Translation as 'Reported' Verbalization: An Extension of the Theoretical Postulates of 'the Bakhtin Circle'

Amith Kumar P V

Department of Comparative Literature and India Studies

School of Literary Studies

English and Foreign Languages University

Tarnaka, Hyderabad 500007, India

Abstract

This paper seeks to critically investigate the notion of "reported speech" as envisaged by members of 'the Bakhtin Circle', especially Valentin Voloshinov, and attempts to understand the process of interlingual translation of creative literatures in the light of their specifications. The paper aims to understand the activity of translation metaphorically as transforming a source-text into a reported speech/indirect discourse. The central concern is to exemplify how Bakhtin Circle's observations on indirect discourse can prove to be effective strategies for a translator in communicating the semantic liveliness of the source-text. The paper is divided into three parts: the first part seeks to elucidate the Bakhtin Circle's views on indirect discourse; in the second, the purport is to provide a theoretical framework for understanding the activity of translation as composing an indirect discourse; and the third part seeks to exemplify the theoretical position with the help of a few examples from the translations of Marathi poetry and Hindi prose into English.

Keywords: the Bakhtin circle, Voloshinov, Indirect discourse, word-with-quotation marks, Saadat Hasan Manto

1. Introduction

Bakhtin Studies scholars such as David Shepherd, Craig Brandist and Galin Tihanov have emphasized the presence of "the Bakhtin Circle" in the post-revolution Russia. In their opinion, apart from Mikhail Bakhtin, three other literary theorists and philosophers (Valentin Voloshinov, Pumpianskii and Pavel Nikolovich Medvedev) were part of this "Circle" that had "an impressive lineage in Russian social, political and cultural history" (Shepherd 2004: 3). According to Shepherd, they were Bakhtin's associates in his intellectual and political endeavours, and have played a significant role in shaping his thoughts and ideas about dialogism.[1] The current scholarship is of the opinion that the author of *Freudianism: A Critical Sketch* (1927) and *Marxism and The Philosophy of Language* (1930) is Voloshinov, and *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship* (1928) is written by Medvedev. Shepherd terms Bakhtin's association with the other three members of the Circle as "centre and circumference" (Shepherd 2004: 1), thereby bringing to light the marginal status provided to these thinkers by scholars and critics. In Shepherd's words:

> […] even if there is a case for acknowledging that the naming of the Circle after Bakhtin has a certain practical validity, it does not follow from this that other members of the Circle may not have possessed intellectual credentials as great as, or even greater than Bakhtin's, or that their intellectual endeavours and achievements are best accounted for with reference to their association with Bakhtin (2004: 11).

One of the prime concerns of the Circle was to investigate the problems posed by Saussurean linguistics, and provide an alternative theoretical formulation to understand language. Voloshinov's *Marxism and The Philosophy of Language* is of particular interest here since it provides us with a trajectory of studies in linguistics in Russia till then. Apart from an inquiry into the social function of language, the book discusses the historical and sociological aspects of the word and the utterance. Voloshinov identifies two trends in the linguistic scholarship during his times; namely, "abstract objectivism" (Voloshinov 1973: 48) and "individualistic subjectivism"(Voloshinov 1973: 48). While "abstract objectivism" is a critical term Voloshinov utilizes to refer to the formal linguistic scholarship that rooted itself in "Saussureanism", "individualistic subjectivism" refers to the study of linguistic signs that are unique, individualistic and ideologically charged. His predisposition towards the latter is certainly obvious throughout the text.

However, it could be observed that the theoretical idiom and the conceptual framework provided by Voloshinov have not received much critical attention. Either his ideas are simplified as the theory of a Marxist language or simply understood as some postulates of Bakhtin's dialogical principles.[2] Both the assumptions are false since they underestimate the potential of Voloshinov's ideas. Partly, this marginal status accorded to Voloshinov's ideas is due to the forceful imposition of a peripheral place for him in the Circle. Authorship issues have received more attention than the ideas present in his text. In the words of Vladimir Alpatov,

> Unfortunately the problematic of the book is discussed more, especially in its authors' homeland, by philosophers and literary scholars than by linguists, although there is much of interest here. But the topic, '*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* and linguistics today' is in need of treatment in its own right (2004: 96).

Alpatov points out that it is extremely crucial for scholars and critics to take cognizance of the theoretical insights provided by 'the Bakhtin circle'. Debates on authorship, though important, can contribute very little to the extension and application of the theoretical principles.

2. A Theoretical Survey of "Indirect Discourse"

Voloshinov, in his social and historical investigation of language, presents a critical analysis of reporting and reported speech in the Russian language.[3] His exploration of the "author's" and "another person's speech" leads him to distinguish between three major and complex speech categories namely, direct discourse, quasi-direct discourse and indirect discourse (1973: 125). In his elaboration of direct discourse, Voloshinov's main concern is to understand the "reciprocal infectiousness between the reporting context and the reported speech" (1973: 133). Quasi-direct discourse, according to him, blurs the dividing line between the reported and the reporting speech and is characterized by half narration and half-reported speech (1973: 134). Distinct from these two types is the indirect discourse, "the pattern least elaborated in Russian," which envisages an analytical tendency that modifies the emotive features of the direct discourse by making them appear different (1973: 127). It transforms the form of the message into its content, and renders it in a new and different manner with adequate pictorial effects.

Indirect discourse is characterized by what Voloshinov calls an "analytical tendency" that interprets the message of the direct discourse. It elaborates, modifies and transforms the message to make it new and appealing, and hence, a mechanical transmission of the message is impossible here.[4] Indirect discourses vary in degrees and directions of analysis. Sometimes, the form of the message is transformed into the content. As Voloshinov writes,

> The analytical tendency of indirect discourse is manifested by the fact that all the emotive affective features of speech, insofar as they are expressed not in the content but in the form of a message, do not pass intact into indirect discourse. They are translated from form into content, and only in that shape do they enter into the construction of indirect discourse, or are shifted to the main clause as a commentary modifying the *verbum dicendi* (1973: 128).

For Voloshinov, the analytical tendency of indirect discourse "hears" the message of the direct discourse differently, and reproduces the message by interpreting its intonations and inflections. Imperative, exclamatory and interrogative sentences are modified in the indirect discourse, so much so that, their recognition becomes solely dependent on the content. It erases the punctuation marks like ellipses and substitutes them with modifying clauses and phrases. Voloshinov provides us with an example to understand the analytical disposition of indirect discourse:

> Thus, for example, the direct utterance, 'Well done! What an achievement!' cannot be registered in indirect discourse as, 'He said that well done and what an achievement.' Rather, we expect: 'He said that that had been done very well and was a real achievement.' Or: 'He said, delightedly, that that had been done well and was a real achievement' (1973: 128-29).

What acquire significance for Voloshinov are the alterations and innovations that supplement the message of the direct discourse. These creative infusions enrich the meaning of the direct discourse which otherwise would appear barren and indifferent. The analyzer who translates the message into the indirect discourse adopts certain modifying approaches. Voloshinov classifies these approaches as "referent analyzing" and "texture analyzing" modifications (1973: 130). The "referent analyzing" modification is preoccupied with the thematic significance of the message, and as such, it depersonalizes the message. Though Voloshinov mentions authors like Turgenev and Tolstoy's writings as instances that demonstrate, to a certain extent, the prevalence of this modification, he does not provide us with concrete examples from their texts. He asserts that this modification largely prevails in scientific, philosophical and political discourses in the Russian language.

Of particular interest is the "texture analyzing" modification which attempts to assimilate the idiosyncratic characteristics and the stylistic anatomy of the direct discourse. The distinctive features like contextual relevance, emphasis, typicality, collocation, inflection etc. of the utterance are absorbed and retained in this modification. These features are "made strange" and presented either with the help of complementary phrases/clauses or by utilizing quotation marks to express the peculiarities of certain words. In Voloshinov's words,

> The words and expressions incorporated into the indirect discourse with their own specificity detectable (especially when they are enclosed in quotation marks), are being "made strange", to use the language of the Formalists, and made strange precisely in the direction that suits the author's needs: they are particularized, their coloration is heightened, but at the same time they are made to accommodate shadings of the author's attitude – his irony, humor, and so on (1973: 131).

Voloshinov provides us with some examples from Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* and *The Idiot* to substantiate the operation of the "texture analyzing" modification. To quote one example from *The Brothers Karamazov* that demonstrates the operation of quotation marks:

Krasotkin proudly parried the accusation, giving to understand that it would indeed have been shameful 'in our day and age' to play make-believe with his contemporaries, other 13 year-olds, but that he did it for the 'chubbies' because he was fond of them, and no one had any business calling him to account for his feelings (qtd. in Voloshinov 1973: 131).

According to Voloshinov, the "texture analyzing" modification, with its modifying phrases and quotation marks, individualizes another person's speech. It captures and accommodates the "verbal envelop" of the speech that results in a high degree of pictorial effect in the indirect discourse. For Voloshinov, the "texture analyzing" modification is characterized by a critical and realistic individualism, as against the rationalistic individualism of the "referent analyzing" modification. Therefore, it entrusts itself with the task of critically evaluating the direct discourse and not merely mechanically transmitting the idea presented there. It allows the author to examine the speaker's utterance and comment upon its unique features.

A comparison of Voloshinov's word within quotation marks and Bakhtin's double-voiced words will certainly be an interesting endeavour. In Bakhtin's double-voiced words, an author conveys two intentions through a common word/utterance. As Bakhtin writes,

[…] an author can […] make use of another person's word for his own purpose by inserting a new semantic orientation into a word which already has – and retains – its own orientation. […] Then two semantic orientations, two voices, are present in a single word (1984: 156-57).

A double-voiced word is always a borrowed word or "the word of the other." Similarly, the word within quotation marks is also a borrowed word or expression that is a part of "another person's speech."

However, at least two differences could be observed here. While word within quotation marks is a stylistic device used to capture the idiosyncratic characteristics of another person's speech, double-voicedness is a larger phenomenon that attempts to coincide two semantic intentions despite their differences. Secondly, while the word within quotation marks is used to exemplify peculiarities and strangeness of words and utterances, double-voiced words are words that show both agreement and disagreement between the author and another person whose word the author uses. G. S. Morson and C. Emerson elucidate the subtle differences between Voloshinov and Bakhtin thus:

Voloshinov with his special interest in shared horizons and synthesizing dialectical processes, stresses how the elimination or overcoming of boundaries between speech acts facilitates complex communication. By contrast, Bakhtin tends to stress the importance of boundaries and of unmerged horizons, which provide the outsideness that ultimately makes all dialogue and all creativity possible (2001: 166).

3. The Indirectness of Translation: A Theoretical Elucidation

Translation is above all a communication process. A translator is a special and privileged reader who is entrusted with the task of communicating his experience of reading the source-text to the target audience. The meaning, content and significance the source-text carries should be "reported" to the readers of the translated text. In Roman Jakobson's words, "[…] a translation is a reported speech; the translator recodes and transmits a message received from another source. Thus translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes" (1959: 233).

This gives rise to a crucial problem, viz. the cultural voices that are unique to a specific culture might be devoid of any significance in another culture. The source-text written in a particular context, targeted at specific readers, when translated for a different culture might lose its multilayered meaning and relevance. Thus, the task of the translator is to effectively bridge the gulf across cultures. S/he has to mediate and communicate the belief systems, social tendencies, values and practices of the source culture to a new culture where such cultural predispositions might not exist at all.[5]

Hence, a translator has to embark upon interpretation and elucidation for his target readers. What is implicitly and indirectly suggested in the source-text, needs an explanation for readers belonging to a different culture. The semantic divergence needs to be linked by ways of modification and illustrations. In George Steiner's words:

[…] the mechanics of translation are primarily explicative, they explicate (or, strictly speaking 'explicitate') and make graphic as much as they can of the semantic inherence of the original. The translator seeks to exhibit 'what is already there'. Because explication is additive, because it does not merely restate the original unit but must create for it an illustrative context a field of actualized and perceptible ramification, translations are inflationary (1975: 277).

This "explicative" nature of translation calls forth an analytical tendency that examines the source-text in all its unique dispositions. The translator has to answer certain crucial questions. What facets and peculiarities of the source-text need an explanation for the target readers? What methods and strategies could be devised to create a similar perceptive context, without at the same time, mechanically transmitting the message? More importantly, how to maintain a dialogic concordance and yet preserve the semantic polarities of the source language/culture and the target language/culture? The practice of translation will certainly be a disorganized endeavour if the translator does not take cognizance of these questions. The theme, content and more importantly the form of the source-text might require a modification for the receiving culture. As B. Hatim and I. Mason explain:

> The form of a source-text may be characteristic of SL [Source Language] conventions but so much at variance with TL [Target Language] norms that rendering the form would inevitably obscure the 'message' or 'sense' of the text (1990: 8).

The native reader is aware of (sometimes, subconsciously aware of) the cultural significance of the form of the source-text. But, the target reader lacks such an acquaintance and consciousness. This situation necessitates the transfiguring of the form of the source-text.

A translator should have an "analyzable understanding" (Steiner 1975: 277) to formulate certain approaches to render the source-text for a new cultural readership. The resultant work is certainly a restating of the original work. As Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere assert, "Translation is, of course, a rewriting of the original text" (1990: ix). The translator has to manipulate the discourse of the source-text by aesthetically distorting the inner-dialogism of the utterances and by making them appear new for the target readers.

The discussion above theoretically formulates that it is possible to view translation as a kind of indirect discourse in Voloshinov's sense. A translator "hears" the message of the source-text differently. Elements like style, choice of words, intonation etc. are analyzed and their specific functions and operations are understood by the translator. And then, these features are explicated and interpreted, not by mechanically reproducing them, but by rewriting them for the target readers with the help of certain analytical techniques. At times, the form is transformed into the content in the translated text. Thus, in Voloshinov's sense, if the source-text could be seen as a direct discourse, then translator's rewriting could be viewed as an indirect discourse. The translator, through his/her analytical intelligence and critical acumen transforms the phonemic pattern and verbal accentuation of the source-text by interpreting and describing its semantic intensity in the target text.

4. An Analysis of Examples from Marathi Poetry and Hindi Prose

A few examples from Indian literatures and their translations into English could be examined in this context. G.V. Karandikar, one of the major modernist Marathi poets has translated many of his Marathi poems into English himself. His translated poems exemplify an analytical tendency that seeks to interpret and explicate his Marathi poems to the English readers. Karandikar, the translator (who is also the author of the original text), transforms his direct discourse by analyzing and modifying it, and by presenting it in a new form to the target readers.[6] Thus, the translated English utterances function as an indirect discourse to the original Marathi utterances.

Let us consider an example here. The poem "Chakra" has been translated by Karandikar as "The Wheel" (both the original Marathi poem and its English translation could be seen in Karandikar's *Poems of Vinda,*1975: 100-101). The poem throws light on the sense of alienation experienced by the persona who is puzzled at the cyclic monotony of routine life in the modern world. He (- the speaker is revealed to be a male by the verb form in Marathi -) is a part of such a bizarre humdrumness, and yet, is not able to participate in its ludicrous trivialities. The poem presents an existential dilemma between participation and disengagement, between mechanistic tediousness and sordid aloofness, and at another plane, between mundane fixities of life and the spiritual disillusionment that haunts the modern world.

The second stanza of the Marathi poem's translation by Karandikar himself reads as follows:

> My soul of flesh and blood puts a long thread in the needle's eye.
>
> I stitch a patch on my son's umbrella.
>
> I pick his nose and name the pickings,
>
> I call one "Elephant" and another "Lion".
>
> Someone is about to come and doesn't. Is about
>
> to turn on the stair, and doesn't.
>
> I tickle my children,
>
> they tickle me in turn; I laugh,
>
> With a will; for I do not feel tickled.
>
> It doesn't matter.
>
> I scan their fingers for signs:
>
> Nine conches and one wheel (1975: 101)

Karandikar's English translation demonstrates three important transformations. Firstly, his translation seeks to explain what is directly stated in the original poem; example,. in the expression "puts a long thread in the needle's *eye*," the image of the eye which is implicit in the Marathi poem is made explicit. Again in the utterances "I stitch *a patch* on my son's umbrella / I pick his nose and *name* the pickings," the expression "a patch" on the umbrella, and "name the pickings" are explanations in the translation that are suggestively expressed in the original Marathi poem [italics mine]. These additions, apart from interpreting the original utterances for the target readers, also exemplify the analytical mindset of the translator. Quite a few explanations of the type mentioned above could be observed throughout the translated poem. Thus, what is actually a sixteen-line poem in Marathi neatly organized into two stanzas of eight lines each, is translated into English as a twenty-seven-line poem, divided into two stanzas of fifteen lines and twelve lines respectively. It could be easily seen the repeated use of enjambment as a figure of speech in translation.

Secondly, in his Marathi poem, Karandikar utilizes ellipsis marks to suggest strains of anxiety and uncertainty. The fourth and the fifth line of the second stanza show these marks. The lines from the English translation read thus:

Some one is about to come and doesn't. Is about to turn on the stair, and doesn't.

It is noticeable that in his translation, Karandikar does not use the ellipsis marks. Rather, he conveys the anxiety of the Marathi utterances by translating them into crippled affirmative and negative statements. The erasure of ellipsis marks shows the analytical mindset of the translator who refuses to mechanically retain the form of the original utterance. The translator negotiates with the form by making the text/content more explanatory.

Thirdly, we can observe Karandikar utilizing quotation marks in his translation. In the fourth line of the stanza quoted above, words like "Elephant" and "Lion" appear in quotation marks. These marks are absent in the original poem. In order to emphasize the animal imagery Karandikar utilizes quotation marks. The reader of the translated text is encouraged to ponder over these words. We will return to a discussion of the quotation marks a little later.

All the three characteristics of Karandikar's translation demonstrate attributes of Voloshinov's indirect discourse. The source-text which behaves as the direct discourse is analyzed and transformed before rendering into the target language. Suggestively stated utterances and indirectly articulated expressions of the source-text/direct discourse are explained and modified, and are made to appear "different" in the target-text/indirect discourse. At the same time, a personal element is added that ratifies the presence of translator as an individual, independent of the author of the source-text.

In another translation, Karandikar alters the form of his Marathi poem so as to make it more lucid for his English readers. He translates the title of his poem as "I have a strange feeling" (both the poems could be seen in his *Some More Poems of Vinda,* 1983: 68-69). The poem deals with a sense of estrangement in the speaker's mind arising out of an existential insecurity. The sensitive mind of the speaker perceives a threat to his existence by imagining and hallucinating the operation of bewildering and mystifying powers. The Marathi poem is meticulously organized in the couplet form with a specific meter and rhyme scheme.

To quote the translation of the third and the fourth couplet by karandikar:

> Is it the sound of bangles?
>
> No, it can't be that.
>
> That doesn't belong to the room.
>
> It's something passing in the street.
>
> Outside, a leaning banana tree,
>
> And a leaf that's torn.
>
> Do I merely see its shadow
>
> Seated in the chair? (1983: 69)

The translation shows a transformation of the rhythmic couplet form into four line stanzas of free verse, and also a compensation for the absence of rhythm and rhyme through the use of elaborated expressions that tend to clarify the subtleties of the original poem. Again, punctuation marks like ellipsis are erased that demonstrate an exchange between form and content in the translation.

A noticeable aspect in Karandikar's translations is that there is certainly no generic change when the source-text is taken across the English language. That is, his English translations, retain their distinctiveness and identity as poems. But, they are certainly not poems in the sense in which his Marathi poems are. They are modified and rewritten for the readers of another culture. Their tone, texture and content are analyzed and explicated so as to revitalize the theme in a lucid manner.

Let us now shift our focus to the word-within-quotation-marks, an important and effective device for a translator to keep possession of and yet maintain a distance from the words of the author of the source-text. The word-within-quotation-marks reserves its peculiarities and uniqueness by securing for itself special attention from the reader of the translated discourse. It strikes as something uncommon and strange. The quotation marks infuse the expression with an individual identity, and keep it aloof from the rest of the words/utterances. They also allow the translator to add critical and ironic undertones that show that the expression is retained from the direct discourse and the translator would like to maintain a distance.

Let us consider the two translations of Saadat Hassan Manto's famous Hindi short story "Toba Tek Singh" that demonstrate the significant role quotation marks can play for a translator. The two different translations are by M. Asaduddin and Khalid Hasan. The story revolves around the insane protagonist Toba Tek Singh who is unable to understand and negotiate with the reality of partition between India and Pakistan. He claims to belong to a place called Toba Tek Singh, and is confused as to whether it is included in Hindustan or Pakistan after partition. Since the state authorities of the two countries decide to exchange the lunatics, the problem of locating Toba Tek Singh's native place which is not identifiable by the authorities on either side of the border acquires grave proportions. The story ends with the death of Toba Tek Singh on no man's land, between the borders of India and Pakistan. The story is an incisive commentary that juxtaposes the insanity of the harmless lunatics with the insanity of the state authorities who divide and exchange even the mentally deranged.

In the course of the story, Manto provides the readers a peep into the psychological meanderings of the different mad people who are confronting the problem of partition. Two Anglo-Indian lunatics find themselves in a fix, since they are not sure whether the Indian or Pakistani authorities would treat them with due respect like the English did. They hold clandestine meetings among themselves to decide their future. They are engulfed with several questions.

M. Asaduddin's translation of this passage:

> They would now spend hours in secret confabulation about their changed status in the asylum. Would the European Ward be there or done away with? Would they be served breakfast anymore? And, instead of Western style bread, would they be forced to swallow the "bloody Indian Chapatti?" (2001: 66).

It is noticeable that the expression "bloody Indian chapatti" is merely a transliteration of the words that appear in the Hindi text. But the translator chooses to put them in quotation marks as if to distance himself from the expression, and to emphasize that there is something peculiar about it. At least, two reasons could be made out for the strangeness of the expression. Firstly, the expression "Indian chapatti" lacks a semantic equivalent in English. Added to this complexity in finding a formal equivalent, the expression is qualified by the derogatory word "bloody" exemplifying the animosity Anglo-American lunatics nursed for the Indian chapatti. Hence, the translator retains the whole expression but puts it in quotation marks.

Secondly, Manto in his Hindi text, adopts the English expression by merely transliterating it into Hindi. However, the translator into English has to bring it back to the English readers. That is, the English expression has to be translated back to the readers of the translated English text. Thus, the expression travels from the target language to the source language and then back again to the target language. This journey of the expression between the two languages demands special attention from the reader. The translator utilizes quotation marks as a device to convey the strangeness and peculiarities of the expression.

Khalid Hasan translates the passage as follows:

> They were worried about their changed status after independence. Would there be a European ward or would it be abolished? Would breakfast continue to be served or would they have to subsist on bloody Indian chapati? (1997: 27)

Hasan's translation renders the original by paying absolutely no attention to the strangeness of the expression "bloody Indian chapati". The journey of the expression across the source and target languages does not receive any special focus by the translator. Therefore, Hasan's translation freezes the inner dialogicality of the expression and renders it monologically.[7]

As the story progresses, we come across a description of Toba Tek Singh. He would never sleep, but he used to lean against a wall for some time to rest.

Asaduddin's English translation reads as follows:

> The guards said that he had not slept a wink in the long period of fifteen years. He did not even care to lie down, though he would lean against a wall and take a "tek", now and then (2001: 66).

The word "tek" in Hindi is used to refer to a support to lean or rest against. Contextually, it is also utilized to suggest a nap. The writer deliberately and quite appropriately calls his protagonist Toba *Tek* Singh. It is clear from the context that "tek" is a word of the source language which explains the plight of the protagonist. Implicitly, the quotation marks convey this strangeness.

Hasan's translation reads as follows:

> Guards said he had not slept a wink in fifteen years. Occasionally, he could be observed leaning against a wall, but the rest of the time, he was always to be found standing. Because of this, his legs were permanently swollen, something that did not appear to bother him (1997: 28).

It is interesting to observe how Hasan's translation erases the strangeness in the idiom. Asaduddin's emphasis on the expression "tek" is absent in Hasan's translation. This act not only curtails the significance of the name "Toba Tek Singh" but also reduces its inner dialogism.

Sometimes, a translator may choose to translate a particular word/utterance, rather than retaining the same word of the source-text, and also put it in quotation marks. In an earlier example from Karandikar's translation, we have noticed words in quotation marks like "Elephant" and "Lion" which are translations of corresponding Marathi words. In the translation of Manto's story too, we can ascertain such examples. Toba Tek Singh is oblivious of the passing of time, as he has been confined to the prison for over fifteen years. However, intuitively he would discern the dates on which his relatives or friends would visit him.

Asaduddin's translation:

> But every month, when it was time for his relatives and friends to come, he would somehow come to know of it. He would tell the guard that his "visit" was on its way (2001: 67).

The word "meet" is closer in its semantic thrust to the original Hindi word. The translator deliberately chooses the word "visit" since it highlights a dignified delicacy. This word is then personified, and to emphasize the strangeness of the personification, it is put in quotation marks. We should note that for Toba Tek Singh, it is not the visitors who are

important, but the "visit". And the "visit" stops visiting after partition. The word carries with it an ironic indictment of the insanity of the society that marginalizes lunatics and treats them as a liability. The quotation marks demonstrate the translator's attempt to draw our attention to these characteristics of the word.

Khalid Hasan's translation has these lines:

> However, he had developed a sixth sense about the day of the visit, when he used to bathe himself, soap his body, oil and comb his hair and put on clean clothes (1997: 28).

Hasan's translation does not make a reader to pay special attention to the expression "visit". The connotations of the term are thus reduced and the cultural markers are eroded.

Thus, the examples discussed above bring to light the relevance of Voloshinov's categories for translators. Both Karandikar and Asaduddin as translators could be seen as authors of indirect discourses who analyze the source-text and render it by highlighting its subtlety and sophistication. At times, they exchange form with content, so that the elements of form are compensated in terms of explicative modifications in the content. The source-text is "another person's speech" that has to be rendered not by mechanical reproduction, but by way of strict analysis of its stylistic skills and cultural significance. In Voloshinov's sense, translators attempt to answer the problems posed by the source-text by reconstituting and re-patterning it. This act also allows the translator to maintain a separate and independent identity which enables her/him to comment on the stylistic characteristics of the source-text.

We shall now turn our attention to the notion of "polyphony" and its significance for the process of translation. In chapter four, we shall examine lyric poetry of Indian regional languages like Kannada, Marathi and Hindi, and the differing polyphonic appeal in their multiple translations into English. Chapter five focuses on the translation of polyphonic fiction and changes in the assemblage of voices in English, Hindi and Marathi translations.

References

Alpatov, Vladimir. (2004). "The Bakhtin Circle and problems in Linguistics". *The Bakhtin Circle: In The Master's Absence*. Ed. Craig Brandist, David Shepherd and Galin Tihanov. Manchester and New York: Manchester U P, 70-96.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and Trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota Press.

_ _ _ (1994a). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. (Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, Austin: U. of Texas P.

Bassnett, S. and Andre L..(1990). "Introduction: Proust's Grandmother and the Thousand and One Nights. The 'Cultural' in Translation Studies". *Translation, History, Culture*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere. London: Printer Publisher. 1-14.

Clark, K. et al (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard U P.

Fludernik, M. (2006). "Free Indirect Discourse". 20 March. <http://www.litenencyc.com/php/stopics.php?rec=Trans.ue&UID=444>

Hatim, B. and I. Mason (1990). *Discourse and the Translator*. London and New York: Longman.

Holquist, M (1986). "The Politics of Representation". *Allegory and Representation*. S.J Greenstall (ed.). Baltimore: John Hopkins U P

Jakobson, R. (1959). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." *On Translation*. Ed. Reuben A. Brower. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harward U P.

Karandikar, G.V. (1967). "You and I Run". *An Anthology of Marathi Poetry (1945-65)*. Trans. & Ed. Dilip Chitre. Bombay: Nirmala Sadanand Publishers.

_ _ _ . (1975a). "Ten Minutes With The Poet". *Poems of Vinda*. Trans. G.V. Karandikar. Bombay: Nirmal Sadanand Publishers. 7-15.

 _ _ _ . (1975b). "The Wheel". .*Poems of Vinda*. Trans. G.V. Karandikar. Bombay: Nirmal Sadanand Publishers. 100-101.

_ _ _ . (1983a)."Daatapaasun Daataakade". "From Teeth to Teeth". *Some More Poems of Vinda*. Trans. G.V. Karandikar. Bombay: Nirmal Sadanand Publishers. 48-53.

 _ _ _ . (1983b). "I Have a Strange Feeling". *Some More Poems of Vinda*. Trans.: G.V. Karandikar. Bombay: Nirmal Sadanand Publishers. 68-69.

Lewis R., A. (2005)."Language and Translation: Contesting Conventions". *In Translation: Reflections, Refractions, Transformations*. Ed. Paul St-Pierre and Prafulla C.Kar. Delhi: Pencraft International. 15-24.

Manto, S. H.(2002). *Toba Teksingh: Short Stories by Saadat Hasan Manto*. Allahabad: Upasana Prakashan. 89-94.

_ _ _ (2001). "Toba Tek Singh". Trans. M. Asaduddin. *Translating Partition*. Ed. Ravikant and Tarun K. Saint. New Delhi: Katha Books. 63-72.

_ _ _ (1997). "Toba Tek Singh". Trans. Khalid Hasan. *Mirrorwork: 50 Years of Indian Writing 1947-1997*. Ed. Salman Rushdie and Elizabeth West. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1997. 25-31.

Morson, G. S. and C. Emerson. (2001). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford: Stanford U P.

Parrington, J. (2006). "In Perspective: Valentin Voloshinov". 14 June. <http://pubs.socialisTrans.eviewindex.org.uk/isj75/parring.htm>

Shepherd, D. (1989). "Bakhtin and the Reader". *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Ed. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd. Manchester and New York: Manchester U P. 91-108.

_ _ _ . (2004). "Re-introducing the Bakhtin Circle". *The Bakhtin Circle: In The Master's Absence*. Ed. Craig Brandist, David Shepherd and Galin Tihanov. Machester and New York: Manchester U P. 1-24.

Steiner, G. (1975). *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. London: Oxford U P.

Volosinov, V.N. (1973). *Marxism and The Philosophy of Language*. Trans. Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik. New York and London: Seminar Press.

Notes

[1] Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist hold the view that Bakhtin is the author of the disputed texts. In the chapter "Disputed Texts" (1984: 146-170) of their book *Mikhail Bakhtin* they write, "…there is good reason to conclude that the disputed works were written by Bakhtin to the extent that he should be listed as the sole author, Medvedev and Voloshinov having played a largely editorial role in each instance. For one thing, nothing has established that Bakhtin could *not* have written the disputed texts and published them under their friends' names. More important, many eyewitnesses have said that he was the author, as did both Bakhtin and his wife on private occasions" (1984: 147).

[2] See Holquist's article "The Politics of Representation" (1986: 165-187). According to Holquist, the Marxist concepts in Bakhtin's theories appear merely to provide a seemingly Marxist fervour to his philosophy in Stalinist Russia. He had to change names and embrace ideas with Marxist overtones because of pressures and compulsions. In Holquist's words, "…if the Christian word had to take on Soviet flesh, it has to clothe itself in ideological disguise" (1986: 173). This understanding curtails the potential of Voloshinov's ideas and underestimates their creative significance.

[3] For an analysis of Voloshinov's social and historical investigation of language see the online article by John Parrington titled "In Perspective: Valentin Voloshinov". http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj75/parring.htm

[4] A parallel could be drawn here with Free Indirect Discourse (FID) in narrative texts of English. Monika Fludernik points out that, "Free Indirect Discourse (FID) can be defined as a mode of speech and thought representation which relies on syntactic, lexical and pragmatic features. On the syntactic level, passages of FID are constituted by non-subordination and (if applicable) temporal shifting in accordance with the basic tense of the report frame". (http://www.litenencyc.com/php/stopics.php?rec=true&UID=444). She also highlights the element of ambiguity in the mode of representation of thought in FID. Unless indicated through syntactic and lexical features, it is not possible to interpret the tone and temperament of an FID.

[5] There have also been theorists who have argued that translation is not between two entities called source-language/text and target-language/text but within the same larger rubric called 'language' or 'text'. As Anthony Lewis writes, "What translation scholars who speak of 'text' fail to recognize is that the inordinate amount of attention paid to the systems in which texts exist is born of the structuralist construction of languages into hermetically sealed, normalized types" (2005: 23).

[6] Interestingly, when Dilip Chitre translates Karandikar, the poem is rendered not in an elaborated manner, but in cryptic and terse expressions. Chitre does not take recourse to descriptive tendency.

[7] An interesting question here would be what would have happened had the expression "bloody Indian chapatti" been italicized and not rendered with the help of quotation marks. In both the cases, the expression would receive extra attention from the reader. However, quotation marks help to retain the otherness of the expression by not making it a part of the speaker's vocabulary and intentions. In the context of quotation marks, the expression in question would help the reader to identify it as borrowed expression or loan utterance and hence a sarcastic tone gets added to its inner dialogicality. Merely italicizing the expression would highlight some strangeness without exemplifying the same to the reader. Quotation marks assert the strangeness of the utterance/word in a more emphatic manner than italics.