



ISSN 2348 – 6937 (Print)
ISSN 2348 – 6945 (Online)

Scholar Critic

AN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE,
LITERATURE AND CULTURE STUDIES

(TRIANNUAL REFEREED, OPEN ACCESS, ONLINE & PRINT JOURNAL)

Volume-1 Issue-1 April 2014

Editor

Dr. B. Siva Nagaiah

Honourary Editor

Prof. T. Nageswara Rao

www.scholarcritic.com

**Multiculturalism in Postcolonial Era and its affinity with
Comparative Literature and Translation Studies**

Narendra Kumar Jangid

*(Department of English and Comparative Literature)
Pondicherry Central University*

E-mail: narenkumarjan000@gmail.com

Abstract: Comparative Literature is the study of literature and other discipline ignoring the walls of nationality, linguistic, culture, socio-economic, and political etc., differences to move towards the notion of Goethe's 'Walt literature'. In the recent world the comparatists' responsibility is to bridge the gap between two far distant cultures, different languages and to different areas of knowledge. The main objective of this paper will be to provide the study of reception of a particular literature influences other culture and how it assists in forming bicultural and multicultural society through either Comparative literature or Translation studies. The concept of the world literature can be best realized in pursuance of comparative literature and its inevitable segment 'translation studies'. The spirit of original text envisages the entire world under a single umbrella and boundaries of national literature widen up to the universality of literary texts and earns readership throughout the world. By scanning the point of world literature and its process of extension in every soul of literary figure arrive on emergence of universality of culture, thought and reason, but my focus on the post-colonial prospectus on embedded culture which is problematic because of cultural differences and true depiction of the source language text. The paper focuses on different methodologies in Postcolonial approach for translation cannibalism and African methods of translation.

I

Comparative literature is a term, rather than an independent discipline; performs its function as an inter-discipline between literary studies and other fields of knowledge providing understanding of culture beyond one's own. In other words "Comparative Literature is a branch of literary study which traces the mutual relation between two or more internationally and linguistically different literatures or texts." Jean Marie Carre defines it as "a branch of literary history for it tackles the

international spiritual affinities.” Comparative literature is an intellectual approach to the study of world literature which goes beyond the walls of nations in terms of history, geography, linguistic, cultural and politics. It is kind of study which comprises of one literature with another, constructing the bridges between uncommon cultures and languages. Translation study is a kind of offshoot of the broad umbrella term Comparative Literature deals with linguistically different texts. Translation is a school of thought “carrying across” or “bringing across” language or in other words it is system of transmission of texts across literatures and cultures. It is process of decoding and Re-encoding from source language to target language.

Earlier the function of Translation considered as conversion of a text from one language to another, but in contemporary approach many other inevitable aspects brought into account such as culture, history, socio-economic positions of the period etc. Though language is the first point on which a translator heeds on, but language itself is an integral part of culture. The particular term ‘culture’ has no certain definition as such but can refers to all socially conditioned aspects of human life, and associated with three categories of human activity: ‘Personal,’ whereby we as individuals think and function as such; ‘collective’, whereby we function in a social context; and ‘expressive,’ whereby society expresses itself. As Harish Trivedi stated in his essay *translating culture vs. cultural translation* that “the translation of literary text become a transaction not between two languages, or a somewhat mechanical sounding act of linguistic... but rather a more complex negotiation between two culture”. Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere in their book *Translation, History and Culture (1990)* argues the presence of cultural in translation entitling the chapter “The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies” these “interdisciplines” are no more stick to conventional “Eurocentric beginnings” to enter “a new internationalist phase,” and they introduces a four-point common agenda that translation studies and Cultural Studies together address, “the way in which different cultures construct their image of writers and texts” a tracking of “the way in which the texts become cultural capital across cultural boundaries,” and an exploration of the politics of translation (Bassnett and Lefevere 138). Bhabha says: “Translation is the performative nature of culture communication” (Bhabha 228) Bhabha deconstruct the concept of ‘cultural translation’ rejecting all the norms applied conventionally such as two texts from two different languages and cultures, and translation is the process and condition of human migrancy, rather he uses the term “translational transnational” (Bhabha 173) that is the

condition of Western multiculturalism brought about by Third World migrancy. Sherry Simon also argues about cultural turn in translation, though she wrote with intention of projecting the conscious participation of feminist ideology in translation but she also accepts the contribution of cultural studies to translation:

Culture studies bring to translation an understanding of the complexities of gender and culture. It allows us to situate linguistic transfer within the multiple 'post' realities of today: poststructuralism, Postcolonialism and postmodernism. (Simon 1996: 136)

II

The intercultural communication in contemporary universal society by the medium of language which connects and transfers cultural and social values from one group of people to another. Translation is the process which constructs the bridge not only to exchange information but also cultural elements. The term refers to the intermingling of multiple cultures across the boundaries of linguistics, nations and religions. In contemporary ethnographical relativism of culture where anticipation of informality of cultures appears to be contradictory to each other. Differences of ideologies, religious and cultural values influence distinct community. It is a policy for managing the consequences of cultural diversity in the interests of the individual and society as a whole. All the group of people in different parts of the world cannot follow any absolute rules in common, but rather our ideas and conception about particular 'action' differs as our civilization progresses.

In the Postcolonial period there are influences and resistance to the colonizer's language and culture but an effort is made to establish neo-colonial linguistic culture. The differences of cultures and literatures become the leading topic to observe and discuss in Postcolonial period. Goethe's idea of "World Literature" was based on the humanistic approach which requires cultural aspects to discuss, and to extend further his idea Fawzi Boubia, Moroccan scholar, argues against the danger of an asymmetrical "assimilation of cultures" and emphasizes on the distinctness of marginal literature and cultures and the notion of the world literature has seen through communicative function in translation (285). But later this view was not completely accepted because of widely 'interrelatedness of

cultures' functioning in interdependent system of politics and economy. The new point of discussion arises where the individual identities of cultures are given much importance rather than finding the relevance between cultures under the name of differences. The binary dichotomy aspects like Western and non-Western, Occident and Orient, native and foreign were tools to represent the 'intercultural contact' and 'literary reception' but now its main intention is to define a particular culture with its own cultural identities by the projection of a complete otherness, which was achieved by the construction of an imaginary Orient. The new conceptions of world literature are process-oriented rather than canon-oriented and take into account the experience of cultural differences. With the emergence of so called Third World Countries a hierarchical order has established in cultures and literatures where the First World countries or West possess the power over the 'East' and a thread of 'power relation' is maintained. Tejaswini Niranjana presents the image of colonizer in Postcolonial era as 'still scored through by an absentee colonialism' (Niranjana 1992: 8). She focuses on the hegemonic eternal presence of ideologies and cultures of West. The translation of Oriental writings into English by colonial power to construct a self made image 'East' therefore a constructed image of East by the power structure accepted as true image by the whole world hence she calls literary translation as one of the discourses. Translation's role was pointed as the role within the power structure:

Translation as a practice shapes, and takes shape within, the asymmetrical relations of power that operate under colonialism. (Niranjana 1992: 2)

The power relationship in Postcolonial context reach on the point where Third World languages has to struggle against the 'one master language' of Postcolonial world, English, to preserve their own cultural values intact. This power of language bring closer to the notion of 'translational transnational'. Transnational refers to Diasporic writers 'living "between" nations as emigrants' for example Salman Rushdie and Amitav Ghosh. In the "post-colonial" world migration, exile, and diaspora are the terms widely used. These migrated, exiled and diasporic writers are not being "post-colonial" in native country, but writes about the "imagined communities" without experiencing the real slice of that community about which they writes. Such kinds of translations are not based on "original" cultures, for these have already been represented and "translated". The

diasporic writes like Salman Rushdie who writes in syncretistic cultural experience and the blending of cultures in their writings. As Rushdie's character in *Shame* representing author himself by saying, "I, too, am a translated man. I have been *borne across*". In such situations the act of translations has become questionable because the depth of the culture in original text is absent and there we come across the Arjun Appaduraj's notion of "deterritorialization" and "displacement" which means by the transfer, blending, and shifting of local experience towards new, multiple ethnic and social identities. Now coming on the recent topics of translation where the traditional manners of translating a text based on its rooted original culture and carrying the individual identity of source language text, and this conception of cultural translation takes a shift from its convention way to terms like Cannibalism and African contribution against the translated work through the Eurocentric point of view. Cannibalism is act of eating human flesh. The term is coined by Brazilian Translator Haroldo de Campos. This approach rises out of the Postcolonial approaches of translation in which translator devour the colonial text metaphorically, symbolizes the destruction of oppressive colonizer, and digest the source language and after thus taking the whole text in the mind translator supposed to write a new text from his own cultural point of view. Therefore this process refashioned the European culture and ideologies into a new creative work from its target language cultural point of view. African theory of translation described by the Wole Soyinka who opposes the tradition methods of translation by 'whites', colonizer learnt the languages of natives and translated the texts by their own point of view. In such translation the original culture of native land has oppressed and depicted negative picture of colonial countries. Therefore these methods in translations bring self-cultural identities in the foreign language text.

III

Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities* (1859) translated/adapted in Oriya by Godavarish Mishra entitled as *Athara Sa Satara* published 1940s. The original text is a historical account written in the hegemonic language about the French Revolution. Dickens avoids historical facts and moves into the fictionality that also captured the atmosphere of the time and presents it through the 'tale'. The French Revolution of 1789 is in background of the story but main focus on the consequences of it. Whereas Mishra's translated work covers the countries' struggle for Independence from the colonial rule. Since Mishra's work is kind of translation-cum-

adaptation creating a new text out of the source language. My observations will mainly focusing on a few aspects such as Title, Major Characters, Setting and context based on culture. Firstly, Dickens' title *A Tale of Two Cities* fascinate reader's mind towards unexpected 'tale' rather than to a historical writing, it also can bring waves of imagination about anything undefined in narrators' mind. The story tells a 'tale' of individual's life depicted in the novel against revolution out in world of corruption and exploitation where an undeclared fight between public society and individual life is always on. Whereas other title *Athara Sa Satara* radically marks specific number of year indicating a historical sense in which Oriya Militia known as *Paila* in Khurda rose against the colonial rule in Orissa. Mishra wrote this fiction in historical context connecting with the struggle of freedom against British rule. Secondly, the Characters in Dickens' fiction are merely fictional in nature (Charles Darnay, Sydney Carton and Jarvis Lorry, Lucie Monette and Miss Pross) because there is no bloodshed and hardship instead, he depicted the human feelings like kindness, revenge and selfishness therefore there is absence in of real revolutionary feeling in character that made his characters as fictitious. Whereas Mishra's player are factually real existed in the world and struggled against the British rule. Ganapati and Ghanashyama appear before reader as the Oriya versions of Darnay and Carton, the narrator of the Mishra's novel is a real actor of the history, Buxi Jagabandhu. Thirdly, the setting taken in two fictions is factual Paris and London in *A Tale of Two Cities* and Translated into Oriya with two kingdoms of Khudra and Badamba. Finally, Context, as I already mentioned it, completely based on culture of two different geographical spheres one is written in mid of the nineteenth century when there was a push to science and technology instead of constructing human morality and religious values therefore text deals with corruption and exploitation, horror of revolution brought by aristocrats etc. whereas the other work is completely rooted in historical context of 1817 when Indian freedom struggle got its first lit. The aim of the Indian people in that era was to sweep off the British and there was revolution in and out of the individual.

IV

The Postcolonial process of translation discussed above as Cannibalism and method contributed by Africans aim at the 'transformation' of an original into a new text. The Postcolonial notion of

re-writing against the grain implies in Mishra's adapted/translated *Athara Sa Satara*. It is proved that Mishra devoured *The Tale of Two Cities* and digested it with all its European cultural aspects and then he Re- writes an original out of the original text which suit to the culture of the land.

Notes and References

- Bassnett, Susan and Andre Lefevere. 1998. *Constructing Culture: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Dickens, Charles. 1859. *A Tale of Two Cities*, Heartfordshire, Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1993.
- Mishra, Godavarish. 1989. *Athara Sa Satara*, Cuttack, Cuttack Student Store.
- Cf. Arjun Appadurai, "Patriotism and Its Future", *Public Culture* 5 (1993).
- Fawzi Boubia, "Goethes Theorie der Alterität und die Idee der Weltliteratur. Ein Beitrag zur neueren Kulturdebatte", in: Bernd Thum (ed.), *Gegenwart als kulturelles Erbe. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturwissenschaft deutschsprachiger Länder*, Munich 1985.
- Said, Edward W. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*, London, Chatto and Windus.
- Ramakrishna, Shantha. 2007. *Translation and Multilingualism*, Delhi, Pencraft International.
- Prasad, GJV. 2010. *Translation and Culture: Indian Perspective*, New Delhi, Pencraft International.
- Niranjana Tejaswini. 1992. *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism and the Colonial context*. Berkeley: university of California Press.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2012. *Introducing Translation Studies*, New York, Routledge.