ISSN: 2011799X

Preserving Linguistic and Cultural Diversity *in* and *through* Translation: From Theory to Practice*

Marina Manfredi
University of Bologna, Italy
marina.manfredi@unibo.it

Translation negotiates *difference*. It can be hard work. The larger the difference, the harder the work of translation. (Hermans 2006: 9, emphasis added)

A thick description of the *context* of literary production, a translation that draws on and creates that sort of understanding, meets the need to challenge ourselves and our students to go further, to undertake the harder project of a genuinely informed *respect* for *others*. Until we face up to *difference*, we cannot see what price tolerance is demanding of us. (Appiah 1993: 818, emphasis added)

Abstract:
On one hand this paper offers theoretical reflections on the phenomenon of translation in a postcolonial framework, referring mainly to the Anglophone context, and to India in particular. On the other, it forges concrete links between theory and practice. Major issues raised by Postcolonial Translation Studies are discussed, like the concepts of translation as a channel of colonization, as an instrument for maintaining cultural inequalities, even after the collapse of the British Empire, and as a possible, and desirable, means of de-colonization (Robinson 1997).
It is argued that, in order to convey linguistic and cultural diversity when translating literary texts from Indian English into Italian, the radical method championed by postcolonial scholars (Niranjana 1992; Spivak 1992) – which can be clearly linked to Venuti's 'foreignization' (1995) – is not the only solution and that 'hybridization' (Wolf 2000; Tymoczko 2000) represents a viable choice. Different translation strategies that can be employed to produce a 'hybrid' text are illustrated through case studies on Indian English literary works translated into Italian by the author of this study (Narayan 1997; Narayan 1998; Chandra 1999; Dhondy 2003). The paper not only proposes that this method is instrumental in safeguarding language, culture and identity *in* the process of translation; it also posits that, *through* translation, linguistic and cultural differences can be conveyed to the European world.
Keywords: Cultural diversity, linguistic diversity, theoretical reflections, identity, translation process, translation strategies.

Resumen:
El artículo, por un lado, ofrece reflexiones teóricas sobre el fenómeno de la traducción en un marco poscolonial, principalmente en el contexto anglófono, y en particular en el caso de la India. Por otro lado, busca forjar lazos concretos entre la teoría y la práctica. En el artículo se discuten serios cuestionamientos planteados en los estudios de traducción poscolonial, tales como los conceptos de traducción como un medio de colonización, como un instrumento para mantener la desigualdad cultural, incluso después del colapso del Imperio Británico, y como un posible, y deseable, medio de descolonización (Robinson 1997).
En el artículo se plantea que, aunque, para transmitir diversidades lingüísticas cuando se traducen textos del inglés indio al italiano, priman los métodos radicales defendidos por los eruditos poscoloniales (Niranjana 1992; Spivak 1992) – lo que está claramente ligado al concepto de "exotización" de Venuti (1995) – no son la única solución, y que la "hibridación" (Wolf 2000; Tymoczko 2000) representa una opción viable. Las diferentes estrategias de traducción que se pueden utilizar para producir un texto "hibrido" son puestas en manifiesto en los diferentes estudios sobre traducciones de obras literarias del inglés indio al italiano, realizados por el autor de esta investigación (Narayan 1997; Narayan 1998; Chandra 1999; Dhondy 2003). El artículo propone este método como decisivo para salvaguardar la lengua, cultura e identidad en el proceso de traducción, asimismo propone la traducción como medio para transportar las diferencias lingüísticas y culturales al mundo europeo.
Palabras clave: diversidad cultural, diversidad lingüística, reflexiones teóricas, identidad, proceso de traducción, estrategias de traducción.

*This paper was developed within the framework of the research project: Theory and practice of postcolonial translation, Bologna University.

1. Introduction[1]

Today, when the postmodern/postcolonial translator is embedded in a global environment characterized by a drive toward universality and a quest for uniformity in cultural behaviour and world-view, the activity of translation becomes an ever-more ethical act. As Theo Hermans (2006: 9) remarks, the traditional metaphors of translation as transport and transference "[...] have proved a narrow basis for an encounter with the complexities and inequities of an unstable, postmodern, postcolonial, globalizing world". Indeed, he continues, "[e]ven as communication across continents and time zones increases, *diversity* leaps to the fore" (emphasis added). In translation history, in part due to a legacy of colonialism, members of hegemonic cultures tend not to be exposed to difference and to be sheltered from the disturbing and alien features of the Other.

This paper will aim at presenting theoretical reflections, as well as concrete interconnections between theory and practice, concerning the phenomenon of translation in a postcolonial – mainly Anglophone – context. It will engage with key-notions such as power, alterity and identity, which have grown increasingly complex. By focusing on the role of the translating act as a means either of "repressive force" or of "liberating power" (Simon 2000: 28), it will explore major issues raised by Postcolonial Translation Studies in the last two decades: in particular the concepts of translation as a channel of colonization, as an instrument for maintaining cultural inequalities even after the collapse of the British Empire and, finally, as a possible and desirable means of de-colonization (see Robinson 1997). Narrowing the focus to the Indian context specifically, strategies to avoid ethnocentrism, as suggested by Niranjana (1992) and Spivak (1992/2004) will be presented. Their radical positions – which can be clearly linked to the Anglo-American "foreignizing" translation method championed by Venuti (1995) – will be juxtaposed with alternative options, such as those proposed by scholars like Wolf (2000) and Tymoczko (2000), who see "hybridization" as a possible choice to prevent the assimilation of cultures. According to this contrary view, translation can be seen not so much as a means of bridging gaps between different cultures, but rather as a strategy of intervention, where what is "new" comes to life and where cultures are mingled.

The paper will then move on to offer first-hand experience of translating Indian English literary texts into Italian. Through an examination of case studies, the most common strategies employed by the translator in facing the problems involved in translating such cross-cultural works will be discussed. A selection of illustrative examples will aim at highlighting the cross-cultural dimension of translation as well as highlighting the possibility of preserving linguistic and cultural diversity while at the same time catering to the Italian reader. Indeed, we will argue in favour of a

[1] This paper is a reworked and updated version of an invited talk delivered at the University of Bologna, Italy, Department of Modern Foreign Languages and Literature, for a seminar organized by CeSLiC (Centro di Studi Linguistico-Culturali) on 29 November 2006. Since then, its theoretical, practical and pedagogical implications have been exploited and tested in teaching the theory and practice of postcolonial translation to graduate students of the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literature at the same university.

method of translation which tends to overcome binary oppositions and seeks rather to combine traditionally opposed translating methods. The final claim will be that it is *through* translation, and in particular through "hybridization", that linguistic and cultural differences of Indian English texts and contexts can be not only safeguarded but also bequeathed to the European world.

The findings will also be viewed from a pedagogical perspective, in the belief that a university classroom, in our contemporary globalized world, can be considered as the ideal "[...] site where translating subjects are provoked and enabled to move *across* and *between* cultures" (Dingwaney & Maier 1995: xii, emphasis added).

2. Postcolonial Translation Studies: A Theoretical Framework

If Postcolonial Studies can be said to have grown out of the dissolution of the great European empires in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, the approach to the study of translation known as Postcolonial Translation Studies came quite a bit afterwards: in the mid-/ late 1980s, out of the influences exerted by disciplines such as anthropology, ethnography and colonial history, all of which have been increasingly interfacing with Translation Studies (hereafter TS). Scholars working in the field of such interrelated disciplines came to realize that "[...] one of the most significant intercultural phenomena they should have been studying all along [was] translation" (Robinson 1997: 3). The first major statement testifying to the transformation of anthropological studies of intercultural communication into a truly Postcolonial TS could be considered Talal Asad's article "The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology" (1986), where the issue of translating across asymmetrical power relations was tackled.

Indeed, as Sherry Simon (2000: 13) points out, in the field of TS, the term "postcolonialism" evokes two essential ideas. The first is concerned with "the global dimension" of research, the second with the framework through which we perceive relations of power and of alterity.

Not surprisingly, one of the most influential works dealing with such issues in a colonial and postcolonial perspective was Niranjana's *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism and the Colonial Context* (1992), which we will focus on in more detail below (see 1.2.).

The 1990s saw the rise of seminal publications within the discipline of TS in its postcolonial framework, such as the volume edited by Anuradha Dingwaney and Carol Maier, *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts* (1995), which is centred on the cultural, political and ideological aspects of translating from the so-called "Third" to "First World"[2].

[2] R. Jacquemond, mainly focusing on France and Egypt, spoke instead about "North" and "South" of the world (see Jacquemond 1992).

At the end of the decade, Bo Pettersson went so far as to identify a "Postcolonial Turn in Literary Translation Studies" (1999), one that we can see represented by a number of crucial works, including the following: Douglas Robinson, *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained* (1997); Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi (eds.), *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice* (1999); Sherry Simon and Paul St-Pierre (eds.), *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era* (2000); Theo Hermans (ed.) *Translating Others* (2006). More recently, as evidence of the "global dimension of research" postulated by Simon (2000, see above), Postcolonial TS has widened its horizons and has expanded outside a Eurocentric/American vision. This is what Siri Nergaard (2009: 489) considers a sort of "second cultural turn" in TS, after the major one occurred in the late 1980s. The publication of *Translation Studies in Africa* (2009), a collection of contributions edited by Judith Inggs and Libby Meintjes, in the "Continuum Studies in Translation" Series is indeed indicative. The current moment of research in TS, embracing the so-called "non-Western" traditions, has also been reflected in Italy, where a collection of fundamental contributions written by mainly non-Eurocentric theorists (spanning 1992-2007) on postcolonial translation issues has been recently translated into Italian: *Oltre l'Occidente: Traduzione e alterità culturale* [*Beyond the West: Translation and Cultural Otherness*], edited by Rosa Maria Bollettieri Bosinelli and Elena Di Giovanni (2009).

A caveat is now necessary. From a postcolonial perspective, the terms "East" and "West", as Maria Tymoczko (2006: 13, note) observes, indeed pose some problems, because they entail ideological positioning. As she herself does, we will employ "West" in a rough way to refer to views that originally started in Europe and then spread to other places such as the United States, where they became dominant. Likewise, we will refer to "Other" to indicate "the 'other' of the West" (see Dingwaney & Maier 1995: xi), with no particular ideological stance being implied.

Over recent years, Postcolonial TS has broadened its focus to include cases of general imbalance of power relations between any cultures/societies, even in settings strictly speaking not affected by colonialism (see, e.g., Robinson 1997: 14-16; Simon 2000: 14; Nergaaard 2009: 507-511). However, only the primary approach will be our concern in the present study, centred as it is on postcolonial situations in former colonies of powerful European empires, such as British India.

2.1 From Translation-and/ as-Empire to Postcolonialism

Postcolonial TS can be best described as "the study of translation in its relation to empire" (Robinson 1997: 1). As Robinson notes, at first sight, the concepts of "translation" and "empire" might appear unrelated (Robinson 1997: 8). According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, while "translation" is defined as "The action or process of turning from one language into another; also, the product of this", "empire" is designated as "Supreme and extensive political dominion; *esp.* that exercised by an 'emperor' or by a sovereign state over its dependencies" (*OED*: http://www.oed.com/). Yet, they are of course strictly linked: indeed, Postcolonial TS came "[...] out of the realization that translation has always been an indispensable channel of imperial conquest and occupation" (Robinson 1997: 10),

so much so that Bassnett and Trivedi felt they needed to deplore a "shameful history of translation" (Bassnett & Trivedi 1999: 5). The basic assumption underlying postcolonial theory is that translation, far from being an innocent and neutral activity, has played a key role in the construction of a distorted image of the subjected people and in the obscuration of their identity, thus helping to strengthen the hegemonic power of the colony.

Colonialism involved not only territorial appropriation, political domination and economic exploitation, but also cultural subjugation. Firstly, colonizers imposed their language. Secondly, not only did they look for "[...] some effective way of communicating with their new subjects", but they also developed "[...] new ways of subjecting them, converting them into docile or 'cooperative' subjects" (Robinson 1997: 10). One of the colonizers' first concerns was the selection and training of loyal interpreters, to mediate between them and the colonized. Either members of the dominated culture or of the dominating one, they were instructed to serve the empire and its needs (Robinson 1997: 10-11). The interpreters and translators being the only mediators, their interpretation could not be questioned and hence the reliability of the product of translation was clearly at risk. In general, translations during the colonial era were an expression of the hegemonic culture. Missionaries, anthropologists, learned Orientalists, etc. chose to translate only the texts which fit prevailing stereotypes and helped to construct and legitimate the ideologically-driven image of the suppressed world (Simon 2000: 10).

Before the rise of Postcolonial TS, the claim offered by Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978/1995/2003) might be defined as pioneering. Said had described the West's portrayal of the Oriental, invariably seen as "irrational, depraved, childlike, 'different'", as opposed to the European, who was viewed as "rational, virtuous, mature, 'normal'" (Said 1978/1995/2003: 40). Such stereotypes, according to Said, had been dominant in Western thinking since the Eighteenth century and had greatly contributed to creating an attitude that was imperialist, racist and ethnocentric towards the Otherness of Eastern culture (Said 1978/1995/2003: 204).

Translation in the history of colonization was thus used to dominate, educate and widely shape conquered populations (Robinson 1997: 6). In other words, it represented part of the violence used to construct the colonial subject (Simon 2000: 11). To a certain extent, as suggested by Simon, translation could even represent a metaphor for the colony itself:

> "Translation" refers not only to the transfer of specific texts into European languages, but to all the practices whose aim was to compact and reduce an alien reality into the terms imposed by a triumphant Western culture. (Simon 2000: 11)

One of the best known examples of colonizing translation is probably the 19th century version of the *Rubayyat* by Omar Khayyam translated by Edward Fitzgerald, who declared:

> It is an amusement for me to take what liberties I like with these Persians, who [...] are not Poets enough to frighten one from such excursions, and who really do want a little Art to shape them. (Fitzgerald in Lefevere 1992: 1)

To epitomize westernized and domesticated translation, Bassnett and Trivedi (1999: 7) cite Sir William Jones' translation of the Sanskrit Romantic play *Abhijnanashakuntalam* into English as *Sacontala, or the Fatal Ring: An Indian Drama* (1789). A typical example of departure from the source text (ST), the scholars observe, is that the heroine, in the English version, is prevented from sweating, as if the translator "[...] felt obliged to mitigate this essential bodily function in the interests of his Western notion of the aesthetic" (Bassnett & Trivedi 1999: 7). In other words, his pre-Victorian censorship intervened in what would have become later a common euphemism: "Horses sweat, men perspire and women glow". However, in India, sweating did not necessarily convey hot weather, illness or hard work like in England, but rather was traditionally appreciated as a sign of sexual interest, so the cultural specific reference was simply erased (Bassnett & Trivedi 1999: 7).

Even after the collapse of the British empire, during the period following independence from the former colonizer, translation has perpetuated colonial structures, working as a tool for maintaining cultural inequalities (see, e.g., Robinson 1997: 6). Hence, translation "[...] remains steeped in the political and cultural complexities of postcoloniality" (Robinson 1997: 6) and postcolonialism can even thus be said to represent a sort of neo-colonialism.

As examples of domesticated translation in postcolonial time Spivak (1992/2004: 372) comments on two different translations, from Bengali into English, of Mahasweta Devi's short story "Stanadãyini" (1980), one entitled "The Wet-nurse" (1986) and the other one, translated by Spivak herself, "Breast-giver" (1987). She contends that Devi's irony in proposing an uncanny and shocking word is completely neutralized in the first version, as well as the implications of the role of the woman's body and the treatment of "[...] the breast as organ of labour-power-as-commodity". Moreover, Spivak deplores how, in the first version, the startling proverbs expressing "earthy wisdom" are omitted in English, hence not conveying the contrast "[...] with class-specific access to modernity" (Spivak 1992/2004: 372).

Following Robinson (1997: 31-36), we will outline some of the important dynamics of postcolonial translation by drawing on the work of Richard Jacquemond (1992). Jacquemond, although most directly concerned with translation between France and Egypt, offered valuable insights that can be applied to similar colonial situations. Jacquemond identified four main tendencies which highlighted the new, and also the partly old, questions that arose from the colonial legacy after independence. According to Jacquemond (1992: 139), it is hardly surprising that cultural and economic hegemony are strictly linked.

Firstly, he observed, the South (i.e., dominated cultures), tends to translate more than the North (i.e., hegemonic ones) (Jacquemond 1992: 139). Secondly, when works from a dominated culture are translated into a dominant one, they are seen as difficult and mysterious, thus in need of interpretation. He offered as example the works in the Orientalist tradition, aimed at specialists and having large paratexts which emphasized their obscurity to the non-professional reader (Jacquemond

1992: 149). Thirdly, as repeatedly happened in colonial times, a hegemonic culture only translates what tends to conform to the stereotypical image of the dominated culture (Jacquemond 1992: 150). Finally, members of the dominated culture who wish to be read by large audiences will write with an eye to translation into a dominant language-culture (Jacquemond 1992: 151).

In light of this view, translators working into the hegemonic language are "[...] authoritative figures who keep the other culture at a non-contaminating distance at the same time as they make it acceptably comprehensible" (Robinson 1997: 36).

2.2 Voices from India[3]

There is nothing startling about the fact that much of the work on power relations in translation has emerged in postcolonial settings, like India, Canada, Ireland or Brazil. In this wide map, India seems to be a particularly fruitful site for TS (Simon 2000: 12). This can be explained by the fact that India constitutes one of the greatest "translation area[s]" in the world, with a polyglot mosaic of official languages, by the particular position of English within such a multilingualism, and by the tension between Indian English literature and Indian literature in English translation (Simon 2000: 25).

At the beginning of the 1990s, two women's voices from the Indian subcontinent raised important issues on postcolonial translation theory and practice, drawing heavily on feminism, post-structuralism and Marxism: Tejaswini Niranjana, with her influential book, *Siting Translation* (1992), and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, with her seminal essay, "The politics of translation" (1992/2004).

One of the earliest and fiercest attacks on colonial and postcolonial translation came from Niranjana, who critically examined the way in which translation, under British colonial rule, secured and reinforced control over India and created the distorted image of the Eastern Other.

She questioned the commonly held view of interlingual translation as a bridge between different cultures: according to her, the act of translation is, instead, a political action and "a significant technology of colonial domination" (Niranjana 1992: 21).

Colonial society, Niranjana (1992: 33) argued, offered a good example of the implications of a hegemonic culture. Her criticism was addressed in particular to the way that translation had been used by the British colonial power to construct a falsified image of India and Indians that then had come to stand for the "truth". Under colonialism, she maintained, translation played a major role in

[3] For the purpose of this paper, the focus will be on Niranjana (1992) and Spivak (1992) only. However, as evidence of the active role played by scholars from the Indian subcontinent in raising postcolonial translation issues, it has to be mentioned that most major books in the field of Postcolonial TS examined in this paper include a wide range of contributions from Indian theoreticians. See, e.g., Dingwaney & Maier 1995; Bassnett & Trivedi 1999; Simon & St-Pierre 2000; Hermans 2006. See also: Kothari 2003.

"interpellating"[4] India, i.e. by fixing its image as inferior, hence contributing to the imposition of certain ideological values. Niranjana showed how Indians, first "interpellated" by the East India Company, then by Great Britain, came to see themselves through the colonizer's eyes, as childish and irrational (Niranjana 1992: 10-11).

The scholar, in the context of colonial India, identified different groups that fostered this goal. In the field of education, for example, missionaries who ran schools sponsored by the government, and also acted as linguists and translators, "[...] functioned as colonial agents in the formation of practices of subjectification" (Niranjana 1992: 34). Ethnographers who recorded grammars of local languages did likewise. Hegemony also permeated theology and historiography, philosophy and literary translation. She saw the latter as one of the discourses which "[...] inform the hegemonic apparatuses that belong to the ideological structure of colonial rule" (Niranjana 1992: 33). In particular, she discussed earlier translations of a 12th century spiritual poem from Kannada, a South Indian language, into English. Her forceful critique of the earlier translators, in particular A.K. Ramanujan, whom she blamed for adhering to Western thought and religion and for simplifying the ST, was accompanied by her own proposal of a different translation (Niranjana 1992: 173 *ff*)[5]. She also strongly censured the translation of India's laws produced by Sir William Jones in the 18th century, with "[...] the desire to 'purify' Indian culture and speak on its behalf" (Niranjana 1992: 13). Judge of the Supreme Court in Calcutta, Jones translated the ancient Sanskrit laws into English, "[...] correcting, retrieving and purifying" them (Robinson 1997: 80). The incentives for his work, Niranjana says, were the desire for translation by a European, since the British did not trust the reliability of earlier interpretations of the law by local learned men, and the wish to give the Indians their "own" laws. The real motive behind this, however, was that, as Niranjana pinpoints, he re-interpreted the ancient law to justify colonial domination. Indeed, she reveals how Indians, in Jones' translation, were portrayed as used to dispotism, because of their submissive nature, and so it was necessary for Britain, although proud of its democratic institutions, to keep India away from democracy (Niranjana 1992: 14).

If the colonial was unmasked as a subjugating force, her image of the postcolonial was "[...] still scored through by an absentee colonialism" (Niranjana 1992: 8).

Along similar lines, Spivak, a Bengali theorist and translator, in "The politics of translation" (1992/2004), spoke out against Western feminists who expected literary works written by Eastern feminists to be accessible to the target reader in the language of power. When Bengali works, for example, were translated into English, their speech patterns were often erased and differences eliminated, through a lifeless "with-it translatese", which Spivak derogatorily described in these terms:

[4] Niranjana borrowed the term "interpellation" from L. Althusser, the Marxist critic (see Robinson 1997: 22). He coined it to describe the "'constitution' of subjects in language" on the part of ideology (Niranjana 1992: 11, note).

[5] Niranjana's criticism of Ramanujan's translation was, in turn, attacked by V. Dharwadker (1999). The latter sought to demonstrate that Ramanujan had actually not been a colonialist translator and that, for example, he had acknowledged the "hybridity" of languages/cultures.

> In the act of wholesale translation into English there can be a betrayal of the democratic ideal into the law of the strongest. This happens when all the literature of the Third World gets translated into a sort of with-it translatese, so that the literature by a woman in Palestine begins to resemble, in the feel of its prose, something by a man in Taiwan. (Spivak 1992/2004: 371-372)

The ideological consequences of such a lamentable practice of translation were that less powerful cultures were distorted and their identities eliminated.

2.3 Radical Strategies of "Resistance"

The postcolonial scholars whose issues we have discussed so far, while pointing to translation as a damaging instrument in the hands of a hegemonic culture, did *not* argue for its demise. Rather, they rescued translation and indicated how it could be exploited as a liberating force. Translation, therefore, far from being "[...] purely a harmful and pernicious tool of empire" (Robinson 1997: 105) could fruitfully become a strategy of resistance to the power of the colonizer's language.

Niranjana called for a policy of "resistance", described as "speculative, provisional, and interventionist" (Niranjana 1992: 173), through a practice of "re-translation". Borrowing from Walter Benjamin's (1923/1963) concept of literalism, the Indian scholar prescribed that texts were re-translated through a more literal translation, rich in calques and borrowings, which could help to preserve the Otherness of the Indian culture when translating, for example, texts from Kannada into English.

Spivak's assertion tallied with Niranjana's in arguing for literalism as a means to convey the difference (Spivak 1992/2004: 378), without over-assimilating it to Western values (Spivak 1992/2004: 379). To put it succinctly, both Niranjana and Spivak advocated a kind of translation which aimed at highlighting the *difference* of cultures by making the ST *visible* even in the colonizer's language.

This clearly has its echo in Lawrence Venuti's fierce attack on the dominant Anglo-American practice of "domesticating" translation (Venuti 1995: 20), a key and much debated concept in TS that had been heralded at the beginning of the 1990s as follows:

> [...] a labor of acculturation which *domesticates* the foreign text, making it intelligible and even familiar to the target-language reader, providing him or her with the *narcissistic experience* of recognizing his or her own culture in a cultural other, enacting an imperialism that extends the dominion of transparency with other ideological discourses over a *different* culture. (Venuti 1992: 5, emphasis added)

From Venuti's point of view, the translator should aim, instead, at a "foreignizing" translation practice, which consists in

> [...] locating the alien in a cultural other, pursuing cultural *diversity*, foregrounding the linguistic and cultural differences of the source-language text and transforming the hierarchy of cultural values in the target language. (Venuti 1995: 308, emphasis added)

After the radical strategies proposed by Niranjana and Spivak, not unlike Venuti's view, "foreignization" seems to be the most valid strategy to adopt when translating a postcolonial literary text with the aim of preserving its cultural specificity and *diversity*. Nevertheless, this solution is not that straightforward. Without denying the value of the strategy in itself, we will now introduce different perspectives that help the translator to take into account other important aspects.

2.4 Hybridization

More recently, the radical positions advocated by Niranjana (1992), Spivak (1992) and Venuti (1995) have been juxtaposed with alternative options. Postcolonial TS, since the late 1990s, has been rather informed by the notion of "hybridity", after Homi Bhabha (1994).

Although the age-old dichotomy between "word-for-word" and "sense-for-sense" translation has grown increasingly complex (see, e.g., House's "overt" *vs* "covert" translation or Venuti's "foreignization" *vs* "domestication"), it has nonetheless proved inadequate when dealing with postcolonial texts.

Michaela Wolf (2000) and Maria Tymoczko (2000), for example, start from the presupposition that translation, nowadays, is more than a means for bridging gaps between different cultures; it is a tool for producing meanings that originated in a multicultural encounter which is typical of our contemporary world. Due to the growing phenomena of migrancy, exile and diaspora, many postcolonial writers are representative of "hybrid" cultures because their identity is fragmented (see Bassnett & Trivedi 1999; Simon 2000; Bandia 2009, among others), as they live across borders. In this new map, the polarity between self/other, us/them, East/West, First/Third World, Colonizer/Colonized is questioned, because of the existence of what has been called a "Third Space" (Bhabha 1994: 36), a "space-in-between", where cultures meet.

According to Bhabha, this "Third Space" can represent the starting point for postcolonial translation strategies. The target text (TT) can result in a dialectical interaction of different cultures that hybridize, without giving up their characteristics (Wolf 2000: 131), through a process of mutual contamination. As Wolf points out, "[t]he translator is no longer a mediator between two different poles, but her/his activities are inscribed in cultural overlappings which imply difference" (Wolf 2000: 142). For this reason, s/he should opt for an "interventionist" strategy[6] (Wolf 2000: 130), where what is "new" comes to life and where cultures are mingled. As Nergaard observes, "[t]he space where we move is mixed and hybrid, separations and differences are *in* the world and not *between* different worlds. It is in this space that translations take place" (Nergaard 2009: 511-512, original emphasis)[7].

---

[6] For a thorough account of Translation as "Intervention", see Munday 2007.
[7] Personal translation.

This leads to a new concept of translation in contemporary theoretical discourse, which assumes a broader definition that goes beyond the interlingual passage and rather encompasses the multiple aspects of "transnational and transcultural encounters" at the base of our global culture (Bandia 2009: 1).

However, both this new metaphorical notion of translation and the more pragmatic one amply entail the notion of "hybridism", especially in the case of texts which are hybrid because of linguistic, cultural and literary reasons. But this will be our focus of investigation in the second part of the paper.

3. Practice of Postcolonial Translation: Translating Indian English Literary Texts

We will now examine how the fundamental insights offered by Postcolonial TS in its different perspectives can be exploited for theorizing translation practice.

It is widely acknowledged that, before any practical work of translation can be tackled, both source and target cultures need to be studied. In translating literary works from distant cultures, when the "Context[s] of Culture" (Malinowski 1935: 18) are radically different, this becomes an imperative.

In the translation of Indian creative writing in English, language is an integral part of culture, not only because of the pragmatic cultural aspects of a distant setting, but also because of the particular nature of the literary context. Indeed, although Indian English (IE) is widely recognized as a variety of English, the language of Indian writing in English is not merely or wholly illustrative of that variety; it is mostly indicative of the author's artistic use of that variety (see Manfredi 2005). English has the status of an associate official language and has been increasingly used in many fields; still, it is not necessarily the language of everyday life. The language spoken by characters in novels or short stories, who would actually use Hindi, Urdu, Punjabi, Marathi, etc. in real life, is rather the outcome of linguistic experimentation made by Indian writers who claim their right to use English for artistic purposes. This right was vehemently asserted by Vikram Chandra when he declared: "My grandfather paid for it; my father paid for it. English is mine to do with as I will"[8]. So, when translating an Indian literary work written in English, the translator should consider language as both the effect of a multilingual/multicultural contact and a writer's deliberate choice. This choice was eloquently expressed by R.K. Narayan when he stated:

> We are not attempting to write Anglo-Saxon English. The English language, through sheer resilience and mobility, is now undergoing a process of Indianization in the same manner as it adopted U.S. citizenship over a century ago [...]. (Narayan 1965: 123)

[8] At an appearance at the *Associazione Italo-Britannica* in Bologna, 20 November 1997.

Similarly, almost thirty years later, Salman Rushdie avowed:

> [...] we can't simply use the language in the way the British did; […] it needs remaking for our own purposes. (Rushdie 1991: 17)

And for their "purposes", Indian English writers manipulate language, either inserting Indian elements or translating from Indian languages, so that local and Western discourses are blended into a sort of "hybrid" code. Ignoring the conscious "hybridity" of the texts to be translated would be a double form of *dis*respect.

3.1 Combining Translation Strategies

Generally speaking, throughout the history of TS, translation paradigms usually vary in terms of the degree of their orientation towards the source language (SL) or the target language (TL). Nevertheless, it is posited that, when dealing specifically with postcolonial texts, such poles are not necessarily mutually exclusive and a combination of translation strategies could be a more valid solution. When translating Indian English literary texts into Italian, for example, combining contrasting alternatives like a "foreignizing" method of translation and a "domesticating" one could actually aid the admirable aim of respecting both the foreignness of the ST as well as the different target reader.

This claim is fundamentally based on two assumptions. First, as we have seen, Indian English texts are hybrid texts themselves, in their plurilingual and pluricultural nature. For this reason, in order to convey their "hybridness", the constant overlapping between different languages and cultures should also emerge in the translation. If it does not, their linguistic, cultural and literary value would be compromised.

Second, we argue that, along with theoretical issues raised by postcolonial scholars – absolutely fundamental to respecting the cultural and ethical aspects underpinning this particular kind of literary texts – the needs of the target reader should also be taken into account, if our aim is also that of diffusing different cultures and their literary traditions on the world stage. Bringing together insights even from dissimilar schools of TS could prove fruitful to this purpose. For instance, the conceptual framework set up by "Skopos" theory (*Skopostheorie*, Reiss & Vermeer 1984), with its central concern for the purpose and function of translation, and consequently for the TT reader's needs and expectations, could help. Among this kind of "functionalist" theories of translation, we believe that a more moderate approach like that proposed by Christiane Nord (1988/1991; 1997) can be particularly useful. In the middle, between radical strategies of "foreignization" and extreme forms of "domestication" for the sake of the target reader, her notion of "loyalty" (Nord 1988/1991: 29), i.e., a bilateral responsibility towards both the ST author and the TT reader, seems suitable for translating postcolonial texts in today's globalized context. In the light of "loyalty", it would be possible, we believe, to respect Otherness, while being simultaneosly able to convey it within the global community, and even encouraging its spread.

3.2 Analysis of Case Studies

The paper will now move on to a selection of illustrative examples taken from specific case studies, i.e. four Indian English literary works, translated into Italian by the author of this study, with the aim of investigating the most relevant strategies that can be employed when dealing with the translation of such "hybrid" cross-cultural texts.

The first two case studies are two novels, *Swami and Friends* (1935; *Swami e i suoi amici*, 1997) and *The Dark Room* (1938; *La stanza di Savitri*, 1998), written by one of the founding fathers of Indian literature in English, R.K. Narayan, writer of the older generation. The other two, *Come to Mecca* by Farrukh Dhondy (1978; *Vieni alla Mecca*, 2003) and *Love and Longing in Bombay* by Vikram Chandra (1997; *Amore e nostalgia a Bombay*, 1999) are contemporary collections of short stories, the former written in the late 1970s by a writer of Indian origin moving to the United Kingdom, the latter by a writer of the younger generation, who divides his time between India and the United States. Although Narayan's novels belong to the colonial period and only Dhondy's and Chandra's to the postcolonial properly, the linguistic and cultural issues of Indian writers who decide to use English for their artistic expression are, as we have seen, similar.

The texts can thus all be considered examples of "hybrid" texts, i.e., representative of postcolonial discourse discussed above. All, at different points along an imaginary cline, include linguistic experimentation. We argue that the problems and challenges of their translation into Italian could point the way to a combination of translation strategies in order to preserve their linguistic and cultural value and simultaneously make them accessible to the Italian target reader.

When "New English"[9] writers creatively handle the language of the ex-colonizer, they broadly make use of three main methods:

> (1) insertion of parts of dialogue in a local language;
> (2) inclusion of lexical items drawn on local languages;
> (3) translation of lexico-grammatical elements from local languages.
> (Platt *et al.* 1984: 183)

We will see examples from all three strands, although, for the limited purpose of this study, the third point will be briefly exemplified by lexical aspects only. The options available to the translator to tackle these devices could include stressing the unfamiliarity of the foreign elements, to domesticate them, or to omit them.

---

[9] The distinction between "new" and "New Englishes" (Platt *et al.* 1984) corresponds to the one between "native" and "non-native", the former typical of nations where the British language was imposed and became primary (e.g., US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, West Indies, Ireland), the latter of countries where local languages were maintained although, after independence, English was kept as a second language, like in East and West Africa, Singapore, Philippines and on the Indian subcontinent (see Trudgill & Hannah 2002).

We will examine different kinds of problems posed by the translation(s), from instances were the "Indian-ness" was apparently an artistic choice and thus has been respected, to examples where it was the cultural context that influenced certain decisions.

In order to illustrate the choices in terms of translation strategies in the texts under scrutiny, Joseph L. Malone's (1988) linguistic approach will be adopted[10]. This model is considered useful for classifying strategies employed by a translator on the basis of structural and functional considerations.

The possibility of using different translation strategies throughout the text will be proposed, but this will also be accompanied by exemplification of instances of combining these simultaneously.

Carry-over Matching + Equation

As is typical of many Indian English literary texts, the STs under discussion are rich in borrowings from Indian languages, though in different proportions. Borrowings are, in fact, one of the most common devices that writers use to "Indianize" English. In a few cases, the translation was provided by the author himself within the flow of narration, such as in:

> (ST 1) [...] the old ones only thought of "taka" (money) and the young ones only thought of "heta" – a dirty word. (Dhondy 1978: 13)

Given that the above must be a creative choice, perhaps with the aim of foregrounding the multilingualism of the characters, the translator has applied one of the most extreme methods of "foreignization", i.e. what Malone calls "carry-over matching", which "[...] obtains when the source element [...] is not translated into the target language but merely carried over as such into the target text" (Malone 1988: 23). Our TT has thus become:

> (TT 1) [...] i vecchi pensavano solo ai *taka* (soldi) e [...] i giovani pensavano solo alla *heta* – una parolaccia. (Dhondy 2003: 13)

In keeping the parentheses and translating their content into the most direct Italian equivalent, the translator has employed at the same time the strategy of "equation", which "[...] obtains when an element of the source text A_s is rendered by a target text element deemed the most straightforward counterpart available E_a" (Malone 1988: 16).

The fact that postcolonial texts often employ translations themselves could be exemplified by the following instance:

[10] Of Malone's strategies, i.e. Carry-over Matching, Equation, Substitution, Divergence, Convergence, Amplification, Reduction, Diffusion, Condensation, Reordering (Malone 1988), the first seven will be taken into consideration.

> (ST 2) I had gone to be by my brother's side, because Shahid was like a brother to me, but you don't always want to be "kavab me haddi", the "bone in the kebab", someone who gets in the way. (Dhondy 1978: 24)

In this case, the author had offered his source reader a common Indian idiom, followed by its translation into English – but keeping the Indian element and, finally, paraphrasing it. When translating this sentence into Italian, the author's significant choice has been respected and the three idioms have been kept/translated as:

> (TT 2) C'ero sempre andato per essere al fianco di mio fratello, perché Shahid era come un fratello per me, ma non vuoi sempre essere il "*kavab me haddi*", l'"osso nel *kebab*", quello tra i piedi. (Dhondy 2003: 26)

A "domesticating" translation could have been *il terzo incomodo*, and it has been avoided. After all, even though the Indian idiom could sound "estranging" to an Italian reader, the mention of *kebab* in our current multicultural society should be clear. In any case, it seems quite obvious that the author had made a creative choice, which has been respected in the Italian translation.

Carry-over Matching + Amplification (1)
In Indian English fiction it is far more common, however, as it is in the texts under scrutiny, for borrowings in the ST to be used in such a way that their meaning can be inferred from the co-text. Since writers employ English but convey a different, or hybrid, culture, they often feel the need to insert culture-bound words, for which an English equivalent is not readily available.

By way of illustration, Narayan would not have found a lexical equivalent in the English language for conveying a kind of raised platform for sitting on in the houses of South India (Hawkins 1984: 74), and so, instead of using a contorted paraphrase, was almost compelled to opt for the Indian word *pyol*:

> (ST 3) He went home, flung his coat and cap and books on the table, gulped down the cold coffee that was waiting for him, and sat on the *pyol* [...] (Narayan 1990 [1935]: 31)

This has been rendered into Italian as:

> (TT 3) Arrivò a casa, scaraventò giacca, berretto e libri sul tavolo, tracannò il caffè freddo che lo stava aspettando e si sedette sul *pyol* [...] (Narayan 1997: 38)

It is easy to see that with a plain translation, like *piattaforma*, the cultural load would have been totally lost. The choice of keeping the Indian word in the Italian TT also means a loss, since the comprehension of the target reader is not guaranteed. However, it is compensated for by the explanation of the item in a glossary at the end of the translation.

In all similar cases, the Indian lexical items have been left in, italicized, and their meanings have been collected in a glossary at the end of the text. In terms of

translation strategies, a combination of them has been employed, that is, the aforementioned carry-over matching together with "amplification", defined by Malone as follows:

> Amplification [...], whereby the target text picks up a translational element (B) in addition to a counterpart (A_t) of a source element (A_s), is probably the single most important strategic trajection for bridging anticipated gaps in the knowledge of the target audience – that is, for providing the target audience with *extra explicit information* not required by the source audience. (Malone 1988: 41, emphasis added)

In this kind of cross-cultural text, a paratextual element such as a glossary is usually considered a less obtrusive technique than a footnote or a clarification within the text.

Instances of this kind are very common. Indian writers make an abundant use of borrowings from Indian languages, especially when they face a problem of nomenclature. For culture-bound elements like plants, fruits, garments, food, coins, customs, festivals, religion, politics, society, kinship terms, greetings, modes of address, etc. (see, e.g., Manfredi 2005), equivalents in the TL do often not exist, and the author is almost compelled to borrow them in order to avoid long explanations.

Hence, for elements of the material culture like garments, where equivalents in the English language do not exist or which are culturally loaded, the same borrowing technique has been adopted, such as in

> (ST 4) [...] a woman dressed in a Rajasthani *ghagra* and *choli* with mirrors all over, and a black rural-type *bindi* on her forehead. (Chandra 1997: 169)

translated into Italian as:

> (TT 4) [...] una donna in costume rājasthānī, con *ghāghrā* e *colī* tempestate di specchietti, e una *bimdī* nera sulla fronte come le contadine. (Chandra 1999: 203)

In the case of *bimdi*, the typical dot on the forehead of Hindu women (Lewis 1991: 66), the use of the Indian item was deemed to be necessary to describe a typical local custom. On the contrary, the Hindi words *choli* and *ghagra* – the former a close-fitting upper garment, worn by Indian women with a sari (Hawkins 1984: 20), and the latter a long loose skirt (Hawkins 1984: 33) –might have been translated into Italian as *corsetto* and *gonna ampia e lunga*. However, they would have lost their "Indian-ness", because garments, like food, are usually a sign of national identity. An instance of a typical Indian garment that could not be expressed otherwise is:

> (ST 5) "Mother, would you mind if I don't come here for coffee and <u>tiffin</u>? Can you send it to my room?" He turned to the cook and said: "Look here, you can't come to my room in that <u>dhoti</u>. You will have to wear a clean, white <u>dhoti</u> and shirt." (Narayan 1990 [1935]: 36)

Dhoti, indeed, is the traditional loin-cloth worn by Hindus, wrapped round the body (Lewis 1991: 102). The Italian translation reads:

> (TT 5) "Mamma, ti dispiace se non vengo qui per il caffè e il *tiffin*? Puoi mandarli in camera mia?" Si rivolse al cuoco e lo apostrofò: "Senti, non puoi venire nella mia stanza con quel *dhoti*. Dovrai indossare un *dhoti* bianco pulito e una camicia". (Narayan 1997: 44)

The word *tiffin*, corresponding to "a light mid-day meal or snack" (Lewis 1991: 236), has been left untranslated too, thus better conveying its Anglo-Indian usage. This is an instance of "foreignizing" option, while *merenda* would have been a "domesticating" translation, assimilated to the Italian culture – which has been avoided.

Carry-over Matching + Amplification (2)
It can also happen that Indian writers insert portions of dialogue in an Indian language, as Chandra did in:

> (ST 6) "Iqbal," she said. "*Kaisa hai*?"
> "I'm alive," I said. (Chandra 1997: 165)

Such a piece of dialogue expressed in an Indian language has been maintained in the TT, with the addition of its translation in a footnote:

> (TT 6) – Iqbal – disse. – *Kaisā hai*?*
> – Si tira avanti – risposi.
>
> * "Come va?" [*N.d.T.*].
> (Chandra 1999: 198)

The insertion of a footnote also represents an example of amplification, outside the text. In literary translation footnotes (in Italy known as *Note del Traduttore*, *N.d.T.*), tend to be reduced to a bare minimum, given that they could divert the reader's attention and make reading tedious. However, in translating postcolonial texts, if limited to a few cases, they are often thought to be useful for enhancing comprehension, and in fact likely to be appreciated by target readers who, without them, would inevitably lose relevant cultural information. In addition, the translation of the piece of dialogue into Italian would not respect the creative choice made by the author, which was to convey the "Indian-ness" of his character and the fact that he would actually be using an Indian language in his real conversation.

Equation
As said above, we can also find examples related to the importance of attending to the context of culture in/by which a text is realised and which it invariably expresses. And they can regard simply the English language itself. The example that follows demonstrates the important role of lexico-grammar in construing meaning:

> (ST 7) Now Savitri had before her a little business with her god. She went to the worshipping-room [...] (Narayan 1990 [1938]: 4)

It has become in our TT:

> (TT 7) Ora Savitri doveva dedicare un po' di tempo al suo dio. Andò nella stanza delle preghiere [...] (Narayan 1998: 10)

In Italian, this may seem an instance of an unusual collocation in the TT, with the deictic and possessive close to the noun *dio*, in lower case. However, its rendering as *a Dio* ["to God"] would have represented a Eurocentric and "domesticating" choice in its most pejorative sense, catering to Western target readers and their (most probably) Christian religion. An equation, instead, can convey the multiplicity of Hindu divinities and the religious tradition is successfully conveyed. A strategy of equation was also employed when translating

> (ST 8) She sat alone in a room inside, on the ground in a corner, in a widow's white [...] (Chandra 1997: 149)

into

> (TT 8) Era in una stanza interna, sola, seduta sul pavimento in un angolo, vestita di bianco vedovile [...] (Chandra 1999: 178)

Given that, in India, a white sari signals the status of being a widow, although inevitably strange for some readers, the cultural reference has been kept, and so cultural associations are intact and "Indian-ness" is respected.

Equation + Amplification
At both a stylistic and a cultural level, the rendering of an Indian simile into Italian has been tackled in this way:

> (ST 9) [...] and a diffused white gleam through a skylight, and in the halo, changeless and eternal as the day that Bijlani threw his future kingdom at her feet, was Sheila, her skin glowing, her hair as dark as a Malabar wave on a moonless night. (Chandra 1997: 34)

> (TT 9) [...] un lucernario da dove scendeva un biancore diffuso, e in quell'alone, immutabile ed eterna come il giorno in cui Bijlani aveva gettato il proprio futuro impero ai suoi piedi, c'era lei, la pelle luminescente, i capelli scuri come un'onda che si frange sulla costa del Malabar in una notte senza luna. (Chandra 1999: 44)

The comparison with a Malabar wave has been retained, through an equation, but opting at the same time for an amplification, with the addition of the relative clause *che si frange sulla costa*. This has been done in an attempt to clarify the association but at the same time to keep a sort of poetical image. Thus a "domesticating", and stale, rendering, such as *come l'ebano*, or an omission of the geographical reference (translating simply into *come una notte senza luna*), have been avoided.

Amplification (+ Carry-over Matching)

Yet a totally "domesticating" amplification has sometimes been employed as well, of the kind that Malone calls, more specifically, "compensatory amplification" (Malone 1988: 41). This is probably the strategy most often adopted when the translator feels the need to fill in cultural gaps, by offering the target audience extra information not required by the source reader. An instance is:

> (ST 10) Her hair was pulled back and neatly oiled, and around her plait she wore a single string of white *mogra* flowers. (Chandra 1997: 39)

translated into Italian as:

> (TT 10) Aveva i capelli tirati indietro, accuratamente cosparsi di olio profumato, e attorno alla treccia portava una semplice coroncina di fiori di *mogrā* bianchi. (Chandra 1999: 50)

The translation of "oiled" into the direct Italian equivalent *unto* would evidently have conveyed a negative attitude of untidiness. Through the compensatory amplification, both the typical Indian custom and its positive cultural value have been rendered, respecting the ST and its sociocultural environment, as well as the target reader's needs. As usual, the Hindi-Urdu word *mogra*, indicating a particular kind of sweet-smelling jasmine (*Jasminum sambac*, Hawkins 1984: 63), has been left untranslated through a strategy of carry-over matching, with its meaning included in the glossary at the end of the translation (amplification). An example of a more straightforward kind can be found when expressing the following cultural habit:

> (ST 11) She prostrated herself before the god, rose, picked up a dining-leaf, and sat down in the kitchen. (Narayan 1990 [1938]: 5)

In South India, plantain leaves are traditionally used as plates or trays, an aspect of the source culture that will probably be unfamiliar to the target audience. In order to bridge the knowledge gap, a strategy of amplification has been applied and the Italian version reads:

> (TT 11) Si prostrò davanti alla divinità, si alzò, quindi prese una foglia per posarvi la colazione e si sedette in cucina. (Narayan 1998: 10)

Divergence

Again concerning the English language, but strictly linked to the sociocultural environment and expressing interpersonal relationships, has been the translation of "you" in one of Narayan's novels, of the pre-independence period. In this case, we have chosen to adopt Malone's useful strategy of "divergence", "[...] whereby an element of the source text may be mapped onto any of two or more alternatives in the target text" (Malone 1988: 29). In a novel set in the 1930s, the "you" has been rendered into Italian as a formal *lei*, when an outcaste is addressing a Brahmin woman; as an even more formal *voi*, when another outcaste is speaking to an old priest; as the familiar *tu*, when the latter is talking to the former. The translator's decision has been aimed at highlighting the speaker/addressee relationship and the

respectful tone typical of Indian interactions. Elements of the co-text such as modes of address have influenced and guided the translation choices. Of course, all the verbal groups and deictic possessives have been translated accordingly. Illustrative examples are:

> (ST 12a) "A nice thing you are saying, my lady! What can you do, with your soft hands? [...]" (Narayan 1990 [1938]: 158)
>
> (TT 12a) "Bella cosa sta dicendo, signora mia! Che cosa può fare, con le sue mani delicate? [...]" (Narayan 1998: 154)
>
> (ST 12b) "My salutations to you, my noble master."
> "Who are you?" asked the old man [...]
> "I am Mari, my master, your humble slave."
> "Mari, you are a vile hypocrite," said the old man. (Narayan 1990 [1938]: 164)
>
> (TT 12b) "I miei ossequi a voi, mio nobile maestro".
> "Chi sei?", chiese il vecchio [...]
> "Sono Mari, mio maestro, il vostro umile schiavo".
> "Mari, sei un vile ipocrita", proruppe il vecchio. (Narayan 1998: 160)

A further example of divergence can be illustrated by a subcontinental use of English. The common standard English word "evening", indeed, must be interpreted with its Indian meaning, as speakers of IE often tend to use it much earlier in the day (Nihalani *et al.* 1979: 75). This use can be exemplified through the following examples, among many others:

> (ST 13a) [...] the languor that comes at the end of a strenuous evening in the sun. (Narayan 1990 [1935]: 125)
>
> (TT 13a) [...] la fiacchezza che segue a un duro pomeriggio sotto il sole. (Narayan 1997: 141)
>
> (ST 13b) "How can the children be at home in the evenings? Doesn't he know that they have to go out and play?" (Narayan 1990 [1938]: 24)
>
> (TT 13b) "Come possono i bambini essere a casa il pomeriggio? Non sa che devono andare fuori a giocare?" (Narayan 1998: 29)

The target reader would have been puzzled by the unusual collocation in Italian of *sera sotto il sole* (see TT 13a). Likewise, it would have been misleading to convey that children are used to going out to play *la sera* (TT 13b). Obviously, it has been the co-text to suggest the most credible choice and the paramount concern has been the reader's comprehension, from a "domesticating" perspective.

Convergence

The strategy of "convergence" can be described "[...] as the mirror image to divergence, [...] a paradigmatic opposition in the source language [that] has no direct (or ready-made) counterpart in the target language" (Malone 1988: 36). This has been employed to translate, in Chandra's short stories, the items "porch" (e.g.,

Chandra 1997: 5) and "patio" (e.g., Chandra 1997: 20), both rendered in Italian merely as *veranda* (Chandra 1999: 9; 26). Since the author makes a wide use of American English, when translating "porch" into Italian, its American meaning of *veranda* (instead of *portico*, see *OED*) has been considered more plausible in a subcontinental setting, "verandas" being a common feature of Indian architecture.

Substitution (+ Amplification)

In the translation of the texts under scrutiny, typically "domesticating" strategies have also sometimes been employed. These include "substitution", which "[...] obtains when a source text element (A_S) is rendered by a target element deemed as being *other* than the most straightforward counterpart available (S_a)" (Malone 1988: 16, emphasis added). For example,

> (ST 14) He then asked, "Aren't the sauce and the plantain chips excellent?" (Narayan 1990 [1938]: 54)
>
> has become:
>
> (TT 14) Poi continuò: "Non sono squisite la salsa e le banane fritte*?"
>
> * Si tratta propriamente della banana da legume, frutto tropicale simile alla banana, che di solito viene cucinato (*N.d.T.*). (Narayan 1998: 58)

In this case, where a father is addressing his children, the naturalness of the dialogue has been the main concern and the cultural information has been footnoted. A further example of substitution can be represented by:

> (ST 15) He was U.S.A.-returned and all [...] (Chandra 1997: 30)
>
> (TT 15) È vero, lui aveva studiato negli Stati Uniti [...] (Chandra 1999: 41)

"USA-returned" expresses an IE use, similar to "England-returned", normally adopted with reference to someone who has been abroad, usually for further studies (Nihalani *et al.* 1979: 73), and come back, i.e., "returned". In this case the choice has been made to suit the receptor audience as well.

Reduction

Finally, the "domesticating" strategy of "reduction" has also been employed. In Malone's model, "[...] as the inverse of Amplification, [it] is a pattern whereby a source expression (AB) is partially trajected onto a target counterpart (A) and partially omitted [...]" (Malone 1988: 46). In this last example, some cultural information has been omitted for simplification:

> (ST 16) The children had finished their dinner. They stood round and admired her and asked if she had been to a marriage-house. "You smell lovely, Mother," Kamala said. (Narayan 1990 [1938]: 105)
>
> (TT 16) I bambini avevano finito di cenare. Le stavano intorno ad ammirarla e le chiesero se era andata a un matrimonio.

> "Hai un odore delizioso, mamma", esclamò Kamala. (Narayan 1998: 105)

In the Italian TT, the specific allusion to "a building where wedding ceremonies are performed" (like "Marriage-hall", see Nihalani *et al.* 1979: 120) is certainly lost, but the choice is felt to lend greater fluency to the dialogue. After all, if postcolonial writing, as Bandia (2006: 355) reminds us, is not precisely "an anthropological exercise" – where every cultural detail needs to be clarified – but rather "an artistic and literary one", its translation should follow suit: the translator is not supposed to tell readers everything.

Summing up, as argued elsewhere (Manfredi 2007: 212), in order to preserve the Otherness of another culture, the translator can "[...] refuse to translate, be silent, not enunciate" (Karamcheti 1995: 188), that is, leave Indian words in the TT untranslated. On the other hand, the translator can also "name excessively" (Karamcheti 1995: 188), by expanding the TT through additions (Malone's compensatory amplification), or paratextual elements such as glossaries and/or footnotes, for the sake of the target reader. In some cases, the translator could even employ the most "domesticating" strategies to meet target reader expectations. In other words, when dealing with the translation of Indian English texts into Italian (or other European languages), an "opaque" translation that makes use of "both insufficient and excessive translation" (Karamcheti 1995: 187-188), is proposed as a valid solution.

The examples have been offered in an attempt to demonstrate that translation of cross-cultural texts, as Dingwaney and Maier say, always entails "a complex tension" (Dingwaney & Maier 1995: 304). In other words, as the two scholars effectively put it:

> [...] translation, *ideally*, makes familiar, and thereby accessible, what is confronted as alien, maintaining the familiar in the face of otherness without either sacrificing or appropriating difference. This means that the translator must have a foot in each of two worlds and be able to *mediate self-consciously* between them. (Dingwaney & Maier 1995: 304, emphasis added)

Such an "ideal" is undoubtedly ambitious and difficult to achieve; nevertheless, despite the difficulty of the undertaking, we hope that the instances of translation choices discussed above can at least show an attempt at "self-conscious mediation".

4. Some Pedagogical Considerations

The implications of the theoretical and practical issues seen so far have been tested from a didactic perspective by the author of this study at the University of Bologna in recent academic years[11]. At the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures, the author has taught "TS: Theory and Practice" to graduate students of different degree courses, in "Modern, Post-colonial and Comparative Literatures" and in

[11] From Academic Year 2005-06.

"Language, Society and Communication". For both degree courses, a part of the syllabus of the author's TS course has focused on postcolonial translation, from both a theoretical and a practical point of view, with gratifying results in terms of students' motivation and pedagogical goals.

It is hardly surprising that the choice of postcolonial translation has generally been well received by the students from the degree course in comparative and postcolonial literatures, as it is centred on the literature of both European and postcolonial non-European countries.

The results of the testing have been more surprising with students from the degree course in "Language, Society and Communication", with its major focus on modern languages for communication and international cooperation, involving linguistic and cultural, but also legal and economic, aspects. In this case, where the focus of the TS course has been on both specialized and literary translation, the author has decided to deal almost exclusively with postcolonial translation as regards the literary side, in the strong belief that it could represent a viable means to fulfil the students' expectations in their concern for "language", "society" and "communication". The feedback from students has been generally positive and enthusiastic and the final results have been more than satisfying. Thus, even within a course where literary studies were certainly not the primary concern, postcolonial translation has been favourably received, and, to tell the truth, we are not surprised.

The Indian linguist, Braj B. Kachru, had proposed the study of non-native literature in English as a resource for language teaching in the 1980s. We pursue a similar choice in the field of translation, in the firm belief that, as he put it, "[...] such literary texts are a repertoire of resources for providing *linguistic* and cross-cultural explanations [...] [i]n other words, what it means to use English for cross-cultural *communication*" (Kachru 1986: 148, emphasis added). Similar aims seem to fit perfectly the needs of students of translation in the 21st century who have chosen to study how "language" works within "society" in order to achieve "communication" competence.

The decision to teach theory and practice of postcolonial literary texts, therefore, does not arise from the fact that they are currently "in". It rather stems from the firm conviction that they can point up the ethical and pragmatic aspects of the translation act as well as "[…] a conceptualization of translation as a cross-cultural activity in which the goal of immediacy or readability is tempered by a simultaneous willingness – even determination – to work in difference" (Dingwaney & Maier 1995: 304). As regards the specific approach discussed in this study, we also find a parallel with the kind of method suggested by Kwame Anthony Appiah (1993: 818) for teaching the translation of African literature to American students. The scholar, indeed, advocated what he called "*thick* translation", a particular kind of literary translation that makes a heavy use of paratextual material. According to Appiah, it is vital to urge students to reflect on difference and respect for Others, as we can see clearly stated in one of the epigraphs to this paper.

However, apart from the specificity of the issues connected with the topic under discussion, we posit that a focus on the theory and practice of translating postcolonial texts in a general Translation Studies course can make students aware of even more general cardinal aspects of translation.

- Firstly, they offer the opportunity to heighten awareness of the importance of cultural context when translating – always fundamental, but in this case, as we said, absolutely essential.

- Secondly, they can highlight the key role of translation in shaping history and the crucial work of the translator, whose activity is not passive or neutral, but laden with responsibility, since his/her choices could compromise the identity of the Other.

- Thirdly, from a TS perspective, they provide an enabling means to show students how the theory and practice of translation are inextricably linked and how a practice without theory is a merely subjective exercise, while theory without interconnections with practice is a sterile abstraction.

- Fourthly, they instruct them to avoid strict binary oppositions, and to be more flexible according to specific translational purposes.

- Finally, but no less fundamentally, they help them to reflect on the ethical issues of the multicultural society they live in.

Albeit not original aims, we maintain that they are well worth having in a pedagogy of translation in the 21st century.

5. Conclusion

This paper has sought to highlight the fundamental *dual* role of postcolonial translation in today's globalized world, as an unrivaled means of preserving different cultures and, at the same time, as an invaluable channel of disseminating them. It has been argued that a theorized practice of translation, flexible and so open to different approaches, will best serve this purpose.

On the one hand, language, culture and identity can be preserved *in* the process of translation, through an emphasis on linguistic difference, ensured by the use of "foreignizing" strategies, championed by Venuti and by most radical postcolonial translation scholars. Such a choice, we believe, does not necessarily "[...] lessen the impact or immediacy of a story for its [target] readers", but rather can actually intensify that immediacy "[...] by compounding an awareness of translation and bringing the act of mediation to light" (Dingwaney & Maier 1995: 315).

On the other hand, combining these with "domesticating" methods, which simultaneously give the target reader access to the identity of Other, can ensure that

through translation those linguistic and cultural differences of Indian English texts and contexts can not only be safeguarded, but also transmitted, to the Western world. In the case of postcolonial translation, we believe that the principle of "loyalty" proposed by Nord (1991; 1997) might represent the most appropriate solution, committing the translator to both parties involved in the act of translation: the ST author and the TT receivers.

Such a perspective implies the aim of respecting *both* sources and targets, since translation is viewed as an act of "mediation" which, as Donna R. Miller (2010: 9) suggests, does not mean "[...] assimilation, a pot in which Self and Other blend into a third entity, but rather their essential inter-dependence". In this way we assert a right to difference.

Robinson (1997: 6), writing at the end of the last decade, identified three phases in the history of translation: a first stage, corresponding to the "past", in which translation was an instrument of colonization; a second one, when cultural inequalities were perpetrated in postcolonial "present" time, and a third, "future" phase, one in which translation would be able to work as a desirable means of de-colonization. More than a decade later, we envisage, with Paul Bandia, that today

> [a]sserting one's identity through an emphasis on linguistic difference in a global language is a way to subvert or challenge the unsavoury legacies of colonialism. It can indeed be said that contemporary global culture has benefited from the various cultural traditions around the world, and that translation has played a major role in the encounter between these traditions. (Bandia 2009: 18)

If our Postcolonial TS can be open to *diversity* both from a theoretical and a practical point of view, the dynamics of the multidimensional world we live in could also benefit from this ethically responsible stance.

I am grateful to Prof. Donna R. Miller for her helpful suggestions concerning an earlier version of the paper.

Bibliography

APPIAH, KWAME ANTHONY (1993), “Thick Translation”. *Callaloo*, vol. 16 (4), 808-819 (available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2932211, last accessed, October 2009).

ASAD, TALAL (1986), “The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology”, in J. CLIFFORD and G.E. MARCUS (eds.), *Writing Culture*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 141-164.

BANDIA, PAUL (2006), “African Europhone Literature and Writing as Translation. Some Ethical Issues”, in T. HERMANS (ed.), vol. II, 349-361.

BANDIA, PAUL (2009), “Translation Matters: Linguistic and Cultural Representation”, in J. INGGS and L. MEINTJES (eds.), 1-20.

BASSNETT, SUSAN and TRIVEDI, HARISH (eds.) (1999), *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*, London/New York: Routledge.

BASSNETT, SUSAN and TRIVEDI, HARISH (1999), “Introduction: Of colonies, cannibals and vernaculars”, in S. BASSNETT and H. TRIVEDI (eds.), 1-18.

BENJAMIN, WALTER (1923/1963), “Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers”, in H.J. Störig (ed.) (1963), *Das Problem des Übersetzens*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 182-195.

BHABHA, HOMI K. (1994), *The Location of Culture*, London/New York: Routledge.

BOLLETTIERI BOSINELLI, ROSA MARIA and DI GIOVANNI, ELENA (eds.) (2009), *Oltre l’Occidente: Traduzione e alterità culturale*, Milano: Bompiani.

CHANDRA, VIKRAM (1997), *Love and Longing in Bombay*, London: Faber.

CHANDRA, VIKRAM (1999), *Amore e nostalgia a Bombay* [Translation, M. Manfredi], Torino: Instar Libri.

DHARWADKER, VINAY (1999), “A.K. Ramanujan’s theory and practice of translation”, in S. BASSNETT and H. TRIVEDI (eds.), 114-140.

DHONDY, FARRUKH (1978), *Come to Mecca*, London: HarperCollins.

DHONDY, FARRUKH (2003), *Vieni alla Mecca* [Translation, M. Manfredi], Macerata: Quodlibet.

DINGWANEY, ANURADHA and MAIER, CAROL (eds.) (1995), *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

DINGWANEY, ANURADHA and MAIER, CAROL (1995), “Preface”, in A. DINGWANEY and C. MAIER (eds.), xi-xiii.

DINGWANEY, ANURADHA and MAIER, CAROL (1995), “Translation as a Method for Cross-Cultural Teaching”, in A. DINGWANEY and C. MAIER (eds.), 303-319.

HAWKINS, R.E. (1984), *Common Indian Words in English*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

HERMANS, THEO (ed.) (2006), *Translating Others*, vol. I-II, Manchester: St. Jerome.

HERMANS, THEO (2006), “Introduction”, in T. HERMANS (ed.), 9-10.

INGGS, JUDITH and MEINTJES, LIBBY (eds.) (2009), *Translation Studies in Africa*, London/New York: Continuum.

JACQUEMOND, RICHARD (1992), “Translation and cultural hegemony: The case of French-Arabic translation”, in L. VENUTI (ed.), *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, London/New York: Routledge, 139-158.

KACHRU, BRAJ B. (1986), “Non-native Literatures in English as a Resource for Language Teaching”, in C. BRUMFIT and R. CARTER (eds.), *Literature and Language Teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 140-149.

KARAMCHETI, INDIRA (1995), “Aimé Césaire’s Subjective Geographies: Translating Place and the Difference It Makes”, in A. DINGWANEY and C. MAIER (eds.), 181-197.

KOTHARI, RITA (2003), *Translating India: The Cultural Politics of English*, Manchester: St. Jerome.

LEFEVERE, ANDRÉ (1992), *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London/New York: Routledge.

LEWIS, IVOR (1991), *Sahibs, Nabobs and Boxwallahs: A Dictionary of the Words of Anglo-India*, Bombay: Oxford University Press.

MALINOWSKI, BRONISLAW (1935), *Coral Gardens and Their Magic*, vol. 2, London: Allen & Unwin.

MALONE, JOSEPH L. (1988), *The Science of Linguistics in the Art of Translation: Some Tools from Linguistics for the Analysis and Practice of Translation*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

MANFREDI, MARINA (2005), "Translating varieties of English in a cross-cultural perspective: lexical items and nominal groups in the translation of works by R.K. Narayan and V. Chandra into Italian", in M. BONDI and N. MAXWELL (eds.), *Cross-Cultural Encounters: Linguistic Perspectives*, Roma: Officina Edizioni, 205-215.

MANFREDI, MARINA (2007), "The issue of 'visibility' in translating topography and the culture of London and Bombay/*Mumbai*", in L. JOTTINI, G. DEL LUNGO and J. DOUTHWAITE (eds.), *Cityscapes: Islands of the Self, Language Studies*, Cagliari: CUEC, 203-214.

MILLER, DONNA R. (2010), "Why 'mediation'?", in D.R. MILLER and A. PANO (eds.), *La geografia della mediazione linguistico-culturale*, Quaderni del CeSLiC, Bologna: Dupress, 5-9.

MUNDAY, JEREMY (ed.) (2007), *Translation as Intervention*, London/New York: Continuum.

NARAYAN, R.K. (1965), "English in India", in J. PRESS (ed.), *Commonwealth Literature: Unity and Diversity in a Common Culture*, London: Heinemann, 120-124.

NARAYAN, R.K. (1990) [1935], *Swami and Friends*, London: Mandarin.

NARAYAN, R.K. (1990) [1938], *The Dark Room*, London: Mandarin.

NARAYAN, R.K. (1997), *Swami e i suoi amici* [Translation, M. Manfredi], Firenze: Giunti.

NARAYAN, R.K. (1998), *La stanza di Savitri* [Translation, M. Manfredi], Firenze: Giunti.

NERGAARD, SIRI (2009), "Cosa significa traduzione oggi?", in R.M. BOLLETTIERI BOSINELLI and E. DI GIOVANNI (eds.), 479-518.

NIHALANI, PAROO, TONGUE, R.K. and HOSALI, PRIYA (1979), *Indian and British English: A Handbook of Usage and Pronunciation*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

NIRANJANA, TEJASWINI (1992), *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism and the Colonial Context*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/Oxford: University of California Press.

NORD, CHRISTIANE (1988/1991), *Text Analysis in Translation*, Amsterdam/Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

NORD, CHRISTIANE (1997), *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*, Manchester: St. Jerome.

PETTERSSON, BO (1999), "The Postcolonial Turn in Literary Translation Studies: Theoretical Frameworks Reviewed". *AE. Canadian Aesthetics Journal/Revue canadienne d'esthétique*, 4 (http://www.uqtr.ca/AE/vol_4/petter.htm., last accessed, October 2009).

PLATT, JOHN TALBOT, WEBER, HEIDI and LIAN, HO MIAN (1984), *The New Englishes*, London/Boston/Melbourne/Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

REISS, KATHARINA and VERMEER, HANS J. (1984), *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.

ROBINSON, DOUGLAS (1997), *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained*, Manchester: St. Jerome.

RUSHDIE, SALMAN (1991), *Imaginary Homelands*, London: Granta & Penguin.

SAID, EDWARD W. (1978/1995/2003), *Orientalism*, London: Penguin Books.

SIMON, SHERRY and ST-PIERRE, PAUL (eds.) (2000), *Changing the Terms: Translating in the Postcolonial Era*, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

SIMON, SHERRY (2000), "Introduction", in S. SIMON and P. ST-PIERRE (eds.), 9-29.

SIMPSON, JOHN ET AL. (eds.), *Oxford English Dictionary* (http://www.oed.com/, last accessed October 2009).

SPIVAK, GAYATRI CHAKRAVORTY (1992/2004), "The politics of translation", in L. VENUTI (ed.) (2000/2004), *The Translation Studies Reader, 2nd Ed.*, 369-388.

TRUDGILL, PETER and HANNAH, JEAN (2002), *International English: A Guide to the Varieties of Standard English, 4th Ed.*, London: Arnold.

TYMOCZKO, MARIA (2000), "Translations of Themselves: The Contours of Postcolonial Fiction", in S. SIMON and P. ST-PIERRE (eds.), 147-163.

TYMOCZKO, MARIA (2006), "Reconceptualizing Translation Theory: Integrating Non-Western Thought about Translation", in T. HERMANS (ed.), vol. I, 13-32.

VENUTI, LAWRENCE (1995), *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, London/New York: Routledge.

VENUTI, LAWRENCE (1992), "Introduction", in L. VENUTI (ed.), *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, London/New York: Routledge, 1-17.

WOLF, MICHAELA (2000), "The *Third Space* in Postcolonial Representation", in S. SIMON and P. ST-PIERRE (eds.), 127-145.