means “the loss of once acquired divine grace” and several others have been subjected to free translation, unleashing all the aforesaid problems of translation (p.125 et al).

13). On page 154, paragraph four, the word “Sambandhakkaran” or the male who maintains the “Sambandham” is termed, “sweetheart.” Again, a case of casual approach towards cultural problems is to be noted (p.154).

Page 150, paragraph seven: once again, the word “Sambandham” is translated as “to be paired off.” Reference to earlier comments on the same topic is relevant (p.150).

On page 251, last paragraph, second line, “Sambandham” is described as “union.” The same word is used on page 153 and in many other places in the text. Previous comments in this regard are valid (p.251).

14). On page 228, towards the end of the page, the exchange between Indulekha and Suri Nambudiripad is presented, at one point, as the Nambudiripad telling her things, which, literally translated, would be: [“Learning English makes one devoid of all Sringar (expressed as coquetry, or voluptuousness, in women, to put it plainly) for sure” (TPR).] Indulekha affirms the statement. Then the Nambudiripad proceeds encouragingly to make an exception in the case of Indulekha, and asserts that she is coquettish enough, which, translated from the original would be something like, [“But you are really coquettish (voluptuous)”]
Indulekha denies it. This part of the exchange goes like this in the translation:

"It's pretty clear that English destroys romance and stops all lovemaking."

"Quite so, that is very clear."

"Don't you feel at all inclined that way, Indulekha?"

"I don't quite think I do."

The translation is very subdued to suit the taste of the T L readership.

Cultural problems referred to earlier raise their heads here.

15). Following this section, the next part of the exchange goes like this in the original, literally translated:

["Have you studied Naishadham? " (TPR)] The reference is to the Sanskrit classical text containing the Nala-Damayanti story. But the translation is watered down as: "Have you read the poem about Nala?" possibly to avoid footnotes. But the casual approach is really evident, and writing down to the target audience spoils the grandeur of the original. Cultural problem of fee translation leading to appropriation to be noted here (p.228).

16). On page 268 there is, in paragraph one, last but one line, an appeal, "my readers must bear with me while I attempt to describe...." This entire portion is an addition, after the Western fashion (p.268).

17). On page 297, second paragraph, last line, there is an expression, "bewitched." In the original it is, "Shanippizha" which can be translated as "the malevolent effects of the planet Saturn." Free translation avoiding a footnote.
causes erosion of the culture-content of the original.

18). On page 367, last paragraph, seventh line, the word “swayamvaram” in the original is translated as “gave her hand,” once again diluting the translation and depriving the TL readers of a word that connects Indulekha with the heroines of epics like the Ramayana (p.367).

19). On page 317, first paragraph, the last sentence reads, “But the pith of what Wallace, Darwin and other great philosophers say...” In the original there is no mention of Darwin at this place. The next sentence is, [ “If you think carefully, we can see that all the creation we see around us was formed through a process called Evolution” (The author uses the English word, transliterated in Malayalam)...(TPR)] In the translation, there is no mention of the word “Evolution,” but there are additions: the mention of Darwin’s name once again and that of the titles of Darwin’s works, The Origin of Species and The Descent of Man. In the original text, the name of Darwin occurs towards the middle of this paragraph, after all the arguments are set forth, so far mentioning him as the “scientist.” This increases the dramatic quality in the original. However, the freedom taken with the original is with a view to facilitating the TL text for the readers back home (p.317).

20). On page 363, last but one paragraph, in the scene of the expiation for breaking the oath, the letters of the oath words are spelt out. In the translation, it is avoided, though it would have been possible, and would certainly have been an attractive cultural item. Freedom is seen taken, omitting the details of SL text (p.363).
1). C. V. Raman Pillai opens the novel, (the first paragraph of the Prologue in the T L text) withholding the identity of the region. The original opens thus, literally translated: [The incidents described at the beginning of this story happened in a jungle tract (TPR).] C. V. has his own reasons for doing so. In fact, C. V. 's narrative technique employed in this novel hinges on keeping the suspense on as long as possible. However, the translator opens with the sentence: ‘The story opens in South India, in the heart of the vast jungle tract known as Panchavankadu, that stretched before Nagercoil… ’ It would seem the translator is doing so with the express purpose of presenting the novel before a world readership, taking into account the kind of hegemonic role English has.

2). The above paragraph ends thus in the original, [The Nairs, who are keenly interested in hunting, have not even planned to attack this jungle stretch, owing to their concern for their own feet (TPR).] But the T L text goes like this: ‘...secure from the molestation of shikaris, who, for more reasons than one, never dared to venture into the depths of that particular jungle spot...’ The poor “Nairs” have been needlessly replaced with the anonymous “shikaris.” It is an instance of free translation wreaking havoc (p.24).

3). The next paragraph opens with the statement of a universal truth in the original. However, the translation begins only after deleting the two sentences in which the above statement is couched. This is a needless deletion. The description of the moon in the translation is totally different from the original that reads: [Although the aforesaid jungle had been glowing with the touch of moonbeams in
the first quarter of the night, "the full moon that rose with the colour of red sand-
stone," upon reaching the zenith, had turned pale, losing its complexion (TPR).] The T L text reads, "A pale ghost moon rose above the bank of clouds and streaked the darkness below with silver." This "infidelity" also has been committed need-
lessly, as the grandeur of C. V.'s description is totally lost because of the free translation.

4). The above paragraph ends with C. V.'s statement, [Let us find out what is that incident that has shattered the slumber of the birds and beasts of this jungle which people believed was the abode of Yakshis, ghosts and others evil spirits (TPR).] However, in the T L text the paragraph ends thus: "Panchavankadu, which had witnessed thousands of cold-blooded crimes, seemed to be the abode of Evil Spirits that wander about in the silent watches of the night in a dismembered state thirsting for human blood." Certainly, this is a case of the translator trying to improve upon the original author's techniques, in an unwarranted manner, with a plea of free translation. In spite of the translator's protestations, we fail to see the necessity for such distortions, effacing C. V.'s narrative techniques in the process.

5). In the next paragraph, C. V. introduces a young man, pounced upon by some desperadoes and smitten down, bathing in the pool of his own blood. The description runs into two long paragraphs covering more than two pages. However, the translator adds four more paragraphs running into two pages, beginning with the description of the traveller passing along the path in the jungle, the marauders swooping down, slashing at him with fell blows of their swords, and their celebra-
tion of victory over their quarry. An interpolation of more than two pages was thus
effected. It has to be suspected that the translator wanted to make it a racy narrative, like a crime thriller. This is totally unjustifiable, since the original, if translated faithfully, retaining the narrative style, would have been amply vindicated. Even in the portions of the original retained, the degree of "transcreation," is very high, bringing in a tepid kind of narrative style. The masterly narrative style of the original is supplanted by the shaky, amateurish attempts at free translation (p.24-32).

6). The first two paragraphs of Chapter One of the T L text form a historical background, which is not found in the original. About this, the translator states in his apology that he has, on his own account, attempted to give a political colour to the activities of the "Chiefs of the Eight Houses," a powerful body of Nair chieftains of Travancore in the eighteenth century, in the light of later events, in order to give a more rational interpretation to what would otherwise have been a callous crime. Here we see the translator going out of his way to explain certain issues for the benefit of the reader, within the body of the translated text of the novel. His seeming lack of understanding of the structure of the novel, or the propriety or otherwise of tampering with the original’s plan, is amazing. He could very well have added this explanation as a note at the end. This kind of freedom taken within the text is witnessed in Indulekha, as already seen. But B. K. Menon did not have the compulsions of a colonial administrator like Dumergue, to put in explanatory paragraphs for the benefit of the readers of the T L text.

7). On page 34, third paragraph, line 13, there is a mention of "the long hawk-like nose which lent an added majesty to the face...." However in the origi-
nal it goes like this: [One has to be cautious in praising the handsomeness of his face, as his nose is uncommonly long and protruding big. Except for the disfiguration caused by this member abnormally jutting out, no other defect can be attributed to the shape of his face (TPR).] The difference in the approach of the original author and the translator is epitomised here, as it were. This is the most important moment in the portrayal of the character of the hero, beginning with the outward description of his person. This departure from the original is unnecessary and counter-productive (p.34-34).

8). In the first and second paragraphs of Chapter Two, inaccuracies abound in the translation of the description of the demography, and places of that part of Trivandrum under discussion. ["Nambudiris, Pottis, Tirumulpads, Temple Menials and Nairs" (TPR).] found in the original are compressed to "the Nambudiri and the Tulu Brahmins and the higher sects of the Hindu community."

9). On page 48 of the T L text, mention is made in the fourth paragraph, of "that blood-sucking Vampire, Neeli of Panchavankadu." In the original, it is "Yakshi." "Vampire" is not equivalent to "Yakshi." "Yakshi" could have been retained as a generic term. B. K. Menon was under no obligation to water down the cultural content, for the T L readership in such a free translation (p.48).

10). The name Sundarayyan in the original is truncated to "Sundaram" in the translation.

11). Terms like "Philosopher's Stone" and "Promised Land" are thrown in, unnecessarily loading the text with Western cultural connotations.

12). On page 77, second paragraph, the bodyguard's remarks, "If that is so,
If he has given his word, it is as good as a Government bond! My God! What a relief!" is totally different from what is found in the original. [Yes, Your Highness. I can save a trip. Now, is it about whatever this gentleman has undertaken? It will be neatly executed, for sure " (TPR).] This is another case of a free translation without any sensitivity towards the original.

13). On page 83, last paragraph, we read: “It was not merely the agonised cry of a single individual in distress. It was the traditional loyalty of the Nair race, whose swords alone guarded the thrones in the days when men proved their manliness in the fields of war…” This is not found in the original. This portion, and the explanatory paragraphs in the beginning of Chapter One of the S L text are to be seen as the continuation of a protracted attempt to give voice to the aspirations of the Nairs of Travancore of that time, protesting against the stranglehold of Pattars, or Brahmans of foreign extract, over the affairs of the State. C. V. had inaugurated this movement through the Malayali Memorial of 1891, of which he was the guiding force. These efforts are extra-literary, to say the least. Appropriating the text for propaganda purposes maybe noted here.

14). The second half of the first paragraph of Chapter Five, dealing with the description of a mansion within the Padmanabhapuram Palace Complex, and of the streets around the town are dropped from the translation, for no apparent reason.

15). On page 86, line 15, the statement “owing to the early association with the Mohammedan Nawabs of Arcot,” is not found in the original. This explanatory addition appears to be unwarranted. In both cases, freedom is taken in an arbitrary manner (p.85).
16). On page 107, the paragraph ends, “till at last the door split and fell back.” However, in the original, the paragraph ends thus, […] the door split open, and the Chaannaan dropped the axe and other things into the room, calling out, “Oh dear ones, do not be afraid,” to free the occupants of the room from alarm, and jumped down himself (TPR).] Such unnecessary omissions abound in the translated text. What is the purpose of taking such freedoms is difficult to guess (p.107).

17). On page 133, last paragraph, first line, there is a usage, “The cross has to be borne in silence,” uttered by Parukkutty, which is a very Western observation and incongruous, when the original can be translated as follows: [“Whatever burden is put on us, we have to bear it” (TPR) (p.133).]

18). Chapter Ten, first paragraph, last but one line: we find a Hindi expression, “pansupari plates” in the place of “vettilattattam” in the original. This is a highly unlikely equivalent in an English translation of a Malayalam novel. Betel-leaf Salver or Tray would have been much better.

19). On page 148, there is a mention in the third paragraph: “Her uncle’s appealing words came to her mind, and thinking that no harm could come out of answering a commonplace question, answered in the negative.” Except the girl answering “No” to Thampi’s query, the rest is not found in the original. Free translation of an explanatory nature is to be noted here (p.148).

20). On pages 161-162, it is mentioned thus: “Superstitious by nature as all these people were…” whereas, in the original it is like this: [Since they had total faith in portends…(TPR).] The variation in cultural content in the two words is to
be noted. The comment "superstitious" is a rationalist explanation of what is found
in the original, and not a translation (p. 161-162).

21) On the first page of Chapter Eleven, second paragraph, there are men-
tions of "Elysian heights" and "African drums," that are found to be incongruous
in such a translation.

22) The description of Subhadra’s physical beauty in the paragraph on
page 171 goes like this:

A thin Cashmere shawl of delicate shades was now thrust
aside, and a girl of exquisite physical charms stood up from the cot,
looking as bright and fresh as a picture on which the brush was not
yet dry. Her figure was so full and perfect under the voluptuous
throb of youth that it was impossible to look upon her without
tfalling in love at once. The thick wealth of raven black hair that fell
back from her proud and haughty head, floated like a silken sheet till
the base of her soft rounded neck as wide as the shoulders, and then
ran in riotous curls almost to the level of her shapely ankles. Each
feature of the face was so clear and finely cut, and the harmony
between each limb so classic, that the shadow of a single expression
or the slightest movement of her person was like a well-written
poem, rippling with rhyme powerful enough to fire the human heart
with the maddest desires. But beneath all the blandishments and
coquetry of the face and the dancing invitation of those carmine lips,
there lurked in the velvet depths of her eyes a kind of unfathomable
gravity which would have warned the boldest to keep his distance

Let us now see how it is in the original, when translated faithfully:

[A figure that outshone the glow of a bright lamp that burned in that boudoir got up from the bed and stood on the floor. It was a noble lady — who looked like the mirror image, in the wealth of her physical beauty, of certain maidens who were brought into existence by that renowned creator, Ravi Varma, Koyiltampuran of Kilimamoor, affording supreme joy to the eyes and untold unrest to the minds of spectators, in portraits that demonstrated the un paralleled graphic imagination of the artist — that appeared before Ramananmadhom. The otherworldly richness of this lady's beauty, was enveloped by a rare radiance which made the viewers suspect that she was indeed some Yakshi of alluring physical charms. As youthfulness had matured in this lady like the swelling waters of a dammed up river inundating the banks, her body had turned superbly buxom along with its shapeliness. On her expansive bosom of the colour of a screwpine blossom, rising at a certain gradient, the twin pitchers of her breasts, jostling with each other tightly, and her massive buttocks, proclaimed the opulence of her bodily endowments and her mature elegance. And her hair flowed idly down from its source, her head, till her neck, rippled along in
wavelet after wavelet, and thence, assumed the form of gigantic
waves, rolling and curling and sweeping down towards the high
bank of her lofty behind, spreading all over that region and com-
pletely covering it. Her face could be compared somewhat to the
battleground where Kamadeva and his antagonist, Shiva met in
combat. Kamadeva’s bow made of the purple sugarcane, his five
weapons beginning with the lotus flower, the bowstring made of a
straight line formed by black beetles, her eyes, the twin fish that are
the emblems on the flag of the god whose wiles and guiles pierce
the armour of chastity and austerity, and, his orderlies, the full moon
and the soft breeze, were seen on that face along with the eagerness
to steal the mental steadfastness of those who confronted her. Yet,
there blazed forth from that face, an effulgence like the glow of the
tire from the third eye of Rudra that destroyed the hauteur of the
world-conquering Kamadeva (TPR).

The present researcher has gone to the extent of faithfully translating the
original passage to give an idea of the wealth that is squandered away in a transla-
tion that is free and bland — ready to serve as it were — to suit the taste of the T.L
readership. Facilitation for appropriation is the least of the charges one can make
in such cases. Mildly put, the translation of this passage is subdued and under-
stated, in conformity with the late-Victorian value system of the West. However,
C. V. has followed the best traditions of Dravidian aesthetics and has carried out
the description of Subhadra’s beauty exuberantly as demonstrated above. Through
such a departure from the culture of the original text, the translator has caused grievous damage to an exquisitely beautiful descriptive passage in the original, depicting the personality of one of the central characters of the novel.

23). On page 181, line four, instead of the part of the TL text, "Even the most loyal citizens showed open reluctance to pay the dues to the State, afraid of the punishment that would be meted out to them if the conspiracy were to succeed," goes like this if faithfully translated:

[As there was a widespread belief among the populace that a change in the Order of Succession in the ruling dynasty was imminent, many among the citizens who had been loyally obedient to the monarch, now assumed a rebellious stance and prepared themselves for a quarrel and desisted from paying the King's due. Upon requests for financial succour by some of the King's ministers to certain wealthy subjects in view of the depletion of resources in the Royal Exchequer, these worthies do not dare to extend any such assistance for fear of the enemy camp (TPR).]

This is another case of inaccuracy of translation and an unnecessary departure from the original. The point to be noted is that, the whole exercise appears to be needless, and that the majesty of the original is dented through this deletion. The free translation has not served any purpose (p.181).

24). In the same paragraph, what has been compressed in the line "the great agricultural lords living in Nanjinad," reads thus in the original: [The inhabitants of the Southern Tracts known as Nanjinad, under the influence of the local...
Mudaliar feudal lords known under titles such as Cherakonar, Mylavanar and Vanikaraman, have switched their allegiance in favour of the Thampis (TPR).}

This kind of deletion serves only the cause of appropriation by the T L culture, as all uncomfortable and hirsute portions that stand for the linguistic, cultural and political elements of the S L text that give it individuality, have been smoothened out and what remains is a sanitised version.

25). Again, the last portion of the paragraph, “The people of the middle districts of Eraniel, Kalkulam and Vilavancode, smarting from the transfer of the capital from their midst to Trivandrum…” reads in the S L text, thus: [The people of the middle regions of Eraniel, Kalkulam and Vilavancode, lying adjacent to the erstwhile capitals like Thiruvithamkode and Padmanabhapuram, hurt that the capital had been shifted to Trivandrum…(TPR).] Once again, the missing details are specific to the history of Travancore, and should not have been deleted (p.181).

There are many other passages that are missing, which, if enumerated, will assume inordinate length.

26). On page 182 the second paragraph opens thus: “Having moved amongst the people almost from his very birth, the Yuvarajah knew that….” This is not to be found in the original and it contradicts the manner the Yuvarajah is portrayed in Chapter V, as being credulous to the flattery of courtiers so much so that the plain-speaking farmer Mankoyikkal Kurup’s remonstrations and obvious lack of courtliness roused his royal ire and that he reflected on these lines in self-examination and reproached himself (p.182).

27). On page 193, second paragraph, the passage dealing with the emotions
of Parukkutty’s uncle has been translated inaccurately. The portion reads,

“Although, since then, he had not given verbal expression to his grief, his glances towards the cot and at his sister were surcharged with the acute agony that he endured. That wild social ambition, which had led him to hope for an alliance with the royal house, was now putting him on the pitiless rack of remorse and self-reproach.”

However, in the S L text goes literally, thus:

[But, it becomes clear that his brain is heated up by intense ire. from the glowering stares he is directing at his sister. He looks at his niece’s face, his heart melting, heaves a deep sigh and looks at his sister with blazing eyes. He might be saying in his mind, “Just bear this calamity you brought about on yourself through your highhandedness falling prey to wild ambition, swaying even me in the process” (TPR). Again, a case of free translation is detected here (p.193)

28). On page 194, line three, there is a sentence: “Sanku Asan now began to defame the whole pantheon of Gods in Hindu Mythology.” This, read in the S L text is thus: [Sanku Asan... cursed Brahma, Vishnu, Maheswara and the deities of all the temples that were known to him (TPR).] Among other things like free translation, the Orientalist expression of the translator is to be noted (p.194).

29). On page 210, there is as an expression, “She does not understand the ABC of the art of love.” It is an incongruous and totally Western expression to be encountered in the translation of such a novel.
30). On page 253, paragraph three, we see a sentence: “We will consult the next astrologer,” said Parameswaran Pillai flippantly, tired of the whole affair. However, the original merely goes: [Let’s go to Pazhoor for consultations (TPR).] Pazhoor is the seat of a very famous family of astrologers, dating back to several centuries. If it could be retained, if necessary, with footnotes, or mentioned in a paraphrasing way, thus, “Let’s go to Pazhoor, to the famous astrologer” (TPR) it would have been a great cultural pointer. The second point to be noted here is that, there is this famous Malayalam proverb which says, “Is it necessary to go to Pazhoor for that?” implying that the matter under discussion is something so certain. Parameswaran Pillai is using this proverb inverted. Loss of cultural content through free translation is to be taken note of (p.253).

31). On page 225, the first line, “...my decision will be as irrevocable as the decrees of Fate!” goes like this in the original: [“My resolve will not melt. I have resolved as firmly as the rocks of Mount Sinai!” (TPR) By opting to render a free, neutral translation, the cultural content (so different from the tone of the dominant culture) has been eroded (p.225).

32). On page 259, the second paragraph is a too-free translation and the third paragraph is a sheer addition. The second paragraph reads thus: “The quantity of drink that he had already consumed had deprived him of what little he possessed in the nature of an independent will and the rest succumbed to the fascination of the vision of sheer loveliness that stood before him, driving him almost to the verge of madness by playing upon his hopes and fears.” The faithful translation of the passage would be as follows:
Ramamadamthom, buffeted between two powers — within him, the liquor he has consumed and without, the mind-enthraling dazzle of Subhadra’s beauty — exhibits, by turn, the expressions of one enjoyably melting with the erotic passion, like Keechaka face to face with Saarandhri, and that of absolute divine devotion, obedience and humility, like Hanuman has for Sita when he espies her (TPR).] Once again, the above paragraph bears ample testimony to free-translation inducing appropriation by T L culture (p.259).

33). On page 260, except for the two sentences of the first paragraph, the rest is the result of addition and expansion.

34). On page 300, the last but one paragraph of 14 lines is wholly an addition not found in the original. It’s the translator’s creativity raising its head (p.300).

35). On page 275 the last line and the first line on the next page read, “I told him even then... he started at an inauspicious hour... and reaped the consequences.” The original reads thus, [“He had seen the preceding New Moon on a Tuesday night. We both saw it together. And he suffered the evil results of that. Just that” (TPR).] Again, this is a clear case of cultural loss through free translation (p.275).

36). On page 282, there is a scene of the guards at Kazhakkoottathu Pillai’s house singing songs and making merry. In the S L text, there are two quatrains that are dropped in the T L text, without translating. The scene itself is rich with rustic humour, with all the individual guards speaking in their own style, the blundering songster pretending to be a Mahabharata scholar and asserting that Gandhari is the
one who bore five sons while another corrects him saying that Gandhari is none other than Dhrtrarastra’s mother, and a third claiming that Gandhari is not a character of Mahabharata and supposed that she maybe a character in Ezhuttachan’s songs (little aware that the most important among Ezhuttachan’s ‘songs’ is Mahabharatam Kilippattu). The entire episode, almost two pages, is translated in a free, neutral language devoid of any of the cultural flavours.

37). On page 317, the first paragraph is an explanatory one, not found in the original. As noted above, there are several such additions. It would seem that, without trusting C. V. to make his own narration, the translator is always overbearing and is putting words into the author’s mouth. Because, the vast majority of such additions are explanations, making it more palatable for TL readership; these do mar the magic of the original narrative plan, because whereas C. V. tends to play with the element of suspense, the translator makes all these explicationary additions in his anxiety for communication to a readership that is unacquainted either with C. V.’s credentials, or with the wealth of Malayalam prose as written by C. V., though the medium was of recent origin when the novel was written (p.317).

38). On page 305, the last paragraph is heavily diluted and added to. The translators’ general comments are on what it is to die, startling everyone even if one lies long in the sick bed making everybody familiar with the idea of death coming in anytime (p.305).

39). On page 236, third paragraph, last line, there is a sentence: “In fact he was eighty-two!” This is not found in the original, and is an addition.

40). On page 356, the scene in which Biram Khan kills Sundarayyan, is
handled independently by the translator, who has expanded it in a verbose, expository fashion. The succinct, pithy description of the original author is given a short shrift.

41. The second paragraph also suffers at the hand of the translator from the vice of needless expansion. So do several of the succeeding long, descriptive paragraphs (pp. 356-361).

42. In the first paragraph we read, “The strange adventures of Ananthapadmanabhan which surpassed even the best works of fiction, became a common topic all over the State and a halo of glory and romance clung to his name.” The same portion, faithfully translated would be, [People extol the account of the happenings involving Ananthapadmanabhan, terming it as something that excels even the puranic stories (TPR).] Once again, the translator is exceeding his brief.

43. On page 378, third paragraph from below: “Utter another word I’ll pull out your tongue. Now bend your neck and take what is due! This sword ought to have been plunged into you while you were still in your mother’s womb! You child of sin! Let me see who interferes now!”

This portion, if translated faithfully will be, [I’ll pull out your tongue if you so much as speak. Bend you neck. The sword I once raised against the mother now cleaves the child. Let me see who comes preventing me (TPR).]

44. The section spreading over the last paragraph of this page and all over the next page, is again a perfect example of how an emotionally charged, terse and tight piece of writing is rendered lax and sagging by expansion and inaccurate
translation. The translator’s aesthetic sensibility is evidently in question; instead of
 economising on words and phrases to keep the tension up, he is explaining every
 allusion and connotation in the original text, in the body of the translation.

45. Last but one line reads, "Oh! God! I can die in peace now!" In the
original it goes, [Oh Padmanabha! Now I don’t mind even to die" (TPR).]

46. Even the last paragraph of the novel has turned out to be an example of
the translator’s keenness for explication and expansion (pp.378-382).

Chemmeen

1). On page five, after the third paragraph, the first sentence in the TL text
is: “Her breasts were a symbol of the exuberance of youth, throbbing with life.”
But the original, literally translated would be, [How high her bosom was! As if
growing by the minute! (TPR) (p.5).] Here is an obvious attempt at expansion, to
suit Western sensibilities.

2). On page eleven, paragraph five, the last line reads in the TL text:
“...stare at your bare breasts and eye you with lecherous eyes.” This would, if
literally translated from the original, read thus: [“...stare piercingly at your breasts
and buttocks” (TPR).] There is no mention of “bare” breasts anywhere in the SL
text, whereas the translator has repeated “bare” almost wherever “breasts” appear
in the text. One is tempted to infer that there is some attempt at exoticisation here.
But “buttocks” is deleted.

3). In the next paragraph too, the case is repeated. The last two lines read,
“If anyone stared at her bare breasts...” Again, one find that the addition of “bare”
and deletion of “buttocks” has taken place when compared with the SL text. The
translator might have avoided the expression "buttocks" owing to a sense of propriety in keeping with the TL sensibility.

4). On page 208, the fatal words Palani speaks are given in capital letters to denote their importance: "OH NO, PANCHAMI, HE WOULD ASK FOR NEWS OF KARUTHAMMA." However, this is accomplished in the original, with just two words in Malayalam, "Ala Chothikkum," which can be translated closely as, "No, he'd ask." Connecting to Karuthamma's query, "Would he then ask for news of me?" And Panchami's answer, "He used to smile when he saw me." Palani's intervening dialogue would be succinctly put if it were presently as: "No, he'd ask." By the elaboration and extra-ordinary presentation quoted above, the great word-economy and subtlety Thakazhi used have come loose in a most unbecoming manner.

PROBLEMS RELATED TO POWER

Translation is described as an act of subversion. The translator decides to unsettle the supremacy of the SL text and literally dismantles it to create the TL text. What s/he decides to retain in the TL text will remain, and what s/he decides to drop, will be dropped. At least, this is the common perception. Of course, some may rail at the translator for dropping certain portions from the SL text, or suppression of details, from the texts of their favourite writers. But, what of it? The original author has to grant her/his permission for the publication of the TL text provided s/he is still alive. Won't s/he safeguard her/his own interests? Isn't that enough? These are the common assumptions. But the reality is that most of the translators get away with what they do. There is any number of translators engaged
in free translation, subverting authorial authority. The translator places himself in a position of authority, deciding what the TL reader should read. The possibility remains that the translator may suppress, eliminate partially or misrepresent the SL text in a number of ways.

*Indulekha*

1. Dumergue suppresses the description of Indulekha's physical beauty found in the SL text, concerned about the sensibilities of the TL audience. This is already quoted under the section "Free Translation Leading to Appropriation."

This is also an example of the translator exercising arbitrary power over the SL text.

Apart from this particular case, all those instances in which the translator has departed from the original or suppressed details in the original, quoted in the above sections, are relevant under this section too.

*Marthanda Varma*

The translator has resorted to large-scale omission and suppression of details from the original and taken liberties with the structure. All these have been quoted in the above sections on Appropriation and Free Translation.

*Chemmeen*

1. On page five, the third paragraph in the TL text ends with the sentence, "She had never experienced such a feeling until then." (p.50).

However, there is one more sentence in the original that may be read as,

[At that moment, in that confusion, she has spoken something far too harsh that wounded his heart] missing from the TL text (TPR) (p.5).]
With this, Narayana Menon begins the incredible exercise of selectively omitting at least some part from almost all paragraphs, or several paragraphs altogether from the S L text, as discussed in the "Introductory Note" above.

2). After the last paragraph on page 14 that ends with the line, "He must not sing in her vicinity," an entire paragraph has been omitted in the T L text. This paragraph is translated below:

[Till two days ago, she flitted about animatedly like a butterfly. The changes that have come over her within these two days! She got things to sit down and think about. She began to understand herself more and more. Isn’t it something that adds gravity to life? She is being careful about herself. She must put each step forward cautiously. How can she then dash about as before? A man looked at her breast. That moment she became a woman (TPR) (p.14).]

3). After two paragraphs on page 17 there appears the sentence, "Why don’t you go and stare at the women working at your curing yard?" In the original, it is, [Why don’t you go and stare at the breasts and behinds of the women…" (TPR).] Again, the deletion seems to be in deference of T L sensibility (p.17). Suppression of original material is to be noted here.

4). On page 49, towards the middle, a sizeable portion of the original has been deleted, which is given below in translation:

[Whatever Chakki said was right. And she was right about saying that in a cut and dried manner. But those words seemed to rip through Karuthamma’s heart.]
Walking some distance, Karuthamma looked back. Not wittingly, she cannot help looking back like that. As they reached home, that heart-piercing song began from the seashore.

Said Chakki: “Isn’t that boy going to sleep today?”

Again, Chakki spoke, aiming at Karuthamma. “ Somehow, you will have to be sent away from this seaside now.”

There is an accusation implied in her mother’s words. Her presence has brought trouble there; everyone has lost peace of mind. Unable to hear her sorrow and anger. Karuthamma said:

“What did I do?”

Chakki didn’t say a word (TPR) [ p14].]

5). At the end of Chapter Six, an entire section is missing from the T L text. The translation is done below:

[While sitting alone, Karuthamma’s mind would slip out of her grasp. She loves Pareekutti. No one else can have any place in her heart. She yearns to forget for at least a moment, not him, but her relationship with him. Because, she was born as an Arayathi. And she wishes to die as an Arayan’s Arayathi. She knows how to go about it. Shouldn’t she forget Pareekuti, then?

She believes that, if his money is returned, and that obligation resolved, she could forget him. Therefore, Karuthamma can’t even imagine him wandering about, broke. But, it is that picture that is retained in her memory.
Days rolled by; there is no solution to the problem as yet.

Chemban Kunju is not repaying that money (TPR) (p.59).

6). The mention of “rice soup and vegetables” in the third line of the paragraph, is in the place of “boiled tapioca and rice gruel,” the staple of the poor during lean season. There is dilution of a culture-specific phrase here (p.68).

7). On page 80 towards the end there is a sentence, “Thus Chemban Kunju acquired a second boat.” However, there is an entire section missing in the T L text. The following translation is offered for the same:

[That day too, there was quarrel in Achakunju’s house.

Chemban Kunju now had not one, but two boats. Nallapennu taunted Achakunju:

“Why are you living thus, as a human being?”

“Hey you! It’s because you became my partner that I am always broke. Where’s the money I gave you to be deposited with Joseph just after the Chakara?”

“Can I go about without clothes? Can we drink water, without having a vessel to store it in?”

“Suppose I had kept the money with me?”

“You’d have drunk and piddled it away.”

Achakunju swung two blows at her (TPR) (p.80).]

8). On page 82, after the first paragraph, a section is left out. Translation for the same is offered below:

[She is aware of everything. Yet she said: “Repay that
money. Mother."

"I too want it."

"No Mother. You only talk. But you don’t return the money. How many solutions did I point out? You didn’t do any of those things, Mother...

Only after you repay that money — " she stopped abruptly. Chakki sensed it.

"What you said is correct. That is the way it should be"

(TPR) (p.82).]

9). Immediately after that, there is an entire sentence missing, which is translated below. [If she was to enlist the assistance of Karuthamma’s peers, it would be the song on the seafront the next instant (TPR).]

10). On page 84, last but one paragraph. One last sentence is missing in the translation. [She has a lot of things to tell him (TPR) (p.84).]

11). The last paragraph on page 86 is formed with several separate small sections in third person fused together and put in the first personal singular form. There are vital sentences missing in the translation, in this clustering together. Like, [Chakki said, without submitting herself to Chemban Kunju’s despotism (TPR) (p.86).]

12). On page 87, towards the end of the page, a paragraph is missing in the translation. It is translated thus:

[Karuthamma has spoken out all that was there to say. There is nothing more left in that history. But Chakki isn’t aware of it. If
she did, what all a mother would have had to ask further? Or, has Chakki understood everything? A woman, even though she is a mother, may understand the course of her daughter’s love. And remain silent about it.

“'My child, Mother will pay off that debt.’

“I know that Father won’t pay it” (TPR) (p.87).]

13). On Page 90, a crucial section is missing in the T L text. The translation is provided below:

[Chakki said: Still, you haven’t paid back that Moslem boy’s money.”

Taking it to be a nuisance, Chemban Kunju said: “It has become a habit with you to bring in that topic whenever Karuthamma’s marriage is mentioned.”

Chakki was startled.

Indeed, that was the truth. Whenever Karuthamma’s marriage is discussed, she can’t help being reminded of that topic. But Chakki never imagined that Chemban Kunju would question her thus

Chakki was soon ready with an answer (TPR).]

14). The fifth paragraph to come on the T L text when compared with the S L text on page 92, is entirely missing from the translation. The translation is provided below.

|There would certainly be. A lover and his beloved would
have walked those sands, collapsed and perished, their hearts broken. And that girl would have lived as another man’s wife, hiding her love that can never be put out by anything... Or, they must have together committed suicide. Or... ?(TPR)

15). Three sentences later, we read in the translation, “No, Mother. I have not been defiled,” she said casually. It is slightly different in the original, which can be translated as: [“No, Mother. I haven’t become a fallen girl” (TPR).] And now, after this statement, one important sentence is missing in the translation. It may be translated thus:

[There was a kind of boldness in that statement (TPR).]

16). Further down, on page 93, a paragraph begins thus: “Karuthamma had only one request.” The sentence that follows this one, is missing from the original. It can be translated as: [That she should escape (TPR) (p.93).]

17). On page 94, towards the middle, there is a sentence: “That question was always on her mind.” It appears in the original differently: [Her mind is filled with that question.] The next sentence in the original is missing from the TL text. It would be: [And yet she didn’t ask any one (TPR).]

18). After the last sentence in the next paragraph on the same page, there are two more sentences in the corresponding part of the original. They may be translated as follows:

[Not only that. In those grains of sand, that grandmother’s pulverised bones must have been deposited (TPR) (p.94).]

19). Further down, on page 95, a section is missing in the translation. The
The young girls of the neighbourhood asked her: “Are you going away, Karuthamma Chechi?” (TPR).

Karuthamma has got weighty things to tell those girls. They should not flutter about on this beach like dry leaves. She told so to many of them.

Karuthamma is bidding farewell. She was born there; and grew up. Now she is leaving that place. But can she forget that seafront? (TPR) (p.95)

20). Two paragraphs further down, on page 95, this sentence is missing in the translation:

[She bid farewell to everything (TPR).]

21). The next paragraph is inadequately translated: “One moonlit night when the sea was calm. Karuthamma heard a song which seemed to mingle with the moonlight.”

However, in the original, it is somewhat like this:

[A moonlit night! The sea is calm. The moonbeams seemed to have a special beauty. That song, dissolved in the moonlight, wafted all over there (TPR) (p.95).]

22). One paragraph later, on page 96, there is another diluted paragraph in the translation. “Karuthamma stood up. She could see Pareekutti’s figure clearly in front of her. Was he really calling her? Or, was he consoling himself with the song?” A faithful translation of the passage would be:
The strains of that song entered her being. Karuthamma sat up. Pareekutti’s form appears before her! Is he actually calling her? What else is there beside that song to give him solace? Not only now, he would ever sing that song. Even after she goes away from there. Not for anyone to listen to (TPR).]

23). On the same page, the opening sentences of the paragraph after the next one, are missing from the translation. Translated faithfully, they would be:

[That singer’s heart doesn’t break. He is singing for that heart to burst open. Some strains of that song of that fallen girl (TPR).]

24). One sentence later, on the same page, there is again a missing portion:

[She doesn’t remember the lines. But the poetic beauty of the essence of those lines moved her heart-strings (TPR).]

25). Last but one paragraph ends with the sentence: “And above all, she had not said her farewell to Pareekutti, the angel who had been sent to her.” However, the original sentence can be translated only thus: [She didn’t tell the angel of moonlight that she was going (TPR) (p.96).]

26). After this an entire paragraph which ought to be there on the T L text is missing from the translation. This may be rendered thus:

[Perhaps tomorrow and the day after—till she leaves that place, that song may not be sung. And it may be that, that singer’s throat would burst open, from unending singing that day. And, couldn’t it be that he may stop singing forever? And thus, the moonlight on that seafront may turn melancholy, mute (TPR) (p.96).]

27). Two paragraphs later, as the third one ends, three sentences are missing:
[She has to beg him not to sing anymore. That he mustn’t move the moonbeams so, on the seafront. She has a lot of things to tell Pareekutti…(TPR) (p.97).]

28). Two paragraphs later, on page 97, we come across this paragraph in the translation:

“When you go away, Karuthamma, will you think of me?” he asked. “Even if you won’t think of me, I shall sit on this beach and sing. When I grow old into a toothless man—even then I shall sit here and sing.”

This is a rather free translation. In the original, it is more or less, thus:

[He said: “Are you going away, Karuthamma?”

What other pleasantry is there for him to exchange with her?

“Once you are gone, Karuthamma—will you remember me?”

That was Pareekutti’s genuine doubt.

“Even if you don’t remember me, I’ll sit here on this beach and sing. Even when I have grown into a tottering, toothless, old man.” (TPR) (p14).]

29). On page 105, fourth paragraph, there is an addition and an omission. The addition is the part which says, “The rest, to be used for the goodwill of the village, …” The omission is provided below in translation:

[Though so much of a ruckus had broken out, the muhurtam had not passed (TPR).]

What is compressed into one sentence in the last sentence in the last-but-one paragraph, “Like a machine, Karuthamma did mechanically all she was told,”
is an entire paragraph. It is translated below:

[What would have been going on in Karuthamma’s mind? What would she have been thinking about? Who knows! She did whatever she was told to do, like a machine (TPR).]

30). The sentence, “Some of the women said that all these things augured ill,” on the same page is the compression of an entire paragraph. It is translated below:

[Some women said that all these were inauspicious. Wasn’t there something in what they said? Chakki came around again. Some said if she could be given complete rest, everything would be normal once again (TPR) (p.105).]

31). On page 108, third paragraph from below, ends thus, “My son, look at the state of your mother. And then speak.” There is a whole section missing after this, which is translated below:

[“It would be complete only if he says, Aren’t you too born of a mother? But Chemban Kunju didn’t say that (TPR) (p.108).]

32). On page 109, the third paragraph is terminated with the statement “Palani stood firm.” However, in the original there is one more sentence, which proves to be a crucial observation of Palani’s character. This portion is missing in the T L text. It is translated below:

[Perhaps, if Achyuthan and others had agreed, Palani wouldn’t have had any objection (TPR).]

33). The next paragraph on the same page is also compressed. It merely says: “The Headman, who was sympathetic to Chemban Kunju’s plight, got a little
In the original there is much more. It is translated below:

[The Arayan’s heart melted. Anyone’s heart would melt. Achyuthan’s heart would also have been melting. Only that he didn’t show it openly or acknowledge it…” (TPR).]

34). At the end of the next paragraph, on the same page, two sentences are missing. Faithfully translated they would be: [Chemban Kunju may have felt that it was a mistake to have given him his daughter in marriage. Such a feeling, on the very day of the wedding! He has no love in his heart. That fact has been revealed at the very outset (TPR).]

35). The last but one sentence on the same page, “The Headman welcomed the suggestion” is an incomplete translation of a paragraph in the original. Faithfully translated, it would be: [“That suggestion was really comforting to Chemban Kunju. Palani too would have felt some relief. And it was also acceptable to the Arayan (TPR) (p.109).]

36). In the middle of the second paragraph on page 110, it is stated: “She had said her farewell to her village; yet she thought of her future with misgivings.” However, in the original, it differs substantially. Faithfully translated it would be:

[She had bid farewell to this locality. She had prepared herself to leave at the earliest. on account of her fear (of scandal)., and concern for the future (TPR).]

37). In the middle of the last paragraph on page 110 and ending on the beginning of page 111, a crucial sentence found in the original is missing:

[The mother sees before her that terrible picture, waxing (TPR).]

38). After Karuthamma says, “I am ready to go.” (Which, in the original is
"I am going..."

A small paragraph is missing. It can be translated thus:

[Again, mother and daughter clutched each other in an embrace. Their hearts are breaking (TPR) (pp.110-111).

39). The ending of the chapter on page 111, is marked by inaccurate translation. After the sentence, "Karuthamma—my sister," (in the original it is just "Chachy" or "O Elder Sister") the translation should be:

[Nallapennu and Kalikunjoo stayed with Chakki.

Karuthamma is setting off towards her future. What would her future be? Is she going away, having escaped from the great danger that threatened her?

No one prayed for her. Nor did she pray for herself. Perhaps, Pareekutti may be praying for her.

Thus, Karuthamma, who was a familiar sight on that seashore, left.

Will that song float around here anymore? It may. But there wouldn't be anyone to listen to it (TPR) (p.111).

40). In the last paragraph on page 115, before the sentence beginning "Palani had not..." one sentence is missing. It can be translated as:

[He has purchased some rice, salt and chillies and kept them in a basket (TPR) (p.115).

41). On page 116, after the words, "Fisherwoman Vavakunju asked," a short sentence is missing. It can be translated as below:

[In which way is he flawed? (TPR)]
42). On page 117, in the middle of the third paragraph, one small section is missing in translation, which goes like this:

[Karuthamma felt that her action was really high-handed. Would any other daughter have done like she did? No; not likely (TPR).]

43). There are substantial missing portions in the next paragraph, on the same page shown below, translated:

[Let alone there isn’t anyone to attend to her, giving her food and water, her father would still blame her mother. And she has to bear all that. ...Her father would never forgive her (TPR).]

44). The next paragraph on the same page is compressed. In the place of “She had known security” in the original it goes like this:

[“She had a father; a mother. And her father was someone who toiled hard and made money” (TPR) (p.117).]

45). On page 118, there are a couple of sentences missing from the second paragraph. Translated, these are:

[If only he had said, “No, I am not taking my bride away now,” there would not have been any trouble at all. It would have been enough if they had stayed back home for a couple of days How should she.... Isn’t it possible that this person is capable of such pitiless actions in future as well? (TPR)]

46). On the same page, after paragraph five ending, “That was Karuthamma’s fear, an entire paragraph is missing. It is translated by the present researcher, as given below:

[Someone says from within her that that is not going to happen. That
thought is not of recent origin. It began long ago. Events that never happened in another girl’s life have sneaked into her life already. And it may that more such events may happen. And it may distort her life in unimaginable ways. She has such a feeling. That feeling has acquired a form now (TPR).

47). In the second paragraph on page 119, two sentences in the beginning and one in the end are missing. Translated, they would be:

[All young women want their husbands to love them. But has at least one of them any comprehensive idea as to what love is?... That may be the reason why she doubts whether she would get love any more (TPR).]

48). The next paragraph in the S L text is entirely missing in the T L text which was to appear on the same page. The same is translated below:

[An impression that Palani is incapable of love somehow entered Karuthamma’s heart. Then why did she come with him forfeiting her claim over her own family? Isn’t it a dangerous experiment? But suppose she were to remain back home with her father? It would have been a much more dangerous experiment (TPR) (p.119).]

49). On page 122, the fourth paragraph is cut short by two sentences, when compared with the original. Translated they would be:

[How will she make him believe it? If he doesn’t believe it, it will be the greatest blow yet her life would suffer (TPR).]

50). The next four paragraphs are entirely left out from the T L text. A faithful translation of the same is provided below:

[Before that question is thrown at her, she wishes to narrate
the whole story to him as an apology. But what should she say? That doesn’t take shape in her.

Are all girls like this? Can one lose all sense of shame and modesty, even if a stranger becomes one’s husband and so soon? She doesn’t know the answer. How did she become so passionate, she reflected, with an element of self-doubt. She cannot take herself to be an ordinary girl. Long, long ago, there lived on their seafront locality quite a few grannies who were really extra-ordinary.

Someone said from inside Karuthamma, “You are one who loved a man.” That is, whenever she thought of that man, she would experience a strange excitement. In short, the yearning for a man had developed in her.

For such a one as her, when she got a man all to herself, she lost all inhibitions and decorum befitting a modest wife. She soon turned crazy for the experience. It may be that other girls never have had such an exposure (TPR).

51). The sentence, “The love affair had perhaps awakened the woman in her (prematurely)” comes after this section. The omission is a serious lapse as it has certainly impaired the portrayal of the heroine’s emotional life.

52). The next paragraph is inadequately translated. Faithfully translated it should be:

[She is unable to erase the memory of Pareekutti. Isn’t that a sin? She, a wife, thinks of another man. Yet, someone from inside says, “You can never forget
Parekutti.” That’s going to be a nightmare lasting an entire lifetime (TPR).

53). The next paragraph is entirely left out. This part is translated as follows:

[His song might still be heard around that seafront. Karuthamma’s mind was increasingly troubled. How and when is she going to know some peace? Perhaps, she might be fated not to have any peace of mind (TPR) (p.122).]

54). On page123, before the sentence beginning, “Palani described the situation,” there is a sentence that is missing in the TL text. It is translated presently as follows:

[She got the impression he believed that it was improper for him to leave her there back home and come away (TPR) (p.123).]

55). On page124, before last but one paragraph, an entire section is missing. Faithfully translated it would be:

[Thus there was a gap. From one side, there was a demand to be loved; from the other side, there was no such demand. She offered to be a good wife in however ways one becomes a good wife. Even if Palani didn’t ask her to love him, shouldn’t she tell him so? But does that mean that she wouldn’t love him? Perhaps, if Palani had asked her to, she would have declared her unconditional love for him.

In the course of the promises of the first night, that conversation went on thus, without conflicts, but with gaps. However, they reached a common understanding:
They must build a house. Karuthamma said, with a smile, “I too don’t have any kith and kin. I too don’t have any house” (TPR) (124).]

This omission is also inexplicable, and affects the narrative power of the text.

56). On page 127, a major portion of the third paragraph is missing and the rest is inadequately translated. It should have been thus: [Kochayyappan asked what was so wrong about that. Wouldn’t young men feel that way? All in that group were married and had children. Velayudhan said, based on the common experience of the married: “That would be wonderful for four days…” (TPR) (p.127).]

57). On page 129, in the middle, after the sentence “Karuthamma hurried home,” a crucial link-paragraph is missing. It is translated as below:

[She waited and waited. When the night had progressed a couple of hours, Palani returned. There was a small packet in his hand (TPR).]

This missing paragraph causes a jerk in the narrative.

58). On the same page, after the middle portion there is a passage in which it is said “That look was directed at her finely formed breasts.” In the original it is “her high-rising” breasts. “Finely formed” is indicative of Western aesthetic sensibility, whereas “high-rising” indicate the Dravidian exuberance in sculpture and iconography. The next sentence is “Then his eyes were fixed on her shapely back.” In the original it is. [That time his stare was fixed on her buttocks, covered with just a single-piece cloth (TPR) (p.129).]
59). On page 131, fourth paragraph, the last line ends, "...to make him into somebody." In the original there are two more lines. Translated it goes like this:

[She has acquired the freedom to tell him so much. She had just become confident about his passion for her (TPR) (p.131).]

60). On page 132, two paragraphs from below, there is a statement, "That is something you must experience." However, just before that, there is a link paragraph that has been omitted in the translation. The same is faithfully translated below:

[She said:

"Then why are we starving when there is no catch?" (TPR) (132)]

61). On page 133, last but one paragraph, has three more sentences in the original. Translated, they would be:

[He sat looking at her weeping like that. For quite a long time, only her sobs were heard resounding there. Would he have felt pity for her?

A disembodied-like voice fell in her years (TPR).]

62). Just before the last paragraph on the page, there is a small paragraph in the original. The translation of it is provided below:

[Certainly Palani’s heart has melted somewhat. And he has qualified his statement, saying, “It’s not what I say.” After some time he said:

“It’s that Pappu who says it all” (TPR) (p.133).]

63). On page 134, the third paragraph will have to begin with the following sentence:

[She beseeched him to trust her (TPR).]
64). The beginning sentence of the third paragraph is missing. It goes like this:

[He was immersed in the innumerably busy affairs right after a wedding.]

65). On page 139, in the middle of the page, there is a statement:

“I wonder whether my mother is alive now.” Before that there are two sentences, which are missing from the TL text. Translated they go thus:

[One day, sitting after lunch, she felt it was a good time to broach the subject. She said as if in a monologue (TPR).]

66). On page 141 after the third paragraph, there is once again, a case of a grievous, glaring omission. What is said in the translation in an extremely sketchy manner is very elaborately put in the original, bringing in all necessary details. For the sake of bringing clarity to the point established here, first the relevant portion from the translation is quoted below, and then the alternate translation provided within square brackets.

“You two played together like children on this seashore,” she mourned.

Pareekutti’s heart was touched by those memories. He realised now that Chakki knew of their love. She knew how deep it was.

“I never had the good fortune to bear a boy,” Chakki continued. “But I have a son.”

Chakki clasped Pareekutti’s hands and said, “You are my son, Pareekutti.”
Her statement was like a healing balm on Pareekutti’s bruised heart. Karuthamma was not to be his, but she would always be something to him and he something to her.

“My son, you must marry a nice girl, have children and prosper in your trade,” Chakki said. You must not trouble Karuthamma any longer. She is married. You are now her brother. As my son you must accept her as your sister.”

Pareekutti’s eyes overflowed with tears.

“I know you love Karuthamma. This is the test of your love.”

Pareekutti couldn’t answer her. His voice choked with emotion. If he loved her, he had to care for her like a brother—yes, that was right.

Silently, time passed by.

“Shouldn’t it be so, my son?” Chakki asked.

“Yes,” Pareekutti answered mechanically.

“Then, my child, may you children live like my son and daughter.”

In a moment Chakki continued, “If she were here, I would have told her this on my deathbed.”

Chakki asked him again to be only a brother and no more. If Karuthamma could not come to Chakki before her death, he should inform Karuthamma that she now had a brother. Although Pareekutti gave his consent, Chakki felt uneasy about the way he
gave it. She begged him to give her his word of honour.

That night Chakki heard Pareekutti singing his song on the seashore (p.141-142).

Now the translation of this portion following the original faithfully would be:

["You both were playmates on this seashore."

A soft string of Pareekutti's heart was played upon. Those bygone times awoke in him. And Chakki realised that. Wasn't that love story known to Chakki as well? Perhaps, she knew too, how vehement it was. It was something that touched two lives in a grave manner. The ailing Chakki spoke like a mother:

"Son, no male child sprouted in my womb."

And Chakki continued with intense grief:

"I now have a son."

As if asking who it was, Pareekutti looked at Chakki's face and Chakki at his face, as if asking him whether he didn't want to know who she referred to. Chakki grasped Pareekutti's hands and said: "This is my son here—Pareekutti."

Pareekutti felt as if a cool breeze of consolation was blowing in some corners of his blazing heart. She, whom he loved, became not his. No, she still belongs to him in some way. And he is hers in some way too.

Chakki has no hopes about the durability of Karuthamma's
marriage. And she remembers at the same time the fact that they were playmates on this seafront. And now she recognises him as her son. Then... then... Pareekutti's wilted hopes put on fresh shoots yet again. Will Karuthamma become Pareekutti's once again? Even if it is not possible, would the mother be longing to see that happen? In a moment, Pareekutti arrived at confused, vague and unrealistic conclusions. That mother told Pareekutti,

“My son! Go, marry a girl, thrive in business and come up in life.”

Those same words were reverberating in Pareekutti's ears, never fading out. That night, Karuthamma too told him the same thing. But Pareekutti didn't give Chakki a reply like the one he gave Karuthamma.

“My son, do not give anymore trouble to Karuthamma. She has a husband now. Do not disturb her.”

Pareekutti was stunned. Those words had landed in his ears like a disembodied voice. Was it Destiny commanding him not to enter her life again. Or, was it a mere feeling? No, Pareekutti had certainly heard it.

“Pareekutti, Karuthamma's brother. She has no brother born from the same womb. My son, be her brother.”

It is Chakki herself who said that. He had no doubt about it now. Chakki said many more things. That Chemban Kunju had
given her up; that she was dying; Karuthamma had been sent away at the mercy of that man who has neither home nor hearth, neither kith nor kin. Who is there in this world, related to her in some way? Only Pareekutti! And Chakki has defined that relationship: brotherly bond!

Chakki asked of him:

"My son! Would you be Karuthamma’s brother, always? Be only here brother!"

Pareekutti’s eyes overflowed. Chakki saw those tear-drops falling. Chakki knows its meaning. And Chakki has understood what tears those are.

Chakki explained the meaning of that love story:

"My son, you were in love with Karuthamma. From now on, think of her only as your brother. That is the surest indication of your love for her, isn’t it so?"

Pareekutti is unable to give her an answer. He feels choked as his tears gush forth. Be her brother if you love her—that is the right thing.

Silent moments passed. Chakki asked:

"Isn’t it so, my son?"

Pareekutti answered mechanically: “Yes.”

“Then, be brother and sister, my children!”

After a moment, Chakki continued:
“If she were here, I would have told her so myself, upon my death-bed.”

Chakki again made an emotional appeal to him, to be her brother. That he must remain just her brother! That he should look after her, if things come to such a pass that she doesn’t have anyone to support her; if she fails to come before Chakki dies, to let her know that she has a brother. Pareekutti agreed. Chakki felt that the way he agreed was not wholehearted enough. She repeated her entreaty.

Chakki heard Pareekutti singing on the beach that night

When one compares the two sections, one can find that the bulk of the material the translator deleted are relevant to the narrative. The reasons leading to the deletions, and motives for the same, can be understood readily as the need to make the narrative trim. What has been lost in the bargain is the unique narrative style of Thakazhi.

68). In the middle of page 144, Chemban Kunju tells Chakki, “My legs gave way. What shall I do, Chakki?”

After this, there is a paragraph that is missing in the T L text. Faithful translation of the same is provided below:

[Chakki had never imagined that her husband would meet with an accident in the sea. She hadn’t even thought about it. Today that has happened. It can still happen (TPR) (p.144).]
69). Right at the beginning of Chapter Fourteen, the first paragraph is missing from the translation. The present researcher is providing below its translation:

[Nallapennu consoled Panchami who was wailing, saying “I’ve no one.” Chakki had entrusted Panchami to Nallapennu’s care. And Nallapennu has deemed it that instead of her four children, from now on she would have five. But, is that enough consolation at such a time? (TPR) (p.146)]

70). A one-sentence paragraph that would have come on the top of page 147 has been omitted from the translation. It goes like this:

[The preparations for the cremation were completed (TPR).]

71). The beginning sentence on the said page is an inaccurate translation. It should have been:

[Pareekutti, who belongs to another religion, is standing around there (without being able to participate in the preparations) (TPR).] The word “burial” used in the translation of the next sentence is inaccurate. It should have been, “cremation.” However, from later descriptions we understand that Chakki was buried on the beach. However, the Malayalam word for cremation, “Savadaaham” is used here in a general way.

72). The next two small paragraphs are omitted from the translation. Translation of the same is given below:

[She would be plunged in untold grief! If she were to see him sometime in the future, she would certainly ask him:

“Why didn’t you at least inform me, Kochumuthali?” Not only that. Would
73). Three paragraphs in the original are missing from the TL text after the sentence ending "...and walked along the seashore." The translation is as follows:

"The wind along the seashore kept on humming a story. The waves also had something to say... Where are you going? To Trikkunnapuzha? What for? To inform Karuthamma of Chakki's death? What authority does he have for that? What answer would he give, if someone raises such a question?

What is to be told to Karuthamma, once he meets her? These are questions that are capable of preventing Pareekutti. However, he walked on. He is firm about one thing. He is her brother. Her mother had made him her brother. But, will she be willing to become his sister?

Once Pareekutti finds out Karuthamma—what will be the outcome of that meeting? Has Pareekutti thought about that? (TPR)

74). Another paragraph, which was to appear after the sentence, "Aren't there fishermen there?" is missing. Its translation would be:

"That question had already been raised before Pareekutti. And he had himself framed an answer, for his own peace of mind. And yet he had never thought that a stranger would ask that question and that he would have had to give an answer. Still he said (TPR) (p.147)

75). On page 148, after the chapter ending "...where Palani lived," there is another paragraph in the original. Translated, it goes thus:
[How will he begin talking to Karuthamma, in preparation of breaking the news? Should he tell her straightaway? How was he to make her aware of what has happened? (TPR).]

76). Further down, there is a statement: "As if her heart would burst, Karuthamma cried, ..." In the original, it is however like this:

[As if bursting into tears, there was a question from inside (TPR).]

77). More than half of the latter portion of the last but one paragraph on this page, and a sequence of dialogues are missing from the T L text. Translated, the portion would read thus:

That was right. She came looking for an escape. But people don’t give her peace even here. He thought of returning without saying anything. Then he decided against it. Why not shout the message into the hut to her inside and leave? But how can he suddenly say it out in a cut and dried fashion? Pareekutti again beseeched her to open the door.

"Don’t you know me Karuthamma?"

She could be heard replying, suppressing her onrushing emotions behind her clenched teeth:

"I know."

"Why don’t you come out then?"

There was no reply. He said:

"I am the same old Pareekutti..." (TPR) (p.148)]

78). Two sentences later, a missing sentence is detected and translated as
below:

[Somehow Pareekutti suddenly picked up courage (TPR).]

79). The next paragraph is inadequately translated. A faithful translation of that portion is also provided below:

[Don’t say that! Karuthamma, we are destined to meet again. We must meet and talk, looking each other in the face (TPR) (p.149).]

80). On page 152, just before the last paragraph, there is a section missing from the T.L. text. The translation of the same is provided below:

[Velayudhan was incensed:

“Who said that his house is not pure?”

Andi also joined Velayudhan’s side. And confronted Kumaru who raised the issue:

“Can you say it with certainty? Who can ever say, with certainty, that one’s house is pure?” (TPR) (p.152)]

81). After the next paragraph, another section with three paragraphs is missing from the translated text. The present researcher is providing the translation of the same below:

[Everyone except Kumaru tried to believe that Palani’s houses is pure. But Kumaru has a question; who can give a clear answer to that?

“Is it customary among Marakkans to send a Muslim as a messenger to inform death in the family? That too, in the wee hours of the morning?”

Altogether, an atmosphere of suspicion prevailed (TPR) (p.152).]

82). After the first paragraph on page 153, a long section of one-and-a-half
pages is missing in the translated text. The present researcher's translation of this section is provided below:

[She asked him:]

"Do you believe me?"

He said,

"I shall believe you, girl."

But he wants to get to know certain details. That much was evident from his promise that he shall believe her. And she was prepared to say whatever there was to be said. She would hide nothing at all. But she doesn’t have the energy or ability to say anything just then. That occasion is of great importance to Karuthamma. But Palani can never understand the solemnity of the occasion. He might perhaps be incapable of understanding the significance of the occasion of not only Karuthamma’s mother’s death, but any mother’s death for that matter.

Karuthamma wept in her helplessness. A way-out came up in her mind. Let him permit her to go alone; she would return in the afternoon. He didn’t give a clear reply even to that suggestion. She thought of going in defiance of her husband’s wishes. That would mean she needn’t ever come back.

She was not prepared for that. She was born as a Marakkati and she would die as one. That was her dead mother’s wish. She would die hugging the feet of her husband. There is no logic in
hoping that her father who was not compassionate enough even to inform her of her mother’s death through a proper messenger, would accept her. And she does not have the right to claim that he must accept her. In defiance of her father’s wishes, she had come away with her man, leaving behind her home for ever. She would live in this tiny hut till the end of her life.

Karuthamma thought about Panchami. She felt she heard her pitiful wail of “O my Elder Sister!” She is weeping without any refuge in sight, as their mother’s body is put in the hole made in the salty sands of that beach. She must live in that house all alone now!

There would be more Pareekuttim on that beach!(TPR)

83). In the middle of the page there is a sentence “She was ready to meet the challenge now. She had the courage for it this moment.” Both are inaccurately translated. Further, there is a last sentence missing in the paragraph. Alternate translation is provided below:

[She is facing that problem. She has the strength for it now. And Palani has courage too. He asked: (TPR).]

84). After this, there is a paragraph of two sentences in the TL text, which is a compression of four sentences. The translation is offered below:

[Grasping the full import of the question, she sat ready to explain everything. The only thing she was unclear about it was how to begin the narration. It was all the same to her in whatever way she began. If she was going to tell all, how did it matter how she began? (TPR) (p.153)]
The opening sentences of the next paragraph are missing in the T L text. They would be:

[She has confessed everything. And he believes all that (TPR) (p.155).]

In the last portion of the third paragraph, one sentence has been incompletely translated: [She can only ask “Don’t you trust me?” and not “Don’t you love me?” (TPR)] This is the alternate translation.

Just alter this, a sizeable section is missing from the succeeding couple of paragraphs in the original. The same is translated below:

[The euphoria of the newlyweds is not yet over; and yet she is on the beach to do work! Asked Kochupennu:

“Why have you come for this trade, girl?”

“I am also a Marakathi belonging to this seafront.”

Still that became a topic of discussion for the day. There were two opinions about even that.

This was a job Karuthamma was not accustomed to. Did she ever imagine that one day she would have to go for such work? Her mother used to do that kind of work. But did Chakki ever expect that her daughter would have to carry this heavy basket on her head, the water from the fresh fish streaming down her face? Was there in Karuthamma’s scheme also the provision to make money? (TPR) (p.157).]

Just before the beginning of the last paragraph on page 157, a whole section is missing. As found in the original, the translation is provided here:
After bath, she didn’t have a fresh mundu to wear. She wore the wet one in which she had bathed.

Without him asking, she explained that day’s happenings in detail—about the new business and she went about it. Although it was loss that registered on the first day, she has made some contacts for the next day’s business. She needed his permission for one more thing: to go for pulling the hand net. He must introduce her to a fisherman fishing with the hand-net.

He said: “I can’t do that or anything else” (TPR) (p.157).]

89). On page 158, towards the middle, a single-sentence paragraph, which is crucial, is missing:

[And people thus began to say such things looking at Karuthamma’s face as well (TPR).]

90). At the end of page 158, a whole section of three paragraphs is missing from the original. Translation of the same is given below:

[So, none of the women of the Trikkunnappuzha beachfront has faltered even once? When the women quarrelled with each other on the Nirkunnam seafront, they would spin yarns, trading charges of immorality. Each one has so many stories behind them. Or, so it would seem. Here, she doesn’t know anything about anyone. If she knew, she would also ladle out a plethora of stories. And why shouldn’t Karuthamma do so too? What crime did she commit?

Aren’t little boys and girls playing about on this beachfront
as well? She has seen boys and girls playing together picking shells, drilling tunnels in sand dunes and collecting fingerlings. And these women too have grown up on this seafront. A strain of malicious thought, as to how to collect stories about these women, crossed Karuthamma’s mind.

Is the wind on this seashore carrying the love story of some woman of yore? Would the soul of the lapsed fisherwoman be hovering around in moonlit nights? She doesn’t hear anyone here singing such a song (TPR) (p.158).]

91]. The fourth, fifth and sixth paragraphs on page 159 are inadequately translated, with several sentences missing. An alternate translation is provided below:

| Karuthamma’s and Palani’s life thus reached the plains. If the passion of the initial days was gone and it had cooled down naturally—if life had come to the plains by itself, it wouldn’t perhaps have affected them seriously. But was it that way? Flaming passions were suddenly, within a moment, doused. It was as if frozen in the middle of a tight embrace of Palani with all his might. Schemes visualised covering their entire life fell apart suddenly. As to how they carry on as husband and wife—are there any number of couples who maintain a relationship devoid of warmth?

Was Karuthamma contented? She might be. And Palani? He too might be contented. As Karuthamma became the topic of discus-
sion on the beachfront, Palani also was included in it. When he passed, people would speak in hushed tones behind his back. Even if it didn't actually happen that way, he would suspect as much.

Four-five months ago, when he lived on that seafront without any sort of firm commitment to social life, anyone coming across him would greet him with a bright smile and exchange pleasantries. He had then earned the name of a good man. Now when he approached, everyone has something to whisper. What a change!

Palani hasn’t committed any mistake, offending anyone. After that day when he crazily rowed the boat to the outer sea, the steering oar has not been handed to that expert helmsman.

Everyone was scared. Not only the mates of his boat, but all others as well. The belief may be that he has been possessed by the devil; or else, the fisherwomen must have frightened their husbands saying that Karuthamma is a fallen woman who will bring ruin to the seafront and forbidden them from going to see with Palani. Such were the beliefs handed down from generation to generation.

There is not a single person to speak up in support of the innocent Karuthamma. Or the orphaned Palani. Anyone can speak ill of them. There isn’t anyone to contradict that (TPR) (p.159).

92). On page 160, after the middle, there is one small paragraph missing from the original.

[Even Velayudhan didn’t contradict that opinion. He too is afraid at the
back of his mind (TPR).]

93). One sentence Kunjan Valakkaran speaks and Velayudhan’s reply to
that should form the section just after the last-but-one sentence on page 160. This
is missing from the TL text. The translation is given below:

[Kunjan Valakkaran asked:
"Is that so? Why don’t we beat him to death?"
Velayudhan said:
"Won’t that be more dangerous than this, Master?" (TPR)]

It may be noted that throughout the exchange, Kunjan Valakkaran is ad-
dressed as Master. This is not reflected in the translation.

94). The second paragraph from this one is inadequately and inaccurately
translated. Alternate translation is provided below:

[If one is to go by what the womenfolk say, Katalamma is certainly taking
pity on us. If it was according to the laws of yore, none of us would be alive now.
All of us would have sunk to the bottom of the sea and turned into bare bones
(TPR).]

95). Just before the last line on page 165, a whole paragraph is missing in
the TL text. Translation for the same is provided as under:

[For some time past, they were living together in that house. But she never
behaved as if she was living there. She had always approached him as a helpless
woman. The big thing was that he had not kicked her away. That was a big thing
indeed.]

96). On page 168, after the second paragraph, a whole section is missing.
from the T T text, which is translated below:

[The boats came ashore. Palani saw the din and bustle of fish trading. Palani said that his former mates would be feeling upbeat thinking they had taken revenge on him, and commenting as to how he was going to live now. No one must try to defeat him. Palani is not the sort to know defeat.

Kuruthamma wanted to know something:

"Wouldn’t the wives of these fellows too have had some problem like in my case?"

"Certainly. These lying bitches. They must be hiding such things."

She wants to get hold of those stories. After getting to know the histories of each one of them, she will take them on one by one. She has the eloquence for that.

She said:

"I will confront each and everyone of them sooner or later" (TPR)

(p.168).]

97). On page 170 towards the middle, one sentence is missing, after the sentence that ends, "...money from that gold."

["Isn’t that gold given you by your avaricious father?” (TPR)]

98). On page 170 one paragraph, which should form the last but one, is missing. The same is given in translation below:

[The news of Palani buying the boat spread all over the locality. There can be stories about that as well. They can very well spread the rumour that the money
for the boat was given by that Moslem boy” (TPR) (p.170).]

99). The last portion of Chapter 16, ending in two lines, is in fact the compression of a section of the original. The translation of the section is given below:

| She had lost her peace. She was afraid that life would become muddled once again. She asked him, tears streaming down her face:

| “Don’t you trust me?”

A black shadow that stretched forward throughout life! How is she to go around it? No way! None. To reach the previous, settled state, an intense effort is needed (TPR) (p.172).]

100.). After the second paragraph, one small paragraph is missing from the T L text. The translation is provided below:

| When Chakki’s eyes closed in death, Chemban Kunju asked in her ear several times, “What am I to do now?” Looking at her closed eyelids, Chemban Kunju said, “Shouldn’t we enjoy ourselves, Cahakki?” (TPR) (p.174)]

101). On page 175, after the paragraph ending “…relax and rest,” a small paragraph is missing:

| His desire to enjoy himself once again raised its head. Alas! Chakki too had worked very hard. She had not known any enjoyment (TPR).]

102). On page 176, two paragraphs before the last, two sentences are missing. Translation is provided below:

| Pappikkunju looked at her closely and asked:

| “Why are you weeping, girl?” (TPR) (176)]
103. Following this, an entire paragraph is missing. The translation is provided below:

[He has much more to tell her to console her. That he brought the step-mother in compliance with her mother’s wishes. That it was for her sake that he did it and all that.

Shouldn’t he also advise her to look at step-mother as mother herself? (TPR) (p.176)]

104. There is a paragraph missing on page 177, after the third paragraph. It is translated below:

[On that bedstead which Chakki had bought, she had never slept. And the mattress was also not made. It was not yet time for that according to her. She had thought that the time for that would come only after getting a lot of things done. He had failed in fattening her up and bringing complexion to her body (TPR) (p.177).]

105. On page 179, sixth paragraph, towards the middle, there is the sentence “Nor did Pappikkunju try to separate the two.” After this, there is a whole page from the original missing in the T L text: Translation of the same is provided below:

[She lived a good life, in the midst of wealth. But everything perished. When a yawning void confronted her in life, she saw Chemban Kunju as a means for her to live on comfortably. That is how Pappikkunju arrived there. She accepted another husband not because she was not satiated with the pleasures of life, nor to keep
alive the thrills a husband could give her. If she had enough to live
by, she would not have ventured to play this new role. Now she is
living in the guise of a wife, pretending. And yet, Pappikunju has
only devotion to her saviour. She is not trying to establish her rights;
she is not issuing commands. She is just obeying them. Chakki
saved up and conserved wealth. She may be rueful about the fact
that she is not able to help her husband that way.

Even though Chemban Kunju was not demanding that,
wouldn't she still have an ambition to do something like that?

Would Chakki have granted him permission to marry a wife
like this? Certainly not. She would have liked to see a woman like
herself becoming Chemban Kunju's wife. A woman who can build
on the foundations Chakki had laid for her family. And one who can
minister to her husband (TPR) (p.179).]

106). On page 180, at the end of paragraph three, two sentences are miss-
ing. The translation of the same is given below:

[It was not because of his anger towards her; it was his way of expressing
his anger towards the neighbours (TPR) (p.180).]

107). In the first paragraph, the second half is missing from the T L text.
The translation is provided below:

[The money was gone. One could put up with that. But the other wealth he
amassed till then, through careful conduct, has been lost. How could he look at
another's face if he didn't have that slight mental derangement? (TPR) (p.184).]
108). After this an entire paragraph is missing. The translation is provided below:

[Perhaps Pappikkunju may be pained by the realisation that she was unable to make money like Chakki did. If only she could go east for selling fish, if only she knew how to pull up the hand-net, things would have been much better.

Wouldn’t it occur to her sooner or later as to why not begin such a life anew?

(TPR) (185)]

109). On page 186, just after the middle, after the sentence ending “…there has been bad luck,” a conversation and a paragraph, as found in the original are missing:

[Cheinban Kunju’s lips opened.

“What of it?”

“What should we do now?”

“Do whatever you like.”

Gangadattan began to pester her for five hundred rupees.

Pappikkunju was dragged away to his world. She has to give him what he asks for. He doesn’t want to know how this money is raised. And Cheinban Kunju is duty-bound to give this amount to him. Cheinban Kunju had bought his mother for a price. Or, she had sold herself to him for a consideration. Kandankoran is present within him. Sometimes Pappikkunju felt that it is Kandankoran himself who was standing before her (TPR) (p.186).]

110). On page 188, after the first paragraph, one entire paragraph is miss-
She shouldn’t have teamed up with a man again, mused Pappikkunjju. But then, life forward had become a problem. Yet, she had not known that such complicated situations would develop.... She felt that she shouldn’t have embarked upon a course like this. Then she could have spared Gangadattan’s tantrums and Chemban Kunju’s privations. Her life itself started as a mistake. If she was an ordinary Arayathi, she could have put a basketful of fish on her head and gone east to do business. And make a living. But she decided to share her life with the prosperous owner of two boats. What did the future hold in store for her? (TPR) (p.188)

111). On page 191, towards the middle, after the sentence ending “…his daughter again,” there is a section missing from the T L text. The translation of it is given below:

[Sometimes he will ask Panchami:

“What are you going to become?”

He doesn’t trust her either (TPR) (191).]

112). The last paragraph on page 191 has been compressed and inaccurately translated. Translated faithfully from the original it would read:

[Panchami felt that there was soon going to be a patch-up (between her father and her step-mother). She must bring her sister back before that. Waiting patiently for her chance to broach this subject with her father, she got it one day and presented her case (TPR) (191).]
113). On page 192, after the sentence ending "...better get out now," two paragraphs are missing in the T L text. Translation of the same is done below:

Chemban Kunju's rage grew by the moment. Forgetting everything, forgetting even himself, he roared. "Hey you, go." "Hey you, go." It seemed he would kick her out just then.

From then on, Chemban Kunju began to speak about Karuthamma. And about Panchami too. She is to follow in the footsteps of Karuthamma! He left off Pappikkunju. And stopped talking about her. Now the topic of his monologues are Karuthamma and Panchami (TPR) (192).

114). On the same page, last but one paragraph, in the scene of the Headman summoning Chemban Kunju to answer to the charges of kicking out Pappikkunju, there is an important cultural item smoothened out from the T L text, and the rest of the paragraph is compressed. There is the statement: "The second marriage itself had been arranged without the Headman's approval." In the original it is:

[The gravest offence of them all was that Chemban Kunju had brought Pappikkunju home without making the offerings of betel leaves and tobacco at the lect of the Thurayilarayan (TPR).]

115). The culture-specific description of the offering of betel leaves and tobacco has been watered down to the generalisation, "without the Headman's approval."

116). The rest of the paragraph left out from the T L text is given in translation below:
Those who gathered eagerly awaited to hear what reply Chemban Kunju was going to give for that charge. Many including Achakunju had taken part in that affair. They too would be answerable. Some slowly crawled back from the front rows. Thurayilarayan asked with authority: (TPR) (192)]

117). On page 193, the sixth line shows the Thurayilarayan questioning Chemban Kunju. He asks, according to the T L text:

"Then, did this woman follow you?"

In the original it is not like that. The correct translation would be:

["How did this woman come here, then?" (TPR) (192)]

118). Chemban Kunju’s answer is also incorrectly translated as she came as a housekeeper. Faithfully done it would be:

["I called in a woman to be a maid-servant in my house…” (TPR) (192).]

119). After the paragraph ending “Is this true, woman?” there is a paragraph that has been compressed, in the S L texts. In the original it goes like this:

[Even if she says whatever he said is lie, then too he won’t budge. He seemed to have been resolved to defy and reject everything. He is decided not to subjugate himself to anything (TPR) (192).]

120). The next question of the Thurayilarayan is to Pappikkunju: He asks her:

"Were you working there as his housekeeper?"

121). Here also, we see the same pattern as above repeated. In the original it goes like this:

["Were you a maid-servant there?” (TPR) (192)]
Now we can ponder on the question of why a “maid-servant” has been promoted to the rank of “housekeeper.” In the enlightened and humanistic West, there cannot be a “servant” it would seem, whereas in India or in any part of the fabulous Orient, there can be any number of native “servants” and “menials.” The TL text is obviously meant for Western sensibilities. The TL text has been custom-made for international consumption.

122). The third paragraph in the TL text is a compressed version of the original. The tragic decline of Pareekutti is described here.

123). Last but one paragraph on page 197 mentions that Pareekutti lived on, “doing some little jobs.” In the original, it is more specific. He lives on doing some “middleman” business.

124). On page 197, last paragraph, the last sentence is missing. It is translated thus:

{He had not seen Chemban Kunju approaching (TPR) (197).}

This is a crucial sentence, as this would explain Pareekutti’s perplexity in the subsequent scene or the reason why he didn’t avoid seeing Chemban Kunju, to whom he used to give a wide berth till then.

125). The second paragraph on page 198 is incompletely translated. Two sentences are missing from the TL text. They are given in translation below:

[...Neither is it Chemban Kunju’s ghost. .... Likewise, is Chemban Kunju seeing in front of him the same old Pareekutti...? (TPR)]

126). On page 200, after the sentence, “Do you realize how many people you have ruined?” a paragraph is missing in the TL text. The same is translated
The full history of that family merits a close scrutiny. The story that begins on the day Chakki carried a basketful of fish on her head and went east hawking fish, with the express purpose of saving enough money to buy a boat and a net of their own, till the present. If one takes up that story and look at it in its entirety, won’t anyone feel that there is something in what Chemban Kunju says? (TPR)

127] The last paragraph on page 200 is compressed and incompletely translated. Certain sentences and parts of sentences in the original are missing in the translation. They are singled out and translated below:

"...An Arayan’s family with a clear-cut programme and plan for the future would have prospered and lived happily on that seafront... He didn’t have the boats he acquired through incessant toil throughout his life, nor the nets... nothing remained. All the relationships he held dear to his heart were severed.

128] The first paragraph on page 201 begins with the sentence: “Like an infection, Pareekutti had wormed his way into that family.” However, in the original it is slightly different. It goes like this:

[Pareekutti drilled his way into the history of that family like a despicable worm. And caused it to wilt by gnawing at its vital core (TPR) (p.201).]

Apart from the handy English phrase “worm one’s way…”, there is no equivalence between “a worm drilling into the history of that family, and causing it to wilt gnawing at its vital core,” and “Preekutti like an infection wormed his way into that family.” The analogy originally is to the coconut tree and a worm that
drills a hole into its soft core at the top of the palm. In the translation, this analogy is completely lost sight of.

129). In the middle of the page, after the line “her heart too,” there is a whole paragraph missing in the T.L. text. The translation is provided below:

[But on none of those counts he is guilty. Pareekutti had never crept into the life of that family purposely. Unwittingly, he had been drawn into the inner flame of the life of that family. Any kind of accusations can be hurled at him. And Pareekutti may be standing there like one guilty. But who is aware of the truth of his conscience? How is he to make it known to others? There is only one person in the world who knows about it. Karuthamma. Will she herself honour that truth? Isn't she getting confused whenever she sees him, or whenever she remembers him? Yes, a being she dreads—that is Pareekutti (TPR) (p.201).]

130). The next paragraph is incorrectly translated. A faithful translation is provided below:

[I have only one more debt left. Your money. The money you gave me with the intention of ruining me, hoping to seduce my daughter. Here it is.” (TPR) (p.201).]

131). Two subsequent paragraphs are missing from the T.L. text. They are translated below:

[Pareekutti stood there like that for an infinitely long time holding that money in his hands. He isn’t aware of anything. Not
even the fact that that money is there in his hands.

What use has he for money? What use? What use, for a person like him, who, without any way-out, is living off the beachfront on a daily basis! What big amounts he has incurred as loss! Only amounts of money? Didn’t he incur the loss of his entire life? He doesn’t have money to buy a meal that day. When such a life is likely to stretch ahead unendingly, isn’t that amount a great deal? Isn’t her getting an old debt settled?(TPR) (201)

132). In the middle of the paragraph stretching over pages 201 and 202 there are a few sentences missing:

[The boat seemed to say: For how long have I been kept like this ashore? Look here! This, my body, has developed long cracks because of the sweltering, merciless sun incessantly beating down upon me. Would I be launched into that unending stretch of brine? The breeze that came grazing the sea, must be cooling it down a bit (TPR) (201-202).]

133). There is a slight variation in the scheme of chapter division in the original and the T L text. What remains as a part of Chapter Nineteen is given a separate identity as Chapter Twenty. The Chapter Twenty of the original is converted to Chapter Twenty-one.

134). In the first paragraph there are several lines missing. They are given in translation below:

| Karuthamma had left, defying her father, and leaving her mother behind after seeing her fall on her deathbed. As she left, |
Panchami's wail, "O my Elder Sister," had followed her throughout. And that wail used to echo in her ears frequently. What all happened after that! Mother died. A step-mother arrived. After all these, the Elder Sister and the Younger Sister were meeting each other for the first time (TPR) (203).]

135). On page 203, after the paragraph ending "...dreaming about this meeting," there is a small paragraph in the original that is missing in the TL text. It is translated below:

[Palani didn't ask any thing about Neerkunnam and its affairs. He has nothing to enquire about that locality. What relation does he have with that land? Nothing (TPR) (203).]

136). In the next paragraph, many sentences in the original as missing or inadequately translated. Those are picked up an translated below:

[Perhaps he may not be hating Panchami. A poor, little girl. Why should he hate her? She is innocent. ... Palani sees not the poor, destitute Panchami who doesn't have a soul in the world as her refuge. It was as a dark shadow that attracted Karuthamma's memory to all that he hated in the world, that Panchami entered that home (TPR) (203-204).]

137). In the next paragraph also there are several sentences missing from the TL text. They are given in translation below:

[That infant's lisping had lit up that home like the lightning flash on the dark clouds, for a brief moment. That child never used to cry. Nor was it ever allowed to cry. But it began crying. And Panchami would then say:
“Elder Sister, don’t let the baby cry!”

If she picked up the child and played with it, she would stop crying immediately. The child likes her “nty” immensely.

138). In the last paragraph on page 206, some crucial sentences are missing. They are identified and translated below:

[“Ayyo, it’s not like that,” the words reached up to her tongue, from her searing heart. But suddenly they dispersed without acquiring a form. Some three-four incoherent words, more like a scream, came out.... It can’t be said about her that she had loved her parents or that she was a dutiful wife, doting on her husband (TPR) (206).]

139). Chapter Twenty of the original, this section opens in the S L text thus:

[Karuthamma acquired a kind of fortitude which she never had till then (TPR) (209).]

This is missing in the T L text.

140). For the rest of the paragraph, the translation is not accurate. The sentence “All her values changed with an indefinable logic” is not found in the original. It would seem the translator is preparing the T L readership to face the fact that the so far well-meaning, virtuous Karuthamma is suddenly receiving her lover without remorse, owing to a change in her value system. All that Thakazhi says is that:

[She has got a particular logic and a vague agenda for her life. The course of the events of her life took her there (TPR) (206).]
141. The next paragraph is also translated inaccurately. The original goes like this:

[That change came over her all of a sudden. It may be because Panchami also came that it happened this way. She got a companion. When all her secrets were out, then what more was there to hide? What was there to be afraid of? The sense that life is secure, that she must see to it that life went on in a secure manner, entirely left her. And she had a companion to go forward in an atmosphere of insecurity: Panchami (TPR) (p.209).]

142. On page 213, third paragraph, third line, mention is made of the "moonlight glitter on the calm sea." However, in the original, it is:

[Afar, an indescribable diffusion of light was moving (TPR).]

The mysterious quality of the description is neutralised by the pinpointing in the TL text of moonlight.

143. On page 215, at the beginning of the fourth paragraph, it is found:

"When he came close to her, she used to worry because he would stare at her longingly. Now she was not worried. Her breasts were no longer as shapely as before. The soft lips of the baby had smeared her mother’s milk over these nipples."

It is however different in the original as illustrated below:

[Isn’t she scared when he comes close? Won’t he stare at her bosom and behind? No. She doesn’t have that fear now. That bosom doesn’t rise as attractively as it used to earlier. It adds beauty to the tender lips of a baby, blossoming in
a sweet smile, smeared with the mother’s milk (TPR) (215).]

144. The last paragraph on page 215 begins with a few sentences inaccurately translated. Faithful translation of those sentences is provided below:

[Within those few moments, Karuthamma forgot all the failures of her life. She is not vanquished. She has as great wealth. A great wealth no other woman has! She felt as if she was under the protection of a strong-bodied man, just as she felt that her life was secure. She had a robust confidence about her life: that she would never have to starve, that she wouldn’t have to face any outside threats. Her Palani was a strong man...” (TPR) (p.215).]

145. Towards the end of the paragraph, there are a few additional lines in the T L text which are explanatory in nature: “And she also had something else which gave her spirit sustenance. A man loved her as no man had loved a woman. Between these two, her life was full...”

What is found in the original corresponding to the above are translated below:

[Likewise, her soul also acquired confidence. One person loves her. She is one who is always loved...(TPR)]

The supreme artistry of the novelist suffers at the hands of the translator in such instances.

146. On page 216, the paragraph beginning at the fourth line is also inaccurate in translation: “He stroked her all over and his hands slowly moved to where he and the rude young boatmen of the seafront used to stare.”
Faithful translation of the same is provided below:

[His hand travelled over that behind which he, the Muslim, and the rude youth of the seafront used to stare at piercingly (TPR) (p.216).]

‘Me Grandad ‘ad an Elephant!’: Three Stories of Muslim Life in South India

‘Me Grandad ‘ad an Elephant!’

1). On page 60, after the first paragraph, a section of eight sentences has been deleted, as found when the T L text is compared with the Malayalam version in Basheer: Sampoorna Kritikal (Basheer: Collected Works), published by D. C. Books, Kottayam (1992). The translation for the same is provided below:

Were gilled fish not there in the water bodies of the earth before the time of Khalipha Ali? And it is said God commanded him to throw the sword into the ocean. Can God speak like that? It can be a legend. What is true, what is a lie? Kunjupattumma, doesn’t know. She heard it during Wa‘as, the nightly discourses in the mosque by Musaliars. And her umma has said that all that was true (TPR).] This is the first case of such an important detail missing in this translation, which is under analysis here.

2). On page 61, third paragraph, after line nine, one sentence is missing from the T L text. It goes like this: [“It is through these nightly discourses of the Musaliars from the mosques that the Muslim community mostly learns religious matters” (TPR).]

Pattumma’s Goal

3). Towards the end of the chapter on page 160, the last section is missing.
It is translated below:

I had my doubts. Was it true? Why didn’t I realize it earlier?

Aren’t all the womenfolk saying so? Aren’t women the sole authorities on child-birth?

Would it be a hassle-free delivery? (TPR)

4). After the end of the chapter on page 171, line three, in the T L text, there are two more sentences to be added, going by the S L text. These are translated below:

[O, the world of these women? What do the foolish idiots called men know about the goings on deep down in the female psyche? Humpty dump! (TPR)]

5). On page 171, third paragraph, Pattumma says, “Elder brother, it doesn’t usually do this sort of thing,” she said. After this, there is a self-deprecatory side comment by Basheer that is missing in the T L text. Translated it is: [May be because of the company it keeps (TPR).] This has an implication that, of late the goat is keeping Basheer’s company, and hence it lost its character!

6). There is a compression effected at the end of Chapter Four. In the original it ends thus:

[What’s more to be said about it? It was cleaned out within that day itself. It means just that the amount of one hundred rupees was divided into small sums and distributed. Not that it was wasted!

Aren’t there expenses in life? (TPR) (p.182)]

7). On page 184, at the end of paragraph four, one sentence is missing. The translation is given below:
["Do you know how many letters are there in the Malayalam alphabet. Elder Brother? Tell me?" (TPR)]

8). The end of the next paragraph on the same page also suffers from the same deletion. Basheer continues his ruminations:

[“And the letters of the Malayalam alphabet!” (TPR)]

On the Banks of the Mayyazhi By M. Mukundan.

The 43 Chapters of the original have been compressed into 37 chapters in the translation.

A series of culture-specific items are deleted from the translation.

1) For example, Chapter Three begins, describing the birth of the hero. In the TL text it reads as below:

“Dasan was born in the deep silence of a pearl grey dawn” (p.17).

However, the same reads in the SL text thus:

“Dasan’s birth was at a dawn the colour of the life-carrying semen and silent as the Krouncha Island.” [TPR]

2) The legend of Vaishravan Chettiyar is haphazardly translated. Culture-specific items, especially the details of the magical rituals towards the end, are suppressed. The Sanskrit mantras are deleted.

3) The ending paragraph of Chapter Six which contains a beautiful lullaby, is omitted in the TL text. Translated it reads:

[“Kurambi Amma sang tunefully, stroking Dasan’s back, as he lay in her lap:
Thus, listening to the stories of the shepherd girl burnt alive in Domremy, of Vaishravan Chettiyar who turned into a serpent and made love to the woman who was the object of his desire and the white men who disembarked at Kozhikode, Dasan grew up.

This is an important link paragraph that helps in the forward movement of the plot and action. Suppressing it arbitrarily, the element of fable and culture-specific items like the lullaby are caused to be lost to the TL reader.

There are several such instances throughout the novel. One wishes the translator would pick up only what she can handle. Whatever strength the novel retains in translation is that of the narrative structure of the original.

Katha Classics: Basheer

This collection of Vaikom Muhammad Basheer’s “short stories” (a very risky classification by the editor) edited by Vanajam Ravindran and translated by various translators is a curious mixture.

1). The whimsicality of the editor is exhibited most ostensibly in the spreading out of the stories. For example, two satirical “Sthalam” stories, which always go together - “The Card-sharper’s Daughter” and “Ettukali Mammoonhu” - are given at the beginning and towards the end. The other stories are placed at random without attempting anything like thematic unity. The stories go like this: “The Card-sharper’s Daughter”, “Walls,” “Anal Haq” “The Rightful Inheritors of

2). One of the profoundly shocking discoveries made during the scanning of TL texts for the purpose of the present research is the way “The Rightful Inheritors of the Earth,” one of Basheer’s unparallelled short-stories, one which was hailed as the first eco-story when it came out in Malayalam in 1977, has been mutilated, suppressed and misrepresented in translation. The story in original Malayalam, “Bhoomiyude Avakasikal,” is a sublime, meditative piece, running into twelve and a half pages. In the translation, it is trimmed and compressed into three pages. The narrative plan, the argument, the unfolding of the logic—all these are left out. What remains in the TL text is not even the gist of the story, because the essence of the story consists in its robustly compassionate digressions, which are left out for the most part in the translation.

AUTHORS AS TRANSLATORS

A corollary to the problem of the translator suppressing or omitting out the portions of the SL text, exercising her/his power over the same, is the original author’s attempts to get to the readers of the TL text, interfering with an already
existing translation or insisting on working alongside the translator, supplying the author’s own inputs, as exemplified by Milan Kundera’s remarks in his “Author’s Note” at the beginning of the novel, The Joke.

“On enlarged photocopies of the fourth version, I entered word-for-word translations of my original, either in English or in French, wherever I thought it necessary. The changes grew more numerous, and soon I realised that, based on that fourth version, a new, fifth version was taking shape. In Heim’s translation there are, of course, a great many faithful renderings and good formulations; these naturally were retained, along with many fine solutions from the Hamblyn-Stallybrass translation. I sent my work in regular installments to Aaron, who created an English-language version from these disparate elements and sent it to me for final correction and approval.” (Kundera, 1992: x). It has to be remarked that this edition of the novel does not carry any credit line indicating the translator’s name. It looks like Kundera had appropriated back his novel from all the four previous “unfaithful” translations!

Although not as disillusioned with his translators as Milan Kundera was, Paul Zacharia is known to the present researcher as intervening in the texts of his stories in English translation. Says Paul Zacharia in the “Author’s Note” of his The Reflections of a Hen in Her Last Hour and Other Stories, translated by the present researcher and the author. “My interventions in these translations have been limited to using the latitude available to a writer to cut, chop and trim his work to make them more presentable to another audience. My mother tongue, so dear to me, can be boringly self-adoring and pompously verbose in hands like
mine. Whatever problems that remain in these stories are neither hers nor the translator’s but mine.” (Zacharia, 1999: xi).

Authors as translators of their own works also figure in this section, which is defined by questions of authenticity and authorial authority over the T L text.

Instant cases in the above categories are identified from the analysed texts and presented below. Attempts have been made to trace the motives behind the suppression/deletion/misrepresentation/dilution/revision of S L material and to delineate patterns, if any, in such actions. These problems are placed in the perspective of this thesis and solution, if any, offered.

Although there have been authors like V. K. N. and C. Radhakrishnan who used to translate their own works into English and publish them, achieving literary eminence in the target language was beyond their reach. Bovine Bugles which is the translation of V. K. N’s Aarohanam does not come anywhere near the achievements of V. K. N.’s style on the linguistic front. Any student of V. K. N.’s style will know that his unique linguistic manoeuvres lend existence to vintage V. K. N. literature. Only the names of O. V. Vijayan, Kamala Das and Paul Zacharia figure prominently in this area. Of this, only O. V. Vijayan’s Saga of Dharmapuri has been subjected to a somewhat detailed analysis. His Legends of Khasak and After the Hanging and Other Stories are also looked into. Kamala Das’s Padmavati the Harlot and Paul Zacharia’s Reflections of a Hen in Her Last Hour and Other Stories are also briefly discussed.

Saga of Dharmapuri

There are changes in the chapter schemes of the S L text and the T L text.
Chapter I. "The Stars" in the T L text is not found in the original. Chapter II of T L text "The President," corresponds to Chapter One, "Prajapathi" of the S L text in part - or, somewhat, till page 14 of the T L text, the last two paragraphs excluded. These last two paragraphs of the page correspond to the first paragraph of Chapter Two in the S L text is titled "Siddhaartha." Then on, till the end of Chapter II of the T L text, Chapter Two of the S L text corresponds. Chapter Three, Niskalankathayude Muktakam, of the S L text and Chapter III, "The General" of the T L text correspond from the beginning till page 20, end of first paragraph in the T L text and till page 34 of the S L text. From the second paragraph on page 20 of the T L text Chapter III, till almost the end of page 24 and the entire Chapter Four, "Prathisandhi", of S L text correspond. The remaining portion of page 24 of the T L text, till the end of the Chapter III on page 28 and the remaining portion of Chapter Three of the S L text from page 35 to 43, correspond. Chapter IV of the T L text, "The Kitchen Maid," and Chapter Six in the S L text, "Laavannyaayude Bharthavu": Chapter V in the T L text, "The Merciful Stranger" and Chapter Seven of the S L Text, "Mercy": Chapter VI of the T L text, "The Mendicant" and Chapter Eight of the S L text, "The Great War to Come", correspond. Chapter VII "The Twice Born" of the T L text has no corresponding chapter in the S L text. Chapter VIII of the T L text, "Laughter Frees the Persuaders" and Chapter Nine, "Athirukalude Kaavalkaar" of the S. L. text, correspond. Chapter IX of the T L text, "The Tartar Republic and the Eucharist," is an edited, compressed and revised version of Chapter Ten of the S L text, "Elankovinte Makkalum Mattu Oharikkarum." Chapter X, "A Cameo of Anti-imperialism" of
the T L text and Chapter Eleven, “Anti-imperialism” of the S L text correspond,
though the T L text is considerably revised. Chapter XI, “The Getaway” of the T L
text and Chapter Twelve, “Chediyyude Pratirodham” of the S L text; Chapter XII of
the T L text, “The Man Who Sorrowed” and Chapter Thirteen, “Karanjavan” of
the S L text more or less correspond. Chapter XIII, “The Legion of the Baptised”
in the T L text and Chapter Fourteen, “Snanappettavarude Sainyam” of the S L
text; Chapter XIV, “The Slumbering Seeds” of the T L text and Chapter Fifteen,
“Nishedhathinte Sraadham”; Chapter XV of the T L text, “The Celestial Birds”
and Chapter Sixteen, “Saakuntalam” of the S L text; Chapter XVI of the T L text,
“The Night of the Bondsmen” and Chapter Seventeen, “Adimayude Raatri” of the
S L text; Chapter XVII, “The Stars Set” of the T L text and “Skalanathinte
Nimisham”, Chapter Eighteen of the S L text; Chapter XVIII, “The Old Ones,” of
the T L text and Chapter Nineteen, “Kizhavan Kizhaviyum” of the S L text;
Chapter XIX, “The Echoing Valley” of the T L text and Chapter Twenty,
“Thaazhvarayile Apasvaram,” of the S L text; Chapter XX, “The White Overlord.”
and Chapter Twenty-one, “Vellathampuran” of the S L text. Chapter XXI; “The
Eyes of the Jaahnavi” of the T L text and “Jaahnaviyude Kannuka” Chapter
Twenty-two of the S L text; Chapter XXII of the T L text, “The Whore and the
General” and Chapter Twenty-three of the S L text, “Thevidichiyum
Patanaayakanum”, correspond. Chapter XXIII, “Tinsel on the Coffin” in the T L
text and Chapter Twenty-fives, “Thilangunna Savappetti” roughly correspond.
Chapter XXIV, “The Forests” in the T L text and Chapter Twenty-four
“Kaadukalude Kali” and Chapters Twenty-six, “Ettile Pata” of the S L text roughly
correspond: a lot of revision has been done in the T L text by way of inter-mingling of different sections from the two chapters. Chapter XXV of the T L text, "The Crystal Prisons" and Chapter Twenty-seven, "Palunku Thadavarakal," of the S L text; Chapter XXVI "The Wayside Scrub" of the T L text and "Peruvazhiyile Varattupullikal", Chapter Twenty-eight of the S L text; Chapter XXVII, "The Revelation" and Chapter Twenty-nine "Rajavinte Darshanam" of the S L text.

Chapter XXVIII of the T L text, "The Last Warrior" and Chapter Thirty "Avasanathe Padayali" of the S L text correspond.

Other striking changes noted while comparing the T L text against the S L text are listed below:

The anti-hero of the novel "Prajapathi" is named "President" in the translation. This is not a translation of the S L word, which would approximately be "The Lord of Subjects." Conversely, the translation of "President" in Malayalam would be "Adhyakshan." Of course, "President" gives a more concrete idea of the person, whereas "Prajapathi" is more of a concept.

Names and terms the author came out with directly or plainly are obfuscated or camouflaged, for reasons best know to him. So, in the place of Pravda in the S L text, we have Prava; in the place of New York Times there is Wild West Times; "Communists" in the original are "Communards," in the translation; mention of London and New York in the S L text are avoided in the translation (pp.11-14).

The scene in which a fresh hand in reporting point out the existence of worms in the President’s excrement, is almost rewritten in the translation (p.14).
“Soviet Union” mentioned in the original, is named the “Tartar Republic” in the translation. “The United States” in the original is “White Confederacy” in the TL text. “Patrice Lumumba University” in the original is “Patrose Lecomba Tartar University” in the TL text; the “Central Intelligence Agency” is the Confederate Intelligence Agency.

Apart from new chapters written into the novel and drastically rearranging sections of different chapters as already mentioned above, there are several sections of the novel, revised, or modified by the author/translator. An instance is described below:

Chapter Ten of the SL text and Chapter IX of the TL text roughly correspond, as seen earlier. However, when subjected to detailed analysis, additions, deletions and revisions with respect to the SL text were noted.

Of the first three pages of Chapter Ten, (pp.90-92), of the SL text, only the three paragraphs on page 91 and 92 have been retained, but after heavy revision amounting to rewriting (pp.52-53 of TL text). Reference to the name of Rajni Palme Dutt is omitted in the TL text. Page 93 of the SL text and page 53 of the TL text correspond somewhat; however, page 94 of the SL text is entirely deleted. Page 95 has been compressed, and revised and it comprises the remaining part of the chapter on page 54 of the TL text. Page 96 and 97 of the SL text are completely deleted.

O. V. Vijayan’s collection of short stories, After the Hanging and Other Stories, translated by the author himself and published by Penguin India in 1989, went into a reprint in the same year. This collection contains the best short stories
Vijayan wrote over a period of twenty-five years, from the mid-sixties. The stories are categorized under different themes, like "Allegories of Power," "Fantasy and Romances," "The Stream of Harmony" and "The Diversions" and are shaken from their chronological order.

In the section "Allegories of Power," there are four stories: "The Wart," "The Foetus," "Oil," and "The Examination." These stories "...are concerned with power and terror, occasioned by India's brief experience of the Emergency" says the author/translator in his "Author's Note" in the beginning of the book (Vijayan 1989, p9).

"The Wart," "Arimpara" in Malayalam, is an allegory. The Malayalam original has been improved upon by the author/translator. The very first paragraph is revised. In the original the name of the surgeon is given as Aechchu Menon, while it is not found in the same paragraph in the TL text.

On page 16, tenth line of the TL text says, "I didn't have a car." This is not found in the SL text and is clearly an addition, by way of explanation of the situation to the metropolitan or international audience.

On the same page, last paragraph, there is the statement "I sat uneasily in a chair in front of him." However, in the SL text it goes like this, "I didn't sit in the chair Eechchu Menon pushed towards me. I only half-sat, tentatively, on a bench. I am like that in front of Eechchu Menon." "Krishnankuttyettan," the way Eechchu Menon addresses the protagonist, is avoided in the TL text, and substituted with "my kinsman."

Obviously, the author/translator is conscious of his different constituencies
in Malayalam and English. What goes well with the Malayalam cultural ethos, the author/translator is editing out or modifying if not relevant to the T L readership. Certainly this is a cultural problem of great magnitude.

The above is a sampling of Vijayan’s translation of his own stories. These stories proved to be a landmark in modern Malayalam short-fiction in English translation.

The next important happening in the world of modern Malayalam fiction in English translation is once again, O. V. Vijayan’s Legends of Khasak that came out from Penguin India, in 1991, going for a reprint in 1994. Vijayan’s magnum opus that ushered in a new era in high modern Malayalam literature, Legends had to wait for the third place in the order of publication in English translation, for a number reasons: but the most important among them would be the virtual untranslatability of the S L text. The local patois used in almost all the conversations in the novel, is beyond any translation. What comes out of an attempt at translation of these is a mere explanation of their meaning. Why did Vijayan translate this work, then? He does not answer this question anywhere, but does reveal the problems he encountered in the translation. He says in the “Author’s Note” in the beginning of the book:

“It has been difficult translating this book. It is full of dense images of nature, old folk customs, evocations of caste differences, the rich play of dialects, all of which are difficult to render into English. So much has been lost, there was no way it could have been salvaged. I have tried to make the narrative depend on its own energy as much as possible, and preserved the pace and rhythm of the
original." (Vijayan 1998, p3).

However, critics have looked at the author/translator's efforts differently. There has been a persistent clamour bewailing the fact that Vijayan has been sanskritising his language to such a degree that in successive novels the language he uses becomes opaque and obtuse, with tonalities alien to Malayalam and more in the domain of the devbhasha. In other words, Vijayan has been obviously improving upon his own creative language and style, in silent acquiescence of obscure cultural diktats. If he could be doing this to his own Malayalam, what would he not do in sprucing up his works in English translation? Observes P. P. Raveendran:

... the motive behind Vijayan's choice (to be truer to the translator in him) cannot be far from the sentiments attributed to Edward FitzGerald, the legendary translator of Rubaiyat. Writing about Persian poetry in 1851 FitzGerald stated: "It is an amusement for me to take what liberties I like with these Persians who, I think, are not Poets enough to frighten one from such excursions, and who really want a little Art to shapes them." (qtd. in Bassnett, 1988, p.3).

Vijayan has taken a great deal of liberties in translating Khasak, more indeed than what is generally allowed for by international copyright regulations. And it is possible to imagine that his reason for taking those liberties was not greatly different from FitzGerald's. The Malayalam original of Khasak after all needed "a little Art to shape it." For by the time of Gurusagaram (1987). Vijayan had
radically revised his concept of art embodied in *Khasak* in favour of a new poetics centred apparently on a monological imagination and a centrally controlled fictional landscape. The predominantly sanskritised diction of *Gurusagaram* is an index of this new and emerging landscape which Vijayan perfects in his translation in *Legends*.

But in doing this, Vijayan was also taking the sensibility of the Malayalam novel back by several decades... He seems... to have retraced several steps backwards to scan the world from the expressive realist perspective or a Thakazhi or to go further back, from that of Chandu Menon... (Raveendran 1999: 184-185).

Vijayan’s *Infinity of Grace* (Malayalam original *Gurusagaram*), translated by Ramesh Menon and the author followed from Penguin India. This novel is a definite departure from the two previous novels of Vijayan in plot, treatment and diction. The highly sanskritised diction of the original invites a highly formal, self-conscious kind of diction in the translation, so much so that one gets the impression that the language is a bit stilted.

The three novels and one collection of short stories were together brought out in one volume as *Selected Fiction* from Viking Penguin in association with D. C. Books, Kottayam in 1998. Vijayan’s is a very significant contribution in the area of modern Malayalam fiction in English translation especially in getting himself established as a credible translator of his own works, unlike some writers who preceded him in this activity, like C. Radhakrishnan or V. K. N.
Madhavikkutty’s “Padmavati Enna Vesya,” translated by herself as Kamala Das, as “Padmavati the Harlot” is a good example of the author revising the story in the capacity of translator. From beginning to end, the story is the same in essence; but entirely different in when one follows the original sentence by sentence or paragraph by paragraph. The story in TL text begins thus:

When Padmavati, the middle-aged harlot, finally reached the foot of the shrine, climbing the seven hills and stumbling along the winding passes that separated each from the other, dusk was a giant bird with its wings spread out, shading the temple, the banyan tree and the stone lamps in which the oiled wicks burnt on feebly. She could only see the outlines of the shrine, when she paused to peer upwards. I am late, she said to herself, hitching up her saree and proceeding to go up the steps. The loafers loitering around approached her and looked at the plump calves with lewd smiles...

(p.23).

From this point in the story, for more than a page, it is an exchange between the loafers and Padmavati, in which the former snatch away the fruit-offerings meant for the Lord, and eat them, and proposition her. However, in the SL text, the loafers and their lewd advances are confined to just two lines. The first part of the story in the SL text is translated below by way of illustration:

When she reached the top of the hill, night had already fallen.

From the base of the hill, the group of devotees returning
after worship, tonsuring and offering many valuables in temple:

"The temple doors are shut for the day. No use going up today."

But she was coming from a city very far away. She could not of returning without seeing the temple or the deity.

On the way up, certain young men stopped her and made some obscene proposals: me was wasted that way to...

(TPR):]

This is the only reference made in the SL text about the young loafers. Comparing it with one and a half pages of addition on the same characters gives an idea of how the author has taken over from the translator and rewritten the story.

THE CHOICE OF LANGUAGE

In the context of the post-colonial experience, the question as to which English you are translating into becomes relevant. Is it the Queen's English, of the erstwhile colonial establishment, the language of the centre, or Indian English, the language developed in the erstwhile colony, the language of the periphery, "english" (which is recognized by the National Academy of Letters, Sahitya Akademi, as one of the Indian languages, having at least a fledgling literature to be nurtured and sustained)? As soon as this question is asked, one can readily answer it with another question: why should one go after an English spoken and written in far away England that is totally removed now from controlling power in this country? Why should one see English as the language spoken and written only in
U. K., U. S. A., Canada, Australia, South Africa or elsewhere, and not in India? At least the language that remained in India after the colonizers left, has by now evolved into a medium that can easily accommodate Indian ethos, and even the metaphors of the remotest rustic corners of this vast country, as is evidenced in poems by Kamala Das or Jayanta Mahapatra. And the best of classical Indian literature is there already in English translation beginning first with the Bhagavadgita, by Charles Wilkins, first published in 1785, (the first-ever Indian great literature to be published in English translation). followed by Sacontala, or the Fatal Ring: An Indian Drama, the translation of Abhijnanasakuntalam by William Jones in 1789. All the Vedas, Upanishads, almost all the Puranas, Itihasas, Sastras and Agamas, Kavyas and Nataks have been translated into English. So are most of the early, mediaeval, renaissance, and classical literatures of the regional languages. Sahitya Akademi and National Book Trust, India, the two premier state-funded publishing establishments of the country have, between themselves, shared the bulk of such translations from regional literatures. Harish Trivedi and Susan Bassnett have this to say of the subject:

...translations from the various Indian languages into English, whether done by foreigners or by Indians themselves, have attained a hegemonic ascendancy. The widely shared post-colonial wisdom on the subject is that the Empire can translate back only into English, or into that lower or at least lower-case variety of it, english, according to some pioneering and influential theorists of the subject (Ashcroft et al. 1989 : 8). To any counter-claims that literature
especially with a post-colonial thrust is being written equally or even more abundantly in languages other than English, especially in countries such as India where only a small elite (variously estimated to constitute between 2 and 10 percent of the population), knows any English, the usual sceptical Western retort is: But show us—in English translation! (Trivedi and Mukherjee Eds. 1996: 239). Meanwhile, however, the old business of translation as traffic between languages still goes on in the once-and-still colonised world, reflecting more acutely than ever before the asymmetrical power relationship between the local “vernaculars” (i.e. the language of the slaves, etymologically speaking) and the one master-language of our post-colonial world, English (Bassnett and Trivedi, 1999: 10-13).

Why must anyone now doubt in which English we have to translate our regional literatures? If we want to retain our cultural identity in the translations, we must translate in an English language that developed here. Learning the latest idiom English of Britain or America to translate into is as unwise as taking a crash-course in western culture of the present. In any case, translations so done in a foreign idiom will only qualify as export quality merchandise and will not pass for genuine cultural expression.

Now we can examine how such a sensibility as to accommodate a foreign language like English as our own developed here. As already seen in the “Introduction” the development of Malayalam prose has been to a great extent, occasioned by the introduction into it through translation world classics from Britain,
continental Europe and Russia, as well as from the already enlightened Bengal. Into this milieu came, the radical and liberal thinking of stalwarts like Kesari A. Balakrishna Pillai. The countrywide compulsory English education during the colonial times, though intended primarily for producing a subordinate class of administrative officials, worked in imaginable ways for the colonial rulers. Language being what it is, an autonomous sign system, did its own permutations and combinations, disseminating the ideals of liberalism, human dignity, equality, individualism and the like. Soon, a class of liberal humanists on the western model emerged, most of whom played an important role in the freedom struggle. How Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Sarojini Naidu and others used the English language is illustrative of the power of the language. This was followed by the influx of all modern trends in European and American literature, along with the rise of successive generations whose dealings with English were direct. The level of competence acquired by them was impressive. The same story was repeated, with inevitable variations, in leading regional literatures like, Bengali, Hindi, Marathi, Kannada, Gujarati and so on, coupled with the development of metropolitan culture, and urbanisation, nurturing along with it a typical English constituency. All the English publishing in India, which is sizeable when compared with the UK and USA figures, is done to cater to these readers. Now, the necessity of translating into the Indian variety of English is amply evident. And this is how a regional literature goes “national,” reaching all parts of the country through English, the link language.

G. J. V. Prasad discusses the role of English for creative writing and trans-
Creating an English that resists easy appropriation by the British or the West as a whole is thus a primary task, but it is complicated by the fact that English does give Indian English writers a Western audience and that the translation skills they put to use primarily addresses audiences across cultures (including across India)....

...Rushdie may be right when he says that ‘The children of independent India seem not to think of English as being irredeemably tainted by its colonial provenance. They use it as an Indian language, as one of the tools they have to hand (Rushdie, 1991: 64). But their contexts have not changed; English is not the language of the streets or even the most spoken or preferred language in offices. There is a greatest acceptance of code-switching and code-mixing and overall a less puritanical attitude to language, but all that this has achieved is a greater legitimacy for Indianism in English (Prasad, 56).

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, during the course of a lecture in Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, in August 2000, said that all of us who practice creative writing and translation in English must beware of the pitfalls this language of hegemonic power prepares for us. We should always be on the look out, at every footstep, lest we fall in line with the discourse of power by the agents of a unipolar world. And yet there is no alternative to translating in English, which, among other things, has esta-
blished itself as the international lingua franca.

Indulekha

In this novel the translator has used the British English of the colonial times with a minimum of Indian words. The translation has tremendous readability because of the absences of footnotes and dilution of the culture and linguistic contents of the S L text.

Marthanda Varma

The translator used a language which is heavily loaded and stilted. It suffers from the lack of a register, as the translator has attempted to imitate the original author's narrative style off and on ending up finding equivalences in the target language without any inherent harmony in totality. The translator would have done very well to use a standard, neutral language, keeping to the narrative structure faithfully, without seeking to replicate the effects brought about by the original writer in Malayalam. Because, C. V. Raman Pillai is banking heavily on the purely Dravidian exuberance of exaggeration and hyperbole which are anathema to English, noted for its qualities of understatement and moderation. The translator does not seem to have been responsive to the sensitivities of both English and Malayalam. Of course, he was swayed by the effect of C. V. 's powers of narration. But he did not have the requisite sensitivity in the target language, to choose the right modes of expression which would have preserved the underlying tone of the original and yet would have been faithful to the overall cultural register of the target language.
Chenmeen

1. The last but one line on page 17 reads, “Karuthama, do you care for me?”

Based on the original, the translation should be “Karuthama, are you fond of me?”, or “Do you like me” or, even, “Do you love me?” (TPR) (p. 17). The TL Version is typical of the language chosen for the translation: one which conforms to British or American sensibilities.

Together with this, the American spellings and expressions, and staccato sentences, ensure that the translation should be in language that is palatable to Anglo-American sensibilities.

‘Me Grandad ’ad an Elephant!’: Three Stories of Muslim Life in South India.

The language used by Asher is Standard English except in the case of slang used by uneducated characters.

Saga of Dharmapuri

The language O.V.Vijayan uses is Indian English, with all a wealth of mythological, philosophical and cultural resonances peculiar to our civilization. The creative use of the language, often employing loaded expressions, has set a standard for Indian English writing.

Legends of Khasak

When it comes to the translation of Khasak, Vijayan flounders. The language of the original, full of rustic slang and references to local myths, was nearly impossible to be translated, but Vijayan attempted the impossible. The result is a very uncomfortable, jerky TL text. The interference of a perceived big culture the
notions of which Vijayan developed much later, has affected the translation adversely. He has tried to bring in an extra baggage of a parent civilization to bear upon the indigenous characters of a small world called Khasak. Says P. P. Raveendran:

At a superficial level, *The Legends of Khasakh* is a direct translation of *Khasakinte Ithihasam*, as far, that is direct translations go. At the level of episodes, there is very little by way of addition to or deletion from the text of the translation... *Khasak* certainly created its own audience, an audience that was willing to respond to the narrative ungrammaticalities that the novel revelled in promoting. But what kind of an audience *Legends* create? Vijayan could have repeated the magic by creating his own pan-Indian audience that would have responded to the nuances of a decolonized English-language from which would radiate the flavour of the original Malayalam dialect. But his sights were set elsewhere. His substitution of “Hindus” and “Muslims” for “Ezhavas” and “Rowthers” proves that. It is clear that potential audience that Vijayan has in mind for *Legends* are the English-speaking communities of the big international world whose global sensibility is a far cry from the locally rooted sensibility represented by *Khasak* (Raveendran 1999, 179-183).

*Herein* comes the unevenness in the language. A sensibility which refuses to be in harmony with the S L text’s inhabits the T L text, and thus sabotages the
the language of translation.

II. LINGUISTIC PROBLEMS

Linguistic problems of translation are much more tangible and hard to resolve, than cultural ones. The reason for this is that linguistic uniqueness is non-negotiable, and it leaves very little room for manoeuvre. Specific linguistic features of each language throw up the problem of untranslatability. In such cases, there are only limited options. Either, one must attempt a very free and approximate translation, which may be frowned upon in the surcharged cultural situation in the post-colonial scenario. The next option is to retain such linguistic formulations and provide explanatory notes or glossary. Even this is being eschewed nowadays. As we find in the English translations of Latin American fiction, most of the culture-specific terms are retained, albeit italicised. However, of late, italicisation is also done away with. Likewise, in the latest English translations of modern Malayalam fiction, Malayalam words and Sanskrit words are retained in the TL text without italicisation. This is one way of asserting the independence and power of the SL text, without standing in awe of the TL culture, exhibiting modesty by the genuflection of italicisation or footnotes.

When it comes to kinship terms, forms of address, honorifics, or even slang, patois or dialect used in conversation, the hands of the translator are tied. So also, when unique idioms, phrases, adages, axioms, proverbs or, even an exclamation, are to be translated, we find ourselves at a loss. Ronald E. Asher, the renowned linguist and translator, in his now famous notes on the translation of ‘Me Grandad ’ad an Elephant!’: Three Stories of Muslim Life in South India, has made
some formulations on this subject.

In the course of the detailed analysis of sample texts, the present researcher came across a number of instances of inaccurate translation. Inaccuracy can creep in owing to a variety of reasons ranging from the translator’s poor grasp of the Source Language, to finding wrong equivalences. These also come under the heading of linguistic problems.

Listed below are such instances, encountered during the detailed analysis of the following novels, with corrective translations offered by the present researcher.

*Indulekha*

1) In the first paragraph of Chapter One of the T L text, Chathara Menon uses the word “Karanavan,” meaning, “the head of the house.” However, in the third paragraph, for the same word, Kummini Amma uses the expression “the head of the house.” Again, on page four, first line, Sankara Menon refers to the “aged head of the family.” Further into the text, many similar expressions are used as equivalents for the term. Use of the word “Karanavan” should have been consistent throughout, since the word is explained in detail in a note at end of the book. A combination of linguistic and cultural problems is presented here; linguistic, because it is impossible to find the equivalent of the word “Karanavan” in English, as it is a unique expression in the Malayalam language; cultural in the sense that “Karanavan” is particular to the matrilineal system of family, particular to the culture of Kerala’s Nairs (pp.1&4 and many subsequent pages).

2) On page 11, first paragraph of Chapter II, the sentence that reads, “The spirit of universal contempt which, unfortunately, sometimes ensnares young
persons of all classes who have attained to some little learning, whether they follow the Hindu persuasion or no persuasion at all, had never taken the slightest hold of Indulekha's mind,” would read literally thus: “Neither the hatred of the Hindu religion, nor atheism, nor the contempt towards all, unfortunately seen sometimes in certain educated youth, had ever come over Indulekha.” The variation in sense owing to this inaccuracy is to be taken note of as a linguistic problem (P.11).

3). On page 22, line 11, appears the question, “And you never mock at anyone, Indulekha?” In the original it is implied: [“Aren’t you mocking at me now, Indulekha?”] Inaccuracy owing to the poor grasp of the original is witnessed here (TPR).

4). On page 27, in the last line of the quoted verse occurs the usage, “the witching Queen,” referred to above in the “Translator’s Note.” The freedom taken here to introduce the moon as “Queen” to English readers, departing from the Sanskrit conceit of a masculine moon is valid enough (p.27).

5). In Chapter II, after page 40, there is the section which reads, “Indulekha, cut to the quick, retorted, ‘What! Did you say that Malayali women are not chaste?’ She argued, ‘To say...’ and ending on page 41, line 17, thus, “...to pass unchallenged”, is dealt with in an entirely different manner in the original, where the author does the explanation directly, beginning with the introduction: [“In this matter, an intelligent Malayalee woman would give Madhavan an answer in the following manner: “What did you say?—That Malayalee women do not observe the virtue of fidelity...?” and ends “Therefore, if you are angry towards
me, I'll not let you slander all the members of my gender on account of that; that's for sure” (TPR).] In this place, Dumergue seemingly puts this lengthy speech of more than two-and-a-half pages in the mouth of Indulekha. The single quotes used throughout this section looks like a mistake crept in owing to proof errors of which Dumergue speaks about in his “Translator’s Preface” quoted above. In all the other places where conversations occur, double quotes are used. If not for these single quotes, the entire section would obviously be a speech emanating from Indulekha’s mouth. What Chandu Menon has done is in keeping with the most modern and the most ancient traditions of Indian narratology: the author uninhibitedly intervening directly in the midst of narration, chorus-like (This is the way the sutradhara functions in a classical Sanskrit play. This tradition of alienation, used by Brecht in western theatre practice, has always been there in all forms of Indian classical art. The idea has been adopted in modern western narratology too and has been used most conspicuously by writers like Borges, Italo Calvino, Milan Kundera and Marquez.). And before and after this section, the translator sticks to the narratological pattern of the original author. Only here does he make a departure. What the translator has done with this passage remains ambiguous. However, after the passage marked in single-quotes ends, the translator puts it like this: “In reply to Indulekha’s last observation, Madhavan said, ‘….’,” which does not in any-way clear the ambiguity, as we are again at a loss as to what that last observation was. Whether the translator wanted to show the heroine as soliloquizing, we do not know. However, it is very refreshing to note that Chandu Menon has stuck to the principles of ouchitya and has saved Indulekha from making such a long, platform
speech, in the original version (p. 41-43).

6). The end part of the above paragraph, which forms a different paragraph in the original, ends like this in the translation: “…and affection and mutual esteeem form no part of the consideration.” This part reads thus in the original: [“…I do not find any taste or praiseworthiness in that” (TPR).] Obviously, the translator has missed the sense here.

7). In Chapter III, first paragraph, line four, there occurs the word “patriarch.” In the original, it is “Karanavan,” which could have been retained, as seen earlier.

In line 15, the word “para,” a measure of rice, is mentioned without any gloss or footnote (p. 49).

8). In same chapter, the second paragraph on page 51, last but one line, Panchu Menon used the expletive, “reprobate.” In the original, it is “chandalan” meaning somewhat like the English word “savage.”

9). On page 56, Chapter IV, second paragraph, second line, Madhavan says, “Let me have breakfast with you Father, only I must go and write a letter for the post to Madras.” The original faithfully means, [“Father, I’ll join you for lunch. But (before that) I have to write a letter to (be sent to) Madras. Today’s mail is about to go.”] The glaring inaccuracies are to be noted (p.56).

10). On page 57, the paragraph beginning with line 15, reads in the original thus: [But in certain things I have to follow my will. Unfortunately, the matter of this oath is one of those things.] In its place, the T L text reads, “But in some things I mean to and can please myself, and the matter of this oath is one of these
11). On page 59, again, in paragraph four, line seven, "lunch" is mistakenly described as "breakfast."

12). On page 60, first paragraph and in paragraph three also, the word "breakfast" appears in the place of the word, “lunch” in the original.

13). On page 97, third paragraph, second line, mention is made of “Govindan Nambudiri of Cherusseri house” in the place of “Cherusseri Manakkal Govindan Nambudiri” which passes of as one single proper name in the original. Either lack of knowledge of such details, or the anxiety to translate in as free a manner as possible, caused this kind of dilution or diminution (p.97).

14). On page 102, paragraph two, last line, the word “signature” is used in the place of the original word thrikkaivilayattam literally meaning, “the play (or flourish) of the sacred hand.” In this case, the translator would have been particularly helpless (p.102).

15). On page 103, line 14, appears the question “Ullattil Panchu Menon, is it?” from Suri Nambudiripad. Nothing could be more inaccurate or inappropriate in the place of “Ullattil Panchuvo?” Almost like the free translation of “Sambandham,” Dumergue has taken an unnecessary liberty. When the caste appellation was not there in the original he did not have to bring that in. The reason is that a Nambudiri never calls a member of a lesser caste, by his caste name. A Nambudiri, in such cases, uses only the maiden name (p.103).

16). On page 109, line two, the word “Madam” is used in the place of Suri Nambudiripad’s corrupted use of a generic term for a white lady, as “Methamma”
Sayvu.” The desired effect in the original is lost in the translation, though the translator is left with very few choices. Loss of culture-content in the translation is to be noted here (p.109).

17). On page 114, first line, there is a usage, “bit a stone in her first mouthful of new rice.” This is a classic case of literal translation of, “puthariyilthanne kallu katichu,” a proverb in the S L text, which is anathema in translation practice. A most serious linguistic problem, this is an instance where free translation is welcome.

18). In the same page, in the fifth paragraph is found, “Kathakali tomorrow and Indulekha’s wedding the day after.” “Indulekha’s wedding” in the original is “Indulekhaaparinayam” which has an echo of the title of a Kathakali text. However, it would have been very hard for the translator either to sense this nuance, or to translate it. A peculiar linguistic problem is encountered here (p.114).

19). The name “Govindan Kutty Menon” is used in several places throughout the text as “Govinda Kutty Menon,” by mistake or lack of attention to detail.

20). On page 125, paragraph one, line five, the word “Motala” is a corrupted form used by the half-witted Suri Nambudripad, to indicate “Mudaliar” or even “Mussaliyar.” The pun implied in the three words, [“Motala” meaning “alligator,” “Mudaliar,” an appellation for a Vysya (trader-caste) gentleman, and “Mussaliar;” a “Muslim priest”] is lost for want of explanatory notes. This too is a case of casual approach to the linguistic aspects of the S L text, as indicated in many instances above (p.125).

21). On page 140, second line, there is a mention of two letters, being
translated. Obviously the hero, Madhavan, had written the two letters in English: so, "translated" means "translated into Malayalam"; but when used "translated" in the English translation, it should have been specified as, "translated into Malayalam."

22. In the same page, in line 15, the expression "outburst of feeling" is used as translation of the original word, "goshti" which literally means only "gesticulations" (p.140).

23. Page 148, fourth paragraph fourth line: the word spelt throughout the text as "Nair" is spelt Nayar here and in a few more places in the text. Inconsistency in spelling is to be noted (p.148).

24. Page 152, first paragraph: the one and only footnote in the entire translated text occurs here. It now seems much better justice would have been done to the S L text, if necessary footnotes were given in other similar cases as well, as pointed out in several places in this analysis (p.152).

25. Page 162, last paragraph: the Nambudiripad's corrupted pronunciation of an Englishman's name as "Meghadantan," literally meaning, "cloud-toothed" is translated as "Mr. Mark Loud." No explanation is seen offered in this connection.

26. On page 242, last paragraph, first line, there is mention of a "brass lamp." In the original, it is "changalavatta" which is a very particular kind of brass lamp. The translator would have been quite helpless about it, unless he was ready to give a footnote (p.242).

27. On page 244, last but one paragraph, there is "Brother Sankaran." In the original, it is "Elder Brother Sankaran." (p.244).
28). On page 256, mention is made of ‘an altar raised around a sacred peepul tree.’ In the original, it is “aalttara,” a mere platform raised around the peepul tree. Inaccuracy in linguistic and cultural aspects is noted here (p.256).

\textit{Marthanda Varma}

1). In Chapter One, the episode of the meeting between the mad Chaannaan and Velu Kurup, the leader of the lancers, takes place. Velu Kurup’s query in the patois and the Chaannaan’s extempore songs in the tribal dialect in reply are not found in the translation. A major flaw in the linguistic and cultural front is to be taken note of here (p.38-39).

2). In Chapter Two, “The place known as Mithranandapuram” mentioned in the second paragraph, line two, on the first page is inaccurate. It is [“...the road to Mithranandapuram Temple” (TPR)] in the original (p.40).

3). There is a factual inaccuracy that has crept in the first paragraph, on the first page of Chapter Four. About Mankoyikkal Kurup, there is a mention that “His reputation had spread through the whole of Southern India,” whereas the reference in the original is that, “in those days he was famous throughout the southern tracts,” (TPR) meaning the regions south of Trivandrum, comprising Nanjinad. This points to the translator’s shaky grasp of historical and political details. For the fame of a personality like Mankoyikkal Kurup, there would surely not have been any reach in Karnataka, Tamil Nadu or Andhra Pradesh, for example. “Southern Venad” or “Southern Travancore” would have been the correct translation (p.67).

4). The fourth paragraph, which begins “At this both the Yuvarajah and his bodyguard decided that, however clever and courageous upcountry farmers are, as
God makes them, they would never imbibe the qualities necessary for conducting themselves properly in royal presence.” However, in the original, the above strain of thought is that of the bodyguard who smiles reflecting on the same. The Yuvarajah, it is mentioned in the original, [smiled out of genuine happiness (TPR).] Inaccuracy in translation is to be noted here (p.77).

5). The chapter opens with a rank mistake. In the original it is found: [That day, by sundown, Sundarayyan’s rising was witnessed in Chempakasseri, (TPR). whereas in the S.I. text it is, “That particular day, the first streak of dawn announced Sundaram’s presence in Chempakasseri house.” In the original it is sunset, whereas in the translation it is sunrise!

6). Further ahead in the paragraph is the statement in the original: [The Senior Pillai and Sundarayyan spent that night as if it was Sivarathri (TPR).] In the translation it goes, “the two of them spent the rest of the day and the greater part of the night, discussing in detail the different aspects of the question...” To cover the first mistake, new additions are brought in (p.138).

7). On page 161, last paragraph, in the scene of Sundarayyan’s oath-taking, it is recorded that “but when it came to the portion pass my lips, he thought it unnecessary to bind himself with such an oath and swallowed that potion.” In the original it reads thus: [But when it came to the portion “won’t reach others’ ears, allured by...,” taking a precautionary measure to ensure that there should not be any restriction in communicating the details of the meeting to anyone if need be, without breaking the oath in the process, Sundarayyan swallowed the syllable “ma” to render the oath not binding on him (TPR). Enough care not seen taken to
make the nearest representation of the original version (p. 161).]

8). One of the pitfalls of his own making into which the translator fell appears at the beginning of this Chapter. Mention is made that, “The end of the tenth chapter had witnessed a strange scene, in which Karthyayini Amma who had gone to her daughter’s chamber with the one intention of scolding her…” But this “Chapter Ten” is as it appears in the original. It is at the beginning of Chapter Nine of the T L text that Karthyayini Amma acts as described above (p. 191).

9). On page 190, third paragraph, we see: “The bodyguard hastened from the place to return half an hour later with the news that Kurup had not returned to his house…” But, in the original it goes like this, […] that’s Kurup has not arrived (at the Pathan camp) (TPR). [The glaring inaccuracy is to be noted (p. 190).

10). On the same page, fourth paragraph, Subhadra says: “Talented physicians have come to treat your royal father. Why not consult…” to which Thampi retorts, “Do you imply that I am MAD?” This is the case of an inaccurate translation, leading to confusion. From the descriptions in the novel, we come to understand that the Maharaja, the father of Sri Padmanabhan Thampi, is in sick bed owing to old age ailments, and not because of madness. How then can the physicians who have come to treat him, treat Thampi for supposed madness? The answer can be found in the original. In the S L text, Subhadra tells Thampi, “Expert physicians have come for the treatment of your father. Why not tell them to put a coolant “talam” on your head?” (TPR). Yes, “talam” is a cure for madness and the connection is easily established. There seems to gaps in the grasping of the original by the translator (p. 210).
11). On page 214, in between the exchanges between Subhadra and Thampi, one sentence reads: “It was now the girl’s turn to start.” In the original it goes like this: [Even Subhadra who was uncommonly brave, unwittingly shouted “Ayyo” (TPR).] The translation is neutral, shorn of the tone of the original. These are unique linguistic problems (p.214).

12). On page 230, first and second lines, there is a portion, “…Like that of Eve, his soul had been sold to the Serpent.” However, in the original it goes like this: [Satan has stolen Shamsuddin’s intellect, like he did with Mother Eve’s (TPR).] Inaccuracy of translation, or confusion between the story of Satan approaching Eve in the guise of a Serpent, hoodwinking her into eating the forbidden fruit, and the story of Dr. Faustus in which he sells his soul to the Devil, has occurred here. Incorrect translation.

13). Again, further in the same paragraph, the sentence “What peculiar fascination has the palace gate got for you?” reads thus in the original: [Is guarding the palace such a blissful act (TPR).] Incorrect translation.

14). On page 233, last but one line, there is a mention of the “Nawab of Carnatic.” In the original there is mention only of “the Nawab.” “Carnatic” is added without basis (p.233).

15). On page 284, second paragraph, last line, it reads, “…one of my dearest brothers.” It is [. . . one of my dearest nephews (TPR).] in the original. Incorrect translation (p.284).

16). On page 286, line six it is mentioned that, “a second and third shot rang out.” In the original it is like this: [Either because of malevolent planetary
influence or God's just judgment, the Kotanki got the wrong impression that the pistol was a single-barrelled one, and rushed forward fiercely. The mad Chaannan dispatched him also with the same obsequies he paid to Velu Kurup (TPR).] In other words, there were only two shots. Such inaccuracies abound in the translation (p.286).

17). Page 287, first paragraph: "At this the mad Channan clutched at his companion's hand and whispered, "Even if they kill me, I'll not put down this weapon." However, in the original it goes, [Do you think that Lord Thirumukhathu Pillai won't call you to account if you kill me? Try and kill me, my lords. But even if I die, I'll not put down this gun (TPR) (p.287).]

18). On page 268, the sixth paragraph reads, "No... No... It seems the fellow can read the past and the future..." In the original that portion reads, [No... It was given to him for predicting the future through the casting of cowri shells or through propitiating Uchina Kali (Ujjaini Mahakali) (TPR).] Again, the loss through the translation is linguistic and cultural (p. 268).

19). On page 303, in the third paragraph from below, Sundarayyan, in answer to Thampi's query as to why he had invited the Kotanki over to his death, Sundaram replied that since it was Thampi himself who rushed the matter of Yuvarajah's murder, to execute which, in the absence of Velu Kurup, the news of whose escape had not reached him, he had brought the Kotanki over. Then he accuses that Thampi was as much, or more, responsible for Velu Kurup's death. Here, it is an inaccuracy. It's the Kotanki's death, and not Velu Kurup's death, that Thampi had called into question according to the original (p.303).
20). On page 307, line 22, the word “confidante” is used to describe Osman, a male. It should be “confidant,” instead.

21). The last paragraph of the chapter reads thus: “The next moment she felt something like the cold chill of death.” But in the original it is, [The undaunted Subhadra, was thrown into a state of brutish dumbness (TPR).] Rank inaccuracy, possibly by mistaking the word “mriga” in the original to be “mrita.”

22). On page 333, there is a sentence, “Because I am under oath to preserve my incognito, you must not think me ungrateful.” But in the original, it goes like this: [“Don’t take me for an ingrate because I haven’t revealed the truth about me” (TPR) (p.333).] Again, this is a case of inaccurate translation.

23). On page 342, there is a scene in which Thirumukhathu Pillai is trying to identify the Yuvarajah and his retinue in disguise as Subhadra’s servants. Inaccuracy is noted here. In the original, Thirumukhathu Pillai peers at the Yuvarajah’s face last of all. In the translation, it is depicted as happening first of all. All connecting dialogues suffer from mutation of meanings owing to this inaccuracy.

24). On page 346, line five, there is a term, “crystal-gazer.” In the original it is, ‘mashinottam or divination through gazing into the surface of an ink-like magical liquid.

25). On page 348 the first paragraph reads; “This is interesting,” continued the girl, “here is a man who is prepared to credit the words of that arch-liar Sundaram and a dancing girl who will sell her honour for the first copper, against those of His Highness, and he advises me to be sensible!” The original, faithfully translated would be, [“Can you beat it? What logic is there when you advise me
not to utter crazy things, and give credence to whatever is said by Sundarayyan’s confidant Kotanki, Kalakkutti, the low-born turn-coat, and the servant maid who sells her honour for a copper, and reject as untrue His Highness’s words?” Inaccuracy and dilution of sense in the translation may be noted.

26). On page 350, in the fourth paragraph from below, there is a sentence, “The late Maharajah, the late Kazhakkoottathu Pillai were all aware of it. But being a favourite at court, he was hated by your people.” In the original it is like this: [“The late lamented Maharaja and the late Kazhakkoottathu Pillai were witnesses to it. But I, being in the king’s service, was hated—” Inaccuracy to be noted.

27). In the same page, further down, we come across, “Your father is none other than this unfortunate self.” In the original it goes, [“My daughter! Your father, is I myself, this pitiless being.” (TPR)] Inaccuracy here is to be noted (p.350).

28). On page 352, there is a sheer addition, “Now that the hour of reckoning was at hand, Subhadra remembered the uncle who had brought her up in life.”

29). The second sentence after this reads, “She is right,” echoed Thirumukkhathu Pillai. “We must save him from danger.” In the original it goes like this: [The Yuvarajah said, “That’s right, Thirumukkhathu Pillai. We should see that he doesn’t die” (TPR).] Inaccuracy is to be noted (p.352).

30). The last two paragraphs on the page read:

“Your Highness,” Subhadra entered her last plea this time on behalf of the whole populace, “let there be as little bloodshed as possible.”
"Subhadra," cried Marthanda Varma, turning towards her, wondering how strangely complex her character was, gave the assurance, "your wishes shall be respected in every detail."

In the original, these paragraphs are as follows:

[Subhadra said, "Your Highness, please desist from slaughter as far as possible."

The Yuvarajah replied, "Whatever you wish will be done, Subhadra"

(TPR).]

The last paragraph is also full of inaccuracies in translation when compared with the original (pp.352-353).

Chemmeen

1). The footnote on page three says: Muthalali literally means "owner...." However, the word literally means "one who controls wealth."

2). On page nine, first paragraph and throughout the novel, the term "godess of the sea" or, the sea-goddess, is used as the equivalent of the word "Katalamma." When several other words with linguistic and cultural specificity are retained and footnotes provided for them, this crucial word should have been retained throughout, or glossed at the instance of first use. However, the word "Katalamma" is used with a footnote much later in the S L text on page 82. This is done after several instances of loose translation of the word, and the translator persists in the same in the rest of the S L text. This serves only to highlight the inconsistency (p.9).

3). Page 12, first line says, "Some Moslem boy..." which is repeated
throughout the text. However, in the S L text it is either “Naalaamvedakkaran” literally “one who follows the fourth Veda,” a deprecatory term used to describe Muslims, along with the other offensive word, “Methan” (p.12).

4). On page 17, first paragraph, there is a question, “Kochumuthali, are you a Moslem?” However, in the original it is a statement, [“Kochumuthalali, you are a Nalamvedakkaran” (TPR). The S L text is not properly understood by the translator.

5). In Chapter II, second paragraph, the last two lines read, “Would Pareekutti be staring with that piercing look of his at those women too?” The corresponding original faithfully translated would be, [Would Pareekutti be staring piercingly at the breasts and behinds of those women too? (TPR) (p.13)]

6). On page 29, fifth paragraph, and subsequently in a number of places the term, “Headman” appears. The equivalent Malayalam original is “Thurayilarayan.” This also should have been retained like “Kochumuthalali” to keep the cultural flavour.

7). The sequence in which Pareekuti asking Karuthamma, “Do you love me?” that appears on the last page of this Chapter has the same wording in the S L text, as it appears in Chapter Two. And yet, in the translation, in the former case, the translation reads, “Do you care for me?” The changed pattern adopted in the English translation is indicative of the conventions of this language that do not brook repetitions.

8). On page 34, second paragraph, there is a mention about Chemban Kunju that “he is a Mukkuvan” by caste. But in the original at the same place, it is stated
that "he is Marakkan." The inconsistency is to be taken note of.

9). On page 47, first paragraph, there is an expression, "His wife is worth her weight in gold" which must have been the most handy parallel expression in English for the Malayalam original that means, "gold purified in fire," which unfortunately conveys a different sense. Inaccurate translation.

10). In Chapter Five, page 47, Pareekutti asks Chakki, "Will you trade fish with us?" This is the literal translation of the original expression. Actually, it means, "Will you sell fish to me?" In two previous instances, the same question has been inaccurately translated.

11). On page 48, the last but one paragraph begins thus: "Chakki asked a little angrily...." In the original, it goes like this, "Chakki asked a little sternly...." The next sentence reads, "She continued, her voice growing louder...." It would be "She continued in a stern voice" (TPR) if translated faithfully. Inaccurate translation.

12). The next paragraph begins: "Pareekutti realised that Chakki was serious." The corresponding original, when translated faithfully, would be, "Pareekutti sensed that Chakki was talking harshly" (TPR) (p.48). Inaccurate translation.

13). Karuthamma asks Chakki what kind of fish was likely to be found in plenty that day and Chakki replies that it would be "herring." However, in the original, it is "mackerel." Incorrect translation.

14). On the page 49 Chakki says, "Will that father of yours do that, I wonder." This is the best form of equivalence that would suit western taste, for the original expression, "Kaalamaadan." This word can be literally translated as, "the
god of Death and the local demon-spirit, “Maadan,” combined together.” A sensible translation would be “Will that demon of a father...” Subsequently, at least in two places, the word occurs. In one place (on page 51, paragraph three), it is translated as, “Who knows if that husband of mine will agree.”

15). On page 53, in the middle this sentence occurs: “You heartless D – “ which, in Malayalam, is “Ampe Kaalaa.” Again the word, “god of Death” is the literal translation. “You Devil” would have been appropriate. Narayana Menon seems to have taken the word as equivalent to a curse word and therefore, to avoid the embarrassment, left it at “D__”.

16). On page 59 towards the middle, Chemban Kunju says, “If you won’t come, I am going to let you starve. I cannot afford to give you any maintenance.” A faithful translation of the original would be, “I’ll tell you something. If you can’t come along, you’ll starve from now on. I am unable to advance money to you.”

The mention of “rice soup and vegetables” in the third line of the paragraph, is in the place of “boiled tapioca and rice gruel,” the staple of the poor during lean season. There is dilution of a culture-specific phrase here (p.68).

17). On page 70 Ayyankunju, says “Don’t make me have to call you...” There is a mistake here. It should be, “Don’t make me call you.”

18). On page 71, towards the end of the page Chemban Kunju says, “You idiots, this is the time for making money.” This, in the place of an adage that roughly corresponds to the English proverb, “Make hay while the sun shines.” Obviously this would be incongruous in the context of a monsoon and Chakara.
But the loss of this culture-specific item is to be taken note of (p.71).

19). Towards the end of page 74, it is Karuthakunju who wants to have a collision with Palani’s boat. However, in the original it is Kunju Vava who wants that to happen.

20). Towards the end of the page 75, there is an answer by Palani, “Well — ” to a question posed by Chakki. In the original it is “Aa,” which reflects total ignorance of something.

21). On page 80, towards the end, Chakki tells Chemban Kunju: “This is all wrong.” But in the original, it is “This is great ingratitude.” The inaccuracy in translation maybe noted.

22). In the next section after the above, she says, “After swindling him, you don’t even talk to him.” But, in the original it reads, [“After making him steal his own goods at the dead of midnight, now you are hush-hush about it” (TPR) (p.80).] In fact this is the whole point about the money transaction between Pareekutti and Chemban Kunju. Chemban Kunju arranged it with Pareekutti to hand over the stock of dried fish to him under the cover of darkness, and hence the other fishermen could not make out the source of Chemban Kunju’s funding to purchase the boat. Even Karuthamma questions her mother as to why her father had made Pareekutti steal his own stock of dry fish and hand it over to him. This is in fact kept away from the eyes of the world till the very end of the novel. “Swindling” doesn’t describe this crucial transaction with is a turning point in the plot. Missing this point is a serious omission.

23). Further, in the paragraph that follows the above one, there is a sen-
tence: “Or was Karuthamma’s relationship with Pareekutti the reason behind it?”

In the original it is somewhat like this: [And yet, she is apprehensive as to what would come of Karuthamma’s relationship with Pareekutti (TPR).] Inaccurate translation should be noted here.

24). The next sentence in the translation after the above, reads thus: “Finally Karuthamma half-promised to marry Palani after the debt was paid to Pareekutti. That was some comfort for Chakki.” It appears in the original as, [As matters stood thus, Karuthamma volunteered to say, “Only after you repay that money— Oh, it’s indeed a relief” (TPR).] The omissions and inaccuracies may be noted (p.83).

25). On page 83 Karuthamma says, “No, it will mean nothing.” In the original, it is like this: [“Oh, nothing is going to work out” (TPR).]

26). On page 84, Karuthamma says, “What is there that I cannot tell?”

In the original it goes, [“Why can’t I tell him?” (TPR)]

27). In the next paragraph after the above there is the sentence: “But the day when Chakki informed her husband that Karuthamma was not against the marriage, she could find no way to tell him about the condition Karuthamma had set.” But, the original goes like this: [That day the wife let the husband in on something. That their daughter was not unwilling for that marriage. And yet, there was behind it an unuttered, “but” pregnant with meaning. How could she mention anything about that “but?” (TPR)]

28). On page 85 last but one paragraph: “It was an ironic smile.” In the original it reads thus: [It was a lusterless smile (TPR).] The translation is inaccu-
rate. The word "Ironic" does not fit in with the character of Pareckutti.

29). The next line after the above is, "You want me to do well, Karuthamma?" in the translation. Buts it actually is, ["How am I going to do well, Karuthamma?" (TPR)] Again, a case of inaccurate translation is found here (p.85).

30). On page 86, there is a sentence, "Chemban Kunju crossed his heart." This is something very incongruous. In the original it is, [Chemban Kunju swore it calling upon Kadalanuma (TPR).]

31). The next sentence after the above one, is: "Because he said he didn’t want it, are you proposing not to give him any dowry," Chakki asked. But following this, there is a fragment in the original that translates thus [...]and stood looking at Chemban Kunju’s face with the expression, “then what” (TPR).]

32). Towards the end of the first paragraph on page 88, the last sentence is: "It was not at all unusual for her to ask such a question." But in the original, it is just the opposite.” It says, “...Chakki asked him that day, which was most unusual” (TPR) (p.88).]

33). In Chapter Nine, page 90, paragraph dealing with the explanation of Chembankubju’s plan to adopt Palani as a son ends thus: “Chakki agreed it would be good to have a son...” But the original is somewhat like this: [It would certainly make up for the absence of a son (TPR) (p.90).]

34). On page 92, at the end of the first paragraph, one sentence is missing. It may be translated thus: [But Chakki never had a clue that it was so intense (TPR).]

35). The next sentence after the above, is translated inaccurately. It should
have been thus: “Between her sobs, she gnashed her teeth and muttered: ” (TPR).

36). On page 92, third paragraph Chakki says: “That boy, it seems to me, has bewitched you.” However, the original literally is, [“That Fourth Veda fellow has cast a magic spell over my daughter through esoteric inscriptions (TPR).]

(“Koodothram,” a corruption of “goodhapatram” or “secret script”). The simplistic translation is aimed at making it smooth for TL readership.

37). In the paragraph that follows the above, we find, “Had someone from outside the fisherman’s caste loved a fisherwoman and because of the love he bore her, wrecked his life?” However, in the original it is thus: [Has a young man from outside the fisherman caste loved a girl of that seafront, and have they both become frustrated lovers on account of their love for each other?” (TPR) (p.92)] This dilution of sense and inaccuracy are to be seen as serious lapses.

38). On page 98, towards the end, the sentence that reads, “... Palani is good. He is clever.” can be translated in a better way thus: [Palani is a good man. He is smart (TPR).] No one who reads the original will use the word “clever” to describe Palani (p.98).

39). The first sentence on page 99, is an explanatory translation of the original Malayalam idiom which literally means: “Don’t stab the corpse (TPR).”

40). A few sentences after the above, occurs the sentence, “He crossed his heart.” This usage was seen once earlier, and commented upon as being incongruous. The correct usage will be, “He swore,” but the translator must have been afraid that the western readers would confuse it with using “swear-words” or “cuss-words.” Last but one sentence on the page reads: “Slowly and silently she
turned away from the sea and walked eastward home.”

But in the original it goes like this:

[She walked slow away eastward without saying anything. That was her farewell. He stood looking intently at her. That was his response to the farewell (TPR) (p.99).]

41. On page 102, last but one paragraph, there is a sentence: “The Headman swore.” This is a vague approximation of the original. [The Headman shouted him down (TPR)] would have been a better equivalent.

42. And the sentence, “Are you such vagrants?” can better be translated as [“Are you such destitutes?” (TPR) (p.102)]

43. On page 104, towards the middle, in the paragraph that begins, “You are arranging…” there is a sentence, “Well, our village may be ruined.” However, the correct translation would be, [“Let our village be damned” (TPR).]

44. At the end of the paragraph after the middle of page 104, there is a sentence: “The wedding had an inauspicious beginning.” It is a incorrect translation. A faithful translation would be [“The wedding was about to be aborted” (TPR).]

45. Towards the end of the same page, there is section that says, “But Pappu wasn’t sorry in the least. He was disgusted.” It could better be translated this way: [There wasn’t even a trace of remorse in him. He entertained a kind of malice (TPR) (p.104).]

46. On page 109 second paragraph goes thus: “Son, I know what it is to bring up a child. Listen, one day you will grow old and you will know,” he said. It
is an incorrect translation. Faithfully translated it would be thus:

["My son, I am speaking as a father who brought up a child. You will also become a father one day" (TPR).]

47). The fifth paragraph on page 109 begins with "What is this!" But in the original, it is ["How can it ever be (normal)!" (TPR)]

48). One paragraph later we find, “Was it necessary to have given away your girl in marriage to someone like this?” It should be actually like this:

[ "It is you who should be condemned for giving away the girl to such a fellow" (TPR).]

49). In the first paragraph on page 115, the translation is inaccurate. The sentences, “The sea here is not calm by nature. In its depths lay hidden treacherous currents and cross currents, which might come to the surface any moment” should be thus, in faithful translation: [The sea here is not of a calm nature. It has, treacherously hidden in its depths, whirlpools and spouting currents, ready to come up boiling on the surface any time (TPR).]

50). On page 120, paragraph two there is a mention that “Karuthamma was starting her life as the mistress of a house, if not as a loved one, at least as a good housekeeper.” This is inaccurate; what is found in the original is: [Karuthamma is beginning life as housewife; no longer a lover, but as the mistress of a household (TPR) (p.118).]

51). On page 121, in the fourth paragraph beginning, “He pulled her to him, his strong arms tightening around her;” the next sentence is, “She lay, her eyes half closed, unable to control her hard breathing.” This is inaccurate translation. It
would be, [In an ecstatic suffocation, she lay, her eyes half-closed, in a semi-conscious state (TPR) (p. 121).]

52). On page 134, third paragraph, there is a sentence that is shockingly incorrect. It says, “She would never behave or live in a way in which her husband would hate his homecoming.” The correct translation would be:

[She would never indulge in any activities that would cause her husband never to return from the sea (TPR).]

This is an allusion to the necessity of the wife remaining chaste and pure, so that the husband will be protected through divine grace from dangers at sea. Here Karuthamman is saying that she would never lose her chastity, plunging thus her husband into the perils of the sea. This sense has not occurred to the translator.

53). On 136, first paragraph, it is stated that Pappu joked. It is an error. In fact it was Velayudhan who joked.

54). Again “Shut up Pappu!”

It has to be [“Shut up Velayudhan Chetta.”]

55). [“Why are you picking a quarrel with me, my boy,” cried Velayudhan (TPR).]

56). Then, again, ... “He was afraid that Pappu might have something more to say.”

It is in fact, “He was afraid Velayudhan would have something more to say.”

Obviously, the translator got a proper name mixed up in as many as four places, consecutively.
57). On page 136, towards the middle there is a sentence, "...He rowed hard with brisk strokes, kicking high with his feet." This is a statement by a person who has no idea of how a boat is rowed, or cannot visualise the scene. If Palani kicked high with his feet, while he rowed, he would surely topple over in a few moments, unable to keep the balance. The sentence in the original goes this way: [When he presses hard, cleaving the water with the oar, the bow of the boat heaves and races ahead (TPR).]

58). The sentence "'You, dog, just because you have no one... 'Kumaru said nervously," would have to be, ["You son of a dog... Kumaru said in fright" (TPR) (p.136).]

59). After the next paragraph, the name of "Pappu" used twice instead of "Velayudhan" (pp.136-137).

60). On page 141 the first sentence "What can I do? He will not pay up," has to be translated thus:

[What can we poor women do? He doesn't intend to repay it (TPR).]

61). Two paragraphs later, there is the sentence, "Pareekutti could say nothing to comfort her."

However, the original goes like this:

[Pareekutti had no opinion to express in that matter. It is something that concerns Karuthamma. Chakki continued" (TPR).]

62). "I feel as if I have put my child in a little boat and sent her out to sea alone." This is again a case which reveals the author's lack of understand of the original. What Chakki means when she says, ["I feel as if I have pushed away my
child in a small boat, out to the sea” (TPR), is that she feels as if she has sent Karuthamma to her certain death. In several previous instances also, the translator exhibits an amazing lack of sensitivity to the Malayalam language and its usages.

63. In the paragraph spread over pages 147 and 148, there are two problems. In the S L text we read, “How did Pareekutti come to be made a brother....” It should be [How did a Fourth Veda fellow come to be made a brother... (TPR).]

64. The next one is in “Kochunathan, agreeing, told him where Palani lived.” In the original it is thus:

[“Who knows whether Kochunathan believed it or not” (TPR).]

65. In the first paragraph there is an incorrect language usage in the sentence, “Could he join forces with Pappu?” In the original, it is, [Can he attack Pappu head on? (TPR)] A few sentences later, there is something that epitomises the linguistic and cultural problems of translation. The sentence, “His duty as a fisherman would not allow him to disavow her.”

The original, faithfully translated would be: [His sense of dharma of an Arayan does not permit him to forsake her (TPR).] This word “dharma” is so light-heartedly translated as “duty.” “Dharma” which is a corollary of the Law of Karma is a deciding factor in any moral code as far as the myriad faiths of the Indian subcontinent are concerned. We hear of “kuladharma” in each tribal community. If the word “dharma” was retained and a footnote provided, the effect would have been very different. The translator has however chosen to dilute it by a simplistic translation.

66. Last but one paragraph on page 156 reads:
"When Palani did not give an answer straightaway, she told him of the advantage. But she would go only if he permitted her." This is however inaccurate and compressed. The original reads thus:

[Palani did not give an answer immediately. Was there really so much to think about it? Still he did not give her an answer. Then she spoke about the usefulness of this enterprise. She said she would go only if he permitted her (TPR) (p.156).]

67). In the last paragraph on page 157, the first sentence reads: “The next day the haul was herring.” But in the original, it is “mackerel.” This mistake is the recurrence of an earlier instance, towards the beginning of the novel.

68). On page 163, first and second lines, there is a word “sea monster.” The equivalent of the original word “katalppanni” is “dolphin.” This is an error.

69). Chapter Sixteen, page 164, the second paragraph begins with:

“You are a bad woman,” he said. It should actually be: “They say you are a bad woman.”

70). The fifth paragraph on page 164 is translated inaccurately. It should be:

["Why did you ever go about playing with that Moslem boy in childhood, without the thought that you were a Marakkati?" (TPR) (p.164)]

71). In the last but one paragraph of page 175, there is a grievous factual error. In the T L text it reads, "They informed the village Headman and brought her to Nirkunnam."

However, the opposite is the case. It is found in the original:

[She said there was no need to inform Thurayil Arayan (TPR) (p.175).]
This assumes further significance, as, in a later development, when Chemban Kunju and Pappikkunj fall apart, there is reference to their not informing the respective Headmen of their villages, of their alliance in the first place.

72). Last but one paragraph on page 176 has Chemban Kunju telling Panchami that, “She will be a good mother to you” But in the original, it is [“She is a good step-mother, my child” (TPR).]

73). On page 185, in the middle, the paragraph ends, “...She was his protector”. It is just the opposites of what is found in the original, where it is seen: [He was her protector.]

74). On page 200, there is a rank mistake in the translation of the first sentence of the second paragraph. Chemban Kunju tells Pareekutti:

“My Karuthamna who ran about this beach like a carefree bird— you ruined her.”

However, the original reads differently:

[“My Karuthamna who went about her work briskly on this seafront like Chakki—you spoiled her” (TPR).]

The mix up must have occurred because the translator mis-read the word Chakki as “Pakki” a colloquial corruption (or Pali original?) of the word “Pakshi” (bird).

75). The last paragraph of Chapter Nineteen on page 202 says in the T L text: “From the side of that boat the terrible laughter of Chemban Kunju emanated. It was like the laughter of death.”

However, the translator seems to have made an inaccurate translation in: “It
was like the laughter of death.” The “Arukola” referred to in the original is an evil spirit—to be precise, the evil spirit of murder, or, Murder personified (p.202).

76). Just before the middle portion of page 216 occurs the famous “pot of gold.” Narayana Menon has translated the Malayalam word “ponninkudam” literally as “pot of gold.” Whether it could have been a pot made of gold, or a pot full of gold, or both could be anyone’s guess. Still, other options like “gold-pot” “golden-pot” and so on are there. But in all of these, the Malayalee or Indian obsession with the yellow metal becomes evident, paradoxically, though. Paradoxical, because Narayana Menon has so far intervened in this translation on the cultural front only in favour of a perceived Western readership. But the “pot of gold” usage rankles as an unimaginative, prosaic kind of usage. Rightly, it has gone down in text books of translation practice as a star example of “rank bound” translation, which is a highly unsuitable method in literary translation. It is a pity that he has resorted to such a blind act, since his translation, on the whole, is eminently sensible language-wise.

77). Narayana Menon also has not taken care to explain kinship terms and forms of address either by transliterating them and keeping them in the body of the text, of by footnotes on the equivalents used. So we have Karuthamma referring to her husband as ‘Palani’ which is anathema in the cultural milieu of the fisherfolk described in Chemmeen. It has to be “Chaattan.” And Panchami calling her elder sister ‘Karuthamma’ whereas in the original it is “Ichchachi”. Likewise, when the fishermen address their elders, the Thurayilarayan, or the boat owner it is either “Achan” or more respectfully, “Odayathu.” “Achan” can mean, “Father” “Elder
Brother” or simply “elder” as the case maybe, according to different regional usages. “Odayathu” literally means “Owner” and most commonly it can function synonymous with “Master” or “Lord.” All these point to the linguistic and cultural problems unleashed in this rather free translation. Linguistic, because it is impossible to find equivalents for them, and have to be negotiated with the few options at hand; cultural because, in the eagerness to make the TL text easy-to-read for the target audience, mostly all that was culture-specific in the novel have been compromised, watered down, or deleted.

‘Me’ Grandad ‘ad an Elephant!’: Three Stories of Muslim Life in South India

Childhood Friend

1). On page one, second paragraph, last line, the phrase “glaring at” is used. However, it implies real anger, whereas in the original, Majid only feigns anger; the SL usage literally means: “rolled his eyes at.”

2). On page three, Majid cries out “Help!” in the TL text. But it is “Oh Mother!” in the SL text. Perhaps, “Oh Mother,” may not convey the sense of the exclamation made upon experiencing unexpected pain.

3). On page nine, after Majid says Suhra is his “princess,” she says, “You’re joking.” It is meant as an equivalent to “Po Cherka,” or “Go, boy.” Majid replies to this incredulousness by swearing by his mother. [“Upon my mother,” (TPR)] he says, and not “On my honour” as seen in the TL text. “Upon my mother,” is an acceptable enough exclamation now in Indian English.

4). In the same page, as Majid makes to cut her nails, Suhra objects to it saying “Don’t” in the TL text. In the original, it is [“Let go off me, boy” (TPR).]
5). The following sentences in the same page: “On your honour?” and “On my honour,” are questions and answers of Suhra and Majid, respectively. However, it is [“Upon your mother?” and “Upon my mother,” (TPR)] respectively, to be accurate.

6). On page ten, first paragraph, fifth line, the sentence begins, “They set…” It produces a “jerk” effect; it is not necessary, as it is a description of the plants they planted, and mentioned about in the previous sentence. A colon or a dash would have done the job.

7). The last part of the last sentence on page ten goes like this, “When Suhra put in the hole they had prepared, there was a red flower on it that had begun to wilt.”

In the original, however, it is: [“When Suhra planted it, there was a red flower on it” (TPR).] This is a case of inaccurate translation.

8). On page 13, second line, comes the statement “He is eager to see the world…” In the original, it is literally like this: [“He enjoys looking at the wide world” (TPR).] “Eagerness,” is not indicated.

9). On the same page, last paragraph, fifth line, there is a word “standing lamp” in the T L text. It is the literal translation of “nilavilakku” or the traditional wick lamp made of brass. This is an unnecessary translation that looks awkward. The original word should have been retained and glossed. This is a specific case of linguistic and cultural problem of translation combining together.

10). On page 14, second paragraph, in the fifth and sixth lines, lies the sentence: “A sensation like the tearing of the dried film of an areca-nut leaf.”
This is the translation of the Malayalam word, "paala". It is not "the dried film of areca-nut leaf" but the ["leaf-spathe of the areca-palm" (TPR.)] "Dried paala" is much thicker and harder than a "dried film." This is a case of incorrect literal translation. Here also, the original word should have been retained and glossed. Again, we come across a linguistic/cultural problem.

11). In the second paragraph on the same page, describing Majid's circumcision, the T I. text goes like this: "...rather like having a circle of ink at the end of the finger from the mouth of the bottle without actually touching the ink." In the original it is like this: ["Like red ink smeared around the tip of the finger when it is tightly inside the mouth of the ink bottle, without it getting dipped" (TPR.)] Incorrect translation is noticed here.

12). On page 15, first paragraph, sixth line, we see the use of "bandy-legged," which is not accurate. The Malayalam is ["he walked with his legs wide apart" (TPR.)] "Bandy-legged" implies the curvature of the part of legs from knees down.

13). Instead of the word "canal" used in the next line after the above, it should be "stream." "Canal" implies an artificial construction, whereas the Malayalam word "thodu" is used here in the sense of a natural stream.

14). The last paragraph on this page we read: "Oh, so posh!" she said. "As though you were going to get married." However, in the original it is like this: ["Oh, this boy's show-off," she said. "As if he is going to get married" (TPR.)] This will just be a literal translation. ["As if he's the bridegroom," is the most sensible translation (TPR).]
15). On page 16, second paragraph, fifth line, the word “red sand” is used. It should be “red mud.”

16). On the same page, in the conversation after third page, we come across the usage “good job.” It should be “big position,” or “high post.”

17). On page 17, fourth paragraph, Majid says, “Oh, I shan’t be coming here to aim at things....” This is a very unimaginative, literal translation. It should have been, [“I am not going come here to shoot at things any more...” (TPR).]

18). On the same page, last paragraph, fourth line, the word “paraffin lamp” is used. It is, in fact “kerosene lamp.” In many other places in the book the same word is repeated.

19). On page 19, last paragraph, the word “hurricane-lamp” is used. But the Malayalam word is “sararanthal” which can be translated only as “chandelier.”

20). On page 20, in the big paragraph among the dialogues, we find the sentence, “...with appetites like the demon Vaka.” This is an incorrect translation. “Bakantha,” the original Malayalam word used is a corrupt word in the Muslim patois, equivalent of “vasantha” of the Christian patois, which means “pestilence.” [“Save us from Panjam, pada, vasantha... ( famine, wars, and pestilence)” (TPR).] was a stock prayer of grannies in the Syrian Christian community.

21). On the same page, third paragraph from bottom, first line, there is: “For handsome men like me....” The Malayalam original for “handsome” is “yogyathella” which can be better translated as, “with qualifications.” The fragment can be translated as, [“For men like me with so many qualifications...” (TPR).]
22). On page 23, fourth paragraph from below ends with the word “moustache.” It should have been “sprouting moustache,” as found in the original.

23). The first line of last paragraph on the same page begins: “To hear her talk...” It can better translated as [“Did you hear her talk?” (TPR)]

24). On page 25, third line there is, “really close.” It should have been, [“They stuck to each other” (TPR)] as found in the original.

25). On page 26, fourth paragraph, last line there is the word “spittle” used. “Saliva” is the correct word here to use, as “spittle” is something to be spat out, which has the Malayalam equivalent “Thuppal.” But Basheer has used the word “Umineer” which translates only as “Saliva.”

26). Fifth paragraph, in 3rd line, is seen: “...the boatmen will sell some on the way.” It is too literal a translation; what Basheer means is that [“the boatmen will pilfer some paddy and sell it on the sly” (TPR)].

27). In the sixth paragraph, fifth line the word “stormed” is vague; for the Malayalam original “alari” the equivalent is “roared.”

28). Page 27, fifth paragraph, first line contains the word lantern. It is, “chandelier” and not lantern, according to the original.

29). On page 29, third paragraph, is found the line “Life is full of selfish deeds.” The translation is inaccurate. As equivalent to the line of a Malayalam poem, “Svarthaparipoorithamaanu jeevitham” it should be, [“Life is saturated with selfishness” (TPR)].

30). On page 30, first line there is the word “reared.” This is used the equivalent for “valarthi.” A better expression would be “brought you up” in direct
conversation.

31). The next sentence, “Because your colour wasn’t good enough, I made you drink a lot of milk mixed with powdered gold.” This is an inaccurate translation: More faithful to the original would be, [“Because your complexion was not fair enough, you were made to drink a lot of milk in which gold and orris root were rubbed in and mixed” (TPR).]

32). On the same page, last paragraph is the line is the expression “His mother’s plants!” “His mother’s—” is part of a swearword, which, used in a sentence like this, would be: [“His mother’s__ plants” (TPR),] the actual, abusive swear-part being silent in usage, when uttered by respectable, middle class people!

33). On page 35, at the end of the first paragraph, there appears an expression, “When I was out—”. It is an unimaginative, literal translation. A sensible translation would be, [“When I was having my periods—” (TPR).]

34). On page 36, sixth line, we see: “Who made her like that?” It is an inadequate translation. It should have been, [“Who caused her to become like that?” (TPR)]

35). Towards the end of the page the following section is inadequately translated:

“It’s been here for a long, long time.”

Suhrā does not dispute it! Everything has been there for a long, long, time.

A long time.”

It has to be translated as follows:

[“Hasn’t it been here since a long time off?”]
Suhra wouldn’t oppose it! Everything has been there since a long time off.

Once upon a time (TPR).]

36). On page 37, last but one paragraph, a single sentence, reads:

“‘You reprobate!’ This is a very English expression. The original is just, [‘Oh, this boy!’ (TPR)]

37). On page 38, towards the middle, there is a section:

“Nothing; you must be careful Suhra! You are a woman; your name must be free from stain.”

“Oh! Let it be stained! Let even my soul be stained—as long as you are the cause!”

This is an inadequate translation. A more accurate version would be:

| “Nothing; Suhra, be careful! You are a woman; lest your name be sullied—”

| “Oh! Let it be sullied! Let even my soul be sullied! It’s not through anybody else, is it?’” (TPR)]

38). Page 41 first paragraph:

“I can’t see very well,” bapa told him. “Will you bring me back a pair of glasses?—No!”

The translation is not very accurate. It would be nearer to the original if translated as below:

| [“My eyes have grown dim. Will you buy me a pair of glasses as you return?—No!’” (TPR)]

39). On the same page, last but one paragraph, the word “Mahanagari” is
used, as a proper name. What Basheer meant was merely, “metropolis.” Inaccurate translation is to be noted in this case.

40). On page 42, second paragraph, the word “cycle” is used, after the Malayalam fashion, instead of “bicycle.” The word is reported at two more places in the same page.

41). In the fifth paragraph on the same page, there is an expression, “unforeseen accident.” This is a funny one; it may be noted that “unforeseen” is redundant here.

42). In the last but one paragraph, the expression “steep slope” is used as equivalent of “valiya irakkam.” It is just the opposite of the intended meaning, unless the word “down” is also added. Therefore, it should be [“down a steep slope” (TPR)].

43). On page 44, in second paragraph in the separate section, there is mention of “fifty rupees” being given to Majid by the company manager. In the original it is “some rupees.” The specific sum of “fifty” is an addition.

44). On page 47, second paragraph, line from the bottom, there is a mention of “dirty” dishes. In the original it is “echchil paatrangal,” and that means “dishes eaten from” and only by definition it becomes “dirty.” “Used plates,” would be ideal substitution.

45). The last line of the paragraph there is mention of “the sum of five rupees.” Again, this is a case of addition. In the original, there is mention only of “a small amount.”

46). On page 48, in the middle, there is a single sentence paragraph:
“What could Suhra see?” This is an incorrect translation. In the original it is like this:

[“When could he see Suhra?” (TPR)]

Me Grandad ‘ad an Elephant’

One: “This is a lucky mole!”

1). The translation of the chapter heading is incorrect. It would be, “This is called ‘the lucky mole.’”

2). On page 54, second line, the word, “head-shawl” is used as equivalent of “kavani.” This could have been retained and glossed as it has no equivalent expression in English and is a culture-specific word, meaning “a fine, soft cloth meant for wearing ceremonially on the upper torso or head.”

3). In the last paragraph on the same page, it is stated, “It was when her bapa took her to the river all dressed up…” In the original, it goes like this: [“It was when her bapa took her to the river all dressed up to bathe her…” (TPR).]

4). On page 55, third line from bottom, there is the word, “stole.” This is as equivalent to, “kasavu neryathu.” This word also should have been glossed, as there is no equivalent expression in English for it, and is very culture-specific item almost the same in meaning as “kavani.”

5). On page 59, and elsewhere, the Islam way of naming the Old Testament characters, as [“Adam Nabi, Ouvah Bibi, Nooh, Ibrahim, Dawood, Moosa, Eesa” (TPR),] etc., has been anglicized as “Adam, Eve, Noah, Abraham, David, Moses, Jesus” etc., which makes them appear out of character. Those names should have been retained, if not for anything else, at least for the “exotic effect” Asher men-
tions about in the "Introduction."

6). On page 60, in the last but one paragraph, the name of the angel
"Gabriel" is used in the Biblical way, rather than the Koranic, "Jibreel" used in the
S L text.

7). On page 62, fourth paragraph, lying in lines four and five, there is an
expression, "...like a path going through a paddy field." It is actually," a mud dyke
in the paddy field."

8). On page 66, first paragraph, eighth line, "Not a trace of the heavens or
the earth will remain," is like below in the original: ["The solar system and the
cosmos...nothing will remain" (TPR).] Basheer's is a very specific and modern
expression, whereas the translator has fudged it though the mystifying
generalisation, "heavens or the earth."

9). The fourth paragraph on page 66 begins thus: "If only she had a
brother...” It should have been, ["If only she had a kid brother" (TPR),] to be
faithful to the original.

10). On page 67, third paragraph, last line the word "copper" is incorrect. It
is in fact "an alloy of gold and copper" and is given in the original as "thampak."

11). On page 68, lines six and seven, there is the expression, "She is burst-
ing." However, it is a very literal translation. ["She feels stifled" (TPR)] would be
the nearest.

12). On the first page of Chapter Four, in the sixth paragraph, third line,
there is a word, "red stome." It is a literal translation. The correct word is "laterite."

13). On page 70, fifth paragraph, in lines six and seven, is the expression
"...after touching the Koran." The description is of the ceremonial way of bearing witness in court. It is therefore, not "after" touching the Koran, but, "touching the Koran."

14). On page 71, first paragraph, two sentences are missing. After the sentence, "To ensure victory, both sides promised offerings to all the mosques," it should be: ["They went to the tombs of saints and prayed for their intercession. And made offerings of money" (TPR).]

15). The next sentence after the above, "In the mosques, flags were raised; sandalwood paste was presented," is an instance of mindless literal translation effacing all culture-specific content from it. "To raise flags in the mosque," is the misrepresentation of an offering in which the supplicant goes to the mosque in question and plants flags in a designated place. It is not "raising" flags, suggesting a flag-hoisting ceremony. This should have been properly glossed. The next expression is really appalling. "Sandalwood paste was presented" is meant as an equivalent for "Chandanakkudam." "Chandanakkudam" is a festival, or rather the celebration of a ritual by Muslim community, which ends up in a mosque or dargha, in which a procession is taken out with band and great fanfare at the head of which is a caparisoned elephant, carrying on its head a brass pot containing sandal paste, as an offering to the saint, or God, as the case may be. The celebration is generally sponsored as an offering by a supplicant who aspires to achieve certain goals by conducting the same. This is a ritual that has strong roots in the local culture of Kerala, where Islam co-existed peacefully with various Hindu communities for almost sixteen centuries. The elephant, the caparison, the sandal
paste—all these are strong links to the local culture. One feels sorry that the translators missed out on this crucial ritual, and made such a lame translation.

16). On page 72, third paragraph, last but one line, there is an expression, “...she saw a long and wrinkled, thin black thing coming towards her.” This is the description of a leech. The translation is not accurate. The description in the S L is about the movement in water, of the insect in question, whereas the translators are describing its physical appearance. It should be as follows:

[“...she saw a thin black thing moving towards her, elongating and shrinking itself in the water” (TPR).]

17). On the same page, last but one paragraph, last but one line says, “But she had no clothes on.” Unimaginable for a conservative, traditionally raised Muslim girl to do in the open! Actually what appears in the S L text is, “But she has not worn the kuppayam or draped the mundu around her.” However, two paragraphs above, her elaborate undressing had been described, and it had been specifically stated that she took off kuppayam and mundu, after wrapping the towel around her. Therefore, she has to be wearing that towel still! “But she had no clothes on,” implies that she was stark naked! Paying attention to details would have saved the translators this embarrassment!

18). On page 73, third line, there is the statement, “...its smooth body rubbed against her naked thigh.” This is incorrect. It should be [“...that rubbed smooth and soft against the naked thigh” (TPR).]

19). The last line of the fifth paragraph on page 73 says “a large murrel made a grab at it...” In the original it is [“...with a noise ‘kap’, a large murrel fish
snapped it up and swallowed it!” (TPR)]

20). At the beginning of the next paragraph there is the statement, “Kunjupattumma did not feel that it was sinful for men to eat fish,” which not an accurate translation. It should be, [“Kunjupattumma didn’t feel it sinful for people to catch and eat it” (TPR).]

21). On page 74, second paragraph, first line, there are two sentences. “It is a big water-snake! Is it the poisonous sort?” In the original it goes like this:

[It is a big neerkoli snake. Or is it a pulavan?” (TPR)] Basheer names two water-snakes both of which are non-poisonous. The translators, apparently not knowing the details, make the above generalizations, incorrectly. Retaining the original names and giving notes would have been a better way out.

22). In the fifth line in the same paragraph, a “paral” fish, which is a full-grown, small variety fish, is translated as a “baby fish.” This is grossly incorrect. Such details and many similar once encountered earlier, makes one wonder what the role of the obviously Malayalee lady, Achamma, as co-translator, was.. How could such details escape her is the genuine doubt anyone will have.

23). On the same page, third paragraph, there is a list of the residents in the pond. It is gratifying to see the word “pallatti” (a small kind of fish) there. What is suggested above, is only that “paral,” neerkoli” “pulavan” etc. , could have been treated likewise.

24). The next word, “carp” is not the correct English word for “Karimeen.” It is “pearl-spot.” Again, this is a case of inaccurate translation.

25). On page 75, line seven there is the statement “...I am licenced to say
anything.” In the original there is a corruption of the English word, “licence,” used by the unlettered Kunjuthatchumma, as “leiness.” Ordinary strategies of translation cannot bring about the effect such a hybrid word has in an ordinary conversation.

26). In the 11th line on the same page, we come across the expression, “You unlawful child.” as the literal translation of the Muslim patois expression, “Haramperanole.” It is such a pity that such unimaginative, literal translation of this expletive was effected. It is so common an expletive that it could have been translated with some equivalent English word. This has been repeated in many places, further in the text.

27). The last sentence of page 76, first paragraph reads, “Thus umma labeled bapa, ‘Shrimp-dealer Adima.’” However, in the original, it is “Chemmeenadima.” and it need be only Shrimp-Adima,” since Kunjuthatchumma’s withering scorn of her failed husband would be better expressed only through such a term, and not through the somewhat respectful “dealer” attached to it. That is precisely why Basheer himself didn’t mince the word: he coined it just the way it is: “Chemmeenadima.” Throughout the text, this word is repeated.

28). In the second paragraph, fourth line: “The men smelt; the surroundings also smelt,” is an inaccurate translation. What is said in the original is that: [“One would smell: so would the premises” (TPR)].

29). In the third paragraph, third line there is the expression, “started selling mutton.” However, in the original it is, [“when he began butchering goats” (TPR)].

30). In the fourth paragraph, just before “tall and straight,” there is also the
expression, “full of God’s grace,” according to the original, which is found missing in the translation.

31). On page 78, line 14, it is seen: “Between his teeth, bapa said softly: ‘I’ll kill you.’” It has to be really, [“Gnashing his teeth, bapa said softly: ‘You die...’” The husband and wife!” (TPR)]

32). In the next line is the world, “neck.” This word has to be “gullet.”

33). One paragraph further down, we find: “There’s no need to cry, child!” said bapa. However it should be, [“My child, don’t cry” (TPR).]

34). On page 83, first paragraph, last line has, “She fumed!” It has to be “She burned!”

35). On page 87, last paragraph, third and fourth lines, we find: “Umma wants to give a hasty opinion.” It should really be, [“Umma wants to butt in...”] (TPR).

36). On page 88, second paragraph, last line ends, “...it was all dried up.” This is a very literal translation. It should have been, [“It was healed perfectly” (TPR).]

37). On page 91, just after the middle of the page, we come across: “At school they call me Aisha Bibi.” However, it has to be either, “At college,” or “at the university,” since “school,” in a Kerala set-up means literally the Class One to Ten course of study every child undergoes.

38). On page 92, line four, the “stream in front of our house,” is “the small dry stream...”

39). On page 94, after the middle of the page, there is the line in which
Aisha tells Kunju patti umma, "...tell your umma right away not to come so close to us to relieve herself..." There is one part more. Aisha asks her, ["Won't it stink?"] (TPR) This part is missing from the TL text.

40). On page 95, first line: "a university-educated girl." In the original, it is, ["...a girl who had a B. A."] (TPR).

41). On page 103, first paragraph, last sentence is: "As usual, umma went to use the small stream." This should actually be, according to the SL text, ["As usual, umma relieved herself, squatting in the small stream and climbed back onto the bank" (TPR).] If not, umma's later accusation that Nisar Ahmed peeped when she was squatting would be proved true! This is also a case of inaccurate translation of a crucial sentence.

42). On the same page, a line later we see, "Umma turned in a frenzy." It should be, "Umma turned around in a frenzy."

43). On page 105, second paragraph reads, "The public thoroughfare is not a place for people to ease themselves," said Nisar Ahmed. In the original it is found this way: [Nisar Ahmed said, "Is the public road not for people to defecate or urinate? It is meant for walking along. Do not make it dirty. Do not make it stinking" (TPR).]

44). On page 106, in the first paragraph of the Chapter, 2nd line, there is mention of a string "dedicated," by the khatib. It is really "chanted upon" according to the original.

45). On page 114, first paragraph, sixth line, there is mention of live coals. "Coal" is not in use in Kerala homes. It is either "live charcoal," or "embers."
46). In the same line there is mention of “candles on earthenware dishes.” This is what happens when one is confused about culture-specific items. It should be [“earthen-ware wick-lamps” or “chirags” (TPR).]

47). Page 114, third paragraph, first line mentions: “over her head.” It is actually, [“waving it around her head in a clockwise motion…” (TPR).]

48). On page 116, in the third paragraph, we come across the phrase: “…how bright the light is.” It is but a commonplace statement. But the original is somewhat like this: [“How bright brightness is!” (TPR)]

49). Chapter Eleven: “The new generation is talking.” The title should be [“The new generation speaking” (TPR).]

50). In the second paragraph sixth line we see, “Specially cooked rice…” It is in fact “ghee-rice,” according to the original. “Ghee-rice,” is a popular and common dish in Kerala, especially among the Muslims, and it is also an Anglo-Indian expression. Why was it not adopted by the translators, is not clear.

51). On page 118, the word “bakanta” is translated as “vagabond.” We have already seen the same word on page 20, in Childhood Friend wherein the translators have gone for a far-fetched translation, “with appetites like the demon Vaka.” The present researcher has given the nearest translation therein, as “pestilence.” The same thing applies here also. It is sad to note the inconsistency of the translators.

52). “Ant-lion” turning into an “elephant ant” in the last but one paragraph of the same page, is interesting. What Asher has stated in the “Note on Translation” notwithstanding, the freedom taken to coin a new word in the place of an
already existing word appears to be quite arbitrary. This particular word, coined to be the equivalent of “Kuzhiyana,” which is a common enough word in Malayalam, has only a one-time use in this instance as it is used to contrast the tiny insect against an elephant, that is always described as a “huge tusker,” and which embodies the blind pride and arrogance of Kunjuthatchumma and the symbolically, the backward Muslim community of those times which Basheer intended to reform.

_Pattumna’s Goat_

1). The sub-title of the novel “Pennungalude Buddhi” in Malayalam is translated as the “Wisdom of Women.” This is an incorrect translation, as this phrase is directly connected to a proverb in Malayalam: “Penbuddhi pinbuddhi” which means “the cleverness of women will enable someone only to slide back” or “the cleverness of women ends up in failure” or something similar. Moreover, at the end of the novel, the narrator wonders, “Which of the women was to have the first brain-wave.” So, this is a brainwave, or cleverness resulting from sudden inspiration or intuition. Hence it is not at all “wisdom.” Therefore, [“Cleverness of Women” (TPR)] would be a good enough translation for the sub-title.

2). In the third paragraph, in the middle, is the mention of a “hibiscus” tree. The word “shoeflower” was used on page 10. Inconsistency has been pointed out earlier also.

3). In the fourth paragraph, fifth line, the word “roof-space” is found. It has to be “attic.”

4). On page 137, third paragraph, on the second and third line, we see the expression, “…The crow turned its head on one side…” It is a clumsy construc-
tion. It actually is, ["The crow looked askance at me..." (TPR).]

5). On page 138, sixth line, we across, "the same side of the house." It is
]\["...this side of the house" (TPR).]

6). On page 139, towards the middle, we find "...a few round stones." This
is ["...a few round pebbles" (TPR).]

7). On page 140, third paragraph from the bottom, last but one line, we
come across the word, "flit." It should be actually, "shift."

8). On page 141, second paragraph, we across, "Stupid twit" used as an
equivalent of "Ulladathipparu." This is a form of taunt used by the child Laila.
"Ulladithipparau" literally means ["the woman Paru of the Ullada tribe" (TPR).]
This is a common way of taunting children resort to, calling peers by some such
caste or tribe names, sometimes in jest. "Stupid twit" is not an equivalent expres-
sion, but a parallel one. This word expression has been repeatedly used in the text.

9). On page 142, the word "banana" is used a couple of times, as equivalent
of "njalippoovan pazham" which is essentially "plantain" and not "banana." In the
Kerala context, "banana" means the big, "ethappazham."

10). On page 149, in the paragraph that comes after the conversation part in
Chapter Two, there is the expression, "Did you see it piddle! Did you see it
piddle!"

This is a gross mistake. The original Malayalam expression is "Mullanathu
kandilla" which means, ["that with which he pees is not to be found" (TPR).]
What is described is not an enquiry into the act of piddling: it rather refers to the
tool with which one pees! Remember, the goat had eaten up the front area of Abi's
shorts, as the child had put an appam in his pocket, and the goat had smelled it and tried to grab at it. Then, the natural outcome will be the disappearance of the male member together with the fabric! The child exclaimed fearing that.

11). At the end of the page, is the expression, “calling him bad names.” It is too literal a translation; what is essentially meant is that the child shouted at the goat.

12). On page 150, second paragraph, second line, there is the expression “rice cake.” This is the equivalent of “appam.” This word should have been retained and glossed. This is a culture-specific item, overlooked by the translators.

13). On page 152, towards the middle of the page, mention is made about Mr. Narayana Pillai. The original carries the name “Puthusseri Narayana Pillai Sir.” This expression, while addressing the person directly, or making mention about one’s teachers or superior officers, is prevalent throughout Kerala.

14). “Who taught us ABC” is a poor equivalent, which does not signify anything. The linguistic difference is so much between “ABC” and “A, Aa,” of Malayalam that it does not serve any purpose. It would have been better if it was stated, [“...who taught us the alphabet” (TPR).]

15). On page 153, tenth line from the bottom: “I struck him on his good leg.” This has to be, [“I kicked him on his good leg” (TPR).]

16). Last but one line on the page, “Why didn’t you think of that sooner,” would be more accurate if it is: [“Couldn’t you think of that any earlier?” (TPR)]

17). On page 154, last paragraph, fifth line, “a knob of it” will be [“a morsel of it” (TPR).] The same word is repeated on page 155, in the second line.
18). On page 158, third paragraph, last sentence: “What cheek,” is not in the original. In the original, it is “phoo,” or the sound of the forceful blowing out of beedi-smoke.

19). On page 159, fourth paragraph, second line, the word “tamarind tree” is there. It is given as the equivalent of “irumpi puli,” which is wrong.

20). On page 160, the first sentence of the chapter: “So Pattumma’s goat was about to give birth,” has to be [So Pattumma’s goat is truly going to give birth (TPR)] according to the S L Text.

21). On page 162, first line, “Pattumma went off and started grumbling…” would be, “…shouting…”

22). On page 167, second paragraph, there is the mention of “astrologer.” It is supposed to be the equivalent of “Kaniyaan.” However, this is not the case. “Kaniyan,” at least in the Kottayam district, are mainly physicians; they astrologers only by chance. When Basheer says that [“The Kaniyaan was then the big physician” (TPR)] what he means is that the biggest medical attendant available around the locality in those times was the “Kaniyaan” who is at the lowest rung of indigenous medicine practice in the land. Moreover, there are two short sentences missing in the T L text. [It’s Ayurveda that’s involved. We must observe how it goes (TPR).]

23). On page 168, third paragraph, second line, “my innocence” would be “purity of my heart,” to be closer to the S L text.

24). In the same paragraph, fifth line, “looking for fleas,” should be “looking for lice.”
25). On page 177, second paragraph, third line, there is the word, “betel-nut bag,” as an equivalent to “vettavatti.” “Vettavatti” is not a bag; it is a pliable, purse-like thing woven from screwpine leaf. And if anything, it is not “betel-nut bag” but rather “betel-leaf purse.” The word “vettavatti” should have been retained and glossed as a culture-specific item.

26). On page 179, in the fifth line after the long first paragraph, Aishomma says, “...We’ll cook kanji and curry for the government.” This is an unimaginative literal translation. In Malayalam, the expression, “Kanjiyum kariyum vecholaam,” means [“I’ll cook” (TPR).] Going into the “kanji and curry” part is absurdly literal.

27). On page 187, towards the middle, there is the statement: “Khadija’s bapa joined a savings club.” It’s rather a “chit fund.”

28). It is felt that the kinship terms and forms of addresses used in the S L text should have been retained and glossed. For example, “elder brother,” “elder sister” should have been “ikkakka” and “ithatha,” throughout in the place of the occasional use. At least, in the vocative form the first letters of the words should have been in upper case: e. g. Elder Brother, Elder Sister etc.

29). In the glossary, on page 203, the word tali is explained as, “a thread, of gold where possible, tied round an Indian bride’s neck by the bridegroom.” The crucial piece of metal concerned, which is tied on the thread, is not mentioned at all! It is a pity that such an unfortunate error should creep in, of places, in the glossary.

Katha Classic: Basheer

Linguistic problems abound in this translation. Such a unique style like Basheer’s
does not yield easily to translation. Hence, one can understand the use of a neutral, standard language. However, howlers arising out of a translator's poor knowledge of Malayalee culture, are many in the TL text. One example: On page 159, in “Ettukali Mammoonhu,” there is mention of Ettukali Mammoonhu by his other nickname, “Coat Mammoonhu,” in paragraph four.

“Coat Mammoonhu,” was another of his names. This was because, while playing cards, Mammoonhu would invariably ask, “Do you have a coat?” This is such an unfortunate error, but certainly arising out of ignorance. The translator has not understood what she is doing. The reference is to the card-game called “Twenty-eight” in which Jack is considered a trump card. In this game, when a bidder stops short of bidding for “honours” or declares that the team would secure twenty points, and settles for a lesser point than twenty and fixes the auction and the game proceeds and at the third or fourth round of play, if, by chance, the team appears to be able to win all the rounds, the opponent challenges the player in whose control the cards are at the moment, [“Do you quote?” meaning, “Do you now wager that you will win all the rounds?” (TPR)] This is what the translator in question, has blindly translated as “Do you have a coat?”

*catching the elephant and other stories* by M. T. Vasudevan Nair

Apart from the sparse glossary appended at the end, there are no notes to explain linguistic and cultural aspects faced in the translation of the stories. Kinship terms (e.g. Valiyamma, Edathi,), forms of address (Kuttiyedathi, Januedathi), titles or class-name (Muthalali), words describing food (kadumanga), dress (thorthu, mundu), forms of greeting (Namaskaram), and the like are retained
in the most natural way, as an integral part of the TL text is a step in the right direction.

_Arab Gold_

The title page of the book betrays the ignorance of the editorial staff of the publishing house; the work is described as “Translated from the ‘Malayalee’ original...” instead of “Malayalam.” The translation is in a racy, natural style, befitting the pace of the original. The culture-specific and linguistically unique terms are retained as far as possible, in a very sensible manner. For the rest, a glossary is appended at the end.

_Roots_ By Malayattoor Ramakrishnan

1). On page 98, there is the description of the elaborate ritual of exorcism. The translation is quite tenuous here.

2). Palachuvattil Kaniyan is a stock reference to any accomplished astrologer, and not to one particular “Kaniyan of Palachuvattil House.”

3). The idea of “poisoning” is not brought out well. This is what is called “Kaivisham” in Malayalam, and it does not refer to any organic or inorganic poison. It is a magic spell done on some eatable. When the victim eats this, he or she will suffer from a number of evil effects. The “kaivisham” can linger in the body system even for decades. When, finally, the same is made to vomit out using magical preparations to be drunk by the victim, the food stuff in which the “kaivisham” was administered would be vomitted out, even if the same was consumed decades ago, according to popular belief.
Pandavapuram By Sethu

1). On page 68, second paragraph, a typically Malayalam proverb is subjected to rank-bound translation which is against the norms. “Ariyum thinnu Asaarichiyum kadichu, ennittum pattikku murumuruppu.” goes the proverb which literally means, [“The dog has eaten the rice, bitten the carpenter woman, and yet it still growls” (TPR).] It is mentioned here as, “They say that after eating the rice and bitten its mistress, the dog still growls.”