

**CAN THE GLOBAL SOUTH THEORISE?
DEVELOPING AN ECO-TRANSLATOLOGICAL MODEL FROM INDIA**

**SYNOPSIS OF THE THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
OF
JADAVPUR UNIVERSITY**

**BY
RINDON KUNDU**

Department of Comparative Literature

Faculty of Arts

Jadavpur University

Kolkata 700032

INDIA

2023

Can the Global South Theorise?

Developing an Eco-translatological Model from India

Synopsis

The present study stems from a contention about whether the Global South can theorise translation, a field that has long been dominated by the Global North. This research tries to trace the notion of translation and translational practices in the Indian subcontinent, thus, building an alternative discourse of theorising translation from the Global South. The intention is not to summarily dismiss/collapse the western paradigm of translation studies but to critically engage with the field of translation as practiced in the Indian subcontinent especially in the precolonial era and how it passes on to postcolonial times, thereby to create a balance in the knowledge generation especially in the broad field of translation studies, because in order to counter the hegemony of the Global North in any discipline, a researcher located in the Global South must present an alternative discourse within that discipline. This project examines the terminologies used to denote the exercise of translational activities in the subcontinent of India as much as possible and attempts to theorize them by creating different models of translation. However, the more significant portion of the present thesis devotes to developing an eco-translatological model from the Global South by analysing specifically two terms *rūpāntar* and *vivartanam* in the context of theatre adaptations by Ajitesh Bandyopadhyay.

What is the Global South? Where is the Global South? A Translation Studies Perspective:

I recognise that we are gathered here today as a result of sacrifices. Sacrifices made by our forefathers and by the people of our own and younger generations. For me, this hall is filled not only by the leaders of the nations of Asia and Africa; it also contains within its walls the undying, the indomitable, the invincible spirit of those who went before us. Their struggle and sacrifice paved the way for this meeting of the highest representatives of independent and sovereign nations from two of the biggest continents of the globe.¹

- Indonesian President Sukarno's opening speech at the Bandung Conference dated 18th April 1955.

¹ <https://transperiphery.com/Sukarno-Speech-in-Bandung> [Accessed 2022-02-14]

In the midst of the Cold War between the West and the former Soviet Union, senior representatives from twenty-nine newly independent African, Asian, and Middle Eastern countries met in Bandung, Indonesia, from April 18th to 24th, 1955, to chart an alternative discourse for their peoples' social and economic development and to continue the process of political and economic decolonization. The coming together of these leaders resulted in the formation of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and the concept of the Third World or South.² The notable point in this first large-scale Afro-Asian conference has been the search for “an alternative discourse,” which has been synonymous with the objectives of the Third World.³ The Bandung Conference ended with putting emphasis on the need of developing countries to reduce their economic reliance on the major industrialised nations via the interchange of professionals and technical help for developmental initiatives, which later has been resulted in South-South collaboration.⁴

Jonathan Rigg, while discussing the probable definition of the term ‘Global South’ has mentioned few other possible terms which can constitute the similar idea, i.e., ‘the Less-developed World’, ‘the Majority World’, ‘the Non-Western World’, ‘the Poor World’, ‘the South’, ‘the Underdeveloped World’ and ‘the Third World’. Rigg further mentioned that, in contrast to the First (capitalist) and Second (socialist/communist) Worlds, the Third World was the world that did not adhere to any one political ideology, but the Third Globe swiftly became a convenient shorthand for the rest of the world in which people live in poverty.⁵

The areas of Latin America, Asia, and Africa, together are, in general, referred to as the “Global South”. As mentioned before, the term ‘Global South’, also refers to the “Third World” and/or “Periphery”, interchangeably because any geographic location outside of Europe and North America that is generally low-income and sometimes politically or culturally excluded is being included in the “Global South”. By the first decade of the twenty-first century, the term ‘Global South’ became a common parlance. The fictitious line representing the equator serves as a dividing line between the northern and southern hemispheres of the planet. However, it cannot claim to map the socio-economic situations of the whole world comprehensively. The

² <https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/collection/16/bandung-conference-1955/4> [Accessed 2022-02-14]

³ Alfred Sauvy, a French demographer, anthropologist, and historian, created the phrase “third world” (*tiers monde*) on August 14, 1952, in an article published in the French journal *L'Observateur*. He was referring to nations that played a minor role on the international stage.

⁴ See for further reference: <https://www.southcentre.int/question/revisiting-the-1955-bandung-asian-african-conference-and-its-legacy/>. Accessed 14 Feb. 2022.

⁵ For a detailed discussion by Jonathan Rigg, please visit the Internet Archive of The Global South Centre, University of Köln, Cologne, Germany. <https://web.archive.org/web/20160505210502/http://gssc.uni-koeln.de/node/458>. Accessed 18 Dec. 2022.

countries that fall under the nomenclature of ‘Global South’ share a similar socio-economic status quo.⁶ The positioning of the Global South is also dependent on the geopolitical relations of power with the First World⁷ and Second World⁸. Having said that we should also be careful about the gross generalization of the terms. Certain areas that fall under the geographic region called Global North are not always richer and powerful and at the same time, not all the areas that fall under Global South are poorer and marginalised. Indeed, Antonio Gramsci, one of the first authors who launched the debate of the notion of the South, identified in his essay titled, “The Southern Question” ([1926] 1978) that the Southern portion of Italy has been oppressed by the Northern half of Italy, which eventually resulted in the concept of the north-south split⁹.

The Northern bourgeoisie has subjugated the South of Italy and the Islands and reduced them to exploitable colonies; by emancipating itself from capitalist slavery, the Northern proletariat will emancipate the Southern peasant masses enslaved to the banks and the parasitic industry of the North. (1978: 2)

In a similar line, eminent sociologist Judy Aulette has argued,

North and South, on the one hand, quickly capture a critical cleavage within the global political economy, but they do not tell us about the gaps within the North and South by social class and among various nations within each category. Many people in the North are poor and oppressed, and every nation in the South includes those who are wealthy and powerful. (2012: 1547)

Therefore, the North–South divide is primarily a division based on socio-economic and political status of any state. The North–South division was popularised in the late twentieth century and the idea of categorising the countries into two divisions began in the Cold War era when there was a classification of the world since the germination of two blocks – East and West, where East contained the USSR and China, while the West block contained the USA and its allies. But it has also created another entity, namely, the ‘Third World’, which included all those nations that were not actively associated with either side during the Cold War. Heike Pagel, Karen Ranke, Fabian Hempel, and Jonas Köhler, in their collaborative presentation titled, “The Use of the Concept ‘Global South’ in Social Science & Humanities” Presented at

⁶ Contexts, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 12-13. ISSN 1536-5042, electronic ISSN 1537-6052. © 2012 American Sociological Association. <http://contexts.sagepub.com>. DOI 10.1177/1536504212436479.

⁷ a term used during the Cold War to describe nations that supported the US and NATO

⁸ a term used during the Cold War to describe Soviet-influenced industrial socialism governments

⁹ Text from Antonio Gramsci "Selections from political writings (1921-1926)", translated and edited by Quintin Hoare (Lawrence and Wishart, London 1978)

the symposium titled, “Globaler Süden / Global South: Kritische Perspektiven”, at the Institut für Asien- & Afrikawissenschaften, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin on July 11, 2014, has argued,¹⁰

Since the end of the Cold War rhetoric in the 1990s resulting from the fall of the Iron Curtain, the division of the World into First, Second and Third World has become obsolete. Furthermore, the ubiquitous terms development and developing countries have equally lost some of their theoretical legitimacy, as the centre of global economic growth has been shifting to places outside the so called West (Europe, North America).

In the post-Cold War era, international relations have been characterised by an apparent contradiction. The apparent geographical imprecision of ‘Global South’ affords us the option for adaptability. In this context, the editor of the famous journal *The Global South*, Leigh Anne Duck, has uttered a fundamental issue,

What remains paramount, from the perspective of The Global South, is to understand how forces that seek to impose exploitative and hegemonic economic and political forms have been and can be resisted, both in discrete geopolitical spaces and through broader collaborative networks.¹¹

In this context, we may be reminded of the famous theory of Development Economics ‘North–South model’ developed by Ronald Findlay, which explains the ecologically unequal exchanges between the core and periphery countries. (Findlay 1984:185-9) The binary structure of global differences was not a new theory. In Sociology, theorists from Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer to Emile Durkheim and Lester Frank Ward has discussed about these distinctions in geopolitics while “drawing broad distinctions between “advanced” and “primitive” institutions and societies”. (Dados and Connell 2012:12) The term “Global South” was probably coined by Carl Oglesby while commenting on Vietnam War, “dominance over the Global South ... have converged ... to produce an intolerable social order.” (1969:90)

Former West German chancellor Willy Brandt advocated a line representing this division in his 1980s report titled, *North-South: A Programme for Survival*, often known as the *Brandt Report*. Approximately 30 degrees north of the equator separates the “Core Nations” from the rest of the world. This line cuts through the United States and Mexico, north of Africa

¹⁰ See <https://www.academia.edu/7917466>.

¹¹ See the entry titled, “The Global South via the US South” by Leigh Anne Duck. <https://web.archive.org/web/20160505210457/http://gssc.uni-koeln.de/node/456/#fu%C3%9Fnoteduck>

and the Middle East, up and over China and Mongolia, and then dips south to include the continents of Australia, Japan, New Zealand, and the island nation of Singapore. The “Zapatista uprising” in Mexico, the “African Renaissance”, and the World Social Forum’s inception in Brazil, the emergence of the BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) and then the joining of South Africa, thus making the group acronym BRICS, all supported the concept of a dominant Northern hemisphere and a defiant Southern hemisphere. To better understand the dominant vs. defiant narrative, I will quote from the invitation letter of a recent conversation titled “The Global South and the New Cold War” between Pankaj Mishra and David Malone at the United Nations University Headquarter in Tokyo on 25th November 2022.¹²

Compared to the cold war of the 20th century, today’s new cold war straddles increasingly muddled geopolitics, globalized economies, and deep resource dependencies. But as North-South inequality grows and the lines blur between democracy and autocracy, many global South countries are hesitant to take sides and firmly align with a Western alliance, China, or Russia.

The thesis argues that in today’s world, to understand the dichotomy between the developed, core countries and developing, peripheral countries, the frequently used terminology West vs. East is not sufficient. Because the term West has gathered different meanings as geographer Martin W. Lewis and historian Kären Wigen have discussed in their book titled, *The Myth of Continents: A Critique of Metageography* (1997). They questioned the unconsciously held spatial frameworks that regulate our perception of the world and re-evaluated the fundamental geographical divides we use every day. Therefore, I argue that in the context of Translation Studies to delve into the complexities of power structure in the discipline, we need to come out of the false dichotomies between the West and the East and try to situate the divide on a large-scale geo-spatial construct. This thesis encourages us to adopt a more deliberate, spatially informed approach to the challenge of defining and comprehending the diversity towards understanding the act of translation across the globe, and it also prompts us to consider the significance of an approach towards the discipline of translation studies in order to realise that the defiant Global South can also contribute to the disciplinary study.

¹² See <https://unu.edu/events/archive/conversation-series/the-global-south-and-the-new-cold-war-a-conversation-with-pankaj-mishra.html#overview>

North-South Divide: Global South as the Centre

“I am at war with my time”

- Julian Roosvelt [Manifesto (Kebria Woods) 2015-17]

The Brandt Line was designed in the 1980s to illustrate how the globe was physically divided between relatively wealthy and impoverished countries. As per this paradigm, the richer nations, with the exception of Australia, Hong Kong, Singapore, and New Zealand, are nearly entirely situated in the Northern Hemisphere. The majority of the poorer nations are situated in tropical areas in the Southern Hemisphere. Because many poorer nations have achieved tremendous economic and social progress, the globe is far more complicated now than it was in the Brandt Line's era of analysis. This is clear that, notwithstanding huge global development advances that already have lifted hundreds of millions of people out of poverty, the gap between both the world's wealthiest and poorest nations is growing. Europe's per capita income was three times more than Africa's in 1820, but by 2000 it was thirteen times larger. Oxfam also estimated in 2013 that the wealthiest 85 persons in the world held the same assets as the poorest half of the global population. However, inequality inside nations is increasing, and some commentators are increasingly referring to a 'Global North' and a 'Global South,' which refer to wealthier and poorer populations that may be found both within and across countries, respectively. For example, although India continues to have the highest proportion of disadvantaged people in a single country, the country also boasts a significant middle class and a wealthy elite. Some of the factors that cause this inequality are the scarcity of natural resources, disparities in access to healthcare, the quality of a country's educational and medical systems, and the nature of the country's manufacturing industries. Other contributing factors include the way countries operate and the nature of their global relations.

Since the late 1960s, a substantial quantity of literature has been produced in response to the discussion over the North–South split. South is a notion that deals with geographical representations of inequality. It is useful for assessing difficulties affecting peripheral civilizations, but it does not have much to say about issues affecting countries that are classified as 'Northern' societies. Can the notion of the South be applied to areas of social life that are not directly related to development differences, such as those involving the formation of one's own identity? Regarding knowledge generation, the South has shown to be an excellent location to dump the theories of Humanities, and Natural/Pure Sciences from the Global North without considering the fundamental difference between these two halves. Can we, scholars from

Global South challenge the unidirectional traffic of knowledge production and theorisation of it in the Global North and then setting it as a homogenous 'norm' in the Global South?

Due to the rise of European colonialism and Western capitalism, the North-South split has been employed to convey geographical representations of inequality in society since the 1960s. While the North is associated with regions of prosperity and progress, the South has become a symbol of poverty and marginalisation, as well as an illustration of life in peripheral areas. The question is, however, how the compartmentalization of the world around geographies of inequality affects the creation of knowledge. The geographical region that has been termed as 'Global South' has always been considered at the receiving end of 'theory' with no exception in the field of translation studies. Translation Studies, like other disciplines of social sciences and liberal arts, has treated the Eurocentric ideas as universal and thereby homogenized the differences by non-recognizing the non-European ideas. When we discuss translation studies discipline in India or form syllabus, have we ever referred "Equivalence theory", "Skopos theorie", "Polysystem Theory" as Western translation theories. We have not because we have internalized these theories from Europe as universal and the concepts from the non-European space as 'other', as 'area'. The Global South in terms of knowledge production or if we think specifically from the context of the discipline of Translation Studies, has been non-recognised, silenced, disregarded, and marginalised. The idea of 'non-recognition' therefore, should be used as a weapon, political, social, racial, academic in order to challenge the subtlety through which the Global North operates and tags everything as 'global', 'universal'. The present thesis will try to encounter colonial politics of 'universalizing' the discipline of translation studies by putting forth theories of translation as practiced in India. It will wage a war with the colonial hegemony and strive to present 'global south' as an alter geo-centre of ideas in translation studies, thus will incorporate interactions between and within the 'global south' centres. It seeks to invert the north-south barrier by bringing together plurilingual translation traditions from the Indian subcontinent. The thesis will discuss the Global South's significance as a useful instrument for addressing the 'absence' of translation theories in this geographic space by shedding light on international disparities in the field of translation studies. Finally, South will be addressed as a notion associated with geographies of inequality or critical positionalities, but also as an attitude: a Southern Attitude, which incorporates an invitation to magnify theories that address the infinitely complex notion of translation practices in the Global South.

Global South as the Centre:

“Summer in the deep South is not only a season, a climate, it's a dimension. Floating in it, one must be either proud or submerged.”

— Eugene Walter, *The Untidy Pilgrim*

Samir Amin in his book titled, *Global History: A View from the South* (2011) has cited André Gunder Frank's *ReORIENT: Global Economy in the Asian Age* (1998) and summarized Frank's argument:

History is, from its inception, dealing with a system that has always been global, in the sense that the evolution of the various regions has never been determined by the interaction of forces internal to the societies in question but by forces operating on the global system, and that consequently, all efforts to write the history of a region of the world (Europe, China, or any other region) can only be illusory, since there is only one history, that of the one and only world system. (2011: 120)

The importance of diversity in a more complex spatial construction is important for the discipline of Translation Studies itself. Theories of Translation Studies must be questioned in order to be relevant to the South. The deparochialisation of theory is the essence of that difficulty. The thesis argues that the Translation Studies as a discipline has been reluctant to decolonize itself although attempts to solve the issue via the criticism of the canon have, however, been made more recently. This thesis makes a contribution to the process of evaluating and broadening the discipline in order to make it less provincial in nature. The canon of translation theory, which is Eurocentric, demonstrates the narrowness of the discipline as it is now practised. The thesis then moves on to positing models of translation theories by taking Ajitesh Bandyopadhyay's adaptations of Brecht and Chekhov as case studies of theatre adaptations in South Asia to address biases of the Global North in the discipline's development and perception. The large section of the thesis suggests different frameworks for developing translation theories from the context of the Global South which can harness the rich resources of alternative, non-Global North theories in the field of translation studies. Within the framework of Southern epistemologies, which represent a subaltern history, this thesis has developed theoretical models of conceptualizing translation around the knowledge(s), terminologies acquired from pre-colonial Indian practices – their genesis, etymologies, practices, and the politics of hospitality that surrounds them.

The world, be it the Global North or the Global South has constantly been engaging with European thought and the so-called European intellectual tradition extending back to the ancient Greeks to discuss and analyse any social development or practice in any part of the world. In fact, there is hardly any scholar in India who, when faced with the task of analysing the situation typical to the nation, alludes to classical Indian thinkers, philosophers, or linguists. It is because the heavy influence of the western discourse in Indian academia has led to the belief that the classical Indian tradition is after all, dead. Dipesh Chakrabarty, in his introduction to *Provincializing Europe* writes, “Postcolonial scholarship is committed, almost by definition, to engaging the universals—such as the abstract figure of the human or that of Reason—that were forged in eighteenth-century Europe” (2009:5). This universalization of concepts and discourses has been so imposing that there is hardly an easy way of dispensing it completely. This has led to what Chakrabarty would call “the temporal structure of the statement, “first in the West, and then elsewhere” (ibid 6). As such, if an Indian scholar wants to be abreast with contemporary research, s/he has to be acquainted with the works of all leading European theorists, historians and social scientists. However, the same is not the case with the Western world. If scholars in Europe and America want to be updated, they need not care what theorists or historians in India, China, Kenya, Brazil, or Iran are writing. They can easily ignore these works without concern about being regarded as provincial, parochial, or backward. They do not feel that they are missing out on something important if they do not read these works. This asymmetry of ignorance has made European discourse a referral point for analysing the situations arising in the rest of the world. The thesis, therefore, found the imposition of a westernised construction on the translation studies knowledge system constructed as universal and thereby applicable to every situation. This tendency has led to a one-size-fits-all style of translation studies education, grounded in westernised ideals. This thesis will attempt to put a dent on this ‘universal’ position forwarded by the Global North and reclaim the terrain of translation studies on behalf of the Global South. The North has always been obsessed with the theories conceptualized in their academia and the implementation of them as universal phenomena. This creates an illusion and thereby creates opportunities to counter it.

Is there anything called the Indian theory/(ies) of Translation Studies?:

Judy Wakabayashi and Rita Kothari tried to engage in conversation towards an alternative discourse of translation studies in their edited book titled *Decentering Translation Studies:*

India and Beyond (2009). The editors attempted to foreground discourses of translation practices in the non-Western traditions by looking at the historiography of European and Anglo-American theories of translation studies. The book has tried to broaden the Geo-conceptual periphery of the discipline by breaking away the monopoly of the West in the field. The book has also attempted to move beyond the Indian subcontinent, focusing on other cultures such as Korea and Japan from Southeast Asia, as well as South Africa as a representation from the African continent, in addition to India. In the “Introduction”, jointly written by Rita Kothari and Judy Wakabayashi, the editors have argued,

Although translation is often perceived as a cosmopolitan act bridging linguistic and cultural divides the discipline of Translation Studies is for the most part grounded in the relatively homogeneous and restricted experience of translation in Western Europe. This bias neglects the full richness of translational activities and discourses. In turn, contemporary discourses in the non-Western world sometimes tend to regard traditional on translation as ‘backward’ and to borrow theoretical principles from the West without fully evaluating their validity in the light of longstanding local practices and modes of self-articulation. and both western and non-Western discourses, derivative or otherwise, have largely failed to address the heterogeneity off practices and views *amongst* non-Western cultures. (2014: 2-3)

While reviewing the book for *The Translator*, Harish Trivedi has pointed out that, by reversing an age-old Indian hierarchy where the South of India felt controlled and culturally oppressed by the North, the editors get political correctness points for their editorial choices. (2014: 127) The first essay in the collection titled, “Caste in and Recasting language: Tamil in Translation” by G.J.V. Prasad has underlined the politics of translation and Tamil as a hybridised language through the classical, colonial and nationalist phase, thereby, challenged the notion of ‘purity’. E.V. Ramakrishnan in his essay, “Translation as resistance: The role of translation in the making of Malayalam literary tradition” has focused on the formation of Malayalam literary tradition between the fifteenth and eighteenth century encountering the leading traditions of Sanskrit and Tamil through exemplifying the process of translation as site for resistance. T.S. Satyanath in his essay, “Tellings and renderings in medieval Karnataka: The episode of Kirata Shiva and Arjuna” has established translation as retelling through evidences from mediaeval Kannada. V.B. Tharakeswar, through generic exploration of tragedy in modern Kannada, has investigated issues of the translatorial politics in the colonial and nationalist phase in his essay

titled, “Translating Tragedy into Kannada: Politics of genre and the nationalist elite”. “The afterlives of punditry: Rethinking fidelity in sacred texts with multiple origins” by Christi A. Merrill has investigated the role of Sanskrit pandits as translators cum collaborators during the emergence of colonial period in Bengal. On the other hand, the next article titled, “Beyond textual acts of translation: *Kitab At-Tawhid* and the politics of Muslim identity in British India” by Masood Ashraf Raja has analysed the reception of Muhammad Ibn Abdul-Wahab in the early phase of colonial rule in India. Tridip Suhrd in his “Reading Gandhi in two tongues” probed into Gandhi’s act of translating world literature in Gujrati and the self-translating his text from Gujrati. Rita Kothari in her paper “Being-in-translation: Sufism in Sindh” has spoken about the concepts like hybridity and migrancy in translation by probing into the travel of Sufism in Sindh. Conversely, in “(Mis)Representation of Sufism through translation”, Farzaneh Farahzad has discussed representation of Sufism in English and its interpretation in the West. Theresa Hyun’s article “Translating Indian Poetry in the colonial period of Korea” has brought the idea of relay translation and looked at how the Koreans under Japanese rule grew into translating the Indian poetry through English. Sherry Simon in her essay, “A.K. Ramanujan: What happened in the library” has looked at the figure of the translator in order to understand a translator’s role as a cultural mediator. Judy Wakabayashi has looked at another aspect in the field, the etymological combing of translations of key Japanese terms in her essay, entitled, “An etymological exploration of ‘translation’ in Japan”. Stanley G.M. Ridge in “Translating against the grain: Negotiation of meaning in the colonial trial of chief Langalibalele and its aftermath”, the last essay of the edited book, has looked at the interpreting practice through the archives of nineteenth-century colonial trial to probe further the role of interpreting and translation to understand the mechanisms of societal factors during the colonial regime.

The book project, therefore, seems to chronicle certain hitherto unheard histories of translation and to relativize Translation Studies, possibly shaking the foundations of the field a bit, until such a time when it is possible to rebuild it from the ground up. (2014: 5) Therefore, the book has given space to scholars who have worked on different traditions of translation practices primarily in Indian subcontinent. But this book has not attempted to put all these heterogenous tales of translation into theoretical models. Thus, the book ended with a compilation of micro narratives of different ways of translation in the non-Western cultures especially in India and with a very few exceptions in the Southeast Asia and Africa. This book of course has put forth a remarkable challenge towards “Unsettling the foundations” (2014: 3)

but the editors themselves pointed out that there will be no “fully formulated alternative theories of translation” (2014: 3) for the readers. Hence, I argue. that in order to challenge the western hegemony over the production of translation theories, we should establish common grounds through the tales of translation practices in India and the larger field of global south and then develop theoretical models based on those chronicles, because encountering an institution requires the development of a counter institution.

G.J.V. Prasad edited a collection of essays titled, *India in Translation, Translation in India* (2019) which studies tales of translational practices ranging from Sachin C. Ketkar’s essay on politics of translation of Dnyaneshwar’s *Dnyaneshwari*; Gargi Bhattacharya’s reading of Vidyasagar’s contribution on legal translation in colonial India; Hiren J. Patel’s work on Gujrati literary public sphere as a site of translation; Tara Menon’s excellent study on translation as fraud through the translations of ‘imagined’ *bhakti* literature by the French Jesuit Missionaries; Soham Pain’s work on the English translation of *Mahabharata* which addresses the age-old debate between western notion of accuracy versus Indian notion of agility; Luv Kanoi’s take on the politics of colonial and postcolonial translations through reception of Virgil’s *Aeneid* and Okakura’s *The Book of Tea* in Indian languages; Priyada Shridhar Padhye’s analysis of translation of children’ literature by studying *Panchatantra* and *Grimm’s Tales*’; Subhendu Mund’s attempt to create a brief translational historiography in the colonial time; Amitendu Bhattacharya’s work on Tagore’s translation of Kabir as a *bhakti* reading of *sufism*; Fatima Rizvi’s essay on comparative analysis of English translations of Faiz to the study of the politics of internationalization in the post-colonial India through translating French fiction in Hindi by Nipun Nutan; Runjhun Verma’s examination of translations of Indian literature in French and the politics of anthologizing; Shinjini Basu’s work on the construction of Bengali intelligentsia through the translation of Gramsci in Bengali; Samudranil Gupta’s work on Bengali translations of Samuel Beckett as an edifice of world literature; Regiane Corrêa de Oliveira Ramos’ intervention into underlining the importance of translation as making minority communities visible; Someshwar Sati’s argument about the role of translation in changing the linguistic prejudice towards disability and lastly Amrapali Saha’s exploration of multiple Indias through the English translation of Kannada novel. This book is an excellent collection of case studies of textual receptions in Indian terrain but did not contribute to establish any methodology other than parroting the reception theories of the West.

Saugata Bhaduri in his edited book titled, *Translating Power* (2008) has taken up an important aspect in translation studies: the structure of power as the driving forces behind the

act. In his 'Introduction', he has dealt with the function of ideological state apparatus and repressive state apparatus within literature and their role in translational act. Drawing on Marx, Engels, Gramsci, Althusser, Habermas and Nietzsche, Mukherjee has demonstrated how the "Questions of power are particularly relevant to translation" (2008:xxiii) He has argued that translation can be 'repressive', 'non-repressive' and can also generate 'resistance (2008:xxiii-xxiv) In his work, Harpreet Gill in his article, "Translation and Power: Contingencies and Revolutions" demonstrated how translation might become a revolutionary discourse by analysing a selection of Western philosophical books. Franson Manjali in his article, titled, "Translation and Power: Imagining the Other" examined the problematic link between translation and power by analysing the process of translation from a linguistics perspective, analysing the term's etymology, and associating Derridean discourse. Incorporating further references from Derrida and Foucault, Simi Malhotra in her essay, "Translating Power: Empire, Language and the Postmodern Condition" has problematized the link between translation and power by demonstrating both the ways in which translation both as a subversive force to undermine authority and as an imperial instrument to control power. In "Power and the Case of Horizontal Translation", Meenakshi Mukherjee, reflecting on her own experiences translating a Hindi work into Bangla, discussed horizontal translation and the power status quo in such instances of translating between two languages in similar power position. In his piece, titled, "Translation and Power: A Reader's Perspective", Amiya Dev examined Sisir Kumar Das's translation of Greek literature to demonstrate how dependence on the original may be a significant role in deciding the power. This edited collection is an excellent example of accommodating actual translations with theoretical discussions, but it is limited as it has explored power only from the postcolonial and poststructural point of view, thereby did not address the issues of the status of the discipline in Indian soil.

In *Translation as Growth* (2010) a fascinating and ground-breaking book, famous linguist Udaya Narayana Singh has attempted an understanding translation as a creative act which can be equated with writing. He argued that, translation is primarily a creative act that improves both the source and target languages and thereby used the metaphor of 'growth' in demonstrating the critical role of translation in the development of language. Singh further has demonstrated that the major modern Indian languages have developed not only through the "vertical" translations from the languages of power and knowledge, like English and Sanskrit, but also through the "horizontal" translations between *bhashas*, thereby ultimately contributing to the creation of a literature that is inherently pluralistic in nature. Singh further discussed the

sociological, poststructural and postmodern theories of text and translation, thereby demonstrated the concepts of ‘over-’ and ‘under-translation’ as well as ‘genetic’ and ‘structural’ relationship between the source and target language. (66) In succeeding chapters, Singh discusses a number of theories from a western viewpoint that are not new to the Indian academic community, such as translation as communication, translation as interpretation, translation as rewriting, etc. Although the metaphor of growth offered several opportunities for exploration, Singh has not gone in that route.

The title of the joint edition, *Textual Travels: Theory and Practice of Translation in India* (2015) by Mini Chandran and Suchitra Mathur sounded promising in the field of theorising translation in the Indian context. Supriya Chaudhuri in the “Foreword” began saying,

In India, as in the world today, translation is the air we breathe: not only in its original sense of ‘carrying over’ (*trans-latio*), the condition of meaning – of the conversion of words into signs – but a ceaseless process whereby we make sense of cultures, languages, institutions, and social practices. Yet, while Translation Studies has flourished as an academic discipline, there has perhaps been insufficient attention to the everyday life of translation as social necessity and public instrument. (vii)

The editors of this volume, Mini Chandran and Suchitra Mathur, also acknowledged,

India has followed Anglophone translation theory with diligence, being quick to pick up on the cultural nuances that seem to answer its homespun issues of plurality and diversity. Anglocentric translation theory, for example, has proved useful to highlight the uneven development of languages in India, the lopsided governmental policies, and the irony of supremacy accorded to English. (xi)

G. N. Devy, in the inaugural essay of the volume, has devoted largely to the historiography of “various theories of the linguistic translations and semantic mutations involved in translation, as developed in Europe” (5) although the title of the essay is, “Translation Theory: An Indian Perspective” and thereby has exposed the consciousness of ‘exile’ and ‘anxiety’ embedded in the theorizations of translation in the west by tracing the origin of the metaphysical crisis in the biblical story. He has argued that the western idea of ‘translation as intrusion’ is natural and ‘desirable’ for the monolingual cultures which we cannot equate in the Indian perspective as translation operates on an everyday level in a plurilingual and multicultural space, thereby, indicates, India’s ‘translating consciousness’. (2-3) Towards the last section of the essay, he has divided the literary translation from Indian context into three broad categories and thereby

charted the differing methodologies to address these categories, i.e., “(a) those interested in preserving the ancient literary heritage; (b) those interested in ‘Westernising’ Indian languages and literature; (c) those interested in ‘nationalising’ literature in modern Indian languages.” (16-7) and argued that, in a space which houses numerous cultures, languages, and traditions, western theories should not be accepted without discrimination. But the essay failed to provide any theoretical standpoints except defining ‘translating consciousness’ to understand translation from the Indian perspective. The rest of the essays in the volume have dealt with the literary contacts, reception, and appropriation by focusing on specific textual examples from few parts of India across time, for example, Chitra Panikkar’s take on self-translation by O. V. Vijayan, Vijaya Guttal’s essay on graphic adaptations of Feluda, Meena T. Pillai’s take on the adaptations of the popular, K. M. Sherrif’s piece on adaptation of Shakespearean drama, Mini Chandran’s critical engagement with the translation market in India, Sowmya Dechamma’s article on translation and script, Nikhila H’s multimodal translation in TV advertisements in India and lastly P. K. Nayar’s view on cultural translation and its consumption in reference to Indian Premier League. Therefore, the volume has not been able to justify the theoretical paradigms of Indian translation because the location of theories is always the European continent.

One of the earliest volumes on translation, its role, definitions, and politics from Indian perspective is *Translation: From Periphery to Centrestage* (1998) edited by Tutun Mukherjee. This edited work has attempted to focus on the theoretical parameters of translation studies in general as well as the praxis of translation. The essays in the book attempts to address the broad spectrum of theoretical, practical, textual and contextual specifics in the world of translation in India.

This thesis deals with the translation terminologies in use in India from the precolonial time to come up with a proposition that it is possible to formulate a discourse of translation without falling back upon the globally dominating theories that evolved in the North. However, this study of the particular has an analytical concern for a larger relevance for the entire territory identified as Global South. Anisur Rahman, while discussing translation theory and practice in the world of globalization in his book *In Translation: Positions and Paradigms* (2019), points out that, “While the individual fields may grow crops, the larger field may see sharecropping. This means that in the domains of translation theory and practice both the particular and the universal may bear upon one another with equal indulgence to each other” (Rahman 2019: vii). But this concept which sounds ideologically ideal and talks of creating a utopic space where

the theories emerging from both the “centre” and the “periphery” can coexist and share equal space is fantastical in the present time where the North has created and successfully maintained a hegemony of its position and discourse. However, Rahman acknowledges that globalization which is “identified with modern capitalism, technological developments and new world order” can also be a “bane” as “it camouflages diversities presented by subcultures and less powerful languages in order to hegemonise and homogenise” (Rahman 2019:viii).

In *Translation: Poetics and Practice*, published as early as 2002, Anisur Rahman, the editor of the volume, states that India, being a multilingual nation is seeing an increased interest in the field of translation. He writes,

...during all these consequential years, translational activities of good and bad quality have flourished, publishing houses have weighed the aspects of profit and loss and taken a step, government bodies promoting literature and culture have groped for policies and found some, and literature departments in the Universities have considered and reconsidered their curriculum, supposedly to their gain. With many a slip and success they have ultimately made way for what is now, justifiably enough, an eminently viable academic and market project. All of them seem to be in agreement now and they have joined hands, even without clearly acknowledging each other, in creating a condition for wider acceptance and appreciation of our literary capital. In short, the Translation “industry” has come to stay for good. (Rahman 2002: x)

It is true that a multilingual and multicultural country like India creates a profitable market for books translated from regional languages with pressing concerns. This has proved encouraging for writers from the peripheral regions of the country who, owing to the translation of their works, are now recognized and their works are being appreciated. It is both an academic social responsibility and the responsibility of the government to encourage plurality of voices to coexist and engage in cultural and literary exchanges. Academics in India have practiced and preached translation with an earnest responsibility for almost three decades now. The government, too, has shared its responsibility by introducing prestigious awards and recognitions for translators. However, a persistent problem that continued in Indian academia is that the Western theories of translation always remained a referral point. In fact, syllabus of all the courses of translation in the Universities and colleges across the country are either dealing completely with the western theories of translation or include a larger share of it with a few essays by Indian scholars as representative inclusions.

Methodology/ Theoretical Framework

This thesis has focused on the theoretical lack of translation studies as a discipline in India. The thesis has tried to develop four models, namely, translation as interpretation, translation as illumination, translation as evolution, and translation as fission. In order to do so, this dissertation has reviewed the existing literature on translation studies in India and translation studies as a discipline in the Global South. This research has used a deductive method in so far as it has taken into account the more considerable and normalized practice of analysing translation practice in India, in particular, and Global South at larger, to conclude how there exists a hegemonic prevalence of the epistemological theories of translation from the global north in this part of the world. Even the indigenous scholars of the region have accepted the discourse of the global north as the standard of evaluating translation, even when the translation is happening between two languages from the global south itself. Despite the fact that there exists a plethora of indigenous terms and even a distinct world view that has the potential to be developed into an alternate discourse from the global south, the north has dominated the thought process in the field so far. Therefore, the research proposes an inductive method of developing an indigenous theory of translation for India taking into account the translation terminologies that have been in use since the precolonial times. It is through the formulation of this theory, the thesis explores whether the global south that has always been regarded as the global consumer of discourses is at all capable of theorizing, thereby rejecting the hegemonic dominance of the theories from the global north.

This dissertation has also tried to conceptualise eco translatology in the Indian context by incorporating the concept of eco-translation by Michael Cronin and eco-translatology by Gengshen Hu. The dissertation has attempted textual analysis of the adaptations by Ajitesh Bandopadhyay in order to develop a case study of how we can analyze translations or adaptations through the model of ecotranslatology developed in this thesis. The thesis has pointed out how Ajitesh Bandopadhyay's adaptations can fit into the model of translation as evolution. The larger methodology of this thesis is theoretical in nature and analysed the adaptations by Ajitesh Bandopadhyay as textual translations and not as a performative text in order to create an alternative theoretical framework from the Global South.

Whose Landscape is this? Clearing the Murky Terrain:

The opening chapter, the Introduction, has set the tone of the thesis by positing the field of translation studies in the Global South. The thesis attempts, amongst many of its other ventures, to situate where the Global South is and why understanding the metrics of the Global South is essential in order to re-orient the field of translation studies in India. In order to argue for using terminologies like Global North and Global South, Chapter One has also tried to discuss the limitations of the East–West discourse or First World–Third World narrative. In this globalized world, which has seen several power shifts after the Cold War, locating Global South vis-à-vis Global North is essential. The chapter has never argued that, like the previous binary positions i.e., East–West or First World - Third World, Global North, and Global South, is also a fixed static identity. Rather, it argues about the fluidity of the positions of Global North and Global South against one another and the continuous shift in power locations depending on the geopolitical, socio-economical, and eco-ethnic relationships. The continuous flux in the power status quo in the globe, the wartime exploitation of art and religion, the usage of ethnocultural currency in foreign relationships, the war against different types of terrorism, the continuous subversion of freedom, the constant surveillance by the states, the resource-specific diplomacy, the race in the space, the biological weapons, the differing notions of development and the exhaustion of natural resources and the harrowing end of the anthropocentric world, all these and many other situations in the world order together have contributed the continuous change in the definition of Global North and Global South and made it fluid as well as a continuous emerging concept. The first chapter of this thesis makes an attempt to posit the field of translation studies within the context of the ever-shifting order of the world, and it also discusses the necessity of resisting the unproblematic channel of receiving translation theories from the Global North in the Global South. In addition to this, it looks at whether or not India has contributed any translation theory to the countries of the Northern Hemisphere. In order to identify the areas where further research is needed in the field of translation studies from an Indian viewpoint, it has conducted a comprehensive analysis of the available literature. This chapter also makes an effort to re-orient the Global South as the centre and, as a result, aims to transform those who are on the receiving end of information into knowledge producers. The first chapter comes to a close by elaborating on the rationale for selecting Ajitesh as a case study to illustrate the ecotranslatology model and demonstrate the approach used throughout the writing of the thesis.

The second chapter titled, “Alternative Notions of Translation from the Global South” has stitched together as many substitutive views as possible from the ‘global south’ as against

the ‘universal’ notion of translation to explore various discursive practices and then, tried to foreground four different models through which I tried to liberate the discipline called ‘translation studies’ from linguistic and literary boundaries as propounded by the Global North, and thereby tried to think deeply and discursively about alternative discourses of translation as a field of study from Global South. According to the systematic poetics of Indian practices of translational act, best explained in the prefaces of pre-colonial Indian texts written in Sanskrit and other Indian languages, there was no such spatial concept of transference of meaning like translation, rather a multitude of terms denoting alternative practices in peripheral spaces i.e., *anuvād* (Sanskrit. ‘retelling’), *rūpāntara* (Sanskrit. ‘transplantation’), *bhāshāntaram* (Sanskrit. ‘change of dialect’) *vivartanam* (Malayalam. ‘evolution’), *mozhipeyarttu* (Tamil. ‘transmigration’) *tarjumā* (Urdu. ‘interpretation’), *chāyā* (Hindi. ‘shadow’), *bhāngni* (Assamese. ‘to break’) which depicts the use of the concept in a variety of contexts, thus challenging the obligation of the singularity of ‘translation’ in ‘Global North’ and thereby promoting the plurisemiotic practices across the width and breadth of the Indian subcontinent. This chapter deals with each of these terms in details and thereby tries to propound independent theoretical models from the Global South which also highlights the presence of multiplicity of the translation activities. This chapter, therefore, has offered four theoretical models of conceptualizing translation studies from the Indian context, namely, “translation as interpretation” by looking at Sanskrit terms *anuvād* (retelling), *bhāshāntaram* (change of dialect) and Urdu term *tarjumā* (interpretation); “translation as illumination” by analysing the Hindi term *chāyā* (shadow) and Tamil term *mozhipeyarttu* (transmigration); “translation as fission” by looking at the Assamese word *bhāngni* (to break) and “translation as evolution” by interpreting the Sanskrit word *rūpāntara* (transplantation).

Chapter Three, titled, “Exploring Translational Movement between Spaces: Analysing Brechtian Adaptation by Ajitesh Bandyopadhyay through the Metrics of ‘Geotranslation’”, is a detailed textual analysis of two significant adaptations of Brecht by Ajitesh Bandyopadhyay in order to propagate the model of ‘geotranslation’ from the Global Southern space. The chapter begins with the formation of the Indian Progressive Writer’s Association (IPWA) and a short historiography of the initial days of the association. The chapter further delineates how the Indian Progressive Writer’s Association impacted the germination of the Indian People’s Theatre Association (IPTA) and, subsequently, how the Bengal chapter of the IPTA became one of the most functional and enterprising in terms of using theatre for the upliftment of the poor section of the society. Then the chapter proceeds toward the arrival of Brecht in the Bengal

theatre stage and how Ajitesh has indigenized Brecht in the geography of Bengal. Before moving towards the detailed analysis of the adaptations, the third chapter also introduces Ajitesh Bandyopadhyay to the reader. The next section of this chapter is entirely dedicated to the detailed analysis of *Tin Paysār Pālā* (Adaptation of Brecht's *The Three Penny Opera*) and *Bhālomānuṣ* (adaptation of Brecht's *The Good Woman of Setzuan*). Using the Euclidean geometry and Federico Italiano's idea of "geographic re-orientation" as points of departure, this chapter has demonstrated how geometry and geography can be useful tools to understand the methodology of Brechtian adaptations by Ajitesh. Examining the Brechtian *verfremdungseffekt* (Alienation effect) and Ajitesh's use of *Jatra*, a folk-theatre form of Bengal, this chapter examines how the agency of adapter has played a major role in situating Brecht in Bengal keeping in mind the broader background of reception studies.

Chapter Four titled, "Theatre Translation as Transplantation into Target Language Ecology: Locating Chekhov in Post-Independence Bengal" proposes a dialectical reading of the adaptations of Chekhov by Ajitesh Bandyopadhyay. It explores how, while adapting Chekhov, he risks the de-familiarization of the linguistic nuances for the elite middle-class Bengali audience and allows his play to travel to the remote corner of Bengal and situate itself comfortably there. This chapter also tries to focus on the dialectal translation by looking closely at the Sanskrit term *bhāshāntaram*. The chapter endeavors to record the process of acculturation through a close analysis of different layers of dialects used in dialogues by different classes of people. The concepts of 'transfer' and 'reframing' have received much attention in adaptation studies from the context of "transference of sign system" and "resituating a text in a new habitus". This chapter, therefore, studies 'reframing' through the lens of transplantation through the adaptations of Brecht by Ajitesh Bandyopadhyay. Analysing Ajitesh's adaptations of Chekhov's plays i.e., *Manjari Amer Manjari* (Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*); *Nanaranger Din* (Chekhov's *Swan Song*); *Shuvobibaha* (Chekhov's *The Wedding*); *Tamakusebaner Apakarita* (Chekhov's *On The Harmfulness Of Tobacco*); *Sharater Megh* (Chekhov's *The Bear*); *Prostab* (Chekhov's *The Proposal*) this chapter aims to contribute to adaptation studies by investigating in-depth the methodologies of textual transplantation. In order to elaborate on the 'reframing' of world theatre in post-independence Bengal, I have drawn upon the reception of Brecht in Bengal, illustrating how the locus of the text or the textual ecosystem can be 'transplanted' from the microcosmic ecosphere and 'reframed' into another eco-environment keeping the eco-linguistic texture of the target intact.

In the Chapter Five, titled, ‘Nature’s Tale from the Global South: Indian Tryst with Eco-Translatology – A Beginning’ what I intended to trace is, first of all, whether biology is a suitable metaphor that can be useful for understanding ‘adaptation’, and then going beyond the study of organic metaphors, which is very much present in the concept, can I study adaptation from a biological perspective and reshape ‘adaptation studies’ in terms of biological perspective. I am aware of the fact that metaphors can sometimes be helpful in improving an academic discipline like translatology by opening up new perspectives, although they do always have their limitations. Therefore, using the tools available from eco-linguistics, biosemiotics and eco-translatology, this chapter attempted to re-formulate *rūpāntar* and *vivartanam* as ‘Eco-adaptology’ from the broader spectrum of eco-translatological paradigm in the context of new territories in theatre adaptations especially by Ajitesh Bandyopadhyay who has referred all his adaptations as *rūpāntar* throughout. Reflecting on the Darwin’s theory of ‘Evolution and Adaptation via Natural Selection’, as Bandyopadhyay described his Brechtian and Chekhovian adaptations as *swadeshi bhasai bideshi phool* (making a foreign flower blossom in native language) this chapter has tried to probe how theatre adaptation can maintain the eco-balance between two diverge ecosystems, their inhabitants and the theatres. Depending on the findings in the previous chapters, this chapter postulates that *rūpāntar* and *vivartanam* can be a framework to understand ecological perspective of translation studies – eoadaptology. Keeping in mind the biological conceptualisations of ‘natural selection’, ‘evolution’, and ‘survival’, this chapter explores how we can then attempt to form an ecological model of the process of adaptation. The final chapter of this thesis has centred its primary attention on the heuristic potential of the South, as well as the influence that hegemonic agendas of 'translational ideas and conceptions' have on the field of study as a whole. Despite the hegemony of the Global North in the disciplinary study of translation, the thesis has posited itself towards re-orienting the Global South at the centre at least in the field of translation studies.

Signature of Supervisor
Dated: 31/01/2023

Signature of Candidate
Dated: 31/01/2023