Chapter III

TRANSLATIONS AND ADAPTATIONS OF SHAKESPEARE (Part Two)

TRAGEDIES:

There is an almost complete absence of tragedy in the classical drame of Sanskrit, although the sense of ‘painful mystery’ is not lacking, and from this drama most of the Indian languages derived their inspiration in the early stages of their development. In Shakespeare, Indians, for the first time, came across a genuine tragic atmosphere which gripped them with its novelty and charm. Many of them endeavoured to reproduce it in their works, though quite a few succeeded in their efforts.

*Titus Andronicus*, the least popular of all the tragedies of Shakespeare, has had only two versions: one is a prose narrative, *Titus Andronicus* (1914) by Ganga Prasad, and the other is an adaptation *Junun Vafa* (1910) by A.B. Latif ‘Sad’, which was originally rendered into Urdu but later on put into the Nagri script. Like other adaptations for the Parsi stage, this adaptation too is weak and faulty and takes too many liberties with the plot, though it retains the original names of the characters and places.

*Romeo and Juliet*, Shakespeare's famous love tragedy
has had several versions, out of which *Romeo aur Juliet - Do Mitra* (1884) by Kashinath Khattri, *Romeo Juliet* (1912) by Shiv Prasad Dubey, *Romeo Juliet* (1912) by Jai Vijai Narain Singh Sharma, and *Romeo Juliet* (1922) by Ganga Prasad are in the form of prose narratives. Gopinath Purohit's *Prem Lila* (1896) is a close translation in prose and verse. As pointed out by the translator himself in his preface, he does not lay a 'sacrilegious hand of pruning and clipping at his sweet will on such a perfect work filled with nectar-like sentiments'. He aims at making Shakespeare intelligible, keeping himself as close to the original as possible. And, in this attempt, his translation becomes a slavish imitation, so much so that he not only retains English thoughts and sentiments as they are, but also ineffectively copies the turns of English expression. The translation is, nevertheless, redeemed by certain sparkling passages in fine verse.

*Bazme Fanî* (1897) by Mehr Hasan is a crude adaptation of the lyrical tragedy. Everything ends happily after the death of Paris at the hands of Romeo in a combat. The Shakespearean spirit fades out in the lewd jokes of the court fool Jarif and in the Bachanalian atmosphere of the court of Emperor Shaha. Romeo also indulges in voluptuous dialogues and songs much against the spirit of the idealised tragic love of the original. Mercutio and the nurse do not
have the same importance as in Shakespeare's play. The piece has no literary merit whatsoever. *Romeo Juliet* (1911) by Chaturbhuj Audichya and *Surendra Sundari* (1912) by Seth Govind Das are novels based upon the story of the English play.

*Prem Kasauti* (1931) by Lala Sitaram is not a literal translation; the author takes the sense of the passages of the original and puts it into Hindi. The translation fails to catch the spirit of Shakespeare as should be clear from the translation of the 'prologue' which seems to be an independent composition of the translator and has little to do with Shakespeare's text. Though the names have been Indianised, yet the scene opens in Varnanagar, a city in Italy as stated by the translator, and then shifts to Manmathnagar, another city in the same country. This confusion of Indian names for Italian cities and persons leads to oddities. The translation is in prose with a sprinkling of commonplace verse here and there. At one or two places, the translator renders it beautifully. Romeo says: "Sad hours seem long". The Hindi translation puts it admirably: ॐ के घड़िया लेन जाती है। And the second scene of the second act begins beautifully. How admirably the spirit of the words: "He jests at scars, that never felt a wound", has been infused into the translation:

किसके परम हैं जिनके दिनां ।
सी केह जाने पौर परां ॥
The whole of this speech of Romeo conveys the idea that the translator here seems to be in his inspired moments. But such moments are very rare. For the most part, the translator fails to preserve the spirit of the original. Take, for example, another utterance of Romeo:

"She speaks:

O! speak again, bright angel; for thou art
As glorious to this night, being over my head,
As is a winged messenger of heaven
Upto the white-upturned wondering eyes
Of mortals, that fall back to gze on him
When he bestrides the lazy-pacing clouds,
And sails upon the bosom of the air."

This fine speech is rendered into the following colourless, prosain lines:

And again, Romeo says:

"Alack! there lies more peril in thine eye
Than twenty of their swords: look thou but sweet
And I am proof against their enmity."

Which is put thus:

Here the word 'क्षत्र' does not convey the same shade of meaning as the word 'peril' in the original. Such weak and inadequate expressions are frequent in the translation.
Rangeya Raghaves's *Romeo Juliet* (1957) is a literal translation in prose but the 'Prologue' at the beginning of the play is left out. The 'Prologue' at the beginning of the second act is however rendered beautifully into Hindi verse. The original names of the characters and places as well as the original allusions and references have been retained. The translator, to some extent, conveys the sense of Shakespeare but fails to capture the spirit. The very fact that this lyrical love tragedy is rendered into prose explains much of the loss of the charm of the original. The passages seem lifeless and the prose rings hollow. Sometimes the rendering is much confused and unintelligible. Romeo says:

"He jests at scars, that never felt a wound."

No attempt is made to give the proper Hindi equivalent of the original idiomatic expression. If we look into the translation of the fifth scene of the third act, we realize how stale it is in prose.

There is one more prose translation, *Romeo Juliet* (1961) by Shyam Sunder Suman, with the original names, allusions and references. From every point of view the work is a failure. The language does not convey the sense and sentiments of Shakespeare adequately. It seems to be the translator's first exercise in translation.
Of *Julius Caesar*, we have a rendering in prose narrative namely, *Julius Caesar* (1913) by Ganga Prasad and two full translations *Julius Caesar* (1915) by Lala Sitaram and *Julius Caesar* (1957) by Dr. Rangeya Raghava. Lala Sitaram’s prose translation is closely based upon the original and employs the original names, allusions and references. The translator puts the sense of Shakespeare's passages into simple Hindi and tries to convey the meaning faithfully. But the prose of the translation is not able to capture the spirit of the original puns and quibbles as is clear from the very first scene of the version. The translator’s eyes are always fixed upon presenting the apparent meaning and not on bringing out the beauties of the original. In support of our statement we may produce the following lines:

These lines of the Hindi translation when compared with the following immortal lines of Shakespeare appear to be quite insipid:

"This was the noblest Roman of them all;  
All the conspirators save only he  
Did that they did in envy of Great Caesar;  
He only, in a general honest thought  
And common good to all, made one of them.  
His life was gentle, and the elements  
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up  
And say to all the world, 'This was a man!'"
In the Hindi version, there is no equivalent for 'noblest Roman'; 'सुरक्षा' for 'element' is inadequate and युवा राज्य में है is not the appropriate translation of 'This was a man'. The whole passage does not strike us with the same force and vitality as the original does. Then, there are many other obvious discrepancies. Though the translated play is titled 'Julius Caesar', inside it reference is made to Julius Kaisar. The choice of words is also not very happy.

Dr. Ramgeya Raghava's translation is decidedly superior to all its predecessors. It adheres closely to Shakespeare's dramatic arrangement, and is a faithful prose rendering of the original. Its prose is definitely more polished and refined than that in Lala Sitaram's rendering. Yet it seems to lack something of the vitality of the original play. The speeches of Brutus and Antony ring hollow in prose and do not have the same appeal and fervour as their counterparts in the original. Dying Caesar says:

"Et tu Brute? Then fall, Caesar!"

We may dismiss Hamlet - Denmark Desh ka Rajkumar (1884) by Kashinath Khattri, Hamlet (1912) by Shiv Prasad Dubey,
Hamlet (1912) by Jai Vijai Narain Singh Sharma, Hamlet (1914) by Ganga Prasad, Hamlet (1960) by Dharm Pal Shastri, as they are mere story versions of Hamlet, one of the greatest tragedies of Shakespeare. Khune Nahaq (1898) by Munshi Mehdi Hasan, originally written in Urdu and subsequently put into Nagri script, is a free adaptation of the English play. The translation opens in the court with dance and music on the occasion of the wedding of Claudius and Gertrude. It preserves the main argument of the original but takes too many liberties with the plot; it alters and mixes up the events and incidents in a curious manner. There is no organic unity and several beautiful scenes are spoilt. The original artistic scenes have been replaced by pieces of crude farce which are not properly linked with the main plot. In two out of the seven farcical scenes so contrived by the translator, Hamlet himself appears and in one of them he kills Mansur (son to Cornelius), his rival in love with Ophelia, when he attempts to violate Ophelia's chastity at midnight in a churchyard. The adaptation exhibits the catastrophe in the play-scene which is placed quite at the end. The scuffle between Laertes and Hamlet takes place when in the course of the play Claudius turns pale and wants to go away but is prevented by Hamlet, who is his turn is intercepted by Laertes in his attempt to defend Claudius and in this scuffle Hamlet is wounded by Laertes with a poisoned
sword. The queen rushes to help him and demands a cup of syrup for him. Cornelius brings a cup of poisoned syrup to take revenge upon the prince as he has killed his son. Hamlet refuses to take it and the Queen, quite exhausted drinks it up and dies. Laertes then makes his confession. Claudius wants to run away but is shot dead by Hamlet who also dies. In the version Fortinbras and the Grave-Diggers do not figure at all. Hamlet appears as a melodramatic hero. Moreover, the pensive and tense atmosphere of the original is not at all reproduced. The love of Hamlet and Ophelia too has no appeal. The problem of delay and the problem of the Queen's guilt simply do not arise. Facile doggerels are needlessly thrust in on every occasion.

There is another adaptation, Khune Nahaq (?) by Munshi Arzu Sahib, written for the New Theatrical Company, Saharanpur, which was put into Nagri script by Shiv Ramdas Gupta. This is perhaps the same adaptation and Mr Shiv Ramdas Gupta wrongly ascribes it to Munshi Arzu Sahib. Nothing can be said regarding Nanak Chand Bhanot's Hamlet ka Hindi Anuvad, as no copies of this translation are available. Javant (1912) by Ganpati Krishna Gurjar is a translation mostly in prose but is interspersed with some verses and songs composed by Rupnarain Pendey and Pt. Govind Shastri Dugwakar. The translator points out in the introduction that his translation
was based on the text of Deighton's edition of *Hamlet* and that he also took help from Principal G.G. Agarkar's Marathi translation of the English play, entitled *Vikarvilasita* (1883). Thus, in a way, it is a translation of a translation. In it however Shakespeare is faithfully rendered into standard Hindi prose, act by act, scene by scene, almost line by line. Only a few minor changes are made. For example, in II, ii, the Hindu Polonius quotes some apt Sanskrit verses bearing on the youthful lovelorn condition of Hamlet; for Aeneas's tale to Dido and Priam's slaughter, striking use is made of the familiar and touching episode from Mahabharata relating to the story of Ashvatthama's death in tolerable Hindi verse; and Hecuba gives place to Kripi, the old mother of the Hindu hero. The satire on contemporary performances gains in point as it exactly fits in with the defects of the medieval Indian stage. This Indianised translation lays more stress on depicting the sense rather than on giving word for word, and sometimes the translation becomes quite different from the original text.

We may take the following example:

"A little more than kin but less than kind".

But the Indianised allusions quite fit in and the translation is tolerably good.

A still closer translation of *Hamlet* is Lala
Sitaram's *Hamlet* (1915). It is all in prose but Polonius's advice to his son Laertes, the dialogues between Hamlet and a player, the scene of Ophelia's madness and the two quatrains in Grave-Digger's scene are in rhymed verse. Like his other translations, it does not Indianise the names, events and allusions and also adheres closely to Shakespeare's dramatic arrangement. Sometimes the translator condenses passages which are difficult to understand. In every way it decidedly marks an advance upon all its predecessors. The prose is chaste, noble and dignified; the sense becomes crystal-clear and the verses, particularly those recited by the players, do not degenerate into mere doggerel.

Equally close and successful prose translation is *Hamlet* (1957) by Dr. Rangeya Raghava. The prose is quite dignified and the rhymed verses in the scene in which Ophelia becomes mad and in the Grave-Digger's scene are beautiful. The translation is quite good.

Since *Troilus and Cressida* is represented only by a story version, *Troilus aur Cressida* (1914) by Ganga Prasad, we may proceed to examine the several versions of the most poignant of all tragedies, *Othello*. There are first of all, four story versions of the play, *Othello - Kapat ke Bure Parinam* (1884) by Kashinath Khattri, *Othello* (1912) by Jai Vijai Narain
Singh Sharma, *Othello* (1914) by Ganga Prasad and *Uthello* (1950) by Usha Khanna. *Othello* (1894) by Gadadhar Singh, *Othello* (1915) published from Laxmi Narain Press, Moradabad, and *Othello* (1916) by Govind Prasad Ghildiyal are close prose translations of the original and all are lacking in afflatus. These follow their model without Indianising characters, incidents or allusions, but their language is quite inadequate to convey the sense of Shakespeare's lines. Only Ghildiyal's attempt gains in point as it has some fine verses here and there which make it worth reading. Though it does not attempt Indianisation, yet Desdemona is named 'Deshdamini'. It has some sparkling passages but at most of the places it is weak and does not give adequate expression to Shakespeare's ideas. Gopal Goil's *Othello* (1911) is not available for assessment.

*Shaheede Vafa* (1898) by Munshi Mehdi Hasan, originally written for the Parsi stage and put into Nagri script by Shiv Ramdas Gupta, is a judicious adaptation and, as is usual with such adaptations for the Parsi stage, it does not thrust in an additional unrelated farce but prefers to develop the inherent comical elements in the tragedy, by caricaturing Roderigo to an extreme degree. Though the adaptation does not display the coarse buffoonery and the exploitation of foolish Roderigo to the fullest to please the
spectators, and is certainly better, it is not a very good attempt on account of its vulgar language and indiscreet use of dance and music.

Superior to all its predecessors is Lala Sitaram's *Othello or Jhuta Sandeh* (1915), with original names and allusions and following the original very closely in prose except for the verses at two places spoken by Iago and at one by Desdemona. Shakespeare's thoughts and sentiments are reproduced faithfully. But the translator puts the sense of Shakespeare's passages into his own. The very first passage bears out this point:

"Rod. Tush, never tell me, I take it much unkindly
That thou, Iago, who had my purse,
As if the springs were thine, shouldst know of this."

The translation is not exact. 'दुस्तारी चाली है कि फरीका है गया!' does not convey the sense of the words 'I take it much unkindly'. The original felicity of address in 'thou, Iago' is absent from the translation. Lala Sitaram omits all oaths and other expressions that convey a sense of emphasis or emotional stress. At many places the translation is much too inadequate. Iago says:

"Awake the snorting citizens with the bell,
Or else the devil will make a grandsire of you,
Arise I say."
Here 'बापा' for 'grandsire' is incorrect and the sense of the whole piece is quite missing.

Equally feeble is the rendering of the play by Vishnu Sharma entitled Othello. It also retains the names, allusions etc. and is a faithful prose transcript of the original. As pointed out in the introduction to the translation, the translator aims at giving a literal translation of the original so that one might study it along with the original English text. But in so doing he sacrifices the poetic beauty and felicity of expression; he even crudely imitates the turns of English expression as is clear from the opening speech of Roderigo:

The only way in which this translation improves upon that of Lala Sitaram is in its use of a more polished language. But the retention of original English words like 'त्रंपेट' (trumpet), 'सेनेटर' (senator), 'स्ट्रबेरी' (strawberry) etc. spoils the whole charm. Their too literal character makes the passages yield little sense at several places.

A better prose translation than all the previous
ones came from the pen of Rangeya Raghava in 1957 bearing the title *Othello*. It is much close to the original play. The puns and quibbles are retained and even explained in foot-notes. The translator, however, endeavours to convey the sense of the original passages into his own almost baldly, sacrificing in the process even the subtle beauties of Shakespeare's expression. An example will not be out of place. Cassio says:

"Madam, not now, I am very ill at ease, Unfit for mine own purpose."

The simple sense put into the translation is alright but the last sentence is clumsy. Again, Iago says:

"O, beware jealousy; It is the green-eyed monster, which doth mock That meat it feeds on."

The sense in the translation is finely expressed but the epithet 'green-eyed' translated as 'हरी आँख मालिका ' is not at all convincing as in Hindi it does not mean anything. The conception of Jealousy being green-eyed is quite foreign to Hindi. Despite such blemishes which involve some sacrifice of the poetic charm of the original, this translation is tolerably good.
In 1959, Harivansh Rai Bachchan, the well-known Hindi poet, brought out his translation of Othello. It is a faithful rendering of the verse portion in verse and of the prose portion in prose, with strict adherence to Shakespeare's dramatic arrangement, and is decidedly far superior to all its predecessors. Without any doubt, the lines are more dignified both in music and movement than the jingling thymes used in the other translations. His prose is similarly more polished, refined and poetic than the prose of Lala Sitaram or of Rangeya Raghava. It is remarkable that Bachchan has employed the well-known Sanskrit metre i.e. Rola, with rhymes left off, which matches well Shakespeare's blank verse. It conveys the same impression, charm and grace. Notice, for example, how effective is the following translation; it is as powerful as the original:

And the whole passage in which Othello narrates how he won the love of Desdemona is excellently done into Hindi verse. In it the warmth of emotion, and the movement of the narrative
are as powerfully rendered as we find in the original. The whole of the third scene of the third act in which Iago's consummate roguery is revealed, is deftly reproduced. The following lines deserve special mention:

It is difficult to resist the temptation of quoting passage after passage from this admirable translation, but the consideration of space forbids it. Here we can experience the tempest of agony raging in the heart of Othello after Iago has sown the seed of Jealousy in his heart:
The whole of the touching scene between Desdemona and Emilia before Desdemona's death (IV, iii) is excellently rendered by the translator so as to catch the spirit of the original. Let us now see the other side of the picture. With all these sterling qualities, the translation has certain minor weaknesses. First it is obscene at one or two places. For example, Iago says:

Perhaps, in his zeal for closeness, Bachchan did not mind being obscene. It is true, Shakespeare puts it thus in his play, but the translator could have achieved the same effect by just giving a hint of it. Secondly, at times the choice of words is also not very happy, for example, 'ये बाद के घरे' for 'at one another's heels', 'रंगी' for 'a good wench', 'दुख्ता' for 'jealousy' etc. Thirdly, the translation has two distinct styles, one compounded of persianised Urdu and the other of Sanskritised Hindi. Sometimes both these styles coexist on one
and the same page. For example, in the third scene of the first act, the lines 176-58 patently smack of Persianised Urdu:

\[\text{नार फूल के यह धुष रिश्ते में इसके बाहर अशुरेन्द्री खे तो आप फिर गाज गिरे जो हास मुक्य पर कबीर बदल हेलदाइये लगाते}.

While the next five lines are in Sanskritised Hindi:

\[\text{मेरे गौर, तीन फिसवर हैं जब नबुंदर पर मेरा कहने स्वागतिक तैयार रही है सिवन पालन किया तो गोरी गोरी लिखित के सापा में वृंदुं सुप्त रापके मार जीवन किया शिकार तो जब तक मेरे पुत्रे हैं यह मेरा कहने मुथा अपकौं कोशा माझो। किसी हाथ ने मेरे पति हैं।}

Nevertheless, this translation adequately conveys the emotional impact of the original; its successful presentation on the stage during the same year is further evidence of the dramatic effectiveness and poetic merit of this translation.

Out of the eleven versions of King Lear, six are narratives in prose namely, Raja Lear ka Vratanta (1884) by Kashinath Khattri, Badshah Lear (1912) by Jai Vijai Narain Singh Sharma, Raja Lear (1912) by Shiv Prasad Dubey, Lear (1922) by Ganga Prasad, Badshah Lear (1950) by Usha Khanna and Raja Lear (1960) by Dharm Pal Shastri. In 1903 Pandit Badrinarain of Jaipur translated the English play and named it Snehpariksha. This literal translation is in prose with some commonplace
verses here and there. The dramatic arrangement of Shakespeare, the original names, allusions and situations all remain undisturbed in the version. Inspite of the weak language, the translation catches the spirit of the original sometimes and renders Shakespeare's lines well. But the too literal character and the translator's effort to retain even the puns and quibbles, spoils much of its charm and the pieces become prosaic and dull at places where they should have been poetical and interesting.

*Safed Khun* (1906) by Agha Hashra, turns the English tragedy into a three-act comedy with the usual insertion of fantastic, farcical, episodes and facile amorous songs. It makes most of the element of contrast between the several strongly drawn characters and emphasizes the moral purpose of the piece by making all the villainous characters perish and by rewarding the noble ones. Though the whole play departs a good deal from its original, it is in the last act that a drastic change is made with the addition of rhetorical songs. The play concludes with a spectacular scene in the court where Cordelia offers the crown to her father, who passes it on to her with his blessings after joining her hand with that of the King of France. The falling curtain sees the dancing girls in jubilee. The translation thus lacks the intensity of tragic appeal that is so characteristic of Shakespeare's masterpiece.
Badshah Lear (1911) by Chaturbhuj Audichya is only the story of the English play presented faithfully in the form of a novel. Lala Sitaram's Raja Lear (1915), like his other translations, is a faithful prose translation with a sprinkling of verse. The translation is close and literal but the wisdom of the Fool is not effectively put across. There is no poignancy in the speeches of mad Lear. The verses are also commonplace, and are mere doggerel. The translator reproduces the bare and simple sense of Shakespeare's passages but misses their poetical charm. For example, we may take the translation of the oft quoted passage beginning with "Come, let's away to prison;" spoken by Lear:

Here the slow movement of prose fails to convey the emotional intensity of Shakespeare's sinewy verse. Nevertheless, the translation is readable, and is as such superior to all its predecessors except Badrinarain's Snehpariksha.

Although Rangeya Raghava's translation, Samrat Lear (1957) is also in prose, it succeeds to some extent in conveying the sense of intense agony in the speeches of Lear and in
reproducing the poetical charm of the original. The translation is literal and painstaking. The habit of excessive condensation does not mar the beauty of Shakespeare's lines in this work as it does in Lala Sitaram's. We may compare the renderings of both the translations, of the passage spoken by Lear in the fourth scene of the second act. Rangeya Raghava puts it thus:

while Sitaram condenses the original speech quite a lot to put in the following form:

The latter translation of the passage is decidedly weak and inadequate while former expresses the sense of the original more precisely. Indeed, both in language and expression, Rangeya Raghava's translation of King Lear is superior to all its predecessors.

The last of the four great tragedies of Shakespeare, Macbeth has been translated by as many as ten persons, but five have rendered it into the form of prose narrative namely,
Macbeth - Kapati Badhik (1884) by Kashinath Khattri, Macbeth (1912) by Shiv Prasad Dubey, Macbeth (1912) by Jai Vijai Narain Singh Sharma, Macbeth (1913) by Ganga Prasad, and Macbeth (1960) by Dharm Pal Shastri. Mathura Prasad Upadhyay's Sahsendra Sahas (1893) is a prose translation with plenty of verses sprinkled all over the piece. The atmosphere, the names of persons and places are Indianised. Macbeth is Sahsendra, Lady Macbeth is Tadita, England is Shwet Dweep, and so on. In the beginning, 'Prastavana' and 'Nandi' on the pattern of Sanskrit dramas are added but no change is brought about in the dramatic arrangement of the original play of Shakespeare. The whole translation is in prose but the scenes of the Witches are all in verse, of which the metre well corresponds to its original. He himself says in his 'Preface' to the translation:

"These I have attempted to put into language and metre as much like the original as my own humble pretensions to Hindi and its parent Sanskrit would admit of."

At places the translation has brilliant passages, but such occasions are not many. Usually the language is rather stiff and monotonous owing to the constant use of Sanskritised Hindi. On the whole, however, it conveys well the sense of the original, particularly in the scenes of the Witches where the style of their conversations as well as the regularly irregular measure of their incantation is remarkably suited to their weird and
terrifying pranks. It is laudable as the first successful attempt at presenting a complete translation of the English play.

Lala Sitaram's, Macbeth (1926) is a close prose rendering, with only the scenes of the witches in verse. The original names, allusions, expressions etc. have been retained. The Hindi verse of the scenes in which the witches figure is certainly superior to Mr. M.P. Upadhyay's verse. It is noteworthy that Lala Sitaram adapts the metre in Hindi very aptly to the original:

The translation of the first scene of the fourth act breathes, to some extent, the same spirit of loathesomeness which is present in the original. The other scenes are also good. The prose is chaste and polished. But sometimes the translator condenses the original passages at the cost of meaning and poetic charm. The famous passage beginning with 'She should have died hereafter;' etc. is condensed so much that it almost loses its original effectiveness:

Indeed, such condensations mar the beauty of an otherwise fine version.
Macbeth by Vishnu Sharma is a close prose translation with original names, allusions etc. The scenes of the witches are also in prose with literal word to word rendering. In comparison with the other previous attempts like that of Lala Sitaram and M.P. Upadhyaya, it is disappointing. The others have graces of diction, music and poetry at least in the scenes of the witches while it fails there too being altogether colourless. It is too literal a piece, and, indeed, it does so much violence to the original that in most places the lines yield no sense and can be grasped only by reference to the original. Even the structure of sentence is too English to provide smooth reading.

We have another equally literal but better attempt at translating Macbeth in Rangeya Raghava's Macbeth (1957), with original names, allusions etc. Though entirely in prose, it tries to capture the spirit of the original by not copying the turns of English expression like its predecessor's - Vishnu Sharma's Macbeth, - but by putting the simple sense of the original passages into its polished and chaste prose. Despite these commendable features, this translation, being in prose, lacks much of the poetic charm of the original. The body, it seems, is there but the soul is missing.

Harivansh Rai Bachchan's Macbeth (1957) is a
memorable contribution and perhaps the first Hindi version of Macbeth to be staged. It is in unrhymed verse (in Rola metre) devised by Bachchan himself to match Shakespeare's blank verse. The prose portion of the original is rendered into refined and chaste Hindi prose. The translation is close and faithful, reproducing Shakespeare's thoughts and sentiments with great mastery and skill. Notice the following lines (I, v) uttered by Lady Macbeth:

The lines run on with great dramatic vigour. There is variety and freshness in the following lines of the same scene:

..
Or notice how beautifully and faithfully the translation of the famous passage: "She should have died hereafter" etc. (V, v, 17-28):

The scenes of the Witches have also been finely rendered. The first scene of the fourth act breathes the same spirit of loathesomeness as is found in the English play. The scene in which Lady Macduff and her son figure is very touchingly reproduced. The language and sentiments are well proportioned so as to produce a lasting effect. It is indeed a very successful translation.
Antony and Cleopatra has one prose rendering in narrative form namely, Antony aur Cleapatra (1914) by Ganga Prasad and two adaptations Kali Nagin (1906) and Zan Mureed (1909). Both the adaptations were originally made in the Urdu script for the Parsi stage and then rendered into the Nagri script. These take extraordinary liberties with the original play and effect startling changes. In the first adaptation i.e. Kali Nagin, Cleopatra dies and Antony recovers from his wounds to repent upon his folly, to regain his throne, and to be reconciled to his wife, his brother, his son and his rival Octavius. We may go through page after page of the version and look in vain for either the genius of "the serpent of old Nile" or of her "man of men". Cleopatra's intellectual charm and tragic grandeur are all gone. The adapter wants to impress upon us the vile nature of Cleopatra and to thrust his own fancied moral ideas down our throat. Like other adaptations for the Parsi stage this too is liberally interspersed with items of crude music and dance which are neither dramatic necessities nor well-worded. The other adaptation which is said to be more faithful to the original is not available.

Coriolanus is represented by only one prose narrative, Coriolanus (1914) by Ganga Prasad, while Timon of Athens has been put into four prose narratives namely,
The analysis given above of the various translations and adaptations shows that, in Hindi, there are less translations and more adaptations, their ratio being 2:3. These translations and adaptations, with the possible exception of Harivanshrai Bachchan's attempt, hardly come up to the mark. They are generally rendered into prose and thus ignore one of the most essential characteristics of Shakespeare's plays i.e. the grandeur and majesty, the music and poetry of their verse. And if an attempt is made by some of the translators to put them into verse, it is only in jingling rhymes without much sense or colour. The prose as used in these translations is also not of a very high order; at its best it conveys the sense of the original in a bald unpoetical style and at its worst it tends to be unintelligible and obscure; even atrocious in structure. Some of the translations are literal and both chaste and idiomatic in language yet they do nothing more than convey the general meaning of Shakespeare's plays without adequately imitating the character of his verse. It is only in rare cases, like Bachchan's, that they can command attention for independent
literary worth of their own and can be treated as dependable substitutes for their original. All prose translations are not necessarily lacking in the Shakespearean spirit, but their number is very limited.

Much ink has been spilt over the issue of translation versus adaptation. Obviously, the whole world of critics and translators themselves is divided into two camps: those who prefer adaptation and those who prefer pure and literal translation. Both have their own arguments to advance. Let us analyse them with special reference to Shakespeare.

Those who prefer adaptation, put forth the argument that it is meant for those who are ignorant of English and have no access to the original. And, to make the version agreeable and acceptable to these people, it is necessary to modify and adapt anything in the original which may create a feeling of strangeness or unintelligibility.¹ Thus, they stand for Indianisation of the names of the characters, of the divergent foreign customs and manners, sentiments and ideas and other such items. This view, in support of adaptations, is not wholly acceptable. It is not true that a translation is meant only for those who do not have an access to the original. Translation is

¹ S.C. Gupta, Shakespeare in India, pp. 127-37.
an art and is a 'symbol of human tradition and continuity'.
To regard it merely as a sop for the ignorant is to close our
eyes to the fact that translation serves as a food and
discipline for the development of a young language. Through
translation one language communicates with another to derive
benefit from its abundant reservoir. J.S. Phillimore says:

"By translation a language both learns what it is
lacking in - the beginnings of change are in the
imagination: till it be awakened, a language like
a mind may remain sunk in self-unconsciousness and
quiet hereditary fatuity; and again, by translation
it learns how to make good." 1

Latin, French and English improved themselves by translation
from Greek.

It is not only the language which gains by
translation, but the translator himself also gains thereby.
The exercises in translation may help a translator to attain
easy abundance, simplicity and improved fluency of pen. 2
He may acquire some phrases, some images and, what is more
important, the felicity of expression. The translation may
serve as a disciplinary process for him. Dryden acquired that
discipline by translating Virgil, and Pope by translating Homer.
All great artists have done some translation work before coming
into their own.

1. J.S. Phillimore, Some Remarks on Translation and
   Translators, p. 7.
2. Ibid., p. 8.
Moreover, an adaptation may be similar to the original but it need not be identical. We may call it a parallel re-creation. Thus, an adaptation of Shakespeare would be anything but Shakespearean. It would not represent the real Shakespearean spirit which could have edified our language and literature but a superficial image of it.

Bachchan, in his preface to the translation of Shakespeare's Macbeth, rightly retorts a suggestion made by the 'Indian Express', a daily paper in English in respect of his attempt that he should have made it an adaptation:

There seems to be a widespread belief that translation is possible only when the two languages, the original and that of the translation, are equivalent in point of expressiveness - have a competent wealth of vocabulary economised by good taste. No doubt, perfect translation requires this condition but translation is possible even if the two languages are unequal in expressiveness. In this case the junior language will enrich and improve itself by the process of translation. This is exactly the case with Hindi. A Hindi

1. H.R. Bachchan, Preface to his translation of Macbeth, p.11.
translator has to find phrases and expressions to translate suitably the plays of Shakespeare. The task is a challenge to his mental resources.

The work of translation is, no doubt, a double-faced or 'two-horned task', as pointed out by Robert Bridges. A translator has to respect the genius of the original author as well as that of his own language. It would be impossible to find a translator with a capacity approximating to Shakespeare's unrivalled genius; but, definitely, he must be such a person as understands the genius of the great English dramatist in relation to the conditions of his times and to the conditions of his stage and also has a clear conception of Shakespeare's intent in a particular play. And, what is more important, the translator must be a good poet himself for Shakespeare was not merely a dramatist but also a great poet, for indeed, poetry is the abiding principle of all his plays. To translate Shakespeare into prose would therefore, mean missing altogether the music, the glow of thoughts and sentiments, and the warmth, life and colour of his plays. And then, the translator should be able to modulate his style according to the variation - rise and flow - of style in the original.

As for the capacity of the Hindi language, it may be pointed out that it has developed and is developing very fast, complain howsomon we may of the 'patrii sermonis exastes', 'the beggary of our national language'. Furthermore, it will enrich and improve itself by the discipline of translation. The translator would consider that such and such term or phrase has perfect neatness and unambiguity in Shakespeare, and would seek where he can find it in Hindi, or else, endeavour how he can get it made. Confronted with the problem or piqued by the challenge of keeping pace with Shakespeare's, Hindi would thus strain itself to unsuspected attainments.

Since Shakespeare is to be translated into verse mostly, the translator is confronted with the problem of metre. If it were a case of translating from another Indian language, the question would probably not have arisen at all because having a common root, they have much affinity of principle in respect of metre and versification. But there is the question of translating from a language of a different family. While the metre in the Hindi language is quantitative, it is accentual in Shakespeare's tongue. This is why, most of the efforts at translating Shakespeare's blank verse into rhyming couplet form or some other Hindi metre have proved abortive, as these have failed to reproduce the effect of the original verse. This problem has been solved to a great extent by Harivanshrai Bachchan
who has devised a kind of free unrhymed verse by using Rola—the traditional metre of Hindi with rhymes left off, having 14 matras—for his translations of Shakespeare's Macbeth and Othello. The worth of this measure was also proved when Bachchan's translations were successfully put upon the stage. This measure admirably corresponds to the effect of Shakespeare's iambic pentameter. Bachchan himself explains the choice of Rola thus:

One more problem confronts a translator of Shakespeare. While even the deepest shades of meaning can be conveyed through expression in the Hindi language, it is difficult to render Shakespeare's puns, quibbles and allusions which are typical outgrowths of the English way of life and thought. In fact, these are untranslatable. In such cases,

1. See Chapter IV of the present work.
it would be better either to render them imaginatively in terms of the translator's own real experience or to sacrifice them for the sake of the sense, instead of explaining them in foot-notes and making the translation cumbersome. In other words, the supreme business of the translator is to see that he does not do violence to the original and that his translation itself reads like a piece of original composition.