

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

In the Name of Shakespeare: (En)Gendering India through Translation

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4779c0vc>

Author

Rao, Anandi

Publication Date

2020

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
IRVINE

In the Name of Shakespeare: (En)Gendering India through Translation

DISSERTATION

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in Comparative Literature

by

Anandi Rao

Dissertation Committee:
Professor R Radhakrishnan, Chair
Professor Julia Reinhard Lupton
Professor Ngugi wa Thiong'o
Professor Ketu H. Katrak

2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
VITA	iv
ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION	v
PROLOGUE	1
CHAPTER 1: Seeing a <i>Foreign</i> World: Foreignness, Translation and the intimacies of un/translatability	6
CHAPTER 2: Colonizing Translation, Envisioning Africa and Asia	44
CHAPTER 3: Nationing in/through Translation	85
CHAPTER 4: Queer (in) Translation	126
EPILOGUE: In Search for Portia	161
BIBLIOGRAPHY	176

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express the deepest appreciation to my committee chair, Professor R Radhakrishnan and the other members of my committee – Professor Julia Lupton, Professor Ngugi wa Thiong’o, and Professor Ketu Katrak – without whose guidance and feedback this dissertation would not have been possible. Thank you, Merci, Shukran, Shukriya, Dhanyawad.

In addition, a thank you to Professor Diana Henderson of MIT whose support has been invaluable this year.

Portions of chapter one were workshopped at the Comparative Literature Colloquium in Fall 2017 and with the UCHRI multi-campus working group on Literature and Translation in the Middle East and South Asia. Conversations with Kat Cosby were invaluable when chapter one and two were in the formative stages. Thank you. Portions of chapter four were workshopped with the working group on South Asia and the Queer Theory Reading Group at UC Irvine. I am immensely grateful to all the participants of these working groups for their feedback.

Over the years Nima, Sarah, Huda, Beezer and Patricia have provided writing and editing support.

Thank you to my parents – Nitya Rao and Sudhir Rao – for conversations, sending me links to newspaper articles that I might find useful and for their support.

Finally, thank you to the constellation of people without whose love and support this dissertation would have not been possible – Chandana Anusha, Nandita Badami, Robert Barrett, Saudamini Dabak, Isabell Dahms, Beezer de Martelly, Rachael De La Cruz, Letty Garcia, Mehra Gharibian, Julia Havard, Nabila Islam, Juliet Kunkel, Tilly Lunken, Sasha Matthew, Adhira Mangalagiri, Sarah Mellors, Mhairi Morrisson, Jasmine Navarro, Sarah Ng, Gauri Nori, Linette Park, Saumya Premchander, Pratichi Priyambada, Kalyani Ramachandran, Robina Rayamajhi, Judy Rodriguez, Louise Sider, Sharanya Shridhar, Morgan Slade, Shreya Yadav, Nima Yolmo.

I also thank Intellect Books for permission to include portions of Chapter Four of my dissertation, which was originally published in *Studies in South Asian Film and Media*. Financial support was provided by the Center for Asian Studies, The School of Humanities and Humanities Commons at the University of California, Irvine, and the School of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (SHASS) diversity predoctoral fellowship at MIT.

VITA

Anandi Rao

2010	B.A. in Arabic and English Literature, University of Edinburgh
2013	M.A in Literary Translation, University of East Anglia
2016	M.A in Comparative Literature, University of California, Irvine
2019-2020	Predoctoral Fellow, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
2020	Ph.D. in Comparative Literature, University of California, Irvine

FIELDS OF STUDY

Translation studies, Shakespeare studies, gender and sexuality studies, postcolonial studies

PUBLICATIONS

"Reading Double: Queer Girls and Hindutva politics in The World Before Her," *Studies in South Asian Film and Media* 9.2 (2019) pp 129-142.

"Necropolitics and the female suicide bomber: Gender and the re-presentation of Kashmir in Vishal Bhardwaj's Haider" *Journal of Contemporary Thought* Issue no 42. pp 27-42.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

In the Name of Shakespeare: (En)Gendering India through Translation

by

Anandi Rao

Doctor of Philosophy in Comparative Literature

University of California, Irvine, 2020

Professor R. Radhakrishnan, Chair

Language, identity, conflict and their interactions are an indispensable part of our existence, and as such they bring the issue of translation to the fore. I examine translation—both as a theoretical concept and as a practice—through the lenses of gender and race. In doing so I offer a meta critique of the concept of translation as it is figured in multiple languages. Grounding a close reading of the texts I study in an analysis of their sociocultural and historical contexts, my dissertation “In the Name of Shakespeare: (En)Gendering India through Translation” lies at the intersections of translation studies, global Shakespeare studies, gender and sexuality studies and South Asian studies. I look at select Hindi translations and adaptations of Shakespearean plays in two distinct time periods (1878-1924 and 2014-present) to show how the myth of Shakespeare as a “universal genius” and the masculinist myth of India as a Hindu nation are co-constituted. I adopt a transnational and transregional approach to problematizing Eurocentric, particularly Anglophone, notions of translation by engaging with Anglophone, Francophone and Arabophone critical theorists.

While a wide range of scholarship has been published on global, worldwide and postcolonial Shakespeares, most of this work focuses on the performance history and traditions of translated and adapted plays. In contrast, my work pays careful and close attention to the ways

in which the texts have been translated, and rather than considering the translated playscripts as secondary to the originals, I consider them as works of art in their own right. Translation is often overlooked and feminized in the fields of world literature and area-based literary studies. In foregrounding the racialized and gendered politics of translation via an analysis of literary and visual texts, my work seeks to bring translation out of the shadows, revealing it as a site of powerful political projects. Scholars who work on gender, sexuality and translation have brought to the fore the connections between translation and other “trans” categories like transnational and transgender. However, their theorization is based on Eurocentric models of gender and does not attend to the ways in which race complicates these theorizations of gender and sexuality. Because I bring the discourse on translation in conversation with critical race theory, my work also represents a significant contribution to the field of translation studies.

Prologue

The journey of this dissertation begins in some ways with the first play by Shakespeare that I read, *Julius Caesar*, as a fourteen-year-old, in high school, in India – a high school curriculum that bore the legacies of British colonialism despite more than fifty years of independence. As students in an English medium school we were expected to know and appreciate the supposed universalism and the literary geniuses of Shakespeare, Wordsworth, and Keats, even as we were learning about anti-colonial struggles and movements that shaped so much of 20th century Indian history. In thinking now about which conversations my work speaks to I can't help but feel that in many ways for me, Shakespeare has always been, and can only be, “global Shakespeare”. I mean this both gesturing to the fact that translation, travels, real and imagined globes and worlds are central to his plays themselves, but also to the fact that Shakespeare played an important role in the cultural imperialism of the British empire. A key part of the civilizing mission, as it manifested in British educational policies was a devaluing of indigenous literatures and traditions, while cementing and valorizing the English canon. So, given this history, you might ask why and how did I come to this dissertation which lies at the intersection of translation studies, gender and sexuality studies, postcolonial studies and Shakespeare studies?

Key to this was, I think, watching Tim Supple's production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in 2005 in New Delhi. Even though this was nine years before I started working on my dissertation this production really allowed me to see and experience the beauty and creative potential of an Indian/South Asian Shakespeare. The play was in seven languages – including English, Hindi, Marathi, Tamil, and Sinhala. Even though I couldn't understand several of the languages, it was the first time I felt that I was able to comprehend a Shakespearean play. The

feeling, affect, and exhilaration I felt as an eighteen-year-old made me believe Shakespeare could be mine too. This feeling has evolved into a belief that Shakespeare studies can be mine too. And I make it mine by turning to and embracing translation – both in terms of disciplinary training as well as lived experience.

Growing up in a multilingual, multivalent country like post/neo colonial India, I was brought up in an urban middle-class household and went to an English medium school. In this context my relationship with English was by and large one “without any colonial hang-ups” (Kothari 51). It has only been my experiences of going to academic institutions of higher education in the United Kingdom and now in the United States that have foregrounded the connection between colonization and my use of English. In the midst of this journey I have also spent varying degrees of time in South West Asia and North Africa, most notably two years in Morocco. Living in Morocco I saw the parallels between the afterlives of French colonialism and British colonialism in India especially in terms of language use, the endurance of the colonial educational infrastructures and classism/elitism. Moroccan Darija (Arabic inflected with Tamazight languages, French and Spanish), Hinglish and everyday encounters with languages as being fluid, evolving and not self-contained has shaped the way I think of and embody translation. As Verena Conley says, “Let’s say that the title of Sofia Coppola’s film of 2003 which claimed that we are ‘lost in translation,’ can be turned to affirm that we ‘live in translation’” (Conley 19). Conley also reflects on her background and remarks that she has perhaps “internalized some of the problems of translation with which we live today” (Conley 19). I too have internalized not the problems but rather the possibilities of translation, and it is these possibilities that I bring to this project.

Given my journey it is only fitting that I begin this dissertation with an engagement with “Dislocation,” a short story by the Moroccan writer Fouad Laroui, as a starting point of my enquiry in chapter one. This chapter explores the concepts of foreignness and visibility and their intrinsic connection to translation as it is conceptualized in Euro-American discourse. By asserting that the constructions of the “domestic” and the “native” are based on the erasures of queer and/or black and brown bodies and the silencing of “accented” voices, I demonstrate the liberatory potential for locating “foreignness” everywhere in an age defined equally by the digital and the untranslatable. By theorizing and practicing translation as an art that is multilateral and that listens for the nuances and hidden histories of languages at play, I resist the homogenization enforced by global English and the flattening of the “world” implied by World Literature.

I signal the importance of scales—global, regional, national, local—as my dissertation moves from a global scale in chapter one to a regional/transoceanic scale in chapter two. Recognizing the limits of both the English word “translation” and the Sanskrit-derived word “anuvad,” this chapter develops the analytic “trans*anuvading.” Trans*anuvading establishes a deconstructive reading practice that holds space for the transoceanic (slave, colonial) trade routes that brought Shakespeare to India. I use the story of Lucas Fernandes, a Sierra Leonean interpreter, as it has been told in archival materials and contemporary scholarship along with an image of Shakespeare and the classical Indian poet Kalidasa, to show how contemporary scholarship on Shakespeare reproduces Elizabethan visions of Africa and Asia as foreign colonial spaces.

From colonizing (in/through) translation, I shift to nationing (in/through) translation by exploring the relationship between translation and nation-building in the late colonial era in

chapter three. This chapter brings to the fore two figures who translated plays of Shakespeare into Hindi—Bharatendu Harishchandra and Lala Sitaram— both of whom played a slightly different role in the movements that sought to establish Hindi as a national language. In this chapter, I show how these translators used Shakespeare to promote a masculinist vision of India in their nation-building project. Further, the mapping of religion and language onto geography through the slogan “Hindi, Hindu, Hindustan” was crucial in giving the Hindi movement a religious fervor. The effects of representing India as a masculine Hindu nation are felt today in the ways in which sexual, religious and caste minorities are viewed as intranational foreigners.

Chapter four, titled “Queer (in) Translation,” studies two visual texts, the 2014 Indo-Canadian documentary *The World Before Her* and the 2017 web series *Romil and Jugal* (an adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet*). The former is a documentary that contrasts the world of the Miss India Pageant to the world of right-wing Hindu camps for girls. I contend that one of the protagonists of the film, Prachi, uses the hegemonic space and the cultural capital of the right-wing camps to live a non-heteronormative life. I compare this to *Romil and Jugal* a web-series that transposes the *Romeo and Juliet* story to an elite Indian world, with two young men as the protagonists. In particular, I look at the production and distribution of the series, which aims to draw an audience from beyond the nation-state. This is owing to the series’ digital distribution as well as the fact that the series uses Shakespeare to tell the story, as a growing number of Bollywood films have been doing. By looking at the ways in which the notion of “love” is articulated and translated in multiple languages, this chapter contends with the fraught nature of creating queer spaces within a neoliberal as well as an increasingly religious nation-state.

Working together, these four chapters provide an intricate portrait of the relationship between Shakespeare and India, between early modern England and colonial and postcolonial

worlds. My analysis helps us evaluate Shakespeare's texts anew and in doing so situates Early Modern literature within a global and transnational feminist framework.

A key term that I have had to contend with through this intimate journey from the personal to the "world" of world literature is the question of the "global", especially "global" Shakespeare. So, I want to end this prologue with an invitation from Ngugi wa Thiong'o's work which suggests a mode of reading globally. This is, he writes,

a way of approaching any text from whatever times and places to allow its content and themes to form a free conversation with other texts of one's time and place, the better to make it yield its maximum to the human. It is to allow it to speak to our own cultural present even as we speak to it from our own cultural present. It is to read a text with the eyes of the world; it is to see the world with the eyes of the text (Ngugi wa Thiong'o 60).

Watching a multilingual production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* as in Tim Supple's production, or reading Harishchandra's translation of *Merchant of Venice*, *Durlabh Bandhu*, or streaming *Romil and Jugal* are ways of reading Shakespeare's plays through the eyes of the worlds their translators and adapters lived in. Not only are we engaging with the bard but doing so also allows us to get insights about the translators' politics and praxis through the ways in which they intimately interpret and approach the text.

Chapter 1: Seeing a *Foreign* World: Foreignness, Translation and the intimacies of un/translatability

i woke one morning to another new symptom, my tongue
blazed with territories. diagnosed as geographic tongue
or mapped tongue, a condition where my tongue formed
ridges, its borders appeared and disappeared, a living history.

From “Migratory Glossitis” (Rabiyah 44)

“Que serait, se demanda-t-il, un monde où tout serait *étranger*?” (Laroui 21)

“What would it be like, he asked himself, a world where everything was *foreign*?” (Ramadan, 18).

This question is the first line of Emma Ramadan’s translation of Fouad Laroui’s short story “Dislocation”. The protagonist of this short story is Maati, a Moroccan who is fluent in French, and living in Utrecht with his Dutch wife. This opening question serves as a trigger for his existential anxieties and explorations on the relationship between language, body and place. Like Maati, Laroui too, is a Moroccan who now lives in the Netherlands, so the “foreign”-ness expressed in the question is a lived statement for both the author and the narrator. The question connects something called “a world” with what is “foreign”. Taken on its own, outside the context of the story, this question seems to have only one answer. The world that the narrator is dreaming up is impossible, because “everything” cannot be “foreign”. “Foreign” needs its other, be it “domestic” in geopolitical terms or “native” when we think about peoples, tongues or

languages. This binary, and the racial politics that underlies it, is at the heart of any discussion on translation, especially as it is configured in “Western” theories of translation. These have, in turn, shaped how our “discipline” – comparative literature, and notions of “world literature” have been configured. This chapter begins with a close reading of the story, before turning to an analysis of the categories of domestic and foreign in translation theory. The last section explores the intimacies of the politics of translatability and that of untranslatability. Through these sections I theorize and practice translation as an art that is multilateral and that listens for the nuances and hidden histories of languages at play in order to resist the homogenization enforced by global English and the flattening of the “world” implied by World Literature

The short story “Dislocation” was published in French in 2012 and in Ramadan’s translation as part of the collection *The Curious Case of Dassoukine’s Trousers* in 2016. Seeing as I am focusing on translation as it relates to Global English and World Literature¹, this chapter is primarily focused on Ramadan’s translation of the story. However, there are two aspects of the French I want to highlight². The first is that the title of the story is “dislocation”, a word not foreign to English. But is the “dislocation” of English the same as the “dislocation” of French? Is this even a productive question to ask? What would it mean to see “dislocation” as foreign, to read “dislocation” as foreign, to translate “dislocation” as foreign in a world where everything was foreign? In terms of thinking about how translation theory, and translation and reading

¹ I have taught stories from Ramadan’s translation in a world literature class.

² During the process of close reading Maryse Condé’s *Heremakhonon* in Philcox’s English translation and comparing it to the French, Spivak writes, “in the translation from French to English lies the disappeared history of distinctions in another space – made by the French and withdrawn by the English – full of the movement of languages and peoples still in historical sedimentation at the bottom, waiting for the real virtuality of our imagination” (Spivak 18). Here and elsewhere in the chapter (particularly in my reading of Mireille Gansel’s work, I look at both the French and the English, not to suggest that there is translational loss that occurs in the translation from French to English, but rather to unpack the “distinctions” made in a particular linguistic space, whether that be English or French.

praxis, are not divorced from one another, these are some of the questions I am interested in getting to via my unsettling of the domestic/native and foreign dichotomy.

The second aspect of the French that I want to foreground is the word “foreign”. In the French the word used is “*étranger*” – which in its noun form was the title of Camus’ famous novel, alternatively translated as both *The Stranger* and *The Outsider* in English. While Kamel Daoud’s *The Mersault Investigation* won a lot of prizes for being a postcolonial response to and reimagining of *The Stranger*, I think it is interesting to think of “Dislocation” as a companion piece too. In an interview with Laroui for the online magazine *Words Without Borders*, the interviewer connects Maati, the protagonist of the story, to Camus:

Dislocation can provide a certain privileged, expansive, and, ultimately, existential perspective as it highlights the inadequacy of language and the fallacy of belonging. For Maati, the very notion of home becomes absurd— “as if one were never at home . . . a little speck of dust in an unlimited universe”—and, in the face of this, he contemplates what Camus called the only philosophical problem: that of suicide.

The connection to Camus becomes all the more apparent with the constant repetition of the “*étranger*” in the French. While the interviewer makes the connections at a philosophical level (i.e. thinking about existentialism and absurdism), I think this sidesteps an important comparison. In *The Stranger*, Mersault as a white, French Algerian has an existential crisis in Algeria, a crisis predicated on the Arab being racialized out of identity, citizenship, belonging, humanity, imagination, and other interrelated topoi. In “dislocation”, Maati, an Arab Moroccan living in the Netherlands, has an existential crisis caused by this unnamed feeling of dislocation, which is also predicated on a certain form of being racialized out of belonging. This interconnectedness between race, body, place, citizenship and language lies beneath the conceptualization of the “domestic” and “foreign”.

The story begins with the question: “What would it be like, he asked himself, a world where everything was *foreign*?” and in the next several pages this question is repeated with more and more details from the narrator’s stream of consciousness between the first two clauses (“What would it be like, he asked himself”) and the last one (“a world where everything was *foreign*”). Each statement is an echo of the previous one, and here I use echo in the sense of sounds added, distinct, but secondary to the original. Each addition is secondary, in that the question is comprehensible without it, and yet the secondary is not merely secondary, just as translation as an echo is not secondary in Benjamin, in Derrida, in Spivak. As an example, I want to focus on a paragraph that comes two pages into the story. It reads,

What would it be like, he asked himself, walking slowly in the direction of his house, where his wife Anna was waiting for him – sweet, kind Anna, whom he had ended up marrying in order to *settle down* (isn’t that what it was called, in times past, in the world of Parisian courtesans? --- *Oh Maati, you and your French references...* and sometimes she would add: “*You aren’t even French, you’re Moroccan.*” He had tried one day to explain to her that he was Moroccan by birth, in body, but “French in the head” ... She had laughed in his face, and even he wasn’t very convinced by his *pro domo* pleas. But here, for God’s sake! Here, in Utrecht, wasn’t he ten times more of a foreigner than he would have been if he had moved to Nantes or Montpellier?) – world where everything was *foreign*? (19-20).

This quotation suggests that Maati is always already configured as foreign in Europe, even though he has his “house”, his “wife” and is “settled” there. Drawing on the work of Edward Said, Fatima el-Tayeb argues that “neither long-term residency nor citizenship have anything to do with who is classified as a ‘foreigner’ whose right to remain in Europe depends entirely on the majority’s goodwill” where the majority is imagined as being a white one, what el-Tayeb describes as “the glaring whiteness underlying Europe’s self-image” (El-tayeb xxvii, xv). Maati, owing to his non-whiteness, and in these Islamophobic times, owing to his Arab-ness and Muslim-ness, will never belong within Europe’s self-image – where the native is always white

and Christian. But Laroui, complicates this by also suggesting that foreignness is something of a spectrum, especially in the contemporary world where continued colonialisms' shadows and stamps can never be completely exorcised. One can never be fully at home (even in Morocco, Maati would be "French" in the head, Ngugi's formulation of "decolonizing the mind" seems like another impossibility), and likewise, one can never be fully foreign (even in Utrecht Maati has Anna, something to ground him). So, the answer to Maati's original question then, "what would it be like, he asked himself, if everything in the world were foreign"? seems to be to accept, or rather to embrace a way of seeing the world, in which a pure feeling of belonging, of not being foreign, is impossible, i.e. a pure other of "foreign" is an impossibility.

Is this way of seeing the world, of seeing all its constituents as being foreign, just another way of thinking through Edward Said's conception of the permanency of the exilic condition? Are Maati's wanderings a way for Laroui to write his own "Reflections on Exile"? After all, Maati like the exile has an "awareness that is *contrapuntal*", an awareness "of simultaneous dimensions" born out of a "plurality of vision", of knowing "at least two" cultures, settings, homes (Said 186). Maati "knows" France, "knows" Morocco, "knows" the Netherlands. Perhaps, like an exile Maati "looks at non-exiles", at Anna with "resentment". Said describes this resentment as follows: "They belong in their surroundings, you feel, whereas an exile is always out of place. What is it like to be born in a place, to stay and live there, to know that you are of it, more or less forever" (Said 180-181)? Maati describes Anna as "sweet, kind Anna, whom he had ended up marrying in order to *settle down*"³. Not out of love, and not because he wanted to, but the fact of his marriage seems like it was inevitable and that he had no say in the matter. The notion of *settling down* suggests a desire to belong, to lay down roots and is born, not so much

³ In French La douce, la gentile Anna, qu'il avait fini par épouser, pour *faire une fin* (Laroui 21)

out of resentment but, out of envy or desire to not be exilic anymore where an exile is a person who is “cut off from their roots, their land, their past” (Said 177). Interestingly, Said does not mention being cut off from one’s “language”. Is that taken for granted? Is it supposed that being cut off from one’s roots, one’s lands, one’s past automatically necessitates being cut off from one’s language, one’s “native tongue”.

In her book *Translation as Transhumance* Mireille Gansel explores the relationship between exile and language. The blurb for the English translation of the book, which was published in 2017, reads “Translation as Transhumance is half memoir, half philosophical treatise...Considering estrangement her price paid for the privilege of moving between tongues Mireille Gansel muses on how translation can be an exercise in empathy between those in exile”. Interestingly the blurb on the back of the French “original”, published in 2012 does not mention exile. Is there something English about the Saidian notion of exile? In the book there are two chapters that have exile in the title: “language in exile” and “interior exile”⁴ in Ros Schwartz’s translation. For my purposes here, the latter is significant because it is a notion, or perhaps a notional phrasing, that is unaccounted for when Said does not mention language as one of the aspects that are ruptured. In her chapter “interior exile” Gansel recounts her visit to the poet Peter Huchel’s home. Huchel “found himself excluded from all intellectual social life” after the Berlin Wall was built in 1961 (Gansel, *Translation as Transhumance* 36). In a sense, then Huchel was dislocated even as he was at home, just as Maati is dislocated even in Morocco because he is “French in the head”. Huchel at “home” and Maati in Morocco are equally in states of “interior exile”. However, the role that language plays in both instances is different. For Maati, language is the force of exile, the creator of exile, perhaps exile itself. For Huchel, language, particularly

⁴ In the French the titles are: “*Langue en exil*” and “*exil intérieur*”

the language of poetry “was his recourse and place of ultimate resistance, his inner country” in “this internal exile” where “every morning was precarious”⁵ (Gansel, Translation as Transhumance 37). For Maati, his “inner country”, his “place of resistance” is in his wonderings, in his imagining a world where everything is foreign. A world where everything is foreign is also a world where all languages are foreign languages, where the notion of interior exile will not make sense because the boundaries between that which is exilic and that which is not will blur. While, “exiles cross borders, break barriers of thought and experience”, the Maatis of the world blur borders and barriers of thought and experience (Said 185)⁶.

This brings us back to the dichotomy native versus exile⁷. The notion of a permanent exilic condition assumes that there are people who have stable, well-defined “roots”, a specific

⁵ In the English the sentence reads “In this internal exile, every morning was precarious” (Gansel, Translation as Transhumance 37). Curiously, the translator Ros Schwartz has chosen to switch the sentence structure so that the phrase “in this internal exile” is the first clause of the sentence and is thereby foregrounded. In the French, the sentence reads, “*Précarité extrême de chaque matin dans cet exil intérieur*” (Gansel, Traduire comme Transhumer 42). I would translate this sentence as: Every morning is extremely precarious in this internal exile. Like the blurb on the back of the English translation, Schwartz’s translation foregrounds exile, while Gansel’s French highlights “*Précarité*” with the use of the adjective “*extreme*”.

⁶ In this sense Maati is a Franco-Maghrebian who is “by definition uprooted, a *déraciné*, not even an exile (willing or forced...), whose status is as precarious as it is suspicious, a most untenable *entre-deux* who belongs to a “milieu of which it will always be difficult to say whether it was colonizing or colonized” (Derrida, “La Crise de l’enseignement philosophique” 160). This problematic identity is far from being “a surfeit or richness of identities, attributes, or names.” On the contrary, it is more a liability than an asset, “it would rather betray a disorder of identity [*trouble d’identité*]” (Abdel-Jaouad 261). The word “*déraciné*” is interesting here because the Tamil word for translation also means deracination (Radhakrishnan).

⁷ Here I think it is worth meditating on the connections between three words: the “dislocation” of Laroui and Gansel (in translation), the “discontinuous” of Said and the “dispossess” of Chow. In Schwartz’s translation of Gansel, there is a question: “How was I to render in French this foreignness, this shift inherent in Nelly Sach’s language, if not through a *dis*-location?” (Gansel, Translation as Transhumance 87) Reading this, I thought to myself, perhaps there is something about “foreignness” that lends itself to the notion of dislocation in English and in French. Turning to the French, I found, however, that it is not *dis*-location but “*de-payement*” (Gansel, Traduire comme Transhumer 75), disoriented, dis-countried, perhaps, seeing as “*pays*” is usually translated as country. So then we have a fourth term “*de-payement*” or dis-countried. What is the relationship between being dislocated, dis-countried, dispossessed and discontinuous? Said says, “exile, unlike nationalism, is fundamentally a discontinuous state of being” (Said 177). Maati, however, is dislocated, not dis-countried and not in a discontinuous state of being. Perhaps this is because, the state of being that Maati is in is fixed or continuous in its indeterminacy, its hybridity. This begs the question whether a chauvinism based on indeterminacy is possible? Is this what Laroui through Maati is advocating for? This brings us to dispossession. Chow writes, “In postcolonial languaging, dispossession is the key that opens unexpected doors. Behind those doors lie the vast, wondrous troves of xenophonic *énoncés*” (Chow 60). Through languaging in French, in Arabic, in Dutch, Maati is certainly dispossessed and sees the “troves” of “xenophonic

“land” they call home, and a “past” that is coherent and not fraught with the “essential sadness”. Exile is, for Said, “the unhealable rift forced between a human being and a native place, between the self and its true home” (Said 173). Exile, therefore, assumes that a self has a “true” home, a human being “a native place” and not that everything in the world is foreign. So, where does this leave us in translation studies, in translation theory, especially as it is conceptualized in the West, where the binary between foreign and non-foreign lies at the heart of discourse? A binary that suggests that there is something inherently and uniquely foreign that is not present in the target language (the language a work is translated into) or culture, that posits a domestic against a foreign.

“Domestic” and “Foreign” in Translation Theory

In order to parse the categories of “domestic” and “foreign” as they are constructed and deployed in discourses on translation, I believe it is imperative to start with the word “translation” itself. First, I want to focus on the Europeanness of the word, that not only impacts how we think about translations *into* English but also the epistemological implications of theorizing translation *in* English. In English, the “metaphorical conceptualization” of translation as a unidirectional linguistic transfer from one language to another is “reified” in the word translation (Tymoczko 4). This is to say that a unidirectional movement as a concept metaphor has been reified in the English word, thereby foreclosing several other concept metaphors. This is perhaps due to its Latin roots in the word *traducere* or “to carry across”. In this context Sherry Simon notes that,

énoncés” around him, in a world where everything is xeno-, is foreign. But, Maati is not merely dispossessed but is also dislocated (in language, in place, through time?). Perhaps, this is a reflection of the Afropolitan nature of Laroui’s work. See for instance Valerie Orlando’s work on Afropolitan Maghrebi writing.

Earlier Latin and medieval romance languages had all employed numerous terms to describe various aspects of language transfer according to the kind of text and the status of the languages involved. By introducing the concept of *traducere*, renaissance discourse affirmed an understanding of translation as encompassing all kinds of linguistic transfer, and therefore constituting a single model of language exchange. (126)

Her remarks suggest that translation was not always a reified concept and that the homogenized model of translation that forms the basis of the conceptual metaphor has its roots in the European Renaissance, the same period that saw the Spanish colonization of Latin America. From this, it is fair to say that the way translation was conceptualized by European colonists (certainly British colonists) carried with it this particular notion of linguistic transfer from one language to another. At the heart of this reified conceptualization of translation as a “carrying across” lies a clear distinction between “the source” and “the target”. Andrew Chesterman highlights that “the dominant metaphor” behind this conceptualization is a “movement along a path” (Chesterman 8). This movement is a unidirectional one – from the source to the target. While most definitions of translation only highlight the movement at the level of language, the metaphor of movement along a path also suggests a spatial movement – from a source culture to a target culture⁸. Hence, translation can be defined as a unidirectional movement from one language to another and one culture to another, and described using metaphors of bridges, doors, paths etc.

Mireille Gansel plays with the metaphor of the bridge in interesting ways. In a section titled “The price of a letter”, Schwartz’s translation reads “in these times of solitude and solidarities: translation, a hand reaching from one shore to another where there is no bridge” (Gansel, *Translation as Transhumance* 27). The notion of solidarity, and perhaps, more importantly, of building solidarities through translation is key for both Mireille Gansel and

⁸ In his recent (2018) book *Sympathy for the Translator*, Mark Polizzotti subscribes to this notion when he writes that “even apparently seamless transitions from one idiom, one cultural context, one set of historical and popular assumptions to another...” (Polizzotti 2). I include this quotation to reflect the contemporary prevalence of this concept metaphor within the field.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. The English translation of Gansel's words with the phrase "one shore to another" echoes the notion of translation as being from "one language to another", from "one culture to another", with the hand doing the work of the absent bridge. It is worth noting that the French reads, "En ces temps de solitude et de solidarités, la traduction, comme une main tendue entre des rives sans pont" (in these times of solitude and solidarities, translation, like a hand stretched among shores without a bridge, translation mine) (Gansel, *Traduire comme Transhumer* 34). A hand reaching from one shore to another is easier to imagine – the hand in place of the bridge. It is mystical perhaps, but a familiar metaphor for translation. Gansel could have written "entre une rive et autre rive" (between one shore and another shore) as she does later in the book⁹, but she does not. She uses "Des rives" (shores) which complicates the familiar metaphor. It is not apparent that it is only two shores. The arm could stretch from shore to shore to shore, in a way that a bridge cannot, or perhaps it is stretching vertically, down layer after layer of the shore it's on – also something a bridge cannot do. In her foreword to Schwartz's translation, Lauren Elkin notes that "languages themselves contain multitudes" suggesting that the latter is a possible explanation (Elkin xiii). Translation as a hand that stretched among the multitudes within a language. Is this intralingual translation, and therefore a different kind of translation?

It is clear, however, that one of Gansel's intentions is to problematize the metaphor of the bridge. In the section titled "From shore to shore", Schwartz's translation reads, "If translation is building a bridge between two foreign shores, I realized that night how important it is for each one of the piles to be firmly anchored [on its bank, my addition]" (Gansel, *Translation as*

⁹ One of the sections is titled *D'une rive à l'autre*, "From shore to shore" in Schwartz's translation.

Transhumance 53)¹⁰. First, the bridge is being built between two foreign shores, and not one foreign and one domestic. The second is the fact that the sentence is constructed like a supposition with an “if” and the act that the bridge is contingent upon is the two ends of the bridge being firmly anchored, rooted, non-exilic in Saidian terms. This implies that prior to that night the author had not questioned the rootedness of the piles, the rootedness that lies beneath the metaphor of the bridge, but now she was. The fact that the languages, the cultures, the lands on either side of the bridge are not necessarily fixed. It is worth highlighting that Gansel does not make the leap I do, she only speaks of languages and not cultures, which is itself an important critique of Eurocentric notions of translation, where linguistic translation is often equated with cultural translation – a way to get to know another culture.

Spivak is wary of this configuration and warns us that “When we move from a linguistic translation into cultural translation we are providing ourselves with an alibi” (Spivak 3). In the same lecture she goes on to add that,

Culture alive is its own counter-example. Transculturation is not something special and different. It is a moment in a taxonomy of the normality of what is called culture. To assign oneself the special task of cultural translation or plotting cultural translation has therefore to be put within a political context. Cultures cannot be known, languages can be known. (Spivak 3)

The alibi, therefore, is that under the pretext of translation, we, and here I speak both of translators as well as those of whom, like myself, are engaged in theorizing translation, equate linguistic fluency and cultural fluency. Underlying the metaphor of the path, and indeed metaphors like bridges, doors etc that are often applied to translation, is both the belief that one

¹⁰ In the French: Si traduire c’est tendre un pont entre deux rives étrangères, je réalisais ce soir-là combine il importe que chacune des piles du pont soit solidement ancrée sur sa berge.

source language, maps onto one source culture, and also that the translator is fluent not only in language but also in culture.

This becomes particularly problematic in the anglophone academy where world literature and/or comparative literature classrooms use translated texts as part of an inclusion project driven by discourses of multiculturalism. This has involved a ghettoization of discrete identity (often national) based literatures anthologized as a world, often without questioning the “nature of this world” or indeed how this “world” is to be “named” (Gikandi 1196). Even once the world is named, the classroom has to reckon with its “underlying unevenness”, i.e. a “world that is a world only because it is structured in unevenness: take the unevenness away and the world crumbles, deliquesces for lack of structural integrity” (Radhakrishnan, *World Literature, by Any Other Name?* 1397). And if the classroom does not attend to this unevenness, I would ask whose world is it, that is being taught? Or rather who has “manufactured” the “world literature” being taught¹¹? The “anthologizer’s”, the teacher’s, the department’s, the university’s, the publishers’? After all, these anthologies do not appear in “the so-called global classroom” on their own. The classroom which in Spivak’s phrasing allows us “to be self-interested and provide for little identitarian enclaves” that depend on “locating experts” (Damrosch and Spivak 468). For Spivak, the way out of such models of classrooms is to consider the singular. She writes, “Our concern is not how to situate the peaks of the literary production of the world on a level playing field but to ask what makes literary cases singular. The singular is always universalizable, never the universal” (Damrosch and Spivak 466)¹². The leveling of the playing field would be the

¹¹ Radhakrishnan uses “manufactured” deliberately to signal “the industrial and industrializing mentality that makes world literature function as raw material and “world literature” pose as the value-added finished product. (Radhakrishnan, *World Literature, by Any Other Name?* 1396)

¹² Elsewhere Spivak notes that singularity for her “is the repeatable difference that beings share. In my understanding, this is an immense simplification of the solution offered by Spinoza to the problem of ethical universalism. To every invocation of singularity is attached the double bind of the call to rational universalism. The

flattening tendency of certain forms of world literature that seeks to find the universal, where the hierarchy privileges those who are conceptualizing the world, the universal¹³. Paying attention to the singular flips this particular hierarchy, though with this it gives the translator more power and more “responsibility”.

This power and responsibility cannot be divorced from translation into English, and the “growing power of English as a global lingua franca” (Spivak, *Translating into English* 257). Owing to this, Spivak argues that the “responsibility of the translator into English is increasingly complicated. And [...] it is of course true that the responsibility becomes altogether more grave when the original is not written in one of the languages of Northwestern Europe” (*Translating into English* 257). This recognition of the hierarchical relationship between languages problematizes the conceptual metaphor beneath translation – the carrying across, the unidirectional movement that underlies the concept, is not necessarily between two languages that have equal cultural and political capital in the world today, or indeed in the historical past. And here it bears saying that the directionality matters. Given the power of English translating in to English is not the same as translating from English. Second, her argument implies that “‘Global English’ has to be parsed and historicized as postcolonial and decolonized English” (Radhakrishnan, *Is Translation a Mode?* 16). This parsing and historicization needs to be, at least, two-pronged. The first is to hold English, the language, accountable to its colonial past.

agent-subject distinction in my work is a way of marking this double bind” (G. C. Spivak, *Other Asias* 13). Is the line of questioning posed above, especially if transferred to the classroom, a way to mark the double bind of ethical universalism pedagogically?

¹³ Lydia Liu articulates something similar when she notes that “Universalism thrives on difference. It does not reject difference but translates and absorbs it into its own orbit of antithesis and dialectic” (Liu 1). So those who are conceptualizing the universal wield more power because they are responsible for determining what counts as difference and how that difference is translated and absorbed.

One way of doing this would be to look at the role that translation played in British colonialism, which I do in chapter two.

The second is to hold English accountable to its post/neo colonial present which involves reckoning with the power of Global English which often leads to translation into “translateese, so that the literature by a woman in Palestine begins to resemble, in the feel of its prose, something by a man in Taiwan. The rhetoricity of Chinese and Arabic! The cultural politics of high-growth, capitalist Asia-Pacific, and devastated West Asia! Gender difference inscribed and inscribing in these differences” (Spivak, *The Politics of Translation* 204). Spivak is talking about a certain kind of fungibility that translation into English can produce owing to a flattening process and translational erasures of gendered linguistic, cultural, and political nuances. Earlier in the essay, Spivak asks, “How does the translator attend to the specificity of the language she translates?” (G. C. Spivak, *The Politics of Translation* 201). Underlying this question is the assumption that a way to avoid falling into the trap of translateese, or indeed succumbing to the pressures of Global English is to show care, love, and a deep understanding of the specificities of the “source” language. I use words of intimacy like “care” “love” and a “deep understanding” intentionally to resonate with Spivak’s oft-quoted claim “Translation is the most intimate act of reading. I surrender to the text when I translate” (G. C. Spivak, *The Politics of Translation* 201).

By way of comparison Gansel likens translation to listening. As Elkin notes in her foreword,

In stringing these encounters together, Gansel helps us understand that translation is more than a grammar; it is a listening. When we translate, we are not rendering a block of text in its immediate equivalent; we keep an ear out for what is unspoken, carried through language, smuggled inside of it. Sometimes this means turning to people who/ can perceive the echoes in language that we cannot, even in our own native tongues (Elkin xii-xiii).

Keeping an ear out for what is unspoken, an act of listening can be as intimate as an act of reading. While Elkin uses the term “native tongue”, Gansel when she is talking about translation as an act of listening doesn’t¹⁴. Rather she writes, “Translation, like practicing scales, learning to listen, that never-ending fine-tuning of nuance. Translation became the clay from which I would fashion my own interior language” (Gansel, *Translation as Transhumance* 20)¹⁵. The fashioning of an interior language via translation. If one probes this perhaps one can argue that the native language is being fashioned into an interior language through translation. But it is not the native language that is described as clay, it is translation itself. Be that as it may, it is provocative to think of translation as a form of multisensorial intimacy – intimately reading and intimately listening. A surrender to the text that leads to an inhabitation by the text, the translator is intimately transformed by the text. Her interiority has been refashioned.

To return to Spivak, her claim that translation is the “most intimate act of reading” is reiterated in several essays, though each time, the second sentence is slightly different. For instance, in the essay “Translating into English” Spivak writes, “...it is my sense that translation is the most intimate act of reading, a prayer to be haunted” where the haunting is done by the “project of the original” (G. C. Spivak, *Translating into English* 256-257). What is the connection between surrendering and being haunted? Is the experience of surrendering to a text the same as being haunted by its project, especially when framed in the terms of intimacy? And

¹⁴ Unlike Walter Benjamin who says that the “mother tongue of the translator is transformed as well”, Gansel explicitly uses the term interior language and not mother tongue and/or native language (Benjamin 75).

¹⁵ (“La traduction comme gamme où exercer l’écoute et comme ajustement à l’infime des nuances. La traduction comme argile où façonner ma propre langue intérieure” (Gansel, *Traduire comme Transhumer* 30) Also worth highlighting is the fact that Benjamin also uses a metaphor of music to describe the task of the translator. Instead of using the metaphor of scales, Benjamin speaks of “harmony” when he says that the “language of a translation can – in fact, must – let itself go, so that it gives voice to the *intentio* of the original not as reproduction but as harmony, as a supplement to the language in which it expresses itself, as its own kind of *intentio*” (Benjamin 79). To combine the metaphors, an intimate act of listening produces a harmony of the original and the translated text, and this is the clay that is used to fashion the interior language or indeed transform the mother tongue.

indeed, what does the most intimate act of reading mean for translational practice? Spivak answers this concretely in the “Translator’s Note” of her translation of Aimé Césaire’s *Une saison au Congo*. She writes, “There are two theories of translation: you add yourself to the original or, you efface yourself and let the text shine. I subscribe to the second. But I have said again and again that translation is also the most intimate act of reading” (G. C. Spivak, *From the Translator* vii). The two theories of translation that Spivak refers to are parallel to Lawrence Venuti’s domesticating and foreignizing paradigms.

At the simplest level “domestication” is a notion that describes ‘fluent’ translation strategies which “inescapably perform a work of acculturation in which the cultural other is domesticated, made intelligible but also familiar, even the same, encoded as it is in the ideological cultural discourses circulating in the target language” (Venuti 127). This process seems to intimately resonate with the flattening and fungibility that results from translating into a “translatese”, an outcome that Spivak warns us against. “Foreignization” for Venuti lies on the other end of the spectrum and he uses it at a notional level to describe strategies that resist “values” that are prevalent in contemporary British and American cultures, namely “the canon of fluency in translation, the dominance of transparent discourse, [and] the individualistic illusion of authorial presence” (Venuti 36). Whether it is through the notion of domestication or remarking on translatese both Spivak and Venuti seem to be against a translational practice that elides the nuances of the language being translated. Where they differ is the notion of the translator’s visibility. While Spivak calls for the effacement of a translator, Venuti is arguing for the visibility of the translator, as a counter to the assimilative process that leads to the translator’s apparent invisibility and the idea that the words of a translator are those of the author. Can an

intimate reading lead to both invisibility and visibility? It seems like an impasse or rather a translational paradox.

To unpack this paradox, I turn to Spivak, the translator, and her translation of Mahasweta Devi, in the collection *Imaginary Maps*, and the translational paradox that haunts the translation even as it tries to build transnational (feminist) solidarity. *Imaginary Maps* was published in 1995 and in addition to the three stories – “The Hunt”, “Douloti the Bountiful” and “Pterodactyl, Puran Sahay and Pirtha”, this book also has a conversation between Devi and Spivak, as well as a translator’s preface, translator’s note and an afterword by Spivak. Mahasweta Devi is an award-winning, middle class, English-educated Bengali writer¹⁶ whose prose and drama foregrounds the subjectivities of lower-class tribal women, a multiply marginalized group in India. By translating her work into English, her translators – and Spivak is only one among them, are mediating a conversation between the feminist knowledges produced in Mahasweta’s work and knowledges produced among other communities, both within and outside India. This transnational connection is foregrounded right from the outset in *Imaginary Maps*, via the dedication of the book to “All the Indigenous Peoples of the World” (v). In doing so, Mahasweta Devi who has been described as someone who “writes and works for the subaltern – the denotified and nomadic tribes” of India (Philip 142) is positioned as someone who raises issues that resonate across the world by foregrounding the fact that “nations” need to be “acknowledged as a palimpsest upon the ignored Fourth World” (G. C. Spivak 202). In this regard, it is worth noting how Mahasweta herself, in her conversation with Spivak discusses this transnational connection. She writes:

¹⁶ See Philip (2001) for a detailed biography.

In America I found such lack of information about the Native Americans. Why should American readers want to know from me about Indian tribals, when they have present-day America? How was it built? Only in the names of places the Native American legacy survives. Otherwise entire tribes have been butchered. Their land has been taken away. [...] But I say to my American readers, see what has been done to them, you will understand what has been done to the Indian tribals. Everywhere is the same story. (Devi and Spivak xi).

In the lines quoted above Mahasweta Devi self-consciously makes “connections” between the inequalities that are a result of the colonization of the Americas and those that have been and are present in India, where decolonization has not really reached the subaltern classes. At the same time her statements, especially the question “Why should American readers want to know from me about Indian tribals, when they have present-day America” highlights the question of both methodological and epistemological ethics that are central to any transnational feminist project. The network of connections that is to be established needs to be one that, ideally destabilizes the boundaries between center and periphery. In this case then, this would imply that the translation is only effective as a transnational feminist project, if it allows readers to reflect on their own subjectivities and the politics of their location and is not just a means to enable them to “know” or perhaps “see” – visibility is not only important in discourse on translation but is also associated with feminist knowledge production – the “other”.

The relationship between the reader and the text brings up the question of audience which is one of Spivak’s central concerns in her preface:

This book is going to be published in both India and the United States. As such it faces in two directions, encounters two readerships with a strong exchange in various enclaves. As a translator and a commentator I must imagine them as I write. [...] But the “imaginary” in our title – “imaginary maps” – points at other kinds of divisions as well. “India” is not an undivided perspective, much as both conservatives and radicals in the United States would strive to represent it as such. And the divisions within the United States are there for deconstructive pedagogic use, although both politicians and ideologues on both sides in India would like to convince us otherwise. In what interest or interests does the necessity to keep up this game of difference – India is “India” and the

US is “the US”, and the two are as different as can be – emerge, today? The stories translated in this collection can help us imagine that interest or those interests. (Spivak xxii)

In the quotation above she emphasizes the fact that she is translating with specific audiences in mind, audiences who are diverse. In doing so, not only does she suggest that the translation and commentary may differ if she “imagined” different readerships, but also the fact that the readerships – “India” and “the US” are heterogeneous. Even though Spivak imagines and acknowledges only an Indian and US readership, in reality, in an age of digital books and worldwide shipping it can probably be accessed (if they have the desire and the material conditions to do so) by anyone who knows English in any part of the world. So, the book is not just facing in “two directions”.

Further, in the quote above there are at least three imaginings going on – Spivak’s of her readership, intellectuals in the US of “India” and intellectuals in India of “the US”, and she is drawing our attention to the politics behind these and inviting the reader, through the stories, to “imagine” these politics via our own subjectivities. She emphasizes this further by concluding the preface with an acknowledgement of her prejudice and then an invitation “to acknowledge your own and turn now to the text” (xxix). Her feminist translation, then, foregrounds the subjectivity of the author, the reader as well as her own, as the translator, in the production of meaning and the place that this text has within the infinite corpus of feminist knowledge. This is, in some ways, the hallmark of feminist epistemology. As Simon notes, “feminist writing” and feminist translation intersect in their “common desire to foreground female subjectivity in the production of meaning” (13).

Even though one of Spivak’s aims is to enable shared conversations and political solidarity, the question that arises is whether or not her translation strategies allow for this

ethically decentered conversation – a conversation between equals. A conversation can of course be hierarchical, especially if it is construed as being between an “us” and a “them”, “East” and “West”. It is this very same dichotomy that lies beneath Sujit Mukherjee’s critique of Spivak as being “a dwārpālīka (female doorkeeper) of Mahasweta in the West” (G. C. Spivak, Translator’s Preface xxvi). The basis of this is twofold. The first is that the language of translation, which Spivak describes as “the rootless American-based academic prose” rather than “the subcontinental idiom” of her youth, is geared primarily towards a Western audience thereby enabling them, via a process of reading in English, with all its power, to enter Mahasweta’s house. The question that arises here, is whether this process of reading is different for readers in the West versus non-Bengali but English speakers in India. Furthermore, what are the political implications of labelling “American-based academic prose” as “rootless”? The second basis is the notion that it is Spivak’s academic cultural capital in the West that enables the widespread dissemination of/and access to Mahasweta Devi’s work in the West(ern Academy)¹⁷. The implication of this to the discussion at hand is that it leads to the question of whether or not Mahasweta Devi’s work would count as “feminist knowledge” in the Western academy, had it not been for the fact that Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak is her translator.

In this regard it is worth considering the entry on Mahasweta Devi in *Who’s Who in Contemporary Women’s Writing* (2001), which is an encyclopedia of sorts published by Routledge – the publication details are important because they situate the book within the British and American academy. Prama Tagore, the author of the entry, writes:

Mother of 1084 (1973), which is set amidst the political insurgencies of the 1960s is the only one of her novels in English translation. Also available in English are two short story collections translated and introduced by Gayatri Spivak, *Imaginary Maps* (1995)

¹⁷ *Imaginary Maps* is published by Routledge, conventionally a publisher of academic work rather than fiction.

and *Breast Stories* (1997), both of which explore the interrelated effects of gender, caste, and class hierarchies upon women; the novella *Bashai Tudu* (1990) and the short story 'Rudali' (1979), which has now been adapted for stage and screen. (201)

There are two interrelated aspects of this extract that are noteworthy. The first is the fact that Spivak is the only translator mentioned and the translators of the other texts, who are based in India, are not named. The second is the way in which the texts that have been translated by Spivak are placed within a "feminist" framework by describing them as explorations of "the interrelated effects of gender, caste, and class hierarchies" while the other texts are not described as such even though this description could apply to any work in Mahasweta's oeuvre regardless of whether or not it has been translated by Spivak.

Spivak, therefore is a very "visible" translator of Mahasweta's both in the discourse on Mahasweta as well as because of her tangible presence via the paratextual material in the text itself. While this can, and perhaps does, have implications for the other translators of Mahasweta's work who are marginalized, it is in and of itself an effective strategy of politically feminist translation, as she is resisting, perhaps, the dominant paradigm of, in Venuti's terms, the translator's invisibility. Where, then, does the translator's effacement come in? Or is that, like translation itself (in Derridean terms) an impossibility?

The heterogeneity and the multi-locationality of the audience problematizes the ways in which Spivak's methodology, her translation strategies, are labelled resistant. These strategies include her use of atypical spelling which reflects Bengali (or a Bengali accent) like "barambhon" for brahman (though she does include the latter in a parenthesis) (36) or her maintenance of terms like *kamiya* and *kamyouti* for bondslave and bonded labor respectively (20), or the fact that she italicizes English words that are present in the Bengali with the explicit intention of making the English "difficult to read" and to point to the hybridity that is a

“remainder of the intimacy of the colonial encounter” (xxxix). In doing so, in using “foreignizing” strategies, she is ensuring that Mahasweta’s work doesn’t read as though it were written in translatese. Yet most of these elements are foreign and/or disruptive primarily for a non-Indian audience. For an Indian reader (or perhaps some Indian readers) these strategies will be more familiarizing. For instance, when I read the italicized English words I don’t encounter a rupture, a difficulty, rather, I am reminded of the similarities between hybridized Benglish and Hinglish. This allows for a momentary (albeit illusory) connection with Mahasweta’s world, without Spivak’s mediating presence. This connection allows me, as a reader, from my particular location and cultural embodiment to have a “shared conversation” with both Mahasweta and Spivak as opposed to sharing a conversation just with Spivak and using her to “discover” Mahasweta. It is, of course, possible that Spivak’s use of the so-called “rootless” American idiom has the same effect for some American readers making their response different from some British readers.

The ‘double bind’ so to speak of Spivak’s translation strategy is that while it is resistant and does not really succumb to an “exoticization” of the tribal woman per se, it can, in some readings result in an erasure of Mahasweta’s subjectivity – one which is a mediator between the tribes she works with as an activist and her literate Bengali audience. An example of this is the reading that lies beneath Edwin Gentzler’s praise of Spivak’s translation of “Bengali peasant writer Mahasweta Devi” (206) and his appreciation of the fact that Spivak “introduces” him to “Devi’s tribal community” which “still uses a caste system in which ‘untouchables’ persist” (210). This description of Mahasweta Devi is not factually correct. Her characters are certainly subaltern, but she is the educated middle-class Bengali mediator of their subalternity through her writings. But, the visibility of Spivak as a translator and her association with subaltern studies

could account for Gentzler's assumption that through the translation he was discovering a subaltern writer¹⁸.

Here then is the paradox: depending on the audience (and assuming the validity of the domestic foreign binary) Spivak's translation strategies can be seen as either foreignizing or domesticating. Regardless, owing to her cultural and academic capital, and despite her desire to efface herself, she is a visible translator disrupting the complacency in British and American translation traditions that Venuti identifies. He writes,

The translator's invisibility is symptomatic of a complacency in British and American relations with cultural others, a complacency that can be described – without too much exaggeration – as imperialistic abroad and xenophobic at home (Venuti 13).

This is worth unpacking because it is symptomatic of a “complacency”, to use a term Venuti likes, within many discourses in translation studies and world literature (including I would argue in the work of a range of scholars like David Damrosch, Abdelkebir Khatibi, Abdelfatah Kilito and perhaps even Emily Apter). The complacency rests in the fact that a “cultural other” is also imagined as a “racial other”, “linguistic other” and a “national other”, hence it can only be imperialism abroad and xenophobic at home, and not imperialism and xenophobia, both abroad and at home. These categories – “cultural other”, “racial other” “linguistic other”, “religious other” “national other” – are not necessarily distinct and are often imbricated within each other, and co-constitutive of the other's signification. This complacency is based on a monolingual paradigm and a linguistic chauvinism that relies on a division between native and foreign, and

¹⁸ Spivak is herself attuned to the misuse of the term “subaltern”. She writes, “The term ‘subaltern’ has lost its power to indicate people from the very bottom layer of society excluded even from the logic of class-structure. This may indeed be one of the reasons why I take the museum visitor from the model minority – sometimes myself – as a constituted subject that forgets the other in its haste to claim otherness, only with reference to the metropolitan majority” (G. C. Spivak, *Other Asias* 176). Here, it is Gentzler who, in subalternizing Devi as a constituted subaltern subject whose other is the metropolitan majority, is forgetting those who are “excluded even from the logic of class structure” – the people of the tribes Devi writes about.

the visible and invisible ways in which race and racialization play a role in the construction of these categories, whether in terms of languages themselves or in terms of accents.

So, who translates? If Venuti's work suggests that "English-language translators" are British and American, are they also white? Could Maati who is "French in the head" translate an Arabic or Dutch text into French? In her work on translation and colonialism Tejaswini Niranjana argues that one of the reasons Orientalists translated Sanskrit texts into English was because "natives are unreliable interpreters of their own laws and cultures" or indeed their literature (13). The implication of this is that the person who has the authority to translate is not a "native speaker" of the work being translated. So, if an Indian had linguistic capacities in both English and Sanskrit just as William Jones, the founder of the Asiatic society, did his (or hers, though she might have been rarer still, given the patriarchal limitations to learning, in particular a language like Sanskrit) translation would be considered unreliable and Jones' more authoritative. Having navigated through a MA in Literary Translation during which I encountered a lot of popular discourse surrounding translation, suffice it to say, a translator is expected to belong to the target culture and according to conventional notions of translation she is thought of as a 'native speaker' of the target language¹⁹. This notion of translation is based on the assumptions of a monolingual paradigm. Yildiz explains this paradigm by saying:

monolingualism is much more than a simple quantitative term designating the presence of just one language. Instead, it constitutes a key structuring principle that organizes the entire range of modern social life, from the construction of individuals and their proper subjectivities to the formation of disciplines and institutions, as well as of imagined collectives such as cultures and nations. According to this paradigm, individuals and

¹⁹ Most job advertisements on a site like www.translatorscafe.com, for instance ask for the translator to be a 'native speaker' in the Target language. Furthermore, the leaflets and promotional advertising for the Birbeck University of London run summer school 'Use your language, Use your English!' used the rhetorical questions, 'Are you a native speaker of English? Are you proficient in one or two other languages?' to attract participants (Birbeck University of London 2012).

social formations are imagined to possess one “true” language only, their “mother tongue”, and through this possession to be organically linked to an exclusive, clearly demarcated ethnicity, culture and nation (Yildiz 2).

The term monolingualism, and by extension the terms bilingualism and multilingualism, do not just refer to the presence (or absence) of a certain number of languages but they also imply a way of seeing world. This has, as Yildiz highlights, an impact on society at various levels – from that of the individual to the state. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, she brings the relationship between the idea of a mother tongue – and the organic, genetic and immutable connotations it can have, and its link to monolingualism to the fore²⁰. Young argues that a part of the colonial project was the imposition of this “nominalist monolingual model” (Young 1209) where a person having one true language, one mother tongue, one “native” language – native is of course an integral part of colonial rhetoric – is naturalized.

Within “Western” translation studies, one of the earliest thinkers to talk about the mother tongue was Friedrich Schleiermacher. Before moving on to what Schleiermacher says I want to make a few comments on my method in the next paragraph, because this method is one of the ways in which, I believe, we can destabilize the hierarchies constructed by the world literature paradigm. In the next paragraph, I look at several translations of one sentence by Schleiermacher, because as a non-German speaker, I don’t have the language skills to read the German “original”. In the parenthetical citations and the bibliography, the name of the translator is listed and not Schleiermacher’s. The reason for this is to highlight the constructedness of translation and to destabilize a paradigm where a translator is secondary to the author. I have chosen to do this with a “theoretical” text as opposed to a “literary” text, and one from Europe as opposed to one from India or the Maghreb as an act of anti-Eurocentric reading back. I include this to

²⁰ For a detailed analysis of the implications and connotations of the term see Yildiz (10-13).

present a method that could be an alternative to a method that valorizes untranslatability like that of Apter's.

In an 1813 lecture on translation, Schleiermacher declared that a person does not use a “language only mechanically, as if it were something externally attached to him like a strap and as if one could as easily harness another language for one's thought as one would exchange a team of horses”, rather “every writer can produce original work only in his [or her] mother tongue” (Bartscht 50). This translation is by Waltraud Bartscht and was included in Schulte and Biguenet's 1992 collection *Theories of Translation*. Yildiz uses this in a slightly amended form as a part of her argument on the development of the monolingual paradigm (9). Andre Lefevere translating in 1977 translates the same line as, “everyone produces original work in his mother tongue only” (Lefevere, *On the Different Methods of Translating* 82). Twenty years later, Douglas Robinson translates it as “Original work can only be done in one's native language” (Robinson 234). More recently, for the second edition of Lawrence Venuti's *The Translation Studies Reader*, Susan Bernofsky translates it as, “each person produces originally only in his mother tongue” (Bernofsky 57). Looking at these translations in conjunction, highlights two points integral to my discussion. The first is the way the terms ‘mother tongue’ and ‘native language’ are used. In this instance, they are used by the translators to express Schleiermacher's term *Muttersprache* (lit. Mother-language) in English (2006 [1813]:5), which is a word that perhaps Apter would consider this an untranslatable. Looking at these translations suggests that in terms of the ideas or concepts that “mother tongue” and “native language”²¹ signify, they are

²¹ Native is also a way of seeing the world. An example of this can be seen when Gansel describes the process of learning Vietnamese. Schwartz's translation reads, “The first words she taught me were the Vietnamese for ‘native land’: *dat nuoc* – land (and) water. Two words which opened up a whole different world” (Gansel, *Translation as Transhumance* 47) Is *dat nuoc* an untranslatable or is it just that it reflects a different way of seeing the world, one that foregrounds geology more than human geography? Like seeing everything in the world as foreign as Maati does it is another way of seeing the world. In Gansel's French, the phrase that Schwartz translates as “native land” is “le

thought to be the same, and that the only difference lies in the political and gendered connotations they carry. This is substantiated by the fact that Robinson, who is the only translator to use the term ‘native language’, also makes the rest of the sentence gender neutral through his use of the pronoun ‘one’. The other point relates to the subtle difference between ‘original work’ and producing ‘originally’, where one is an end product and the other a process. Given that Bernofsky’s translation, which uses ‘originally’, is the most recent, this choice can be said to reflect a change in emphasis in translation studies as an academic discipline. Her choice also indicates, perhaps, the fact that the discipline has been pushing for a translation to be recognized as equal to the ‘source’ text, and not secondary to the ‘original’. Reading these in conjunction with one another, thus, tells us more about the evolution of a discipline, in this instance translation studies (which is a discipline in the UK but is subsumed under comparative literature in the US), than just reading one would, even had that one included *Muttersprache* as an untranslatable.

Irrespective of the translation, by setting up a contrast with something that requires effort and human will, Schleiermacher suggests the innateness of the mother tongue or the native language and of expressing oneself in it. This implies that an individual’s native language is hereditary and that any other language learnt by an individual will not come as naturally. This view of a naturally inherited mother tongue and a mechanically acquired other language subscribes to and reinforces a monolingual paradigm. Scholars like Andre Lefevere credit

pays natal”. While “le pays natal” is usually, idiomatically, translated as “native land” or “native country”, the word natal also has connotations of birthing, of mothering. Both native language and mother tongue can be translated as “langue natale” in French making the word native much more gendered and feminized than it is in English – another way of seeing the world.

Schleiermacher's statements like the one above for the diktat prevalent in modern translation practices of translating only into one's native language (Lefevere, Introduction 5).

But, "native" isn't just about place of birth, or even looking native, it is also about sounding "native". For David Damrosch *World Literature* is a response to the Eurocentrism of the discipline of comparative literature within the North American academy. He writes, "what comparative literature really meant, first and foremost was to have a really good accent in French and German. This was the price of admission, and then you might do theory, or you might not, you might study one or another period, but the accent was really what became a marker of excellence and a sort of security" (Damrosch and Spivak 456). Comparative literature, as he saw it, was linguistically and geographically narrow. It was a closed sphere, an elite club, where knowledge of French and German was not sufficient, you needed to have "a really good accent". Damrosch doesn't say this but an implication of "a really good accent" is that you need to have the right accent, to "sound right" or "sound like" a native to borrow Rey Chow's phrase (9)²². So, Maati doesn't just look not-French, but depending on his accent he can also sound not-French. Or an Indian speaking English is foreign not only because of the visual dislocation in terms of race and the whiteness of the English imaginary, but also due to an aural dissonance. This is the driving force behind Radhakrishnan's call for a liberation of "the accents in each language" that is to "practice a lingualism that deconstructs all the normative distinctions between the intralinguistic and interlinguistic, the intraindentiarian and the interidentiarian" (Radhakrishnan, *World Literature, by Any Other Name?* 1402). To this formulation, I want to add, that accents cannot be liberated unless that which is considered to be "native" language/culture or the

²² I agree with Chow who questions the ontological category of native speaker by arguing that it should "be recognized as a last bastion of those epistemic unities that, as Foucault shows, are emblematic of the long-standing practices of knowledge production based on the exclusion of discontinuity" (Chow 58). An exclusion of the exilic, but also perhaps of the dislocated, the disoriented, and the dispossessed.

“mother tongue” is denaturalized and the everything in the world is, indeed, to return to the quote from Laroui that I began with, “foreign”. So, to put it another way, you need to not be able to “see” or “hear” or “read” anything as purely domestic, as purely “native” – especially when this native is imagined, within a Western context as being a white native.

The Intimacies of Un/translatability

So, what would it be like to live in a world where everything was foreign, where nothing or no one was at “home”? Is this just reiteration or a rehearsal of Derrida’s deconstructive monolingualism, as articulated in *The Monolingualism of The Other, or The Prosthesis of Origin*. “Rien n’est intraduisible en un sens, mais *en un autre sens* tout est intraduisible, la traduction est un autre nom de l’impossible” (Derrida, *Le monolinguisme de l'autre* 103). In his English translation, Patrick Mensah translates this sentence as “In a sense, nothing is untranslatable; but *in another sense*, everything is untranslatable; translation is another name for the impossible” (Derrida, *Monolingualism of the Other; or, The Prosthesis of Origin* 56-57). In both the French and English, much like in Laroui’s story, there is an iterative buildup of un autre/another – another, another, another impossibility. A translational impossibility. Given the impossibility, is a world where everything is foreign, merely another name for translation? To unpack the notion of “the monolingualism of the other” a bit further it is important to turn to the “double postulation” that is central to it.

- On ne parle jamais qu’une seule langue...
(ouis mais)
- On ne parle jamais une seule langue...” (Derrida, *Le monolinguisme de l'autre* 25)

Or in Patrick Mensah’s words,

- We only ever speak one language ...

(yes, but)

- We never speak only one language... (Derrida 10).

Here it's worth highlighting that in the French the only difference between the two sentences of the double postulation is the "qu" which could be read as an orthographic representation of the infinitesimal, almost non-existent boundaries between languages, between translatability and untranslatability²³. A translational impossibility, perhaps?

So, Maati is speaking French, yes but it's never just French. Laroui is writing in French, but it is never just French. I am writing in English, but it is never just English. Another way to look at this Derridean monolingualism is as Radhakrishnan does. He writes:

The monolingualism of the other is but a thematic variation of the multilingualism within the self. There can neither be a complete and exhaustive multilingualism nor a pure one language secure in its omniscient inclusiveness of the many. To speak is to resonate as echo both within and without in search of an absent original. (Radhakrishnan 15-16)

This is what it means to see foreignness as a spectrum. There is never a pure language (a "home"), nor a complete and exhaustive multilingualism (a "foreign").

Both the "monolingualism of the other" and the "multilingualism of the self" speak to intralingual, inraidentitarian non-homogeneity (I am staying away from heterogeneity here because it is too close to hybridity, which is beyond the scope of this chapter). While they don't make it explicit, both these concepts can also be extrapolated to push back against notions of racial impurity that undergird certain constructions of nativism, and linguistic chauvinism. The

²³ In *Queer Philologies*, Jeffrey Masten discusses "the extent of Q's queerness: it (or shall I say 'he?') is exceptional both as the letter with a constant friend and companion and the letter that couples with another with his tail from below" (Masten 4). Perhaps the "qu" also indicates the queer potential of this infinitesimal boundary.

“absent original” and the lack of “a pure one language” are further explored by Derrida when he says that “The language called maternal is never purely natural, nor proper, nor inhabitable” (58)²⁴. The implication of this, especially of the word “inhabitable” is that the native language is no longer home, so the world, seen through the lens of Derridean monolingualism, is indeed one where everything is “foreign”. As Hédi Abdel-Jaouad asks, “Indeed, what is deconstruction if not absolute outsideness, non-belonging, and *étrangeté* in the Camusian sense” (Abdel-Jaouad 260)? *Étrangeté*, in the Camusian sense, the *étrangeté* that Laroui is in dialogue with. Perhaps seeing everything in the world as foreign is deconstruction. One difference to highlight is that one of the “maxims of deconstruction” is “Il n’y a pas de hors-texte” (There is nothing outside the text)” and it is essentially a way of reading, whereas seeing everything in the world as foreign, is a way of understanding, and is also a way of inhabiting the world in body and language (Abdel-Jaouad 246).

Either way, perhaps Laroui and his Laroui’s narrator would be satisfied. It would be easy for me to end here by echoing Derrida once more: “nothing is untranslatable; but in another sense, everything is untranslatable” which would mean that Spivak’s “Politics of Translation” and Apter’s “Politics of Untranslatability” are fundamentally the same and if all we do is liberate the accents and the mother tongues, or rather accent the unaccented, we will be able to make the global scale of world literature, and the ways in which translation is theorized much more equitable.

It is around the notions of egalitarianism (and I would say equity) that Chow critiques Derrida. Chow writes,

²⁴ “La langue dite maternelle n’est jamais purement naturelle, ni propre, ni habitable.” (Derrida, *Le monolinguisme de l’autre* 112)

when it comes to the utopian notion of egalitarianism, Derrida is, interestingly not so much focused on the future as on the past – specifically, on some “originary” condition, as // we read in such assertions as “All culture is originally colonial” and “Every culture institutes itself through the unilateral imposition of some ‘politics’ of language” (39). These assertions are troubling not because of their universalist tone, but because of the rather negative (and pessimistic) manner in which egalitarianism is evoked: the only moments when we can/might be equal, Derrida seems to suggest, are when we are all originarily colonial and want to impose some politics of language on others. Does this imply that egalitarianism as such should simply be abandoned, that even if it may seem to be a form of utopianism, it is a bad form – an oppressive sameness, intrinsic to all human culture, from which we should strive to be free” (Chow 31-32)?

Underneath Chow’s critique is a belief in and desire for egalitarianism, a belief I share. In my reading of these originary claims by Derrida, a problem that arises is the implication that only that which is colonial is culture. Does culture always belong to the master? Derrida goes on to add that “Mastery begins, as we know through the power of naming, of imposing and legitimating appellations” (Derrida, *Monolingualism of the Other*; or, *The Prosthesis of Origin* 39)²⁵. Is naming that is not legitimized not culture? Does it even matter what culture is? I think it does because of the universalist claim regarding “all culture” without the C capitalized in Culture. But this also begs the question that is seeing everything in the world as foreign, the same as saying “all culture is originarily colonial”. In my opinion not. While it denaturalizes or defamiliarizes everything, I don’t think it assumes that everything has equal power. Rather by denaturalizing the “native” and the privileges associated with it, it highlights the power dynamics and seeks to move towards redressing it – liberating the accents, accenting the unaccented.

Key to this is my belief that, even if we are to see the world as foreign, the politics of focusing on translation or translatability and one that focuses on untranslatability are not one and the same. The focus on untranslatability emerges, in my opinion, from a certain kind of elitism

²⁵ “La maîtrise, on le sait, commence par le pouvoir de nommer, d’imposer et de légitimer les appellations” (Derrida, *Le monolinguisme de l’autre* 68)

and linguistic chauvinism. To discuss the former, I re-turn, like an echo, to Laroui's story "Dislocation". Within the story, the narrator has several asides. In one such aside he talks about incidentally learning German while learning Dutch. Laroui via Ramadan writes,

I'm cold, he said to himself sometimes with bitter irony, I'm cold and I eat tasteless things, but at least I've learned German, the language of the philosophers, and now I know the exact meaning of *aufheben*. We were so impressed by them, the Althussers and the consorts, the Derridas, the Glucksmanns, in Paris, when they threw out words like that one without translating them, as if they were using an abracadabra that only they could access. (Laroui 25)

This aside makes an important point about philosophic untranslatables and their politics. They are used as a secret code, only those who know them have access to the haloed world of philosophy.

The other, related aspect, by way of a critique of privileging untranslatability is linguistic chauvinism. A part of Apter's work draws from Abdelfatah Kilito's book *Thou Shalt Not Speak My Language*, which to quote Wail Hassan, Kilito's translator, appears at first "to be a manifesto for cultural nationalism and isolationism" (Hassan xxiii). Hassan goes on to add that it "in effect lays bare the anxiety at the root of chauvinism" (xxiii). This anxiety in Kilito is, as Hassan astutely points out "a gendered one" in which "bilingualism is caught up in a battle of the sexes in which attraction is inextricably mixed with the desire for domination, both at the personal and the geopolitical levels. Bilingualism and translation are steeped in the anxiety that defines the erotic as a tension between surrender and conquest, although it is never clear, at any given moment, who the hunter is and who the prey" (xiii). One of the examples that Kilito gives is of an American woman surprising him by speaking Moroccan Arabic well and another is from a novel where an American woman speaks better Italian than the Italian man speaks English. Kilito (in Hassan's translation), in his analysis of the novel says that the Italian man "is double

robbed. On the one hand, she does not allow him to speak her language, and on the other, she storms into his language, invades and captures it. He is no longer the lord of his house, and he has no way of penetrating into hers” (Kilito 94)²⁶. It is worth noting that in the Arabic, “her language” and “his language” is *lisanaha* (her tongue) and *lisanhu* (his tongue) making the image natural, more intimately tied to the notion of mother tongue and also more sexual. The choice seems deliberate because elsewhere, as in “thou shalt not speak my language” Kilito uses the word “*lughā*” to refer to language. Be that as it may, it is clear, here, that the “thou shalt not speak my language” sentiment seems to be integrally linked to feeling of emasculation and of the feminine adopting a masculine mode – she is penetrating his house rather than the other way around – as well as a feeling of being colonized by an American.

He goes on to add, in a manner that seems to be in direct conversation with Derrida’s²⁷ work that “sometimes it seems to me that the speaker is the host and that language is the guest – a quarrelsome and stubborn guest who arrives uninvited and who takes possession of the host and inhabits him against his will” (Kilito 86)²⁸. So, while for Derrida the language is inhabitable (i.e. the person, the speaker is doing the inhabiting) here for Kilito the language is the inhabitant. The relationship between the language and the speaker is both gendered and racialized. It is the white woman, the foreign language who is penetrating, inhabiting the Arab man. Here, Hassan

²⁶ The Arabic reads: فمن جهة لم تسمح له باستعمال لسانها, ومن جهة ثانية اقتحمت لسانه وغزته انه في النهاية مستلب على نحو مزدوج. واستولت عليه. لم يعد سيدا في مسكنه, وليس له اي سبيل لولوج مسكانها (Kilito, *Lan tatakallam lughati* 109)

²⁷ Hédi Abdel-Jaouad situates Derrida within a Franco-Maghrebian tradition (Kilito, Khatibi, Laroui would all belong to this tradition too. Abdel-Jaouad notes that “above all, a Franco-Maghrebian is someone who refuses to be trapped in one single category or definition and for whom genealogy, language, nationality, country and religion are nonfixed entities. A Franco-Maghrebian can only define himself in negative terms” (Abdel-Jaouad 261). The Franco-Maghrebian is a male in this description, as in Kilito, Khatibi and Laroui. For me, seeing a foreign world is about a destruction/deconstruction of the “positive” term so that the words the Franco-Maghrebian uses to describe themselves are the norm.

²⁸ In Arabic: لكن يخيّل الي احباً أن المتكلم هو المضيف وأن اللغة الضيفة, ضيفة مشاكسة عنيدة تنزل عنده بدون استئذان, فتتملكه وتسكنه على (Kilito, *Lan tatakallam lughati* 109)

adds an important translator's note by saying that the words for "language" in Arabic (*lughah*) and French (*langue*) are linguistically feminine (Kilito, *Thou Shalt Not Speak My Language* 86)²⁹. The notion of a pure language becomes further complicated when one thinks about language as a feminine figure and the ways in which gendered notions of purity are socially constructed. Language being feminine is a conceit that is used by Abdelkebir Khatibi in *Love in Two Languages (Amour Bilingue)* where the love between a European woman and a North African man is used to meditate on the erotics of translation, of bilingualism and the untranslatability of *bi-langue*. The conceit is that the woman and the foreign language often merge into one. I am going to end this chapter with a quote from this text and analysis that will allow me, I hope, to move beyond deconstructive monolingualism to imagine translation within a different scalar constellation. Khatibi (in Howard's translation) writes:

His heart was beating and since it always beat with the same force, he ran, talking incessantly, translating himself, translating everything, on the threshold of the unsayable – his lovely demonism. One day – and this only recently – he loved a woman, changed sex. Sex in circumcised sex, two-tongued sex, like a snake. From his anus emerged the face of an invisible god. He was then violated by the foreign tongue. Thrown to the ground, he suffered hideously. But – bizarre sensation – he was behind his violator, not taking his turn as penetrator but rather penetrated by the tongue's orgasm – his homosexuality filed in the dictionaries of the whole world (Khatibi, *Love in Two Languages* 47).

In this passage the untranslatable or the unsayable is both demonic and holy, rape and pleasure, man and woman, untranslatable and translatable. In the French his lovely demonism is "*la belle démonie*" – feminized just as *la langue* and *lughah* are (Khatibi, *Amour bilingue* 55). While some may argue that linguistic gender is structural and cannot be helped, in this instance, where sex, and sexual imagery is at the forefront, I would argue, it does matter. The passage quoted above,

²⁹ This is true for Hindi too where *bhasha* is linguistically feminine

in the French, seems to rest on the double meaning of the word “*langue*” – tongue and language, biological, and social. Does he change sex, does she change sex? The two-tongued sex, the two-langued sex, the queer sex, being violated by the foreign language, the foreign tongue, the inherently feminine. Then, the bizarre sensation of being penetrated by the foreign tongue’s orgasm, the foreign language’s orgasm, the female-turned male’s orgasm. Is the changing of the sex, the foreign being made domestic, the feminine demonism being exorcised? His homosexuality – the changing of the foreign, the changing of the feminine – filed in the dictionaries of the world, a world where everything is not foreign. Is this homosexuality a metaphor for translation? Is translation always already queer, but is it also always already colonizing, always already male? And is this necessarily the case? Counter-intuitively perhaps this meditation gestures towards the colonial impulses of both the politics of translatability and that of untranslatability which we must keep in mind as we translate and theorize translation.

So, seeing a foreign world should not be about gatekeeping, rather it should be about a seeing, reading, translating praxis. To re-turn to questions I posed at the start of the chapter: But is the “dislocation” of English the same as the “dislocation” of French? Is this even a productive question to ask? What would it mean to see “dislocation” as foreign, to read “dislocation” as foreign, to translate “dislocation” as foreign in a world where everything was foreign? Perhaps, it would be to see “dislocation” not as easily translatable, but as untranslatable? To see it as never completely English, and never completely French? Is this the same as Venuti’s foreignizing strategy? Perhaps, but there is a difference, it assumes a different mode of reading that is not so much about knowing the other, or indeed the monolingualism of the other, but rather is more introspective, about the multilingualism of the self. Gansel almost says this when she discusses her “most essential lesson in translation” as being the realization that “the stranger was not the

other, it was me. I was the one who has everything to learn, everything to understand, from the other” (Gansel, Translation as Transhumance 103)³⁰. Through translation, in translation, seeing the self as the stranger rather than the translated as the stranger. I would go so far as to say learning, understanding not just from the other, but also from the self, the stranger, l'étranger, the foreign. That is to say translation is to see everything in the world as foreign, and to view this as liberatory. More than anything, I suppose, this is a call, a call to not see Maati as a lone figure, on the brink of madness, having an existential crisis, like Mersault, Camus' narrator. But, a call to see him as the norm, to see a world where everything is foreign as the norm, because to do so exposes the dangers of the assimilationist discourses that underlie our theoretical categories.

Here, however, I want to acknowledge that “seeing a foreign world” is very similar to Spivak's advocating for the use of “planet” over “globe” and her postulation of “planetary” in *Death of a Discipline*. She writes,

As presumed collectivities cross borders under the auspices of a Comparative Literature supplemented by Area Studies, they might attempt to figure themselves – imagine themselves – as planetary rather than continental, global or worldly. The planet is easily claimed. Let me explain what effort is implicit in my invocation of the word.

I propose the planet to overwrite the globe.... The globe is on our computers. No one lives there. It allows us to think that we can aim to control it. The planet is in the species of alterity, belonging to another system; and yet we inhabit it, on loan.... When I invoke the planet, I think of the effort required to figure the (im)possibility of this underived intuition. (G. C. Spivak, *Death of a Discipline* 72)

If the “planet is in the species of alterity” and “we inhabit it, on loan”, it is not ours. If the “we” encompasses everything in the world, all the people in the world, and if the planet we inhabit is not ours, then aren't we all foreigners vis a vis the planet. And, so wouldn't this be a way to see

³⁰ In French: “soudain je réalisai que l'étranger ce n'est pas l'autre, c'est moi, moi qui ai tout à apprendre, à comprendre de lui. Ce fut sans doute ma plus essentielle leçon de traduction (Gansel, Traduire comme Transhumer 87)

everything in the world as foreign. But I think it's significant that Ramadan, in her translation uses "world", just as world literature uses world, just as Said uses world. This is because underlying all of these ways of thinking is an underlying belief in humanism, of one variety or another. Gansel via Schwartz makes this explicit when she writes, "no word that speaks of what is human is untranslatable" (Gansel, Translation as Transhumance 2). But, what of positions that are not thought of as human, or positions "unthought"? By elevating philosophemes, primarily European ones, as the *Dictionary of Untranslatables* does, by privileging the world, even if it is in the instance of seeing everything in the world as foreign, are we just enacting violence on the black body, on the trans body, on the nonnormative human body? Perhaps then, the paradigm should be seeing everything as foreign, without locating it within a particular global/worldly/planetary scale.

Chapter 2: Colonizing Translation, Envisioning Africa and Asia

A few early birds sang your hymn of
praise while rest of the woodland
choir were asleep.
Then at the silent beckoning of the Eternal
you rose higher and higher till you reached
the mid-sky, making all quarters of heaven
your own.

Therefore at this moment, after the end
of centuries the palm groves by the
Indian sea raise their tremulous branches
to the sky murmuring your praise.

- Rabindranath Tagore From “To Shakespeare” (R. Tagore 599)

I begin this chapter with a short story, her story, my story, a worldly story perhaps. Imagine New Delhi, 2016, a humid day in July, me walking into the Sahhitya Akademi (National Academy of Literature), a reading room filled with various journals, bound, well-worn, some from the early 20th century. All within easy reach. This trip was funded by the Center for Asian studies at UC Irvine. The American academy looms large. I seek out the journal *Translation Today*, with an awareness that it is my ethical imperative to see India as a site of both theoretical and literary production. Scanning the bound volumes, I come across a picture. It is a sketch by RS Naidu, a sketch of Shakespeare and Kalidasa holding hands. Shakespeare in his quintessential English gentleman’s attire and Kalidasa in Indian garb, or to put it more accurately in “feminine” Indian clothes. This coupling, so to speak, puts into relief the binary oppositions

between East and West, India and England, colonized and colonizer and feminine and masculine that have haunted and continue to haunt “postcolonial” studies. This image is also one where a potentially queer relationship is reimagined in a heteronormative manner. It is an image that wouldn’t be out of place in what Jaikumar calls “an orientalist visual economy” where “the feminization of native male body” was all too common (Jaikumar 159). It was, however, not drawn by a white British colonist but by an Indian and was originally published in 1966, undergirding the fact that the binary is not necessarily as fixed as it is often made out to be. Be that as it may, Kalidasa is often considered to be on par with Shakespeare. As Vasudha Dalmia points out, William Jones, the Indologist and one of the founders of the Asiatic society of Bengal, was “the first to identify the genius of Kalidasa with that of Shakespeare” such that Kalidasa becomes thought of as the Indian Shakespeare in the European imaginary, and subsequently in the Indian imaginary (Dalmia, *Urban Theatre and the Turn towards 'Folk'* 206).

To clarify this last point, I draw on Tejaswini Niranjana’s work to refer to “an Indian imaginary” which has accessed the Sanskrit texts via English translations done by the early Indologists. Niranjana analyzes the role of William Jones when she writes, “the most significant nodes of Jones’s work are (a) the need for translation by the European, since the natives are unreliable interpreters of their own laws and culture; (b) the desire to be a lawgiver, to give Indians their own laws, and (c) the desire to ‘purify’ Indian culture and speak on its behalf” (Niranjana 13). Native peoples are not seen as having the agency to translate their own works. Perhaps, this is an early iteration of the maxim common in contemporary discourses on translation – one translates into one’s “native” language and not from it. The “works” in question are not just literary, and cultural but also legal and included ancient treatises of jurisprudence. Translation was, therefore, used to exercise control through different means. Niranjana’s third

point is particularly pertinent to the story of the image because it raises the question of who Jones' work was speaking to. In his analysis of Indologist H.H. Wilson's translation of Kalidasa's *Meghduta*, David Damrosch assumes that Wilson's audience was "Western", or at any rate non-Indian. He notes, for example, that "unlike such colonialists as Thomas Babington Macaulay and the other 'Anglicists' discussed by Viswanathan (1989) and Trautmann (1997), Wilson was not at all dismissive of Indian art and literature, and he makes great efforts in his edition to encourage his readers to take the poem and its culture seriously" (Damrosch 78). His (i.e. Wilson's) readers are assumed not to be from India, where Kalidasa is part of the cultural heritage. It is interesting that Damrosch mentions Macaulay, the architect of English education in India and whose policies I analyze later in this chapter, because his presence points to the presence of another audience for these translations. Thanks to a Macaulayan system of education we – Indians who don't know Sanskrit, and whose first language is English, i.e. urban elite and intelligentsia, like me – access the Shakespeare-Kalidasa dyad via Jones, Wilson and other Indologists. The image of Shakespeare and Kalidasa, drawn in postcolonial India, is perhaps another vestige of this legacy.

Niranjana's claim also connects the idea of "purity" to translation, which is ironic given the discourse in translation studies³¹ which considers the translation as being a corrupt, polluted form of the original. In contrast, for the early Indologists, translation is that which purifies the

³¹ The notion of *traducere* as carrying across was discussed in chapter one in relation to the metaphor of translation as a bridge. A second aspect of the word translation that bears highlighting is that the Latin word *traduce* that underlies it also connotes calumny. This is intimately connected to the gendered conception and theorizing of translation in an Anglo-European context. As Sherry Simon notes there is a "heritage of double inferiority" which is exemplified in the "neat equation" set out by John Florio whereby "because they are necessarily 'defective' all translations are 'reputed females'" (1). As a consequence of the process of calumny, of falsification, all translations are inherently impure, inherently lacking, *les belles infideles* (the unfaithful women). The "double inferiority" is, therefore, inferiority owing to being less than the original, and inferiority as a woman – being less than a man. The notion of translation purifying the original, therefore, serves as a counter to this.

impure original, the feminine original. Here directionality is of utmost importance. Kalidasa is purified through the process of being translated into English whereas Shakespeare is the pure original that is corrupted through translation into Indian languages, the opposite of purification.

I found this image reproduced in an article by T S Satyanath titled “How does Shakespeare become Sekh Pir in Kannada?” Satynath uses a close reading of this image as a metaphor for early Shakespeare translations and the way in which they adapted Shakespeare’s plays and the manner in which these adaptations have been received. He writes

Kalidasa and Shakespeare are represented as being hand in hand and dressed in appropriate attires, suitable to the worlds that they represent. While Kalidasa has a palm-leaf manuscript in his hand, Shakespeare has a scroll. Everything looks like a perfect demonstration of a harmonious East-West encounter.

But wait a minute;

Did someone feel uncomfortable that Shakespeare is slightly taller than Kalidasa?

Or that Shakespeare looks like a 'manly Englishman'!

And that Kalidasa looks a BIT 'effeminate'!

Also there is no doresani [memsahib equivalent] anywhere around (for our comfort)!

It doesn't matter; Kalidasa is represented on the right side and Shakespeare to his left.

We all know that in the Indian iconographic tradition, vama (left) conventionally suggests inferiority and insignificance with reference to its right counterpart. Like Naidu's sketch, many of these early Shakespearian translations were probably doing something of this sort, whether it was intentional or otherwise. Only viewers and audience can decide what to read from a representation (Satyanath 71-72).

Satyanath is suggesting that the early Shakespeare translations, much like Kalidasa in the image, seem inferior, inadequate, and inauthentic at first glance. But using “Indian iconographic tradition” or more appropriately a Sanskritic heuristic, Satyanath is able to recuperate both the image and therefore the translations and the “discomfort” they cause as a form of empire writing

back. However, what is not called into question is the “appearance” of inferiority and the fact that this inferiority is clothed in what is thought of as being “feminine”. Also not called into question is an interrogation of why a woman, a memsahib, a doresani do not and indeed could not belong in this image. The “harmonious” east-west encounter must perforce have been between male geniuses – Shakespeare and Kalidasa. Further, regardless of the “discomfort” – it is after all nothing stronger than discomfort – there seems to be something benign about the image, about the encounter, about the translations. Perhaps, this is because the encounter is cultural, or perhaps it is because it is associated with the “genius” of Shakespeare. The creation and spread of such an image – Shakespeare as a genius – is a theme that runs through this chapter.

In his analysis of the image, Satyanath makes a move that is familiar in postcolonial studies because it involves the rejection of Western epistemological traditions. He turns to the “Indian iconographic tradition”, which is imagined to be the Sanskritic tradition. Having highlighted the problems with the native-foreign dichotomy that underlies the English word translation in chapter one, I too make a similar move to the Sanskrit-derived Hindi word *anuvad*. The Hindi word *anuvad*, with its etymological roots in Sanskrit, refers to a process of “saying after or again, repeating by way of explanation, explanatory repetition or reiteration with corroboration or illustration” (Monier-Williams 38)³². Harish Trivedi and Susan Bassnet suggest that the main difference between *anuvad* and ‘translation’ is the fact that the metaphor that lies beneath the former is a temporal one, unlike the spatial one beneath the latter (9). While both translation and *anuvad* suggest a movement between languages, translation, as seen in chapter one, also connotes a movement between two spaces, two cultures. While, this may be true of

³² For a detailed account of the various words that refer to translation in Indian languages see Trivedi (2006).

anuvad too, though it is certainly not necessarily the case, the key for anuvad is that the movement is through time.

In his essay “Engendering Translation”, M Sivaramkrishna, an Indian academic, draws five “conclusions” on the characteristics of anuvad. Drawing on its Sanskritic roots, these conclusions are presented in a form that is “sutra like” where sutra is an aphorism or rule in Sanskrit literature (Sivaramkrishna 23). The first of these sutras is “Anuvada is sanatana, atemporal” (23). It’s striking that Sivaramkrishna has the words “sanatana” and “atemporal” besides one another, because one of the most common phrases in which the word “sanatana” is used is the phrase “santana dharma” or eternal religion/rules/duty in Hinduism. If anuvad is sanatana, is it intimately tied to a certain kind of Hinduism? The other noteworthy aspect of this sutra is that it begs the question whether eternal and atemporal are the same, or does the comma between sanatana and atemporal indicate that anuvad lies at the interstices of sanatana and atemporal, of eternal and atemporal? Does it lie in the space between that which exists forever (within “time”) and that which exists outside time? These questions are pertinent in that they allow for an exploration of the nature of the temporalities of translations. Is anuvad intended to be sanatana – all encompassing, like a particular version of Hinduism, unchanging, like the dharma – or does temporality not matter at all?

Sivaramkrishna’s second sutra is also worth highlighting: “Anuvada is sabda and bhava realigned in (a) language(s), temporally given” (23). To unpack this aphorism fully, it’s worth considering what he says earlier in the essay. The author notes, “Every generation re-covered a given text not so much by sabdanuvada, literal translation, as by bhavanuvada, transfiguration of ideas. Literal translation, while, faithful to the text may prove, they must have felt, disloyal to the existing context” (22). Sabda – the word, the literal – and bhava – the meaning, the emotion, the

affect, the figurative – are “realigned” in anuvad. The notion of realignment has within it an iterative quality. The image of a puzzle comes to mind – a puzzle that has multiple solutions that can be solved in multiple ways, multiples times. And yet, a puzzle can be unsolved, an alignment askew. The space where the puzzle is being solved, the alignment attempted, is a language or languages. Again, time becomes important in the phrase “temporally given”, which is clarified when Sivaramakrishna talks about “every generation” and literal translation as being “disloyal to the existing context” (22). So, for him, anuvad – as a retelling, a reiteration – is a means by which a generation recovers or perhaps re-discovers a text. It is not so much a literal translation but a transfiguration that is appropriate for, or perhaps an appropriation that is in sync with, a particular context, temporally defined. The unfaithful woman (i.e. the unfaithful literal translation) is viewed as loyal subject or perhaps servant of the context (i.e. the transfiguration or appropriation). Sivaramkrishna ends his essay with the fifth sutra: “Anuvada is purna (holistic): appropriation varies and the whole is acquired afresh: engendering, gendering, eroticizing, secularizing” (Sivaramkrishna 23). If anuvad is “purna” – everything – and implies all this, why not just abandon translation wholesale and use it? My hesitancy in doing this owes to the politics of using a Sanskritic term to metonymically stand for Indian, for non-western, just as Satyanath does in the instance of the sketch. This is especially important in the contemporary moment when the Hindu right in India is working towards erasing all traces of the non-Hindu from what is considered Indian.

Another reason why I am resisting using anuvad alone is that turning to it uncritically would put me back into the native-foreign binary that I deconstructed in chapter 1. To abandon translation as being foreign, and to valorize anuvad because it is “indigenous” perpetuates the divide. Instead I want to recast the terms, to view both of them as equally foreign, to bring them

together in a distancing mode, a mode of alienation from the self, the writer, the critic. To do this I bring the terms together, not as *transanuvad* or *anulation* but as *trans*anuvading* – neither term looks as it does, neither term is at home in this portmanteau. A portmanteau that brings together the gendered notions of faithfulness and infidelity, purity and impurity from translation, and of loyalty and treason, with its connections to the nation and the state, from *anuvad*. Such a coming together that allows for an exploration of the intimacies of gender and nation.

The importance of the prefix ‘trans’ within the field of translation studies has emerged in discussions of gender and translation. Apropos to the discussion above on gendering and engendering, Christopher Larkosh asks :“How is translation, as a gendered performative act, inextricably configured within a constellation of other ‘trans’ terms, such as transnationality, transit, transculturation, or transgender?” (Larkosh 8). Here, once again I think of Kilito and Khatibi, discussed in chapter one, of the transnational, interracial encounter between the white woman and the Arab man, the translational encounter. I am thinking of Khatibi’s sexually charged tongues that change sex? But, neither Larkosh nor Khatibi nor Kilito explicitly addresses this gendering and engendering, this translational alterity, in terms of race, particularly blackness, and racialization. In their work on Morocco for example, Khatibi and Kilito elide Black Morocco³³. While she is not foregrounding translation, this is where Christina Sharpe’s seminal work on “trans*” comes in, a configuration in which the asterisk plays a huge part. As she writes,

³³ In his book *Black Morocco*, Chouki El Hamel notes that, “Morocco has traditionally been described in local historiography as a racially and ethnically homogenous nation, defined religiously by Islamic doctrine and linguistically and politically by Arabic nationalism. Written history is generally silent regarding slavery and racial attitudes, discrimination, and marginalization and paints a picture of Morocco as free from such social problems, problems usually associated more with slavery and its aftermath in the United States” (El Hamel 2). For both Khatibi and Kilito, thinking about racialization within Morocco would complicate the dichotomy between native and foreign, between the Arab man and the white woman.

The asterisk after a word functions as the wildcard; as a means to mark the ways the slave and the Black occupy what Saidiya Hartman calls the “position of the unthought” (Hartman and Wilderson 2003). The asterisk after the prefix “trans” holds the place open for thinking (from and into that position). It speaks, as well, to a range of embodied experiences called gender and to Euro-Western gender’s dismantling, its inability to hold in/on Black flesh. The asterisk speaks to a range of configurations of Black being that take the form of translation, transatlantic, transgression, transgender, transformation, transmogrification, transcontinental, transfixed, trans-Mediterranean, transubstantiation (by which process we might understand the making of bodies into flesh and then into fungible commodities while retaining the appearance of flesh and blood), transmigration, and more. (Sharpe 30)

To Sharpe’s list of trans terms I would add “trans-Saharan” (El Hamel 3)³⁴. The first important aspect of trans* is that it speaks to different “embodied experiences called gender” – the “called” is important here as it signals an act of naming. At the same time, it is speaking or perhaps working towards a “dismantling” of Euro-American constructs of gender, the concept that Larkosh is presumably referring to when he talks about translation as a “gendered performative act”. This dismantling is predicated on the fact that these constructions of gender are unable to “hold in/on Black flesh” as a result of which “transgression” “transubstantiation” “trans-Atlantic” “trans-Mediterranean” do not explicitly figure in Larkosh’s “constellation”. The asterisk “holds the place open” for the terms Sharpe highlights but also for Sivaramkrishna’s temporally determined “transfiguration”. It allows for a thinking through of the transgression of denying Shakespeare authorship, and of the trans-Oceanic (slave) (colonial) trade routes that brought Shakespeare to India, which is the focus of the next section of this chapter. Sharpe also notes that she “can’t help but see that word “risk” in “asterisk”” (Sharpe 29). What is at risk for me in the space between trans and anuvad? I think it’s the ability to see, to hear, and to comprehend erasures and silences, not in terms of translational loss or mistranslations as is

³⁴ El Hamel connects his work on the trans-Saharan slave trade and slavery in Morocco to the trans-Atlantic slave trade. He notes similarities in the form of “zones of cultural exchange, borrowing, mixing and creolization, as well as violation, violence, enslavement and racially segregated zones” (El Hamel 5). Many of these terms are encompassed within Sharpe’s trans categories too.

common in translation studies, but rather in terms of stories untold and bodies elided by translational processes. This brings us to the suffix “ing”. For me, translation is folding and unfolding, always already a process, always already in progress, always already occurring. The body, with its fleshly connotations, is a part of this always already process – always already participating, always already elided.

The notion of flesh – Black flesh, bodies being made into flesh, and into flesh and blood is key for Christina Sharpe. Within an Indian context, S. Shankar, in his book *Flesh and Fish Blood*, brings translation and the notion of flesh into sharp relief through his theorization of the vernacular. The connection is drawn out via an analysis of the poem “Situation” by the Tamil poet Ka Na Su (K. N. Subramanyam). The poem, which was translated from Tamil into English by the poet, reads:

Introduction to
the Upanishads
by T. S. Eliot;

and to Tagore
by the early
Pound;

and to the Indian Tradition
by Max Mueller
(late of the Bhavan);

and to
Indian dance by

Bowers;

and to

Indian art

by what's-his-name;

and to the Tamil classics

by Danielou

(or was it Pope?);

neither flesh

nor fish blood

nor stone totem-pole;

vociferous

in thoughts

not his own;

eloquent in words

not his own

("The age demanded ...") (Subramanyam 101)

The speaker in this poem is deriding a hypothetical "him", a representative of the intelligentsia, who has accessed all facets of Indian culture through a European filter. Importantly, it is not only classical literary culture (the Upanishads, the Tamil classics) that is being referenced, but also twentieth century (Tagore) and other artistic forms (dance, art). This speaks to a larger point that literary translation is just one among several interpretive moves Europeans (the "West") made in an effort to "understand" and produce knowledge about Indian culture. This knowledge is one

that we access now, in “words/not our own”. I would argue that this might have been the case originally, but now they are words that we have had no choice but to make our own. Ka Na Su is making an explicit connection between language (English presumably), knowledge produced in that language, thoughts and one’s embodied being. Owing to their reliance on European translations and interpretations, Shankar notes that

the poem thematizes the contemporary cultural predicament of a certain segment of the *postcolonial* intelligentsia in Tamil India. Not of the land (“flesh”), not of the sea (“fish blood”), not a worthy (even if inanimate) emblem of his culture (“stone totem-pole”), filled with “words not his own” – the individual described in the poem is, it would seem, the product of what is often referred to in the postcolonial context as cultural imperialism (Shankar 6).

An Indian who reads the Shakespeare-Kalidasa dyad in English, like me, would belong to this sort of an intelligentsia – our flesh disembodied by the Indologists’ purificatory translational processes. Within Sharpe’s framework, the asterisk is necessary to highlight the “inability” of categories like gender to “hold in/on Black flesh” and to mark the “position of the unthought”. In this instance, the subject of the poem, the “him” does not occupy a “position of the unthought” but rather a position of privilege and yet the category of intelligentsia is unable, for the poet, to “hold in/on” ‘Indian’ flesh, whatever that may be. The cultural imperialism enacted by way of translation ensures that this is the case. If in this instance, an educated member of the postcolonial intelligentsia, occupies a disembodied position, we are left wondering what positions members of subaltern groups occupy. This line of inquiry makes the asterisk even more important.

To return to the image and the story I began with, what is the story untold in the picture, the story lost under the benignity of the image? It is the story of how Shakespeare came to India. To tell this story I turn back the clock to 1607. I look to the first performance of a Shakespearean

play outside the British Isles, and to Lucas Fernandes, a black man, who saw the performance. There are two main reasons for this journeying through the West coast of Africa to reach Shakespeare in India. The first speaks to the historical spatio-temporal dimension of trans*anuvading. The performance was of *Hamlet* and it occurred aboard Captain William Keeling's ship Red Dragon, the first "British diplomatic mission to India", as it was docked off the coast of Sierra Leone (Taylor 223). The facticity of this performance is questioned by scholars like Bernice Kliman. Kliman provides "circumstantial evidence" to suggest "that the Keeling record of performances by English sailors off the coast of Africa in 1607 is a forgery" (Kliman 180). She ends her persuasive account by asking the reader to think about "our willingness to believe, disbelieve, or make use of Gunthio's and Rundall's well-hidden accounts" (Kliman 204). One scholar who makes use of these accounts is Ania Loomba, for whom this marks the "moment when Shakespeare first travelled to India" (Loomba 111). Gary Taylor, who also uses these accounts problematizes this characterization on factual grounds by asserting that "there is no evidence, on this voyage of a performance of Shakespeare anywhere near India" (Taylor 224). Be that as it may, I believe that the phenomenon of global Shakespeares, which Shakespeare in India is a part of, cannot but be understood "in the wake", to use Christina Sharpe's turn of phrase, of this performance and of the ways in which it is taken up in Shakespeare criticism. Secondly, this detour allows me to recognize the embodied aspect of trans*anuvading through Lucas Fernandes, an educated Sierra Leonean and an interpreter. In the next section I will analyze the implications of this by looking closely at the ways in which white travelers and scholars have talked about him and used him as a "historical example". In particular, I will be looking for the silences and omissions to deconstruct the rhetorical moves

used to create a particularly imagined construction of Africa and the political assumptions that underlie this construction³⁵.

Even as I will be focusing on him, I hope not to idealize him but rather to read his figure and person in a deidealized mode. Here, I am drawing on the work of Kadji Amin for whom

Deidealization is not the wholesale destruction of cherished ideals, but a form of the reparative that acknowledges messiness and damage, refuses the repudiating operations of idealization, and acknowledges the ways in which complicity is sometimes necessary for survival. It names a form of queer inquiry, which I understand to be already under way, that offers a less binary, less repudiating account of the constitutive entanglement of queer and deviant cultures within a range of modes of social power (Amin 11).

“Complicity” is a key word for me in that I hope to acknowledge not only the disciplines’, the scholars’, the writers’ and my complicities but also Fernandes’ complicity as an exemplar of the class of people Ngugi calls “the interpreter as a foreign agent and messenger” (Ngugi wa Thiong’o 79). In order to see this complicity as being “necessary for [his] survival” and part of the messiness we/I need to sit with while looking at him as a historical and symbolic figure. This quote also helps me think about my work as being within a lineage of postcolonial (and) “queer inquiry” that offers a “less binary, less repudiating account of the constitutive entanglement” of not only, the binary of colonizer and colonized, but also the entanglement of Indian and non-Indian, pure and impure, and indeed normal and deviant. These entanglements are in turn entangled within “a range of modes of social power” – and here “modes” in the plural is particularly resonant with my work.

Lucas Fernandes – the trans*lator – spectator

³⁵ Kadji Amin uses this method with contemporary queer theory.

What does it mean to see Lucas Fernandes as a trans*lator and why is it important and necessary for my argument to do so? In his 1981 introduction to selections from Captain William Keeling's unpublished journals from the voyage in 1607, P. E. H. Hair describes Fernandes as "an early African évolu  " (P. E. Hair 3). This term, with its connotations of evolution and progress, along with the Portuguese term *ladino*, is used by Hair to describe "an African who by his contacts with the Portuguese and by their deliberate training had acquired knowledge of the world of western Europe and Christendom" (P. E. Hair 32). Hair's use of the phrase "their deliberate training" to refer to Fernandes' Portuguese education has strong parallels with Macaulay's Minute on Education. Thomas Babington Macaulay is often thought of as the architect of English education in India, and subsequently in other British colonies³⁶. In his famous Minute of February 2nd, 1835, which is more popularly known as the Minute on Education in India, Macaulay makes an argument about "the intrinsic superiority of Western Literature" and goes on to make the bold claim, without knowing either Sanskrit or Arabic, that "a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia" (Macaulay 349).

Macaulay's end goal, however, was not to civilize all Indians. Rather, it was, as he remarks in these oft-quoted lines:

To form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect. To that class we may leave it to refine the vernacular dialects of the country, to enrich those dialects with terms of science borrowed from the Western nomenclature, and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population (Macaulay 359).

³⁶ Ngugi refers to Macaulay's Minute on Education in several instances including when he discusses "Macaulay's spy" in *Penpoints Gunpoints and Dreams* (84) thereby connecting British colonization in Africa with British colonization in India

Just as in Hair's description of Fernandes, Macaulay's words foreground the deliberateness with which the European colonizers implemented a colonial education policy with the express interest of creating a "class of interpreters", i.e. a class of evolved Africans and Indians, not quite as evolved as white Europeans, but more evolved than the "millions" of Africans and Indians. Here it is worth briefly turning to the work of Ngũgĩ, who, in *Penpoints, Gunpoints and Dreams*, traces the genealogy of the interpreter in colonial and postcolonial Africa. He writes that "there are three types and three roles into which he [or she, though perhaps primarily he within the colonial context] could and has fallen in the colonial and post-colonial era: the interpreter as a foreign agent and messenger, as a double agent, and as a people's scout and guide to the stars of freedom" (78-79). Lucas Fernandes would seem to be an interpreter of the first kind, as he is primarily seen by Hair and others as "a go-between for King Bure [the local king], Bartolomeu Andre [a local Portuguese resident trader], and Father Barreira [a Portuguese Jesuit priest] on the one hand, and the English on the other" (P. E. Hair 32).

In the rest of this section I will be performing an intimate close reading of sections from Gary Taylor's 2001 essay "*Hamlet* in Africa 1607". By an intimate reading practice not only do I mean, as Lisa Lowe does, to "read *across* the separate repositories" (Lowe 5) but also to read for and against what is contained in Taylor's text and what is "in excess" of it (Sharpe 30). In particular I focus on the hows and whys of Taylor's citational practices in order to highlight the path not taken in the telling of Fernandes' story within the context of Shakespearean studies. It is important to not just think of Fernandes as an interpreter, a go-between, a colonial agent but also as a trans*lator-spectator. Then, to think of Fernandes as a trans*lator means to leave space/place "open for thinking" from and into his position as an interpreter, and for thinking about how the texts configure him as a Black being. This feeds into and is fed by his role as both

a translator and a spectator and his “transubstantiation” into a valuable commodity for the Portuguese, the English and the local elite (a class to which, it is said, he belonged). A question that looms is does Fernandes, as a black man, but also as an évolu  , a *ladino*, occupy the “position of the unthought”?

Taylor opens his essay with a quote from *Hamlet* where Hamlet discusses seeing his father in “his mind’s eye” and then sets the stage for his readers:

In your **mind’s eye**, I would like to **conjure** up a company of British seamen, far from home. These men will spend the afternoon on shore, sweating, shooting an elephant. But in the cool of the morning they gather on board ship for a different kind of sport. Within sight of **conspiratorial** packs of long-tailed monkeys on the rocks, within earshot of the estuary’s cranes and pelicans, a sailor steps onto the deck. He holds a weapon that combines a spear with a hatchet. He points this weapon in the direction of another man, and says, “**Who’s there?**” – The first words of Shakespeare spoken outside of Europe. (Taylor 223, emphasis mine)

In the quote from *Hamlet*, Hamlet uses the phrase “mind’s eye” to refer to his imagination, but also more specifically to the act of seeing his father’s ghost. What is seen in his “mind’s eye” is not a conjuring of his imagination but a haunting by what was once real. Further, the haunting becomes a haunting of the collective, once Horatio says a few lines later “My Lord I thinke I saw him yesternight”, suggesting that the vision is not merely in Hamlet’s “mind’s eye” (I.ii.197). This notion of the haunting of the collective, or indeed of collective memory, is what Taylor is drawing on with his description of a place “far from home”. Even as his argument is about the ship, the people and the performance, Taylor includes a description of the wildlife around the boat. Key here is his use of the word “conspiratorial” – who are the monkeys conspiring against? This is more troubling when one considers the fact that black peoples, particularly those who

were non- “evolué”, were (and are in many instances) considered outside the category of “human”³⁷, as savage, as wild, like animals. Here it is worth highlighting that,

in Shakespeare’s day “savage” meant wild, barbarous, uneducated, undomesticated – in short *uncivilized* by upper class European standards... ‘Savage’ was thus shorthand for someone culturally inferior to the smug observer. Englishmen lavished the label on the Irish and on the American Indians, the ethnic groups most newsworthy in Tudor-Stuart times, and also on a host of other peoples in Africa, Asia, and even Europe” (Vaughan and Vaughan 7-9).

As in Macaulay’s Minute and Hair’s reference to *ladino*, once again, here, we encounter a reference to being civilized, or in this case, “uncivilized”. So, Lucas Fernandes as an évolué would not be considered a savage but the rest of his peoples would have been – undomesticated wild animals, like the conspiratorial packs of long-tailed monkeys. I am not arguing that Taylor is calling the peoples of Sierra Leone ‘savages’ or indeed using the monkeys as a metaphor, rather what I am suggesting is that by using this image, he is tapping into the collective European memory that is haunted by these tropes, by a vision of Africa that was created through narratives and travelogues in which “fact and fancy were indissolubly mixed” (Jones 14).

In looking at the Elizabethan image of Africa, Eldred Jones argues that “descriptions of those strange creatures together with factual information on the real inhabitants blended to fertilize the imagination of poets and playwrights, and it was from such conflicting material that the background and even suggestions for the language of *Othello* derived” (Jones 14). Like Shakespeare, Taylor’s imagination too has been “fertilized” by the legacies of the “conflicting” material such that his opening paragraph mirrors his sources. The comparison between Taylor and the playwright is one that is encouraged by the text through Taylor’s use of the word “conjure”. Like Prospero, who is often considered to be a stand in for the bard himself, Taylor is

³⁷ Here I am thinking of Sylvia Wynter’s essay “No Humans Involved: An Open Letter to my Colleagues”.

asking his readers to “conjure” an image of 17th century Africa – an image of Africa where “factual information” is supplemented by adjectives that turn the wildlife into “strange creatures”. Furthermore, looking at his footnotes shows us that Taylor got his description of the flora and fauna of Sierra Leone from a different source than his sources for the account of the performance. The former is Andre Donelha’s *An Account of Sierra Leone and the Rivers of Guinea of Cape Verde* while the latter are journals from sailors and merchants on the East India Company ships. The journals, or fragments thereof, that are being used are those of Captain Keeling, Anthony Marlowe, John Hearne and William Finch, as well as an unidentified merchant. The image that Taylor would like us to conjure is just that: a conjuring made up of a splicing of different European accounts of Sierra Leone, and not just the English account of the performance. What are the implications, therefore, of Gary Taylor beginning his academic essay with a rehearsal of the tropes of Early Modern accounts of the continent?

Echoing the “who’s there?” that rings out of the performer’s mouth, Taylor, goes on to ask the question of who was there on that boat on that fateful day. He writes,

Who *was* there? Another British sailor, playing the role of Francisco, soon followed by others to play Horatio and the Ghost and Hamlet and all the rest. A unique company, they played to a unique audience: a boatload of 150 men on the first British diplomatic mission to India – and in their midst, four guests with filed teeth, plucked eyelashes, rings on their fingers and in their ears and noses, braided hair shaved into “elegant patterns” forming “various shapes, some oval, others like half an orange,” and scarified black bodies, artistically tattooed “by means of hot irons” with “pictures of lizards, fish, gazelle, monkeys, elephants and all other kinds of animals, insects and birds.” We even know the name of one of those four African spectators. “Who’s there?” – Lucas Fernandez, the first identifiable black man (or woman) whose life intersects with the works of our most canonical dead white male, William Shakespeare. But when Lucas Fernandez encountered *Hamlet*, the Great White Bard was still alive, and *The Tragical History of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, was a new play (Taylor 223).

There is a discrepancy between the details provided regarding the physical appearance of the “150 men” as compared to those describing the “four African spectators”. The British men,

despite being from different class backgrounds and having different levels of education (Boas 93), are all “men”. Later in the essay, Taylor notes that “by the social criteria of the day most of the crew were indeed ‘rude mechanicals’” and there were also “well-educated merchants and officers of the East India Company” on board (Taylor 234). And yet, both the (c)rude sailors and the well-educated officers are considered “men”, owing perhaps to their whiteness.

In contrast, the group of Africans are not “men”; they are “guests”, they are “spectators” but not men. What’s more is that the description of them begins with their “teeth” – an image that is not even in quotation marks (i.e. that cannot be attributed to the words of a seventeenth century European voyager). The focus on the teeth, the hot irons, and the tattoos of wild animals, including perhaps of the conspiratorial monkeys, play into the stereotypes of wild, black Africans. Given the parallels between Prospero and Taylor, it’s worth turning to Vaughan and Vaughan’s analysis of the word “savage” as applied to Caliban. They note that “‘savage’ tells us much about Caliban’s cultural condition (as perceived by Prospero and Miranda)” (9), a comment that highlights the role of perception, especially Prospero’s perception. Caliban being a “savage” is not a fact that can or would be observed by everyone, rather it is predicated on Prospero and Miranda’s cultural and, even though Vaughan and Vaughan repeatedly deny it, racial assumptions. Similarly, these descriptors that Taylor is using are not value-neutral adjectives. Rather they are based on the ways in which Taylor is using his seventeenth century sources as well as cultural and racial assumptions about Europe and its “other”.

The descriptions are all from P.E.H Hair’s English translations of Portuguese sources. This is important because if one compares these to accounts from the British men on the ship, they are very different – even if the underlying belief in the cultural and racial superiority of Europeans remains. The four African men aboard the ship on the 5th of September 1607, the day

of the performance, are not described in terms of their physical appearance. Not in the remnants of Captain Keeling's journal, not in an unknown merchant's journal, not in Hearne and Finch's journal and not in Anthony Marlowe's journal. Each of them just notes that 4 black men came on board. The only instance of a more detailed description can be found in the "Observations of William Finch, Merchant, taken out of his large Journal", in the section titled "Remembrances touching Sierra Leona, in August 1607. The Bay, Countrey, Inhabitants, Rites, Fruits and Commodities", published in Samuel Purchas' *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes*. While Taylor cites Keeling's journals that were published in Purchas' volumes, he does not cite the observations from Finch, which if he were going for English authenticity might have proved more worthwhile. Describing the clothing and appearances of the peoples of Sierra Leone, Finch writes,

The King, with some about him, are decently cloathes in Jackets and Breeches, and some with hats, but the common sort go naked, save that with a Cotten girdle about their waste, they cover their privities; the women cover theirs with a Cotton-cloath, tacked about their middles and hanging to the knees, wrapped round about them; the children goe starke naked. They are all, both men and women, rased and pinked on all parts of their bodies very curiously, having their teeth also filed betwixt, and made very sharpe. They pull off all the haire growing on their eye-lids. Their beards are short, crispe, blacke, and the haire of their heads they cut into allyes and crosse pathes; others weare it jagged in tufts, others in other foolish forms; but the women shave all close to the flesh. (Purchas 2)

Perhaps Taylor chose the Portuguese sources because they speak of "elegant patterns" instead of "foolish forms" when referring to the hair. Perhaps he chose them because of the details of the animals, or perhaps because the class differentiation that Finch notes between the King and his entourage and the "common sort" would have made the picture Taylor is trying to conjure too complex. Be that as it may, unlike the journals of Marlowe, Keeling, Hearne and Finch and the unknown merchant all of which are dated, this quote is taken from a "remembrance" – a memory retold, perhaps a memory that was haunting and retold, perhaps an individual memory used to

create a collective haunting. Here it is worth turning to P.E.H Hair, who translated most of the Portuguese sources and edited the English ones in the 1970s and 80s. Highlighting the differences between the Portuguese and English sources he notes that,

Some advantage remained with the Portuguese inasmuch as their writers and informants had often lived within the Sierra Leone region for long periods of years, whereas the English were, almost until the end, mere visitors, staying at most a few weeks in occasional years. Nevertheless, in some respects at least the detail collected by the English during spasmodic short visits is superior to that in Portuguese writings; although it is clear that the Portuguese **must have known more than they set down**, and further that the English often collected their detail from Portuguese informants. (Hair 1-2, emphasis mine)

The claim that the Portuguese “must have known more than they set down” foregrounds the fact that these accounts must not be taken as objective truths, or neutral observations, given that the authors were being intentional about what they were writing, their audiences and the genre – i.e. European travelogues. So, the descriptions from the seventeenth-century Portuguese sources must be read as being from the lens of the author, and using them without paying due consideration to this, elides this particular story. Furthermore, the fact that the English “often collected their detail from Portuguese informants” begs the question – are Finch’s “remembrances” his own, or are they his take on the information the Portuguese told him or indeed things he read? This is significant because it highlights that the sixteenth century sources being read by Taylor are intentionally constructed cultural and material artifacts, be they in Portuguese or in English. The writers were writing in a specific genre (journal, travelogue etc.) which itself was drawing on sources – telling one narrative, and foreclosing others. One of the stories being foreclosed is the story of Lucas Fernandes from his perspective, or even more so, of the other unidentified black Sierra Leoneans. The unidentifiable are occupying positions that are “unthought” or perhaps, in this instance, seen but not heard in the European imaginary. Hair alludes to this in his essay “Hamlet in an Afro-Portuguese Setting: New Perspectives on Sierra

Leone in 1607” when he writes that, “Though regrettably the African scene cannot be seen through African eyes, it can to some extent be seen stereoscopically, through the different viewpoints of the Portuguese and the English. These viewpoints have not previously been brought together” (P. E. Hair 23-24). Unlike Taylor, not only does Hair point out the lack of African viewpoints (the “eyes” is after all in the plural), but he also acknowledges that the “scene” (another connection to the theatre) can only be seen to “some extent”, i.e. partially, even when the Portuguese sources and the English ones are combined. So, the scene that Taylor, as a Prospero like figure, is asking us to conjure in our minds, is perforce going to be an incomplete one, and I argue, a Eurocentric one.

After the detailed physical descriptions of the four Africans, Taylor turns to Lucas Fernandes, “we even know the name of one of those four African spectators. “Who’s there?” – Lucas Fernandez, the first identifiable black man (or woman) whose life intersects with the works of our most canonical dead white male, William Shakespeare” (223). This suggests that Lucas Fernandes is one of the tattooed, ringed, braided haired Africans, occupying a non-human position of the “unthought”, even though he was an important part of King Bure’s entourage. Later in the essay Taylor quotes from the various English journals and diaries to paint a more nuanced, “cultured” picture of Fernandes. These references, and quotes, however, need to be contextualized by looking at the language these same seafarers were using to describe the black men they met when they were docked in Sierra Leone. For example, an unidentified merchant on the *Hector*, which was part of Keeling’s convoy, describes the men who came aboard on the 8th of August 1607. He notes,

this captaine Pintes sonne came aborde us, clothed with a shorte and a payer of linnen breeches which the Ginnearall had givene hime, and by their speech and signes they mad, we wear in hoope that abowe in the country fresh vitteales mighte be gotten. They

poynted up the river, naminge one ‘Captaine Caran,’ which woard ‘Caran’ wee at first understood to have benne his name, but afterward perceived the word mended ‘greate’ and that the greate captaines name was Boreach, and Pinto was as his deputye under him (P. E. Hair 15)

Anthony Marlowe, a merchant who was also aboard the *Hector*, describes the same encounter with Pinto’s son though he dates it as occurring on the 7th of August 1607. Marlowe writes,

In the morninge came 4 negroes more aboard in the Generalls pinnesse, one of them beinge sonne to the cheeffe commaunder here called Captayne Pinto, and was in law to their kinge called kinge Burrea; but he and all the rest were such poore smakes, all naked savinge a little peece of [p]intado which covered their privities, and the cheeffe of them had a poore torne coate which scasely would hange together, not worth one penny (P. E. Hair 18).

Neither description mentions tattoos, or rings, or braided hair. Even if the men who came aboard looked like Taylor’s descriptors, they were certainly not noteworthy for these two men. Note as well the discrepancies between the two accounts, and not just in terms of the date. While the unknown merchant describes Pinto’s son as wearing a shirt and a pair of linen breeches the General had given him, Marlowe describes the son as wearing a poor torn coat which scarcely would hang together. One explanation could be that on the 7th the 4 men came aboard, the gift of the shirt and the breeches was made, after which they returned on the 8th. However, neither men mention Pinto’s son returning twice. Also, Marlowe describes the men as “poor” and “naked” – adjectives that would connote savagery and uncivilized manners to the English – even if he doesn’t use the details that Taylor’s Portuguese sources do.

This context is important when we turn to look at how these very same men describe Lucas Fernandes, who as an *evolué* is set apart and distinguished from the other men who may have been aboard. The unidentified sailor aboard Keeling’s ship describes Lucas as follows. In an entry for the 18th, 19th and 20th of August the diarist notes that a fellow seaman, John Rogers told the General “hee had mett with a negere named Lucas Fernanduse, whoe had lived at St.

Iagoe in former time, was turnid Christian and spacke good Porttingall” (P. E. Hair 21). On the 27th of August, the Captain along with several men, went to visit King Bure. There they met, among others, Lucas Fernandes. The diarist provides a detailed account of this:

lucus the interpreter, which interpreter seemed very sensible and plentifull in Spannish complementes, both in speech and action, and verey humane in his carriage, whose sister was wife to Boreah. Boreah in this converse seemed to bee somewhate inclined to Christianitie, and seemed desirous to come aboarde and there to be baptized. He is reverently esteemed of amonge his people, as yt seemed by the deue respecte they had of him, and there attention to his command which was instantly obeyed. This Lucas Fernandus sat with him at meate, though his owne brother was not permitted so to doe, at supper with our captaine who uesied him with what keindness was fytt (P. E. Hair 22)

Lucas is identified by his Christian faith, his ability to speak not just any Portuguese but “good” Portuguese since he had spent time abroad, and his being very humane in his carriage. He may not have the essence that makes the white European a human, but being a “multilingual, literate, Catholic African, a brother-in-law and favorite of his king” as Taylor describes him (Taylor 226) makes him a sensible, evolved African of humane deportment, even if not human. Humane enough to be a suitable dinner guest; eating together is after all an intimate act. In Anthony Marlowe’s account of the same day, 27th of August, Lucas Fernandes is mentioned, by name, eight times, a repetition that seems to highlight his significance on that day. A repetition which places him, despite his blackness, in a position of being thought of, being remembered, being memorialized. In his account, Marlowe also notes that the Captain “took his leave of kinge Borrea and the rest of his ragged trayne. Lucas Fernandus all this while carryinge himselfe very well to our Captayne, accompanied him to the waterside, unto whome he gave a hatt, and delivered him another to present to the kinge” (P. E. Hair 25). Not only is Fernandes not one of the “common sort” who goes “naked” per Finch’s description, but he also carries himself better than most of the king’s entourage so much so that he is given a hat as a gift. Perhaps, then it might be more appropriate to imagine the four Africans who were spectators of the performance

of *Hamlet* on September 5th as being dressed in “jackets and breeches” and at least one of them wearing his newly acquired hat, to show the Captain how much he appreciated the gift. This begs the question, how would Taylor’s narrative have been different if he had painted this picture of the scene on the ship, instead of one that serves up a sharp contrast between the white Englishmen and the black Africans? Perhaps the answer lies in the sentences that follow in Taylor’s paragraph.

Taylor continues, ““Who’s there?” – Lucas Fernandez, the first identifiable black man (or woman) whose life intersects with the works of our most canonical dead white male, William Shakespeare. But when Lucas Fernandez encountered *Hamlet*, the Great White Bard was still alive, and *The Tragical History of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* was a new play” (Taylor 223). One of the aspects of this quote that stands out is the elevating and exceptionalizing of Lucas Fernandes as the “first identifiable black man”. The key here is “identifiable” as it is only his name, being recorded by these seamen, that makes him the first. Eldred Jones notes that

Elizabethans knew Africans as free men; they traded with them, they fought with them, they captured them, they killed them. They learned new facts about them, but they never really forgot the old tales of Pliny and Herodotus. Africans were at the same time well known and yet strange; thus there was plenty of room for the imagination to make what it would of them (Jones 37).

But Lucas Fernandes has a name, a Christian name, so this makes him well known and familiar. But when one asks the question of whether he was indeed the “first identifiable black man whose life intersects with the works” of Shakespeare, the answer is probably no. This is especially true if one thinks of identifiable within a trans*anuvading context paying attention to what is at risk in seeing only one mode of being identifiable. Seeing identifiability as a function of naming causes the unseeing of other modes of identifiability – in particular embodied modes of Black

being. The late fifteenth and the early sixteenth century had seen “the free movement of negroes, apparently with their consent, between west Africa and England” (Jones 16). But this,

was soon shattered by the triangular slaving voyages such as Sir John Hawkins’s three voyages of 1562, 1564 and 1567. More and more Africans (now certainly deprived of their freedom) continued to be brought to England and thus there was plenty of opportunity for Englishmen in London and other ports to see Africans of various shades of color from the middle of the sixteenth century onwards (Jones 16)

Acknowledging this history and the stories of the black people who were a part of this story, who trod along the streets of Elizabethan London, whom Shakespeare would very well likely have encountered, helps us to deidealize Lucas Fernandes and to recognize the stories untold when he is exceptionalized. It is this framing that allows Taylor, later in the essay, to make a distinction between “Captain John Hawkins, who in the 1560s had taken hundreds of slaves from this very estuary” and “Captain Keeling [who] enslaved no one” (Taylor 228). This distinction is important to maintain to highlight the fact that Lucas Fernandes was the first, identifiable, black man to see a Shakespearean play – where “identifiable” refers not only to someone who is named, but also to someone who is free, and someone who is an *evolué*, (i.e. not one of the savage masses). Maintaining this distinction is also a rehearsal of, or perhaps is the result of the collective haunting by, Elizabethan tropes of Africa and African peoples.

Also of note are the phrases “our most canonical dead white male” and the “Great White Bard”. Even if there is sarcasm in Taylor’s words these phrases do reflect a bardolatry (idolatry of the bard) that underlies much scholarship within Shakespeare studies, a bardolatry that perpetuates Elizabethan tropes of Africa, of Prospero’s magical conjurings, a bardolatry that was out of place in the seventeenth century. As Edward Wilson-Lee notes, “Shakespeare had nothing of this iconic status as transcendent genius and national poet in 1607-1608” (61). Instead, he suggests that “the performance on the Dragon would, then, be an even more intriguing episode of

happenstance, whereby Shakespeare found his way to Africa as merely one of a jumble of shipboard occupations, nestled within a bewildering array of scarcely imaginable new experiences for the Englishmen coasting along East Africa” (Wilson-Lee 61-62). What are the implications of viewing an “intriguing episode of happenstance”, a “scarcely imaginable”, and perhaps imagined, performance through the lens of bardolatry? I believe that the politics of bardolatry needs such an origin story, one where the global myth of Shakespeare begins to be constructed while Shakespeare is still alive. The rest of this chapter focuses on the politics of bardolatry and engages with questions of whether or not these are translated when Shakespeare’s plays are.

Translating the Politics of Bardolatry in India

The story I began this chapter with, of the image of Shakespeare and Kalidasa, only exists because the East India company, on ships like Keeling’s, made it to India, and set the foundations of British colonialism in India. As a result of this fraught encounter, Shakespeare’s plays have been performed, translated and adapted in India by Indians since the mid-19th century, if not earlier. In the preface to his study on the impact of Shakespeare on Hindi literature Jagadish Prasad Mishra argues that while,

there is no gainsaying the fact that Shakespeare invaded India in the wake of political annexation of this land by the Britishers, and his vogue, at the outset was mainly due to the political supremacy the Britishers had in this country, his subsequent victory over the mind of India was independent of any political influence; it was entirely owing to the intrinsic merit of his works (J. P. Mishra v).

Prasad’s statements highlight the double-bind, so to speak, of the prevalence, popularity and responses to Shakespeare in India – that he remains intimately linked to colonial educational policies on the one hand and the so-called “intrinsic merit” of his work on the other. This intrinsic merit is at once the literary genius of his wordsmithing (the untranslatability of the

plays) and the themes of his plays that are thought of as being universal (the plays being infinitely translatable).

This claim of intrinsic merit is seen in Rabindranath Tagore addressing Shakespeare in his poem: “you rose higher and higher till you reached/ the mid-sky, making all quarters of heaven /your own” (R. Tagore 599), and Gary Taylor calling him “our most canonical dead white male”. These reflect, to a greater or lesser extent, what Graham Holderness calls “the Shakespeare myth”, one that fuels and is fueled by “bardolatry”, i.e. the worship of Shakespeare (Holderness 136). In this section, I consider two related aspects of this myth in relation to the proliferation of Shakespeare’s plays/texts in Indian languages. The first is related to the English nationalist politics of bardolatry and how that gets translated when Shakespeare is used as a tool of colonization. This nationalism assumes a linear temporality, where the originary past is calcified and differentiated from the present – a form of what Madhavi Menon describes as “compulsory heterotemporality”, owing to its inability to see beyond the binary (M. Menon 1). So, an investment in a particular form of politics and temporality underlies bardolatry. Key questions for me are: are the politics of “the Shakespeare myth” the same in India as they are in Britain? What are the politics of the investment in this myth and its temporality when it comes to translations and adaptations in India in general, but more particularly in Hindi, the “national” language of India? Also important is the way in which this myth propagates and is propagated by Shakespeare’s untranslatability.

To think through this, it is worth starting from the moment that Holderness identifies as “the great formal inauguration of bardolatry as a national religion”, David Garrick’s 1769 Shakespeare Jubilee, “which ‘marks the point at which Shakespeare stopped being regarded as an increasingly popular and admirable dramatist, and became a god’ (Deelman, p7)”

(Holderness, “Preface” xi). To put this in some context, it is after the Battle of Plassey in 1757 that the “rule” so to speak of the East India Company began in India. So, as the East India Company was gaining a stronghold on the subcontinent – all the while sailing past the African continent, interacting with and creating generations of Lucas Fernandeses – Shakespeare was being deified in England. This is important to note as context for Macaulay’s Minute on Education, delivered on 2nd February 1835. In this minute, he references a debate that had been occurring amongst the English officers regarding the language of education. So, Macaulay asks, “What then shall that language be? One-half of the committee maintain that it should be the English. The other half strongly recommend the Arabic and Sanscrit. The whole question seems to me to be-- which language is the best worth knowing?” He goes on to add,

I have no knowledge of either Sanscrit or Arabic. But I have done what I could to form a correct estimate of their value. I have read translations of the most celebrated Arabic and Sanscrit works. I have conversed, both here and at home, with men distinguished by their proficiency in the Eastern tongues. I am quite ready to take the oriental learning at the valuation of the orientalists themselves. I have never found one among them who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia. The intrinsic superiority of the Western literature is indeed fully admitted by those members of the committee who support the oriental plan of education. (Macaulay 349)

Given that by this point Shakespeare was not just a “popular dramatist” but the pinnacle of English literature, Macaulay was surely envisioning Shakespeare in that “single shelf”, perhaps even a whole shelf of Shakespeare. If we think back to the quote from Mishra, and his claim on the “intrinsic merit” of Shakespeare, the echoes of Macaulay and his claim for the “intrinsic superiority” of Western literature are apparent.

This foray into Macaulay is important because scholars like Gauri Viswanathan have shown how the work of writers like Shakespeare and Milton were “standard fare” in government schools in India by the mid-nineteenth century and “were used at one time to supply religious

values that could be introduced into the British control of India in no other way” (Viswanathan 54, 169). This highlights that the Christian aspect of the civilizing mission was also “wrought” upon Indians via literary texts like the plays of Shakespeare, even if Macaulay and the government never gave “any public encouragement to those who are engaged in the work of converting natives to Christianity” (Macaulay 357). While this was most certainly true, I follow Nandi Bhatia who argues that the “ongoing myth about the authority of Shakespeare” is “specially kept alive through educational institutions in India and abroad and through an imaginary construction of audiences’ singular love for Shakespeare to support notions of “timelessness” and “universality” accorded to Shakespeare” (Bhatia 157). I do this to suggest that not only were Christian values “wrought” upon this class of Indians, but so too was bardolatry, even if the values underlying this were not always apparent.

It’s worth highlighting that the “timelessness”, the “universality” that contributes to the immediacy of Shakespeare’s work, in some senses makes him infinitely translatable, and yet the “intrinsic merit” of his English words, the myth of his genius with its linear temporality makes him untranslatable. This makes it such that “the well-known director and Shakespearean, Sir Peter Hall,” when “asked what he thought of translations of Shakespeare. responded brusquely, “Shakespeare is untranslatable!”” and no one in the audience in 2005 at the Baxter Theater in South Africa batted an eyelid (Schalkwyk 37). This seeming contradiction is what makes his work, I argue un/translatable. In arguing this I return to the work of Jacques Derrida, particularly *Le monolinguisme de l’autre*, which has been translated into English as *The Monolingualism of the Other*. In this book there is a pithy and mostly intuitive statement: “Rien n’est intraduisible en un sens, mais *en un autre sens* tout est intraduisible, la traduction est un autre nom de l’impossible” (Derrida, *Le monolinguisme de l'autre* 103). In his English translation, Patrick

Mensah translates this sentence as “In a sense, nothing is untranslatable; but *in another sense*, everything is untranslatable; translation is another name for the impossible” (Derrida, *Monolingualism of the Other*; or, *The Prosthesis of Origin* 56-57). In both the French and English there is an iterative buildup of un autre/another – another, another, another impossibility. A translational impossibility. Perhaps, a trans*anuvading impossibility. Therefore, in a certain way Shakespeare’s works are the epitome of the Derridean translational impossibility, the un/translatable – nothing in his work is untranslatable, but in another sense, everything in his work is untranslatable.

So, when these un/translatable texts with their timelessness and their complicity in heterotemporality are translated to reify the myth of Shakespeare, the question that arises is whether or not the values underlying the myth are also translated. And what are these values? For Holderness, who looks at the development of the tourist industry in Stratford-upon-Avon, the values that bardolatry embodies are those associated with “pure, unimpeded images of an idealized historical past... An idealized ‘English’ past, picturesque and untroubled, is thus embodied and incorporated into commodities for sale to national and international markets, the transaction simultaneously satisfying both cultural and commercial demands” (Holderness 131). The key words here are “idealized”, “picturesque” and “untroubled” that allow Shakespeare to be a benign god, operating within a heterohistorical framework, and not a colonial one who was used to assert the superiority of one people, one race over another. This benignity is what allows Mishra to declare, without any irony, that Shakespeare’s “subsequent victory over the mind of India was independent of any political influence”. It is interesting to me that Mishra speaks of “the mind of India” (as a singular) and not the people or peoples of India. The implications of this phrase, perhaps used unwittingly, are put into sharp relief when one compares this to, what is

perhaps the most famous, and oft-cited part of Macaulay's Minute about the creation of a "class" of "interpreters". A key reason behind this decision was the fact that he felt that it was "impossible" for them "to attempt to educate the body of the people" (Macaulay 359). If the British cannot educate "the body of the people" (also in the singular) and all they are doing is forming a "class" of "interpreters" or indeed translators, perhaps what they are intending is for this class to be "the mind of India". So, when Mishra speaks of "the mind of the people", perhaps it would be more accurate to say Shakespeare has emerged victorious in the minds of this particular class of people, and not of Indians per se. So, when the "universality", "the genius" the "intrinsic merit" of Shakespeare is translated into Indian languages by this class of people, what are the values being transmitted through the translation of this myth?

To answer this question, I turn to Lala Sitaram. A Shakespeare translator of the early 20th century and a product of the Macaulayan system of education, he can be seen as being one of the class of "interpreters" who is "enriching" Hindi by translating Shakespeare. Harish Trivedi, an Indian literary critic, engages with him in this regard in his book *Colonial Transactions* and I think it is worth quoting his description of Sitaram in some detail, for reasons that will become apparent:

After taking a first class degree from the University of Calcutta (which had been founded along Western lines in 1857 under the new education founded along Western lines in 1857 under the new education policy), he had joined the subordinate civil service, rapidly risen to the highest rank then open to an Indian, and was eventually rewarded for his distinguished and loyal service with the title 'Rai Bahadur' by the British government. In him, Macaulay would have readily and proudly acknowledged the fulfilment of his own fondest schemes. The reason why Sitaram added to his official duties the self-imposed task of translating six plays of Shakespeare into Urdu and then fourteen more into Hindi was stated by him in the most forthright terms in one of his Prefaces (originally written in English):

An attempt to publish a translation of Shakespeare, the chief glory of English literature,

does not stand in need of any apology.... Need I then say that an English drama has always its value for my countrymen as throwing a flood of light on the social customs and modes of thoughts of those whom Providence, in His Infinite Goodness, has been pleased to place in authority over us? Could there be a better mode of bringing home to the idlers of India the tenderness of Cordelia, the fortitude of Edgar, the fidelity of Kent and the heroism of Henry V?

This sounds like collaborative compliance at its obsequious best.... The assiduously westernized Indian author here stands scrupulously distant from those unfortunate others, ‘the idlers of India’ (Trivedi 17-18).

It is apparent here that Trivedi uses Sitaram’s Western education and job in the civil service in conjunction with Sitaram’s use of phrases like “Providence, in His Infinite Goodness” and the “idlers of India” as being symptomatic of “collaborative compliance at its obsequious best” which he sees as a characteristic of Macaulay’s class of interpreters.

However, this does not tell the whole story and rather seems to be indicative of what Nandi Bhatia calls “an uncomplicated construction of urban audiences on the part of some critics, who present the audience’s interest in Shakespeare primarily as an outcome of hegemonic conditioning under colonization” (Bhatia 62). While Bhatia is talking about post-independence “urban” audiences I think much the same could be said of Trivedi’s construction of Sitaram. Sitaram was also a translator of Sanskrit works into Hindi (Sitaram 1,4) and this suggests that he wasn’t “conditioned” to the extent that he, like Macaulay, didn’t see any value in Indian texts. He also, clearly, didn’t agree with Macaulay who believed that Indian languages were “so poor and rude that, until they are enriched from some other quarter, it will not be easy to translate any valuable work into them” (Macaulay 348) because he did, in fact, translate into Urdu and Hindi, though perhaps Macaulay would have considered these languages “enriched” through English by this point. In fact, in discussing his translation practice Sitaram writes, “I shall follow the same principle which has been my guide in my Hindi translations of Sanskrit books – keeping in view

the sense of the author, expressing it in the simplest language and avoiding the repulsive character of paraphrase” (Sitaram, Foreword 4). He draws an equivalence between the Sanskrit texts and the plays by Shakespeare, in that, at least as a translator, he is not holding the latter to higher standard of reverence.

The second, and perhaps more important reason, is the sentence from Sitaram’s preface that Trivedi doesn’t quote and instead replaces with an ellipsis. The first three sentences of the paragraph that Trivedi quotes should read:

An attempt to publish a translation of Shakespeare, “the chief glory of English Literature”, does not stand in need for any apology. **The doggerels of India have been published in English with no object other than to give the governors an insight into the habits and feelings of the governed masses.** Need I say then say that an English drama has always its value for my countrymen, as throwing a light on the social customs and modes of thought of those whom Providence in His infinite goodness has been pleased to place in authority over us?” (Sitaram 1-2, emphasis mine)

While the language that Sitaram uses is undoubtedly laced with the obsequiousness that Trivedi points to, if we look beyond the language to what he is saying, it seems to be in response to the work and the rhetoric of Indologists, who wanted to “know” India in translation. If Indologists and the British colonial enterprise could use translation to gain “an insight” into the lives and culture of Indians, then Sitaram felt he had the right to perform the same service for his people, by translating Shakespeare. This is a clearly political project and Sitaram acknowledges this.

However, even as he does this, he also declares his love for Shakespeare and cites his “universal genius” as the reason. Sitaram writes, “In an undertaking like the present, however, the political reason is certainly not the first which suggested itself to a writer who is an ardent lover of Drama, both ancient and modern. The most thoughtless reader of Shakespeare will endorse the opinion, so oft quoted, that Shakespeare was the poet not ‘for an age but for all time’” (Sitaram 2). So, even though Sitaram acknowledges that his project is political he sees himself as not

primarily a colonized subject “translating” back against the empire but as a “lover” of drama who can see the greatness of Shakespeare. In some ways then Sitaram is engaging with both temporal aspects of the un/translatable – the timelessness that allows Shakespeare to be immediate and accessible for 19th and early 20th century Indians and the materiality of the Shakespeare myth as a product of English cultural nationalism, one that is complicit in sustaining a linear temporality. I think seeing Sitaram as this complicated figure and not just as a Macaulay-man is a way to deconstruct the colonial double-bind as well as the temporality of untranslatables at an abstract level without falling into essentializing modes.

But of course, it must be pointed out that the ability to be a Macaulay-man, i.e. to have access to English education, was the privilege of people belonging to a certain class, and by and large to the upper castes. Also, one can’t talk about “the mind of India” without stressing the fact that Brahmins were seen as the “mind” of the Indian body politic. So, in thinking about the politics of translating the myth of Shakespeare I want to foreground that there is a deeply conservative, nativist, brahminical tradition in Indian literary studies: one that is often valorized as a form of “postcolonial studies”. Satyanath’s turn to a Sanskritic heuristic in his analysis of the Shakespeare-Kalidasa dyad can be read as an example of this. This is described in the penultimate chapter of Ranjee Shahni’s 1932 book *Shakespeare through Eastern Eyes*, a chapter titled “Revulsions”. In this chapter he writes,

It is anticipated that Shakespeare in India will remain more and more the monopoly of conservatives in society, politics and philosophy. The aristocrats, the dogmatic and orthodox men of all systems of religion, the plutocrats of modern times, men of leisure and luxury, whose life is “rounded with sleep” of oblivion of the stress and conflicts of existence, these will ever cling to Shakespeare and never cease to burn incense at his altar (185).

Shahni talks about the concept of bardolatry fifty years before Holderness writes his seminal essay. Harish Trivedi reminds us that Shahni's work was part of a group that was produced "in the changed political climate after World War I and the advent of Gandhian nationalism" and in which "Shakespeare began to be represented by some Indians as almost an agent of colonial subjugation whom it was their patriotic duty, therefore, to disparage and debunk" (Trivedi 12). Read in this light it is easy to disregard Shahni for his hyperbolic rhetoric, the word "revulsions" for instance. However, I think the metaphor of Shakespeare being worshipped at an "altar" is an important one. "Burning incense" could be a signifier of Hindu traditions. Given that this was written in 1932, I believe it shows a lot of foresight in terms of predicting that there is a conservative, orthodox thread in Shakespeare's texts that make them appeal to certain groups and classes of people. As such, plays by Shakespeare can be used by scholars alongside a recourse to Sanskrit and Brahminical traditions (which also value purity, just as the "purity" of the picturesque English past Holderness references) to promote a particular kind of "Indian" agenda – also mythic, also invested in heterohistory and heterotemporality – under the guise of Shakespeare criticism.

An example of this can be seen in an essay by C.D. Narasimhaiah titled "Shakespeare, the Hiranyagarbha" in the collection *Shakespeare in Indian Languages* published in 1999. The title of the essay, itself, refers to a certain philosophical concept found in the Rig Veda. In the essay he writes, "Shakespeare came to us at a propitious moment in our history. Our old civilization was a little tired; and our new rulers, the moghuls, lived much too much on the surface to touch the deeper springs of life; it was when we needed the fertilizing contact with a dynamic culture that Shakespeare came to us" (Narasimhaiah 6). This rhetoric of an ancient Indian (read: Vedic) civilization whose dark ages was under the Mughal empire is one that is oft-

repeated by Hindu nationalists. The “fertilizing contact”, the point of hybridity, the locus of miscegenation is configured as being between the Hindu colonized subject and the British colonizer, the Hindu Othello and the British Desdemona³⁸.

The configuration of the Hindu colonized subject and the British colonizer is also seen in a letter written by the famous Indian writer Mulk Raj Anand addressed to ‘Bapu’ – M. K Gandhi. This letter dated June 20 – presumably 1920, because that is the year on some of the other letters in the collection – is titled “Caliban and Gandhi”. The premise of the comparison between the man who is called ‘Bapu’ – the father of the nation – and Caliban³⁹, Prospero’s nemesis, is an intriguing anecdote involving Mohamed Ali Jinnah. Jinnah was a leader of the All India Muslim League, who later became a staunch advocate for the creation of Pakistan. Among the various epithets he was known by in Pakistan, one was baba-e-qaum (father of the nation). Anand writes, “I was amused when Mister M.A Jinnah dismissed you by a contemptuous comparison: ‘Oh Gandhi! That Caliban!’ The scurrilous dismissal of both you and Caliban shows that he has perhaps never read Shakespeare’s fantasy play *Tempest*” (Anand 87). Anand, here, is reprimanding Jinnah not so much for the comparison between Gandhi and Caliban, but for Jinnah’s interpretation of the play, in which Jinnah saw both Caliban and Gandhi as “low creatures” (Anand 88). Anand then goes on to analyze the role of Caliban in *The Tempest*, and gives a persuasive reading that paints Robert Clive, the first commander in chief of British India, and popularly known as Clive of India, as a Prospero-like figure, who

was a magician figure of the 18th century by virtue of superior strategy which he brought to bear to defeat the Indian feudalists. He followed the pattern set by Prospero, of using the local Chiefs everywhere, by giving them gifts. Clive’s successors continued the dual

³⁸ Just as Khatibi and Kilito create a binary that erases black morocco, the binary here erases both non-Hindu India, but also non-elite India (i.e. Indians who are not a part of the mind of India). It is also worth highlighting is the fact that these two categories are not mutually exclusive.

³⁹ Caliban is taken up as an unsung hero by colonized peoples and postcolonial theorists alike.

policy of bribing the local princes and Bania agents while making them the servants of their will to prevail. Every clerk of the John Company regarded the Indians, who served them as inferior ‘Banias’ ‘Babus’ and ‘Baboons’! (Anand 91)

“Baboons”, “Conspiratorial monkeys” – the vocabulary of the Prospero figures is clear. The last sentence suggests that all the company officials – heirs of Keeling – were Prosperos, and all colonized Indians were Calibanesque figures. And yet, Anand remarks later in the letter, “If he [Jinnah] had read Shakespeare’s *Tempest* he might have seen you as arch rebel of the 20th century, as Caliban was of the 15th century” (Anand 93). Caliban and Gandhi do have something in common: education. Prospero “learning” Caliban his language that allows Caliban to “curse” and Gandhi benefitting from the Macaulayan system of education. The comparison breaks down when it comes to the question of Gandhi as an “arch rebel”. If Gandhi is an arch rebel, what does that make someone like Ambedkar? Through such a comparison, Gandhi, an upper caste Hindu leader, a beneficiary of the Macaulayan system of education, is being exceptionalized, and subalternized through the comparison with Caliban.

Along with elevating Gandhi, Anand also uses this letter to dismiss Jinnah. A pertinent aspect of this dismissal is that Anand contemptuously calls Jinnah “an imitation Brown Sahab, who wore suits tailored in Bond Street, London, wore Sulka neckties on a butterfly collar, a monocle on his right eye” (Anand 91). Is the “imitation” calling into question his brownness – owing to his disloyalty to Gandhi and the Indian national congress, or his sahabness, his Macaulay-man persona owing to his lack of knowledge of Shakespeare, after all Mulk Raj Anand could be regarded as a Macaulay-man himself. This latter point is emphasized when Anand says, rather glibly, “I doubt though if this clever lawyer ever had the time or inclination to read Shakespeare at all” (Anand 93). An important sentence follows: “The bard of Avon was a unique genius of all time” (Anand 93). *Un Autre*/Another iteration of bardolatry. Anand is

translating Caliban as Gandhi, Gandhi as Caliban. Looking at this through a lens of trans*anuvading forces us to pay attention to the stories that are being elided. Not only do I refer to perspectives of other leaders like Jinnah and Ambedkar, but also to narratives that shed light on internal hegemony and colonialisms. By comparing Caliban to Gandhi, Prospero to Clive, Anand also sets up a comparison between the Island and India. Adrian, one of the Italian noblemen, describes the island as a “desert”, “uninhabitable and almost inaccessible” (II.i.37, 40). Similarly, while telling Miranda their story, Prospero remarks,

Then was this island
(Save for the son that she did litter here,
A freckled whelp, hag-born) not honored with
A human shape (I.ii.334-337)

When Clive came to India, he did not encounter a desert, an uninhabitable land. Macaulay, a nineteenth century Prospero figure did recognize the “body of the people”, the “great mass of people”. A question that arises is, were “people”, “natives” considered human. Throughout the play, especially when one considers the musicality of his verse, Caliban is considered to have human qualities, to show humanity, but not be human. This is akin to Lucas Fernandes being “humane” but not “human”. If Macaulay men are the “hag born”, those without “flesh” or “fish blood” or “totem pole” like the postcolonial intelligentsia in Ka Na Su’s poem, the “humane” but not the “human”, where does that leave those who are lower down in the hierarchy, particularly the caste hierarchy. Reading Mulk Raj Anand’s translation through a lens of trans*anuvading forces us to ask these questions, to imagine those who are in the positions of the unthought, when colonialism and anti-colonial resistance is imagined as a Prospero-Caliban binary.

And this is why I think it is important, when looking at the Shakespeare-India hybrid or cultural encounter to question both the homogeneity and authenticity of “Shakespeare” in the

myth that is “Shakespeare” (as Holderness and several others do) but also the “India” that is being bolstered by claiming Shakespeare as an “Indian icon” (as a recent collection, that includes an excerpt from Anand’s letter, does) and the spatio-temporal investments in both these categories, and perhaps in untranslatables in general. This is a question that subsequent chapters will attend to, using the analytic lens of trans*anuvading.

Chapter three: Nationing in/through Translation

Chapter two considers colonialism and the role translation plays in the colonial project before tracing the ways in which Elizabethan visions of Africa and Asia have carried across in discourse related to Shakespeare. This chapter is localized to India, as a burgeoning nation state, and the period that saw development of Hindi as a national language. In particular I focus on the contradictions that arise when translations of Shakespeare are published at a time of growing anti-colonial nationalist fervor. This chapter revolves around two figures, two men of privilege – Bharatendu Harishchandra (1850-1885) and Lala Sitaram (1861-1937). Both were involved, to a greater or lesser extent, in the development and spread of Hindi. In doing so, their efforts contributed, whether explicitly or implicitly, to shaping Hindi as a national language. Hindi, as a language, is often associated with “Hindu revivalism and Sanskritization – the spread of Brahmanical culture”⁴⁰ (R. D. King 76). This move towards Sanskritization signified “a kind of cultural counter-offensive against the colonialist, and especially the missionary attack on the ‘backwardness’ and ‘barbarism’ of Indian life and religion” (Pandey 207). Seen in this context the turn to developing Hindi reflects an anti-colonial, nationalist sentiment. And yet, perhaps counterintuitively, both translated Shakespeare, a symbol of British domination. Even as this is the case their relationship with the bard was different. Bharatendu Harishchandra translated *Merchant of Venice* as a play *Durlabh Bandhu*. This is the only translation of Shakespeare that he undertook and there is some doubt as to whether he finished this project. Lala Sitaram aimed

⁴⁰ Drawing on the work of noted Indologist A. T Ambree, Robert D. King argues that “the great unifier of India has always been ‘Brahmanical ideology’; not only the familiar structures of Hinduism such as caste, cow worship, religious ceremonies, cremation and so on, but the intellectual authority of the great classical texts, the *Vedas*, the *Upanishads*, the *Bhagvadgita*. The instrument of penetration of Brahmanical ideology into the Deccan and the south was the Sanskrit language and the sacred texts written in Sanskrit” (R. D. King 11). The use of the word “penetration” is suggestive of the masculinist nature of this ideology and the way in which both the land as well as non-Hindi speakers are feminized.

to create Sitaram's Hindi Shakespeare, with his earliest translation being that of *King Lear* in 1884. While this translation of *King Lear* was in Urdu, his later translations, into the 1920s and 30s were in the Devanagari script (the script used to write Hindi and Sanskrit). Through reading these two figures and their texts in a trans*anuvading mode, this chapter aims to tell the intertwined stories of Shakespeares in India as well as the development of Hindi as a national language.

In looking at the intimacies of translation, translators, translated texts and trans*anuvading, this chapter follows in the vein of Priya Joshi's work on how British novels were read and translated in the nineteenth century. In outlining her methodology, she notes that

Individual readers in multitudes variously indicated the differences between their world and the colonial state in two ways: first by the specific novels they consumed (the selections they made both for and against certain books are revealing here); and second, by how they read, misread, translated, mistranslated the British novel. These descriptions of reading are not just writerly sleights: the historical record is full of British novels translated and adapted into Indian languages and what got translated and how signals a form of consumption characterized not by opposition but by adaptation. It articulates a narrative of production by abduction, diversion, invention. (Joshi 287)

Joshi highlights the importance of consumption and selection patterns. I am interested in these, particularly the latter, with respect to translation. For instance, why did Harishchandra choose *Merchant of Venice*? In figuring the translator as a reader, interpreter and creator, the ways in which they "read, misread, translated and mistranslated" plays by Shakespeare becomes central. What does it mean to think of Shakespeare translation as "abduction, diversion, invention"? To abduct Shakespeare and to invent him both suggest forms of empire "writing back" – anticolonial resistance through translation. From this point of view, it makes complete sense why figures involved in anti-colonial movements would turn to Shakespeare, the "universal genius",

the pinnacle of British literature: to make him their own. I am, however, more interested in the notion of “diversion”. What does it mean to divert Shakespeare? What was he being diverted towards? In this chapter, I argue that he was being diverted towards a certain configuration of India as a Hindu “nation”.

Joshi goes on to add that

As such the Indian world survived and succeeded by translation – not just the literal translation of reams of printed matter but also a symbolic and metaphorical translation in which the Indian world was carried forth from one state to another through the act of reading and interpretation. The encounter with British fiction generally and the melodramatic mode in particular helped Indian readers translate themselves from a socially and politically feudal order to a modern one; from cultural and political subjection to conviction; from consumers to producers of their own national self-image. By translating and being translated by the melodramatic mode, it would seem that Indian readers used their literary landscape to imagine a political one (Joshi 321).

What is the national self-image that is being produced through the translations of Shakespeare? Is it possible to think of Shakespeare as a tool to move from subjection to conviction? And if so, the question that arises is who, in particular, are these readers and translators? As I suggested in the previous chapter, they are mostly Macaulay-men (“the mind of India”). In this chapter I will parse the politics of the national self-image some of these men were invested in, and how and why Shakespeare was used to bolster that investment.

The case of the Parsi theatre adaptations of Shakespeare are interesting in this regard in that they both engage with the melodramatic mode, while at the same time, I would argue, divert and invent, rather than reinvent, Shakespeare. The Parsis are a minority community in India and they started a few theatrical companies in Bombay in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Among their varied repertoire, these companies staged early popular adaptations of Shakespearean plays. As Kathryn Hansen notes, “Even in its earliest years, the Parsi theatre

developed a penchant for producing plays based on Shakespeare. According to the newspapers, Parsi theatre productions of *Taming of the Shrew*, *the Merchant of Venice*, *Two Gentlemen of Verona* and *Timon of Athens* – all mediated through the Gujarati language – were mounted at the Grant Road theatre between 1857 and 1859” (Hansen 66). The “melodramatic mode” of these theatrical productions is noted by Vasant Shantaram Desai. In his account on the development of Marathi theatre in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century he describes the theatre scene in Bombay which at that time consisted primarily of Gujarati and Parsi theatre companies:

The troupe of Kau Khatav, the Parsi Natak Mandali, the Victoria Natak company and the New Alfred Company were some of the leading Gujarati and Parsi drama companies of those days. These companies were more after melodrama and scenic effects, such as transfer scenes. The plays they staged gave prominence to music, which was light but attractive and was practically unknown to the Marathi theatre, as also to humour of the light and sparkling variety. Their performances were very popular even amongst the Marathi speaking population, especially college students. (Desai 22)

Apart from describing the melodramatic techniques they used, Desai also foregrounds the audience. While he is interested in the Marathi speaking publics, his remarks suggest that the audiences who saw this play were not linguistically homogenous. Perhaps we can say that the Parsi theatre appealed to a linguistically hybrid, popular public.

Along these lines, Vikram Singh Thakur engages with the notion of “hybridity” in and of Parsi theatre adaptations of Shakespeare’s plays. In this context he writes, “Parsi theater’s ‘hybrid’ Shakespeare does not subvert the Shakespearean authority by ‘appropriating’ it since it does not acknowledge that authority in the first place” (35). This is important in thinking about how the translator-adaptors of Shakespeare’s plays approach the play as an invention and not a reinvention, a disruption and diversion not an opposition. As Thakur notes, the Parsi theater

companies, even when they adapted *Othello*, did not acknowledge their debt to Shakespeare; instead they merely used the plays as raw materials, so to speak, just as Shakespeare used his Italian and other sources. In doing so “what Parsi theater creates is a syncretic form of theater by yoking together elements of Indian and English theatrical traditions without any obvious foreignness about it” (Thakur 33). In *Othello*, for instance, this would undermine the element of foreignness that this tale of a Moor in Venice would have instilled in the Elizabethan audience. One such example of a Parsi theater adaptation of *Othello* is the Hindi-Urdu version *Saubhagya-Sundari* (lit. Good luck – beautiful woman)⁴¹. C.J Sisson, describes the production, and some context (for his British audience) in his 1926 lecture to the Shakespeare Association in London. He writes:

The audiences demand action, spectacle and variety entertainment all in one, and they delight in rhetoric and declamation. Their drama is essentially romantic, in all the senses of that protean word, even as the classic Sanskrit drama is romantic in most senses. In this respect, and in others, the influence of tradition is strong upon them. *Saubhagya-Sundari*, indeed, one of the two Urdu versions of *Othello*, takes the spectator back to Othello’s early career and gives a wider picture of his life. Even Shakespeare is too restricted, too classic in one sense, for the Bombay stage (Sisson 16).

While Sisson clearly essentializes the tastes of the Indian, or rather the Parsi theater-going audiences, this description, especially the notion that Shakespeare is “too restricted”, is noteworthy as these playwrights and companies use Shakespeare’s plays as fodder and then enlarge them for the Bombay stage. The change of the name reflects this and highlights the way in which the emphasis of this play is no longer on *Othello* but on the beautiful woman, and Shakespeare is but a trace. These productions are worth considering both because they are a

⁴¹ All translations are mine unless otherwise stated.

precursor to Bollywood⁴² and because they share a lot in common with Renaissance productions, including the fact that in many productions, men played all the parts (Hansen, *Stages of Life: Indian Theatre Autobiographies* 170). In fact, the male actor who played Sundari, the Desdemona equivalent, gained so much popularity that he became known as Jayshankar Sundari.

Jayshankar Sundari penned an autobiography in Gujarati titled *Thodan Ansu: Thodan Phul*. This book was first published in 1978 and subsequently translated into Hindi by Dinesh Khanna in 2002. Using the Hindi edition, Kathryn Hansen translated it into English as “Some Blossoms, Some Tears” in 2011 and subsequently published it in the book *Stages of Life: Indian Theatre Autobiographies* (Hansen, *Stages of Life: Indian Theatre Autobiographies* 175-176). This autobiography reveals the role Shakespeare played or did not play in the production of *Saubhagya Sundari*. Additionally, as Hansen notes, it provides intimate details on

how it felt for a man to play a woman’s role. Sundari’s autobiography is extraordinary in documenting his experience as a female impersonator. No other “lady actor”, as such performers were sometimes called, has left such an insightful account of the process of transformation from man to woman. Sundari was a female impersonator of the highest order. Through his method of total identification with women, he created idealized feminine characters that were widely imitated. Sundari’s stage movements, attire, and speech became models for women offstage. He was second only to the great Bal Gandharva in bringing about changes that led, paradoxically, to greater freedom for women (Hansen 170-171).

⁴² The comparison with Bollywood is an important one in thinking about Shakespeare and Melodrama. Harris talks about the similarity between Shakespeare’s plays and “masala movies” (mainstream Bollywood movies) whose “stories mix tragedy with comedy as well as scenes of dialogue with song-and-dance routines. Its lovers, too, are mixtures, often coming from different communities. And its sources are equally mixed: there is usually no ‘original’ story in a masala movie, as its narrative is a khichdi of other, earlier stories or formulas” (Harris 5). This definition of “masala” is quite similar to early definitions of melodrama. An early nineteenth century review of Thomas Holster’s *Tale of Mystery* defined it as follows:

This review appeared in *The Monthly Mirror* for November 1802.

By Melodrame we suppose is meant a drama, in which the language, situations, and passions are accompanied and heightened by music...in addition to this, the subject of the *Tale of Mystery* demands the aid of pantomime, and there is also an opportunity for spectacle.

And the critic goes on to speak of the ‘ingenuity’ with which the plot was conducted. (Sprague 2)
Both early British melodramas and masala movies have music and “an opportunity for spectacle” in common.

Hansen suggests that the gender representations on stage had an impact beyond the walls of the playhouses and on to the streets of Bombay, where nationalist movements were burgeoning. The relationship between gender, nationalism, and Shakespearean adaptations is one that I will return to in my discussion of Bharatendu Harishchandra later in this chapter.

Here, I want to focus on the relationship, or lack thereof, between *Saubhagya Sundari* and *Othello*. While for a Briton like Sisson, *Saubhagya Sundari*, even with its diversions from Shakespeare, is clearly an adaptation of *Othello*, the relationship between the two plays is much more complicated for Jayshankar Sundari. First and foremost, Shakespeare is not given authorship, instead Jayshankar Sundari describes its authorship thus: “An old drama *Saubhagya Sundari* by the poet Nathuram Sundar Shukla, was then playing. After I joined the company Mulshankar Mulani began to revise this drama along the lines of *Vikram Charitra* his successful first drama. He was also thinking how I would represent this new character of Sundari” (Sundari 204). The “original” being adapted is said to be by Nathuram Shukla. Mulshankar Mulani is the adaptor, or perhaps creator, and/or inventor of this version. This process of adaptation is not a solitary one. It is done in conjunction with the company, and Jayshankar plays a crucial role in the manner in which Sundari, the character, is imagined. Shakespeare, however, remains in the story even if he is not the protagonist. First, Jayshankar Sundari, describes Mulshankar Mulani as the “Shakespeare of Gujarati” (Sundari 214). However, unlike the universal acclaim afforded to Shakespeare, Sundari notes that

History has been unjust to the Shakespeare of Gujarat. The company managers did not publish his works, nor did Mulani have even two books of theatre songs to his credit. Newspaper reviewers also overlooked him. After 1901, all of Gujarat knew the names of Jayshankar Sundari, and Bapulal, but few recognized Mulshankar Mulani or knew that he had penned *Saubhagya Sundari* and *Vikram Charitra*. (Sundari 238)

Bapulal was the actor who played the male lead opposite Jayshankar Sundari, and the first performance of *Saubhagya Sundari* was on October 19, 1901 (Sundari 205). Instead of being given his due, Mulani was made invisible (like generations of translators after him), and the names associated with the production were those of the actors. The comparison with Shakespeare remains alive even as he is not directly associated with the play.

Once the play opens to acclaim and Jayshankar Sundari's performance is lauded, he comes into contact with Shakespeare. A well to do Bohra (an Ismaili sect) man named Fazal Husain took some interest in Sundari's career and his development as an actor. As Sundari recalls, "He[Fazal Husain] also ordered subscriptions to *The Tatler* and *The Sketch* containing reviews of Shakespeare and other European playwrights, pictures of actors in various poses, and details of lighting systems and stage production. However, all this was in English and I needed someone to interpret them" (Sundari 208). The question of language, especially as it pertains to Shakespeare, returns. At this time Shakespeare was not accessible to Sundari, unless in translation, owing to the fact that he wasn't a Macaulay man. Subsequent to this interaction Sundari also recounts an encounter with a member of the English-educated Bengali intelligentsia:

A Bengali gentleman, Narendranath Ghosh, also came to see me in the Gaiety. With emotion he praised my performance and described the plots of various Bengali dramas. He told me I should learn English, that it was necessary for advancement in the world and for my personal development. I had no time to enroll in school to learn English, therefore he appointed a tutor and paid his fees. I asked the tutor to read from English plays and explain their meaning, and I started to make progress with English drama. Gradually I began to understand something of Shakespeare's classics, *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Merchant of Venice*, *Hamlet*, *Othello* and *King Lear*. I ordered some Gujarati translations of Shakespeare and got hold of a Marathi translation of *Hamlet* (Sundari 208)

First, this quotation suggests that even then, in the early twentieth century, the power of English was clear, and it was acknowledged as the language needed for “advancement”. Second, and perhaps more interestingly, it forces us to contend with who the imagined audience for these literary translations was. In this case Jayshankar Sundari is grappling with the English text alongside the translations in Gujarati and Marathi. The translations, especially if one sees them as interpretations, serve to guide the reading of the English text. However, Sundari’s relationship to Shakespeare, particularly to *Othello*, did not end here. He writes, “I gradually became more educated and was better able to resolve the problems that arose in my acting. To make the role of Saubhagya Sundari more vivid I practiced the parts of Shakespeare’s Desdemona and Bhavabhuti’s Malati, and within six months I began to play the role of Sundari with greater understanding” (Sundari 209). While Sundari does not acknowledge *Saubhagya Sundari’s* Shakespearean antecedents, Desdemona and Sundari (the character) do come together through the actor’s process. At the same time, like Lala Sitaram, Sundari does not elevate Shakespeare. Desdemona is but one source. A character created by the eighth-century playwright, Bhavabhuti, is another.

To imagine Sundari’s world, therefore, one has to paint a picture where Shakespeare walks hand in hand with Bhavabhuti and, perhaps Kalidasa, to invoke the image from chapter two. Desdemona, Malathi and Sundari are intimately entwined. Gujarati, Marathi, Hindi, Urdu, English – a linguistic *khichdi* – mixing so that there is a “lack of linguistic purity” (Hansen, Language, Community, and the Theatrical Public: Linguistic Pluralism and Change in the Nineteenth-century Parsi theatre 63). While this was the case in Bombay, elsewhere in India languages, particularly Hindi and Urdu, were being purified and separated for nationalistic purposes.

The nationalization and Hinduization of Hindi

As a starting point for this discussion I turn to Javed Majeed's analysis of the relationship between language and nationhood with reference to George Abraham Grierson's *Linguistic Survey of India*. Collected over thirty years, the 21 volumes of the Survey

remain one of the most complete sources on South Asian languages. It covers over 700 South Asian linguistic varieties, and provides lexical and grammatical information for 268 varieties of the four major South Asian language families... The LSI continues to be a base reference for any discussion of the classification of Indian languages, and it has influenced almost all subsequent studies of the language situation in India (Majeed 1)

In his analysis of this comprehensive set of documents, Majeed discusses the "post-1857 'epistemological balkanization'" of the territories known as India and argues that Grierson's *Linguistic Survey of India* "reflects how after 1857 the British saw India more and more as an agglomeration of small societies" (Majeed 43). The Survey's portrayal of "these many Indias as language based nations, using the terms 'nation' and 'nationality' loosely" continued post-Independence with the creation of language-based states (Majeed 44). So how does the notion of Hindi as a national language fit within the conceptualization of India as a political state having multiple "language-based nations" within it. As Majeed notes,

the term 'national language' was and is used by supporters of Hindi as a synonym for the official languages of India, and to distinguish regional languages from English as a 'national' language. Whereas the Indian constitution avoids using the term 'common' or 'national' language, ministers have referred to Hindi as a 'national' language, the Report of the Committee on Emotional Integration (1962) referred to the 14 languages in the original 8th Schedule of the Constitution as having the 'status of national languages', while the Report of Official Language Commission of 1956 called them 'regional languages'. In 1963 in the Indian Parliament Nehru described all the languages in the 8th Schedule as 'national languages'. (Majeed 44)

In order to situate this quote, I turn to the Constitution of India. Chapter 1 of Part XVII states that “The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in Devanagari script” (Government of India 212). As Majeed notes the term used is not ‘national’ but ‘official’. The Eighth schedule of the constitution that Majeed refers to originally consisted of fourteen languages. Now there are twenty-two. These are Assamese, Bengali, Bodo, Dogri, Gujarati, Hindi, Kannada, Kashmiri, Konkani, Maithili, Malayalam, Manipuri, Marathi, Nepali, Oriya, Punjabi, Sanskrit, Santhali, Sindhi, Tamil, Telugu and Urdu. Of these Sindhi was included in 1967, Konkani, Manipuri and Nepali in 1992, and Bodo, Dogri, Maithili and Santhali in 2004 (Government of India 330). Majeed’s work highlights the politically charged nature of the term ‘national’ as a descriptor for the languages of the Eighth schedule. It suggests that the term ‘national’ is often used as a means to “integrate” the various regions of the nation, as was the case with the Committee on Emotional Integration. It is almost as if applying the term “national” to more than one language leads to the integration of peoples, emotionally or otherwise, instead of creating many nations within one political union, as one might expect. And yet Hindi is often constructed as the “national language” in the political and popular imaginary.

While it may be true that this notion is primarily spread by “supporters of Hindi”, I want to parse Article 351 of chapter four of part XVII of the constitution. The article reads

It shall be the duty of the Union to promote the spread of the Hindi language, to develop it so that it may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India and to secure its enrichment by assimilating without interfering with its genius, the forms, style and expressions used in Hindustani and in the other languages of India specified in the Eighth Schedule, and by drawing, wherever necessary or desirable, for its vocabulary, primarily on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages (Government of India 216-217)

Key here is the notion of “the composite culture of India”. Imagining such a culture is crucial to the project of integration. While the use of “national” in the Report of the Committee on Emotional Integration suggests a nation based on the multiplicities of languages, the way in which “**the** composite culture” is used, suggests something monolithic. Not only does the definite article speak to this but it also places the responsibility of carrying this culture (i.e. being a “medium of expression”) on one language alone – Hindi – and not on all the languages of the 8th schedule. The role of the 8th schedule languages is not to be the bearers of “the composite culture” but rather to enrich Hindi. This idea of enrichment harkens back to a discussion of Macaulay in chapter 2. One of the tasks he hoped the British could leave to the “class of interpreters” he sought to form was “to refine the vernacular dialects of the country, to enrich those dialects with terms of science borrowed from the Western nomenclature, and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population” (Macaulay 359). While Macaulay thought of the enrichment being from the West (i.e. English) to the vernaculars, article 351 suggests a model where languages that are at times called ‘regional languages’ enrich a ‘national’ one. It also suggests that Hindi is almost like an empty vessel, able to assimilate “forms, style and expression” from other languages. Perhaps it is this quality that makes it a suitable vehicle for the artificially constructed “composite culture”. Implicit in any project of enrichment, and indeed assimilation, is translation. This is owing to the fact that when a text is translated, its “form, style and expression” is often translated too.

Additionally, Sanskrit and Hindustani are the only two languages specified by name. The former is particularly important because of its intimate connections with Hinduism. In fact, for noted Hindu nationalists like “Savarkar and Har Bilas Sarda the Hindu nation was grounded in the ownership of a ‘common Sanskrit civilisation’” (Majeed 151). If this is the case then by

“logical extension, Sanskritised Hindi would be the natural choice as a national language in a nation that existed for Hindus alone. Such a language would also dovetail with his [Grierson’s] view of Sanskrit as revelatory of the ‘true’ India and its ‘inner mind’” (Majeed 189-190). Here it is worth reiterating a point made in the previous chapter: it is impossible to think about India as a body politic, and of the “mind” of India without also noting that this mind, within the schema of the caste system, is associated with Brahmins and the power they wield over peoples of other castes and peoples outside of and excluded from the caste system.

By explicitly suggesting that Hindi should be Sanskritized, the constitution, despite having the word “secular” in its preamble, seems to be implicitly connecting Hindi as “a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India” with Hinduism, and not just any kind of Hinduism but that which valorizes Sanskrit and the knowledge held in Sanskrit texts – traditionally the purview of the Brahmanical caste. The connection between Hindi and Hinduism, particularly of this valance, is central to the argument of this chapter. It is also tied to the Hindi-Urdu divide of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, where Hindi became tied to a Hindu identity and Urdu to a Muslim one. While Christopher King provides a thorough account of this divide in his book *One Language, Two Scripts* there are two aspects of his argument that I want to highlight. The first has to do with the question of Sanskritization. He writes,

The process of Sanskritization served to differentiate Hindi from Urdu. Here the importance of *shuddhtā* or purity implied by Sanskritization is vis-a-vis Urdu. Hindi must become *shuddh* through the elimination of Persian and Arabic words and their replacement with Sanskrit words, and in doing so Hindi becomes different from Urdu. (King 181)

The notion of purity is salient not only because it resonates with the prominence placed on purity in Hinduism, but also because of the way this concept is deployed in comparing translated texts to source texts in general, and adaptations and translations to Shakespeare’s English texts in particular. Further, implicit in the need for differentiation between Hindi and Urdu is the idea that they were not actually different to begin with it. Here is where Hindustani – the only other language apart from Sanskrit mentioned in Article 352 – comes in. As early as 1882

Babu Syamcharan Ganguli predicted in *The Calcutta Review* that a language he called ‘Hindustani’ which took the form of Urdu among Muslims and Hindi among Hindus would eventually become the lingua franca of India. By the early twentieth century the use of Hindi as the national language had begun to be proposed by national leaders. By 1925 Mahatma Gandhi had persuaded the Congress to accept as its official language a ‘Hindustani’ similar to that espoused by Ganguli (King 6)

The move that the constitution makes in suggesting that Hindi assimilate “forms, style and expression” from Hindustani seems to contradict the directive of enriching its vocabulary via Sanskrit given that one of the goals of Sanskritization was/is to distil Hindi from the impure Hindustani. The fact that both languages – Hindustani and Sanskrit – are mentioned in the constitution is not accidental since they each carried a political valence and ideological implication during the national movement, with “Hindustani” standing in for a desire to unite Hindus and Muslims and Sanskrit for a desire to create a Hindu nation, couched in the idiom of serving the majority. In the rest of this chapter I look at the specific cases of Bharatendu Harishchandra and Lala Sitaram whose use of Shakespeare cannot, I argue, be divorced from their ideological investments in Hindi as a national language.

Bharatendu Harishchandra: Hindi, (Aryan) Hindu, Hindustan

Bharatendu Harishchandra, a notable dramatist, is considered by most scholars to be the father of modern Hindi literature. In her book, *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions: Bharatendu Harishchandra and Nineteenth Century Banaras*, Vasudha Dalmia provides a comprehensive account of Harishchandra's role as a litterateur, a "publicist" and indeed as publisher of many newspapers and magazines. Inhabiting these various roles he was "aware of the political potential of public opinion" and therefore "coined and shaped views on a wide variety of issues, which were inextricably bound to the question of political and national identity" (Dalmia, *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions: Bhāratendu Hariśchandra and Nineteenth-Century Banaras* 10). One of these issues was that of language and of the relationship between Hindi and Urdu. Dalmia shows how Harishchandra's stance towards Hindi and Urdu evolved from a more moderate position in 1873, when he "had no hesitation in proclaiming that Hindi and Urdu were essentially one language" to later in his life when he was an advocate for Hindi as a "national language (deśbhāṣā)" (Dalmia, *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions: Bhāratendu Hariśchandra and Nineteenth-Century Banaras* 189, 219). I do not wish to repeat Dalmia's argument here and instead want to highlight one major aspect that can be linked thematically to Harishchandra's translation of *Merchant of Venice*. Dalmia argues that the

Historicizing process involved the evolution of a strategy to bypass the actual linguistic and cultural history of a growth which had a composite character. Hindi claimed a Hinduness for itself which had to do with 'Hindu'... [as] denoting religion. At the same time it recurred to its past composite usage, which linked it with all the territory covered by the term Hindustan. Yet finally, it stopped short of nothing but national status, for it professed to be the identity marker of a nation. (Dalmia, *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions: Bhāratendu Hariśchandra and Nineteenth-Century Banaras* 217)

It was this process which resulted in the triadic structure of " 'Hindi-Hindu-Hindustan' to use the words of a slogan (or mantra) coined by his [Harishchandra's] younger contemporary and

literary disciple, Pratap Narain Mishra” (Pandey 217-218). This configuration also entailed “the Aryanization of this ideology, the link with Sanskrit literature, the evocation of the once glorious past” (Dalmia, *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions: Bhāratendu Hariśchandra and Nineteenth-Century Banaras* 218). The impact of this Aryanized Hindu ideology can be seen in Harishchandra’s 1878 translation of *Merchant of Venice*, titled *Durlabh Bandhu* (invaluable friend)⁴³. The most striking part of this translation is that the fraught relationship between Christianity and Judaism in *Merchant of Venice*, and the way in which Shylock is constructed as an outsider, is translated and Indianized such that that it is now a relationship between Hinduism and Jainism. If Shakespeare’s play was used to bolster the values and ethics of the Christian majority, Harishchandra’s becomes a vehicle to disseminate Hindu values. The two aspects of Hindu values that I would like to focus on is the notion of *manushya* – particularly those that are excluded from this – and the valorization of the Aryan.

“*sansar ek rangmanch hai jahan sab manushyon ko ek na ek bhag avashya banna padta hai*”

The world is a stage where every human being, or perhaps every man, or perhaps every descendent of Manu has to play one role or another. These are the words not from a translation of *As You Like It* – all the world’s a stage – as one might expect. Rather, it is from *Durlabh Bandhu*. Anant, the Antonio figure says these lines in the opening scene of the play, a translation of Shakespeare’s lines “I hold the world but as the world, Gratiano,/A stage where every man must play a part,” (I.i.81-82). While *manushya* could be read as a benign rendering of the word “man”, I am interested in how *manushya* and *manushyata* are deployed in the play in order to

⁴³ There is some doubt over whether Harishchandra completed the play or not and in some anthologies an unfinished version is published. My quotes are from an 1888 publication published by Khand Vilas Press that published the entire play under Harishchandra’s name. This copy can now be found at the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust Library in Stratford-on-Avon, UK.

interrogate the linguistic contours and transactions of race and caste, and to a lesser extent of class and gender in Harishchandra's translation through a trans*anuvading lens. The analytic of trans*anuvading leads me to ask the question: who occupies the position of the unthought in Harishchandra's "manushya"? Furthermore, I think the asterisk also disrupts the notion of what translation is, not only by connecting it to the other trans words, but also by blurring the boundaries between that which is considered translation and that which is considered adaptation.

In the introduction to *Poetics of Modernity*, Aparna Bhargava Dharwadkar highlights the difference between these two terms in Indian theatrical traditions. She notes that,

The most common Indian terms for interlingual translation are *bhasantar* or *bhashantar* (literally the difference or movement of language) and *anuvad* (repetition or emulation). From the beginning of the modern period, however, the 'translation' of western and world drama into Indian languages has consisted mainly in a form of transculturation for which the general Indian terms are *rupantar* or *rupantaran* (the difference or movement of form; changed or new form, transformation, version, rendering adaptation) and *anuyojan* (the remaking of ancient narratives or unfamiliar forms of expression through a new artistic consciousness" (lxvii).

Within this framework Harishchandra's work would be considered a *rupantar*, owing to the fact that it is Indianized in a substantial way. However, this is not the word that the published version uses. Instead it says that it is a "sadhu bhasha mein anuvad" (translation into *sadhu bhasha*). The use of *sadhu bhasha* – where *sadhu* is a holy man, and *bhasha* means language – is key here, because it refers to a Sanskritized version of Hindi, a Hindi that is priestly, that is rid of the Hindustani vernacular. In the context of the Hinduization of the language, the use of *sadhu bhasha* connects the language to religion right from the frontispiece.

So, to return to the translated text, what is the worldview – especially as it relates to positions unthought, to caste – in this transculturation, trans*anuvad? In the line I started from

Anant talks about the world being a stage and every *manushya* having a part to play, the use of *manushya* seems benign, an equivalent of the Shakespearean “man”. In this context the position of the slave, and the black body, would be outside of and unthought in the Shakespearean “man”. Later in the scene however, the significance of “*manushya*” comes to the fore when Anant, in a translation of the phrase “there is much kindness in the Jew” (I.iii.155-165), says “is Jain me badi manushya hai” (there is much *manushyata*/the noun form of *manushya* in this Jain) (Harishchandra, Durlabh Bandhu 15). Kindness is transformed into humanity, though perhaps more accurately the qualities of being a *manushya*. As a Jain then, Shylock (the Shylock character) is not a *manushya*, he can have the qualities of a *manushya*, but can’t be one. In this worldview then, can only Hindus be *manushyas* – human beings? By way of comparison, and to show that Harishchandra did have a choice in terms of what word to use, I turn to an 1888 translation by “Arya”. While Harishchandra’s is an Indianization, Arya’s is a more literal translation, and I use the word literal here without any judgement. In her translation this phrase reads, “yah yahudi dayamay hai” – this Jew is full of *daya*, where *daya* can be read as kindness or mercy. If he wanted it, the vocabulary of *daya* was available to Harishchandra, and indeed he does use it later in the play. This makes his use of *manushyata* at this juncture much more significant.

In the *Merchant of Venice*, the dichotomy is between Christians and a Jew, with these words being used to describe various characters. This is not the case in Harishchandra’s version. To illustrate this point I turn to Shylock’s famous monologue in Act III.

Merchant of Venice

Durlabh Bandhu

My translation

I am a Jew . Hath not	Keval is liye ki main Jaini	Only because I am a Jain .
a Jew eyes? hath not a Jew	hoon. Kya Jaini ki aankh,	Aren't a Jain's eyes, nose,
hands, organs, dimensions,	naak, haath, paon aur doosre	hands, feet and other organs
senses, affections, passions?	ang aryon ki tarah nahin	like those of Aryans ...
Fed with the	hote. ... kya wah vahi ann	doesn't he eat the same food,
same food, hurt with the same	nahin khata, unhi shastron se	isn't he wounded by the same
weapons, subject to	ghayal nahin hota, vahi rog	weapons, doesn't he bear the
the same diseases, healed by	nahin jhelta, unhi	same diseases, become better
the same means,	aushadhiyon se achcha nahin	with the same medicines,
warmed and cooled by the	hota, usi garmi aur jaad se	doesn't he bear the same joy
same winter and summer	sukh aur kasht nahin uthata	and difficulty from the
	jaisa ki koi arya .	summer and winter as an
as a Christian is?	(Harishchandra, Durlabh	Aryan .
	Bandhu 40)	
(III.i.57-63)		

First, more organs are mentioned in the Hindi, foregrounding the embodied aspects of those who are included within the category of manushya and those that are not. The story untold in this translation is not just an abstraction but is also about flesh – flesh of those who are racialized and constructed as a particular caste. Second, the comparison is not between a Jain and a Hindu. It is between a Jain and an Aryan, with the latter being emphasized much more than “Christian” is in Shakespeare’s text. Etymologically, the word “arya”, with its roots in Sanskrit has several meanings. John T Platts who compiled a dictionary of Urdu and Classical Hindi in 1884,

primarily for British audience, notes that it means “an Aryan” (Platts 42). The Rajpal Hindi Shabdkosh has several meanings of the word. The first, especially when the word is used as an adjective is “uttam, shreshth” meaning someone noble or of a high order. A secondary definition is tied to religion and caste which reads, “unaryon evam shudron se bhinn ek sabhya jati” (a civilized caste that is different or set apart from non-Aryans and Shudras) (Bahri 90). The notion of superiority vis a vis an “other” is intrinsic to the category. In thinking about Harishchandra’s use of the word aryan, I argue that the particular Hinduism being espoused is an Aryan one. Harishchandra is valorizing Aryans and a particularly Vedic, Brahmanical form of Hinduism that values notions of purity and caste-based segregation and discrimination. Dalmia suggests that the “Aryan idea” which was thought, by Indian nationalists, to offer “the possibility of national cohesion” was “invoked” by Harishchandra “whenever the glory of the Hindu national past needed demonstration” (Dalmia, *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions: Bhāratendu Hariśchandra and Nineteenth-Century Banaras* 41-42). This is apparent in Harishchandra’s essay, “*natak, athva drishya kavya*” (drama or visually presented poetry), sections of which have been translated in the comprehensive 2018 collection *Poetics of Modernity*. In a section titled “History of Drama” Harishchandra notes, “we do not think that any other race on this planet can open its mouth on this subject in the presence of India. The supreme repository of knowledge in Aryan culture – the veda – is infused with musical and literary qualities” (Harishchandra, *From 'Natak'* 64). The reference back to the Veda lays out the terms for what constitutes an “Aryan”. Dalmia elaborates this:

Arya, Arya jati, Aryavarta. These were encompassing terms, which offered possibilities of **cohesion** and which claimed historical, territorial and cultural hegemony on the subcontinent. Vaisnavism had expanded to cover these dimensions and arrogated to itself the heritage of the Aryas. As the ‘only true religion of the Hindus’, the ‘ultra-radical’ Vasisnavas, with their monotheism, their bhakti, as specified and propagated by

Hariśchandra and his contemporaries and as countenanced by the Orientalists could, with some concessions to the error of their ways, subsume the Arya and Brahmo Samaj. These were literate, articulate movements, reform-oriented in the best sense and at all events harked back to the Vedas, evoking the glories of the common past...His [Harishchandra's] main concern was to demonstrate that Vaisnavism was not only the **central core** of Hinduism; it held, in its teaching and practice, the most promise for the future **development** of the country, since it could ever **purify** and regenerate itself. (Dalmia, *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions: Bhāratendu Hariśchandra and Nineteenth-Century Banaras* 416-417) (emphasis mine)

The promises and possibilities of cohesion and development are apparent. I want to highlight the through line between Arya, Vaisnavism, the Vedas and Hinduism. The echoes of Hindi-Hindu-Hindustan are apparent or rather these connections are part of the logic beneath the slogan. The linking of the Vedas to a process of purification is important in light of the Sanskritization of Hindi. Keeping this in mind, India is synonymous with Aryan, just as in the play Aryan metonymically stands for Hindu. Then, perhaps *Manushya* refers only to the Aryan descendants of Manu.

Importantly, the “other” is constructed as the Jain, the Dalit in this configuration is outside the “world”, occupying the position of the “unthought”. Here it is worth noting that in December 1927, nearly 50 years after the publication of *Durlabh Bandhu*, B. R Ambedkar, Dalit social reformer and the architect of the Constitution, burned a copy of the manusmriti – “the ancient work of Indic jurisprudence considered unimpeachable in Hindu moral and political culture” (Kumar 4-5)⁴⁴. In his treatise *Annihilation of Caste*, Ambedkar argues that “There is no code of laws more infamous regarding social rights than the Laws of Manu” (Ambedkar 49). Ultimately, he believes that “if you wish to bring about a breach in the system then you have got

⁴⁴ According to Dalmia, in an essay on foeticide Harishchandra gives Manu the appellation as being “the greatest of legislators” (Dalmia, *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions: Bhāratendu Hariśchandra and Nineteenth-Century Banaras* 320)

to apply a dynamite to the Vedas and the Shastras, which deny any part to reason, to Vedas and Shastras which deny any part to morality. You must destroy the Religion of the Shrutis and the Smritis. Nothing else will avail” (Ambedkar 71). The destruction of the *masnusmruti* is symbolic of applying a “dynamite to the Vedas and Shastras”, the very same Vedas that were supremely important to Harishchandra. The annihilation of caste requires the destruction of the category of *manushya*.

Here I want to return to the quote from Harishchandra’s essay on drama which reads: “we do not think that any other race on this planet can open its mouth on this subject in the presence of India. The supreme repository of knowledge in Aryan culture – the veda – is infused with musical and literary qualities” (Harishchandra, From 'Natak' 64). In Hindi it reads, “Ham nahi samajh sakte ke prithvi ki aur koi jati bhi bharatvarsh ke samne is vishay par muh khole. Aryan ka param shastr ved – sangeet aur sahityamay hai” (Harishchandra, Bharatendu Harishchandra ke Shresth Nibandh 176). I would translate this much the same as it has been translated by Aparna Dharwadker and Anubha Anushree. with the exception of the word jati – which can translate as race, but also as caste. This nuance is important because of how hotly debated the notion of Aryan as a race vis vis Aryan as a shorthand for certain castes becomes.

In the 20th century this notion becomes problematized from both ends of the spectrum. On the one hand, we have Ambedkar, in 1937, who argues that

The Caste system cannot be said to have grown as a means of preventing the admixture of races or as a means of maintaining purity of blood. As a matter of fact Caste system came into being long after the different races of India had comingled in blood and culture. To hold that distinctions of caste are really distinctions of race and to treat different castes as though they were so many different races is a gross perversion of facts. (Ambedkar 23)

If the Vedas and other Sanskritic texts lay the rules for the Caste System, Ambedkar argues that the territory was multiracial and indeed interracial long before the laws of the caste system were enshrined in the Vedas and texts like the *manusmriti*. Purity or aspirations to purity are unfounded and unattainable. Given this is the case, and as he was one of the architects of the Indian constitution, perhaps the inclusion of “impure” Hindustani in the constitution was a political decision. On the other hand, writing in 1914, Aurobindo Ghosh, a philosopher and the publisher of a magazine on philosophy titled “Arya” notes that,

Western Philology has converted it [Arya] into a racial term, an unknown ethnological quantity on which different speculations fix different values. Now, even among the philologists, some are beginning to recognise that the word in its original use expressed not a difference of race, but a difference of culture. For in the Veda the Aryan peoples are those who had accepted a particular type of self-culture, of inward and outward practice, of ideality, of aspiration. ...It was the combined ideal of the Brahmana and the Kshatriya.

Western philologists of the nineteenth century would certainly have had an impact on Harishchandra⁴⁵, so it is hard to know whether Harishchandra was merely rehearsing a commonly held belief, that had been impacted by the work of Orientalists, or whether a particular racial conceptualization of Aryan was something Harishchandra was personally invested in. All that can be said is that the category of Aryan in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was one where the negotiations between race and caste were ongoing. Regardless of whether he was translating Shakespeare or not, Harishchandra used his plays to espouse Brahmanical values, and moreover construct those values as being indigenous. As a non-Aryan, Shaylagya is described as a *pardesi Mahajan* “a foreign Merchant” – non-Aryans are

⁴⁵ As Romila Thapar notes, the theory of the Aryan race in India which was bolstered by the work of philologists and Indologists like Max Mueller, “coincided with the emergence of nationalism in the late nineteenth century in India, articulated mainly by the middle class, which was drawn from the upper caste and was seeking both legitimacy and an identity from the past” (Thapar 9)

foreigners in the land, and therefore vilified. Having shown thus far an example of how Harichandra constructs the ideal subject as an aryan man, I want to turn briefly to the notion of “justice”.

The first example I want to take us to is in act 3, scene 3 of the *Merchant of Venice* where Shylock and Antonio are conversing in the presence of the jailor. Shylock proclaims, “the Duke shall grant me justice” (3.3.9). In Hindi it reads, “mandaleshwar sahib mera vichar karenge” - a literal translation would be mandaleshwar sahib will judge/pass a judgement in my favor, where mandaleshwar translates literally to lord of the district. Key here is that he is not using the word “nyay” or justice, the word that later in the play the Hindu characters use. I want to end with Portia’s famous quality of mercy speech in act 4, scene 1 of the play. The speech sets up a dichotomy between the Christian value of “mercy” and the more juridical concept of “justice”.

Merchant of Venice	Durlabh Bandhu	My translation
The quality of mercy is not strained.	Daya aisi vastu nahin jise aagrah ki aavashyakta ho.	Daya is not such an object that needs perseverance. It
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven	Vah jal dhara ke bhanti nabh mandal se prithvital par girti	falls like a stream from the celestial world to the earth. It
Upon the place beneath. It is twice blest:	hai. Uska duhra phal milta hai arthat pahle us ko jo karta hai	yields double that is first on the one who does it and
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.	aur dusre us ko jise is ka laabh pahunchta hai.	second on the one who benefits from it. It gives the
’Tis mightiest in the mightiest; it becomes	Mahanubhavon ko yeh adhiktar Shobha deti hai,	most grace to great men. It gives more grace to the

The throne'd monarch better than his crown.	mandelshwaron ko yeh mukut se adhiktar shobhit hai.	mandelshwar than the crown does. Rajdand
His scepter shows the force of temporal power,	Rajdand keval sansarik bal prakat karta hai. Jo aatank aur	(Penalty/Punishment of the state) only wields worldly
The attribute to awe and majesty	tej ka chihni hai auron jis se rajeshwaron ka bhay logon ke	power and is a symbol of terror and strength and is that
Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings;	chitt par cha jata hai parantu daya ka prabhav rajdand ke	which causes the fear of the Rajeshwar (Hindu king) to be
But mercy is above this sceptered sway.	prabhav ki apeksha kahin adhik hai, daya ka vasthan	cast on the minds/hearts of people but the impact of daya
It is enthronèd in the hearts of kings;	rajeshwaron ka chit hai, yah ek Pradhan mahima Ishwar ki	is greater than that of Rajdand. Daya resides in the
It is an attribute to God Himself;	hai, atah sansar ke rajeshwar usi samay devtulya pratit hote	psyche of Rajeshwars/ Hindu kings. It is the prime glory of
And earthly power doth then show likest God's	hai jab ki ve nyay ke saath daya ka bhi bartav karte hai.	God/Ishwar, therefore the Rajeshwars of the world seem
When mercy seasons justice.	Is liye ai jaini yadyapi tu	godlike when they exhibit
Therefore, Jew,	nyay hi nyay pukarta hai	daya as well as nyay in their
Though justice be thy plea, consider this:	kintu vichar kar ki keval nyay hi ke bharose hum me se koi	behavior. Therefore oh Jaini, though you call for nyay and
That in the course of justice none of us	marne ke uparant mukt hone ki aasha nahin kar sakta. Ham	nyay alone, but none of us can aim for nirvana/moksha
Should see salvation. We do	Ishwar se daya ko prarthna	after death only on the basis

pray for mercy,	karte hai to chahiye ki vahi	of nyay. We pray to Ishwar
And that same prayer doth	prarthna hum ko bhi daya ke	for daya so we want that
teach us all to render	naam bhikave (dikhave?).	same prayer to show us the
The deeds of mercy. I have	Maine itna tere nyay ke	name of daya. I have said all
spoke thus much	aagrah ke hatane ke nimit se	this for the purpose of
To mitigate the justice of thy	kaha par yadi tu na manega to	moving you from your
plea,	jaise ho sakega vanshnagar ke	insistence on nyay and nyay
Which, if thou follow, this	vicharsheel nyaysabha hokar	alone but if you don't agree
strict court of Venice	tujhe is saudagar par	then as is the case the
Must needs give sentence	vinaypatra de degi.	thoughtful court of
'gainst the merchant	(Harishchandra, Durlabh	Vanshnagar will give you a
there	Bandhu 65)	vinaypatra (letter of appeal?)
		over the merchant.

(IV.i.190-211)

There are two aspects of this speech that I want to foreground. One is the through-line of Ishwar – god, through the term itself, through Rajeshwar and indeed Mandaleshwar. Rajeshwar, which is raj ka Ishwar that is, god of the land or state, is an interesting choice in this regard. One dictionary defines rajeshwar as “bada Hindu raja” or great Hindu king, while the Rajpal dictionary defines it as rajaaon ka raja (king of kings). Regardless, the use of rajeshwar in lieu of raja (a word that wasn't foreign to 19th century Hindi, given Harishchandra's famous andher nagari chaupat raja) along with the other vocabulary suggests a religiosity in the way in which

the state is imagined, with the religion in question being Hinduism. The second is that the distinction between mercy and justice is translated as a difference between “daya” and “nyay”. The dictionary of Hinduism defines daya as “An ethical stance sometimes represented as the positive or active pursuit of non-violence (ahimsā), and a component part of the practice of dharma” (Johnson). By not showing or practicing daya, Shaylagya is not living a dharmic life. Here, I want to return to the line I mentioned earlier in the paper, “Is Jain me badi manushyata hai” (There is much kindness in this Jew). Arya translated kindness as dayamay, full of daya. In Harishchandra’s conceptualization daya and Shaylagya are incompatible, and it could be argued that it is this lack of daya that prevents Shaylagya from accessing manushyata. Perhaps this could be read as being a benign rendering of the English, what some would call a “faithful” translation. To counter such an argument, I want to state three claims. First, the choice of text is not benign, seeing as it was the only play by Shakespeare that Harishchandra translated, he intentionally chose to translate this particular text. Second no translation is apolitical. In this instance the politics of the text are overt in many places as I have tried to show through the diction. Perhaps what was so appealing about *Merchant of Venice* was that it allowed for the valorization of these Aryan Hindu values over juridical notions of equality and justice. This was a time when notions of nationhood were being imagined and mobilized. Harishchandra had an important role to play in this imagination of a Hindu nation. Third, and perhaps most importantly, as a non-Aryan, a foreigner Shaylagya does not even have access to same vocabulary of justice or nyaya, even as he stakes a claim to it.

This investment in indigeneity and foreignness are key to the Hindi movement, particularly in relation to script as the Devanagari script was considered to be indigenous and the Persian-based Urdu script foreign. Majeed notes that according to Grierson, “in India scripts are

‘matters of nationality or religion’. The attempt to define a national script is bound to fail, as Muslims and Hindus will not give up their scripts” (Majeed 177). There is a slippage once again between language, religion and nation (‘Hindi-Hindu-Hindustan’). This was clearly a question that the leaders of the nationalist movements and the architects of the constitution were thinking about as the constitution specifies “Hindi in the Devanagari script”. The choice of script, whether at a national level or at an individual level, is reflective of a certain ideology⁴⁶. As Christopher King notes, “Writers could and did use a mixed language incorporating Persian, Arabic and Sanskrit words, but no writer could use a mixed script including elements of the Persian and the Devanagari” (King 132). While Bharatendu Harishchandra was a clear champion of Hindi, specifically in the Devanagari script, the tension between the two scripts is highlighted in Lala Sitaram’s career as a translator of Shakespeare

Lala Sitaram – tarjamah to anuvad

In chapter two I looked at Lala Sitaram in terms of his motivations to translate Shakespeare, and Harish Trivedi’s depiction of Sitaram as a man in whom “Macaulay would have readily and proudly acknowledged the fulfilment of his own fondest schemes”. (Trivedi, *Colonial Transactions: English Literature and India* 17-18) Here, I want to attend to a fact that Trivedi highlights but does not pursue: Sitaram translated six plays by Shakespeare into Urdu and then fourteen more into Hindi. Why this shift? What was his relationship with both languages, and how did he conceptualize Hindi? To do this I turn to a somewhat hagiographical biography of Sitaram by Hardayal Singh published in Hindi in 1939, Sitaram’s editorial comments in a six-volume edited collection titled “Selections from Hindi Literature”, published

⁴⁶ My choice of Hindi in the Roman script has to do with a consideration of my audience who may not be familiar with the Devanagari script but it is also a political decision to disassociate the language from the Devanagari script.

by the University of Calcutta in the 1920s, and paratextual material from his translations of Shakespeare. The legacy of Bharatendu Harishchandra as a litterateur and dramatist live on. In contrast, Lala Sitaram, though he was applauded and well-known in his time, has now disappeared amongst the annals of history.

Lala Sitaram was born in 1861 in Ayodhya⁴⁷. He started middle school in 1869 and this was when he began his education in English. After attending Faizabad high school, he took the university entrance examinations in 1874 and came first in these examinations. At this point in the narrative, Hardayal Singh, the biographer, remarks, “Lalaji was a very dharmic man from childhood (Lalaji balyakal hi se bade dharmic purush the)” and goes on to describe Sitaram’s 28 mile circumambulation of the shrine of Ayodhyaji (H. Singh 6). This is significant only to highlight that Sitaram grew up in a Hindu environment and actively participated in the traditions and rituals. Singh describes Sitaram’s high school and college escapades in great detail. It was during this time that Sitaram published a translation of Arthur Helps’ *Friends in Council* into Urdu with the assistance of his friend Mirza Sajjad Hussain (H. Singh 9). In 1879, Sitaram graduated with a B.A from Calcutta University and got the highest score in the final examinations. Throughout this period Sitaram published literary as well as journalistic pieces. After his B.A, Sitaram spent time in Lucknow, mingling in the literary and political spheres. Singh remarks that at the time the poets of Urdu literature had a tendency to write ghazals. However, “regretfully (khed ki baat)” Sitaram did not write any ghazals. This was owing to the fact that he got a job with the department of education and he felt that it wouldn’t do for a person in his position to compose romantic ghazals. Singh goes on to add that “if those ghazals had been

⁴⁷ All biographical information is taken from Hardayal singh’s biography, “Avadhvasi Raibahadur Lala Sitaramji ka Jeevan charit” (Life of Raibahadur Lala Sitaramji, a resident of Avadh) published as a part of Sitaram *Sangrah*.

available they would be proof that Lalaji was an Urdu poet of the upper echelons (yadi ve ghazalein uplabdh hoti to ve lalaji ke urdu sahitya ke uchch koti ke kavi hone ke liye praman hoti)” (H. Singh 11). Singh’s belief, as speculative as it may be, indicates that at that time Sitaram was considered a prominent literary figure even if he is now forgotten.

In 1880, Sitaram was appointed the principal of the government high school in Sitapur. Subsequently he was transferred to the government high school in Meerut and then in Kanpur. In 1883 he moved to Benares where he developed a deeper appreciation of Sanskrit, and indeed went on to do his M.A in Sanskrit. It may seem ironic that it was during this time that he translated four of Shakespeare’s plays into Urdu – *King Lear* (1883), *Comedy of Errors* (1884), *Much Ado About Nothing* (1888) and *Tempest* (1890). However, when one considers his formative years in Lucknow and his close involvement with the Urdu literary scene there, the fact that he would translate into Urdu at first should come as no surprise. This period in Benares and his study of Sanskrit is important in thinking about his turn to Hindi, as well as to remind us of the fact that not only did Sitaram translate Shakespeare but he also translated Sanskrit texts including *Meghdoot* by Kalidasa. Interestingly he translated *Meghdoot* the same year as *King Lear*, but Singh does not make clear which language he translated the Sanskrit text into. Sitaram would go on to rise up the bureaucratic ranks – inspector to deputy collector.

This is the context and background that produced a man like Lala Sitaram who “had an equal right on Urdu, Hindi and English literature and could write successfully in all three languages (Lalaji urdu hindi aur angrezi sahitya par saman adhikar rakhte the aur teeno bhashaon me badi safalta se likh sakte the)” and yet was “intimately involved in the service of the hindi language (tathapi hindi bhasha ki seva ki saath hi unka ghanishth sambandh hai)” (H. Singh 20).

In discussing Sitaram's work, Singh launches into a discussion on the differences between translation (anuvad) and original (maulik) writing. He argues that while original work is difficult translation is even more difficult⁴⁸. He goes on to give us a striking metaphor to differentiate the work of a translator and a creative writer: "a creative writer swims in the currents of a river and a translator swims in a well (maulik rachnakar nadi ki dhara me behta hai aur anuvadak kue me tairta hai)" (H. Singh 25). While both are swimming, the translator is restricted by the walls of the well (i.e. the characteristics of the original). After describing the various qualities of the original that the translator must pay close attention to, Singh remarks "That translation which doesn't invoke the same pleasure as the original ought to be called a bhashantar rather than an anuvad (jis anuvad se maulik ka sa anand nahi use anuvad nahi bhashantar kahna theek hoga)" (H. Singh 25). This distinction between anuvad and bhashantar is one that Aparna Bhargava Dharwadkar also points to. She translates the former as "repetition or emulation" and the latter as "the difference or movement of language" with both being terms for interlingual translation. While Dharwadkar does not create a hierarchical relationship between these terms, it is clear that for Singh an anuvad is superior to a bhashantar. This distinction is significant given how he talks about Sitaram's Hindi translations of Shakespeare. In categorizing Sitaram's work – most of which comprised of translations from various languages – the Shakespearean translations are categorized separately from other translations under the heading of "other plays (anya natak)". He writes,

Other plays – *Bhulbhulaya, Manmohan ka Jaal, Jangal me Mangal, Hamlet, Raja Lear, Raja Richard, Macbeth, Bagula Bhagat, Apni Apni ruchi*⁴⁹. In these compositions, Shakespeare's plays were first anuvad-ed into Urdu and then after some time bhashantar-

⁴⁸ maulik Rachna karna kathin hai parantu anuvad ka kaam isse bhi kathin hai (H. Singh 23)

⁴⁹ *Comedy of Errors, Much Ado about Nothing, Tempest, Hamlet, King Lear, King Richard, Macbeth, Measure for Measure, As you Like it*. Interestingly Singh's list omits Sitaram's translations of *Hamlet, Othello and Romeo and Juliet*.

ed [into Hindi] which is why these compositions could not have literary magic. I don't see these compositions as Lalajis; they are utterly different from his style and language.

(anya natak - bhulbhulaya, manmohan ka jaal, jangal me mangal, hamlet, raja lear, raja Richard, Macbeth, bagula bhagat, apni apni ruchi. In rachnaon me Shakespeare ke natakon ke anuvad pahle urdu me the aur phir inhi ka kuch samay ke baad bhashantar kar diya gaya isliye in rachnaon me koi sahityik chamatkar na aa saka. Hame to yeh rachnaei Lalaji ki nahi lagti; unki shaili aur bhasha se ye sarvata bhinn hai) (H. Singh 26-27)

Singh goes on to add that this – these texts not being Lalaji's⁵⁰ - is the reason why he will not spend any time discussing them. Perhaps, this was his way of justifying their omission from his analysis. Regardless, why did Sitaram translate into Hindi, and go so far as to want to create Sitaram's Hindi Shakespeare, if he had already translated the plays into Urdu and, according to Singh's assessment, done a good job with them? The answer to this may lie in Sitaram's relationship to the two languages and it cannot be divorced from the cultural and political climate of that time when the Hindi-Urdu debates were widespread.

Given that Sitaram had the ambition to create both Sitaram's Urdu Shakespeare as well as Sitaram's Hindi Shakespeare, it may seem like he was equally fond of both languages. Indeed, if one looks at the foreword to the Hindi translations, which is itself a selection from the prospectus he wrote for the Urdu ones, one might get the sense that he does not think much of the language or indeed the literature in the language, and rather is looking to enrich it through his translations of Shakespeare. In the "Prospectus of An Urdu 'Version of Shakespeare's' Plays", Sitaram writes,

could therefore a better work be pointed out a vernacular rendering of which would supply a want seriously felt in Urdu? Could the most zealous partisan of Urdu undertake to defend the charges of puerility and pruriency against the only standard plays, to wit,

⁵⁰ Yeh rachnaein lalaji ki nahin he (27)

the Inder Sabhas of Amanat and Madari Lall? Can there be any concealment of the fact that the vernacular romances have a most demoralizing effect upon the minds of readers? (Sitaram, Sitaram's Urdu Shakespeare: No. 1 King Lear 2)

While he does see a lack in Urdu literature, he does find some works, “the Inder Sabhas”, to be worthwhile. In contrast in the foreword to the Hindi versions he writes, “could therefore a better work be pointed out, a vernacular rendering of which would supply a want seriously felt in Hindi? Can there be any concealment of the fact that the vernacular romances have a most demoralizing effect upon the minds of readers” (Sitaram, Foreword 2)? The sentence about the Inder Sabhas has been deleted and not replaced. It seems as though Sitaram cannot even find one work in Hindi to highlight, even if the highlighting is done in a disparaging manner. In both the prospectus to the Urdu version and the foreword to the Hindi ones Sitaram seems to identify a lack, a lack that only the greatness of Shakespeare’s work can fill. Sitaram lauds critics who hail Shakespeare as “the greatest dramatic artist, the rarest judge of men and human affairs and the noblest moral teacher that literature has yet known” (Sitaram, Sitaram's Urdu Shakespeare: No. 1 King Lear 2). The notion of Shakespeare as a moral teacher and using his plays to impart a moral lesson that Hindi romances lack seems to be a motive that drives the translations, along with the political motive discussed in chapter two.

The political, moral and aesthetic come together in Sitaram’s preface to the Urdu *King Lear*. He writes,

In whatever shape these works be accessible, my young countrymen should study this masterly delineator of the living world. They may thus heighten their sense of moral and intellectual beauty, teach themselves to reflect upon their own nature and anticipate the experience of years. In arranging these plays for my Urdu version, the tragedy of King Lear has been assigned the first place, less on account of any superiority of the work over others than for the date of the plot, it being my intention to give my readers, among other

things, a connected history of the rise and progress of the British nation through these dramas. (Sitaram, Sitaram's Urdu Shakespeare: No. 1 King Lear n.p)

The pedagogical goals of his translations are clear. The question still remains as to why switch from Urdu to Hindi?

To make an attempt at answering this question I want to turn to an essay written by Sitaram titled, “A Brief History of the Hindi Language”. This was published in part one of Book VI of “Selections from Hindi Literature” compiled by Lala Sitaram and published by the university of Calcutta in 1925. It was during the nineteen tens and twenties that Sitaram published the majority of his Hindi translations. He begins this essay by acknowledging a debt to Grierson’s work on the linguistic survey and other writings on the Hindi language. As I have discussed earlier in this chapter Grierson and the linguistic survey did much to delineate a difference between Hindi and Urdu and map the difference along religious lines. Sitaram begins his essay with a section titled “Importance of Hindi”. This section is comprised of quotes from different sources presented without any context or commentary. The first person he cites is Rajendra Lal Mitra (1822-1891). Mitra was an Indologist and the first Indian to head the Asiatic society. Though a key figure in the Bengali Renaissance he was a polyglot and knew Hindi, Urdu, Sanskrit, Persian, English, French, Greek and Latin. As a polyglot himself, Sitaram must have been well-versed in Mitra’s accomplishments and must have admired him, even if he did not know him personally. So, Sitaram begins the section with the following quote “‘Hindi’ says Dr Rajendra Lal Mitra ‘is by far the most important of all the modern vernacular dialects of India. It is the language of the most civilized portion of the Hindu race.’” (Sitaram, A Brief History of the Hindi Language i). By beginning with this quote Sitaram seems to be foregrounding the relationship between the language and the religion. Further, seeing as it comes

from someone who was a well-known Indologist and a Bengali seems to give it even more credence. It is striking that while all the other quotes that Sitaram cites have a complete citation, this quote by Mitra is just presented, as if it is so well known and undisputable that it does not need to be cited.

Following on from Mitra, Sitaram has two long quotes from John Beames' *Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India*, the gist of which is captured in this sentence: "It represents the oldest and most widely diffused form of Aryan speech in India" (Sitaram, *A Brief History of the Hindi Language* i). John Beames (1837 -1902) was a civil servant in the Indian civil service. He published the three-volume philological work mentioned above between the years 1872 and 1879. His work is symptomatic of what Romila Thapar calls "the sliding from language to race" in the discourse around Aryan (Thapar 6). While much could be said about this, what I am interested in here is Sitaram's citational practice to think through what his choice of excerpts says about his political investments in Hindi. To do this I will cite the entire section where Beames expresses his opinion of the Hindi language. I will italicize and bold the sections that Sitaram cites. I do this to foreground what is the story being elided through the process of excerpting. Beames writes,

I must here express my views on the Hindi language in general, and I do so thus early in the dissertation, as it may be that there will be found to be some novelty in them, and perhaps they will not be readily accepted by those who are interested in supporting the claims of other languages of the class. For I should here mention, for the benefit of European readers, that there exists in India, a sort of rivalry between the Aryan languages, or rather between the three principal ones, Hindi, Marathi and Bengali, each considering itself superior to the others, and my Bengali and Marathi friends will probably not agree with me in giving the palm to Hindi until they read my reasons for so doing, and perhaps not even then.

Hindi is that language which is spoken in the valley of the Ganges and its tributaries, from the watershed of the Jamna, the largest and most important of them, as far down as Rajmahal, the point where the Ganges takes a sudden turn to the south,

and breaks out into the plains of Bengal. This area is the centre and principal portion of Aryan India. It includes the Antarbhed or Doab between the Ganges and the Jamna, the "inner hearth" of the nation. It is therefore the legitimate heir of the Sanskrit and fills that place in the modern Indian system which Sanskrit filled in the old. Under the general head of Hindi are included many dialects, some of which differ widely from one another, though not so much as to give them the right to be considered separate languages. Throughout the whole of this vast region, though the dialects diverge considerably, one common universal form of speech is recognized, and all educated persons use it. This common dialect had its origin apparently in the country round Delhi, the ancient capital, and the form of Hindi spoken in that neighbourhood was adopted by degrees as the basis of a new phase of the language, in which, though the inflections of nouns and verbs remained purely and absolutely Hindi, and a vast number of the commonest vocables were retained, a large quantity of Persian and Arabic and even Turkish words found a place, just as Latin and Greek words do in English. Such words, however, in no way altered or influenced the language itself, which, when its inflectional or phonetic elements are considered, remains still a pure Aryan dialect, just as pure in the pages of Wali or Sauda, as it is in those of Tulsi Das or Bihari Lal. It betrays therefore a radical misunderstanding of the whole bearings of the question, and of the whole science of philology, to speak of Urdu and Hindi as two distinct languages. When certain agitators cry out that the language of the English courts of law in Hindustan should be Hindi and not Urdu, what they mean is that the clerks and native writers should be restrained from importing too many Persian and Arabic words into their writings, and should use instead the honest old Sanskrit Tadbhavas with which the Hindi abounds. By all means let it be so, only let it not be said that the Urdu is a distinct language from Hindi.⁵¹ By means of the introduction of Arabic and Persian words, a very great benefit has been conferred on Hindi, inasmuch as it has thus been prevented from having recourse to Sanskrit fountains again and again for grand and expressive words. This resuscitation of Sanskrit words in their classical form – a process which has been going on in modern languages for ages, and is still at work as vigorously as ever, just as the resuscitation of Latin words has always been and is still going on in French – has done a serious injury to some languages of the Indian group, inasmuch as it has led them to drop their Tadbhavas, which are the most valuable class of words that a language can possess, not only on account of the light they throw on the philological processes which the language has undergone, but because, having cast away all that was difficult of pronunciation, cumbrous, and superfluous in the ancient language, they possess the perfection of flexibility, neatness and practical usefulness. In some languages, notably in Bengali, Tatsama words have been borrowed from Sanskrit and employed in written works, in cases where there already existed good serviceable Tadbhavas. The result has been that the unfortunate peasant who knows no Sanskrit finds it more and more difficult every day to acquire knowledge, and the educated of the masses is thus retarded. In

⁵¹ Beames' footnote: the most correct way of speaking would be to say "the urdu dialect of Hindi" or "the Urdu phase of Hindi." It would be quite impossible in urdu to compose a single sentence without using aryan words, though many sentences might be composed in which not a single Persian word occurred.

respect of Tadbhavas, Hindi stands pre-eminent, whether it be that form of Hindi which relies principally upon indigenous sources for its words, or that other widely employed form which has incorporated the flower and grace of Persian and Arabic nouns, and which is called sometimes Urdu, sometimes Hindustani.

All the other⁵² languages of the group were originally dialects of Hindi, in this sense that Hindi represents the oldest and most widely diffused form of Aryan speech in India. Gujarati acknowledges itself to be a dialect of the Sauraseni Prakrit, the parent of Hindi. Panjabi, even at the present day, is a little more than an old Hindi dialect. Bengali, three centuries ago, when it first began to be written, very closely resembled the Hindi still spoken in Eastern Behar. Oriya is in many respects more like Hindi than Bengali. There remain only the Sindhi and the Marathi. The former of these has always been very distinct from the rest; nevertheless it shades off in some respects imperceptibly into Panjabi on the one hand, and the wilder Hindi dialects of the great Rajputana desert on the other. I am half afraid to speak about Marathi, as some of the Bombay authors who have written on that language proclaim it to be the noblest, most perfect, most eloquent, and so on, of all the Indian languages. Molesworth, however, who is remarkable for the sobriety of his judgment in linguistic matters, derives a considerable proportion of the words in his Marathi dictionary from the Hindi; although he guards himself by stating that he only introduces the Hindi word because it is the same as the Marathi, and may therefore be the origin of it. It is rather hasty to assume that modern Marathi is the lineal descendent of Maharashtri Prakrit. There is quite as much of the Magadhi and Sauraseni type in the modern Marathi as there is of the Maharashthri; and in the long period which intervenes between Vararuchi and the rise of modern languages, so much confusion took place, and such a jumbling together and general displacement of dialects, that it is absurd now-a-days to attempt to affiliate any modern Indian language as a whole to any Prakrit dialect. Maharashtri and Marathi have little in common except the name. (Beames 31-34)

Sitaram's inclusions, or perhaps the omissions are really striking. The first omission is Beames' admission that Hindi, Bengali and Marathi all vie for the title of "most superior". This debate is the context for Beames' remarks, and as such he is making particular rhetorical moves to augment the case for Hindi. By decontextualizing the quote, and beginning with the geographical extent of Hindi, Sitaram is making his own rhetorical move to suggest that it is given that Hindi occupies the prime position. The nearly half a decade between Beames' publication and

⁵² Sitaram's footnote: Except Persian and Arabic

Sitaram's during which the Hindi movement gained a stronghold could also account for this. The next section that Sitaram omits is really interesting in light of the discussion earlier in this chapter. After making a case that Hindi and Urdu are the same, or indeed if we consider Beames' footnote that Urdu is a dialect of Hindi, Beames makes a case against the Sanskritization of languages, and suggests that Hindi owing to its lack of Sanskritic influences vis a vis Bengali is more democratic. This is noteworthy because it is the opposite of what the Hindi movement desired, to purify Hindi from its Persian and Arabic influences. Perhaps by the time Sitaram was writing the Hindi-Sanskrit-Hindu and the Urdu-Persian/Arabic-Muslim binary was so deep seated that these remarks seemed to be from another place and time and seemed invalid. Finally, the last few lines of Beames' "digression" would, if included, have undercut the rest of Sitaram's essay. If "it is absurd now-a-days to attempt to affiliate any modern Indian language as a whole to any Prakrit dialect" then surely trying to trace Hindi's direct descentance from and affiliation to Prakrit, as Sitaram goes on to do, is also absurd.

Following the long quotes from Beames, Sitaram ends the section on the importance of Hindi with a quote from Annie Besant. Annie Besant (1847-1933) was an educationist, theosophist and key to our purposes here was a leader of the Dakshin Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha – an organization founded by M.K Gandhi in 1918 to spread Hindi in South India. The quote that Sitaram cites is from an essay titled 'Nation Building'. It reads

among the various vernaculars that are spoken in different parts of India, there is one that stands out strongly from the rest, as that which is most widely known. It is Hindi. A man who knows Hindi can travel all over India and find everywhere Hindi speaking people. In the north it is the vernacular of a large part of the population, and a large additional part who do not speak Hindi, speak languages so allied to it that Hindi is acquired without difficulty. Urdu is but Persianized Hindi; Punjabi and Gurmukhi are dialects of Hindi, Gujarati and Marathi are again dialects of Hindi, Bengali is a softer and more melodious and poetical Hindi... the learning of Hindi is a sacrifice that southern India might well

make to the unification of the Indian nation (Sitaram, A Brief History of the Hindi Language ii)

Two things are worth highlighting here. The first is an endorsement of the notion that Urdu is “but Persianized Hindi”. This seems like a far cry from the Sitaram who wrote the preface to the Urdu *King Lear* or the one who wanted to compose ghazals in Urdu. Perhaps this reflects a shift in his thinking, a shift that for my purposes parallels his shift from Urdu Shakespeare to Hindi Shakespeare. This is also a shift that marks his growing investment in the movement to spread or make Hindi a national language. The imperative to create a national unity through language is evident in Besant’s words when she talks about the “sacrifice that Southern India might well make to the unification of the Indian nation”. This echoes what other leaders like Gandhi believed and articulated. Language, particularly the search for a national language, was a key part of the National movement.

Sitaram’s citational practices give us some insight on the discourse that he was engaging with, and they offer a glimpse into his political investments. It is also important that this essay was published as part of a seven-volume series of books that presented selections from Hindi literature to a university audience. The goal, like that of many literary translations of Shakespeare, was pedagogical. Interestingly, the other two translators discussed in this chapter – Bharatendu Harishchandra and Arya – also published Hindi textbooks, though these were more focused on language rather than literature. This chapter has tried to tell multiple stories – of the constitution, of the parsi theatre, of Harishchandra, and of Lala Sitaram. The politics of language is one of the threads that connects these various strands, and the politics of translation particularly when that being translated has the cultural capital of Shakespeare is the other. In some ways it is strategic to provide a kaleidoscope of stories, to resist the impulse to tell just one

story, as it allows me to highlight the complexity of moving parts that could help us to paint a picture of Shakespeare in India, of Shakespeare and India.

Because of the archival nature of this chapter, it feels imperative to end by stepping back, or perhaps stepping forward, and considering the anxieties of the present that the archive lays bare. The logics of that time are ones that are replicated today – a hearkening back to a mythical past to claim a unified present and to deploy Hindi as the language of that unity. Describing her engagement with the archive and the urgency thereof, Anjali Arondekar writes,

These (new) reading practices emerge not against the grain of archival work, but instead from within the archive's own productions. Yet the imperative is not about founding presence, but rather about *confounding* our relationship to how and why we do archival work. The critical task lies in crafting an archival approach that articulates against the guarantee of recovery. The perspective I elaborate thus does not end with an argument for methodological reflexivity. It derives more importantly from an urgent need to complicate the very stakes of our archival mediations, especially given their mobilizations within a shifting (and often reactionary) language of political exigency. The continued efforts of the Hindu Right in India and the political Right in the United States, to mobilize the idea of the archive towards sectarian ends (most recently through the rewriting of textbooks) is a dangerous instantiation of the very logic I am referring to. (Arondekar 4-5)

Arondekar's comments urge me to reflect on the stakes of my work. Am I engaging in an act of recovery as I try to piece together the translational personas of Harishchandra and Sitaram?

There are two competing impulses here – to not participate in the very logics I am trying to unearth by resisting the “guarantee of recovery” versus the need to participate in disciplinary conventions that require “evidence”, be it archival, textual or paratextual. This anxiety also takes the form of wondering whether and to what extent does it make sense to read the past through the eyes of the present? Is this different from mobilizing the archive towards sectarian ends as the right wing is wont to do? I believe that the political aims and ends of the project of recovery do

matter, and a big part of the politics of my project is to weave together connections between movements in the nineteenth century and those in our contemporary moment. How and where does resisting the “guarantee of recovery” fit into this? Perhaps it also has to do with resisting the neatly tied narrative and sitting with the complexities of both the nineteenth century and the present.

Chapter 4: Queer (in) Translation

In chapter three I explored the relationship between translation and nation-building in the late colonial era. Using the examples of Bharatendu Harishchandra and Lala Sitaram I drew attention to the connections between their translations of Shakespeare and the movement to make Hindi a national language. Further, the mapping of religion and language onto geography through the slogan “Hindi, Hindu, Hindustan” was crucial in giving the Hindi movement a religious fervor. The effects of representing India as a masculine Hindu nation are felt today in the ways in which sexual, religious and caste minorities are viewed as intranational foreigners. This chapter contends with the fraught nature of creating queer spaces within a neoliberal as well as an increasingly religious nation-state by looking at the ways in which the notions of “love” and “desire” is articulated and translated in multiple languages. The tension between neoliberal discourses of globalization on the one hand and Hindu fundamentalism on the other is central to two right wing phenomena that are the backbone of this chapter – right wing Hindu training camps for girls and young women, and moral police squads called “Anti Romeo” squads. The tension between these often-competing forces is central to my analysis of two visual texts, the 2014 Indo-Canadian documentary *The World Before Her* and the 2017 web series *Romil and Jugal* (an adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet*). The former is a documentary that contrasts the world of the Miss India Pageant to the world of right-wing Hindu camps for girls. I contend that one of the protagonists of the film, Prachi, uses the hegemonic space and the cultural capital of the right-wing camps to live a non-heteronormative life. I compare this to *Romil and Jugal* a web-series that transposes the *Romeo and Juliet* story to an elite Indian world, with two young men as the protagonists. Grounded in a discussion of the transnational cultural capital of *Romeo and Juliet* as it relates to a “global gay community”, I look at the use of language because there is an

interplay between Hindi as a language of intimacy and English as the language in which a universally recognizable, politically inflected gay identity is represented. Ultimately, I explore the potential and limits of translating Shakespeare to create transnational queer solidarities.

So, what does it mean to read double, to think double, to receive double, and indeed to live double, inhabiting queerness as a young woman in a multilingual, multivalent country like India? In his work on the idioms of same sex desire in India, Akhil Katyal, a poet, translator and academic based in New Delhi, argues that sexuality is “marked” by “a doubleness, whereby there is a constant tension between the way it is conceptualized and the way it is lived out” (Katyal 1). Katyal goes on to add that,

This doubleness of sexuality ensures that no matter how much the ‘gay’ or ‘lesbian’ subject is given specific contours, like in various forms of identity politics and literary genres that centre around sexuality, that subject’s position will remain, in actual experience, always open-ended and contested, always forming and unforming (Katyal 1).

This notion of doubleness, this tension and the ways in which language and translation mediate it forms the backbone of this chapter and is one that I will explore in different but interrelated ways with reference to both texts.

Queer Girls and Hindutva politics in *The World Before Her*

Imagine a young woman in an off-white *salwar kurta*, on a rooftop, in a small town, practicing a form of martial arts, with instrumental music playing in the background. “It has been said” she says, “that India was a golden bird”. The Indian national anthem begins to play as she talks about the glories of India’s past, and the perils of the nation becoming “modern”. Then she

proudly declares, “I’ll speak that I am a Hindu.”⁵³ And I’ll proudly say I am a Hindu”. This young woman is Prachi, a leader at a right-wing Hindu camp for young girls and women, the *Durga Vahini* (army or armed group of the goddess Durga)⁵⁴. This is the opening of the documentary film *The World Before Her* (2012). While made in 2012, this Canadian documentary written and directed by Indo-Canadian filmmaker Nisha Pahuja, was released in India in 2014, soon after Narendra Modi’s election and was criticized by some as being a form of Hindutva propaganda. In this section, I explore Prachi’s “doubleness” – her investment in Hindutva ideology on the one hand, and her rejection of a heteronormative life on the other. This sheds light on the tension between the queer coming out narrative that makes Prachi such an empathetic character and was also key to making the film a success in North America, and the Hindutva rhetoric that the intimate glimpses inside the *Durga Vahini* camps provide.

To do this, I look at the filmmaker’s role in shaping the narrative, as well as the moments of linguistic, translational and affective excess that open up the space that makes such a reading of “doubleness” possible. In using the term “excess”, I am drawing on Kara Keeling’s work. She suggests that queer excess can be “a felt presence of the unknowable, the content of which exceeds its expression and therefore points toward a different epistemological, if not ontological and empirical, regime” (Keeling 569). So, the doubleness is read and felt in the space created by that which exceeds the filmic expression. Such a reading suggests that the tension that Katyal refers to is seen at various levels in the movie: a) personal, Prachi vis a vis her family, b) institutional at the *Durga Vahini* Camp, c) at the level of production in terms of the filmmaker’s

⁵³ I have chosen not to use [sic] when citing Prachi in order to legitimize the form of English she is using.

⁵⁴ Tanika Sarkar highlights the fact that Durga is a “militant icon” for the Hindu right (Sarkar 204).

politics and, d) reception in terms of the demands of the North American markets and India post-Modi.

The World Before Her sets the world of young women competing for the Miss India pageant in contrast with young women training at a right-wing, militant (someone in the film dubs it a “terrorist”) Hindu camp, the *Dugra Vahini*. This is in order to, as the film’s website puts it, “ensure that the faces and voices of India’s young women remain front stage center” within, and despite the “pageant dazzle and heated rhetoric” (Storyline Films). While both Pahuja and her producer Ed Barreveld claim that the movie began as a documentary about pageantry in Mumbai, the way the finished product opens and closes foregrounds the fact that through the process of making the film Prachi became the most compelling figure, so much so that Barreveld notes in an interview that, “if the film has a heroine at all, it’s Prachi” (Rothe). In an interview conducted after the Tribeca film festival in 2012, Pahuja is asked how she was able to get such an intimate access to the camps. She replies,

I wanted to explore the world of the fundamentalists, and I wanted to do it in a way that was not sensationalist or wasn’t painting them in a bad light. I think we need to understand where those people are coming from. Once I realized I really wanted to understand them, and spend time with them, and essentially get access to this camp, I knew that I was going to have to really get them to open up and trust me. In order to do that, you have to be in India, you have to be on the ground. You can’t just make phone calls from Toronto. People need to see you. People need to know that you are serious. So, I spent a lot of time in India. I basically went back and forth between Toronto and India — Bombay primarily. And I started to spend time with people and meet people from various levels within the movement. Eventually they started to trust me, and then they basically agreed to give me access. And through that, Prachi and her father were very helpful (Despointes).

Pahuja makes a point to highlight the time she spent in India as well as the fact that she was not setting out to be critical. The last sentence is key here because she foregrounds the role that

Prachi and her father play. It suggests that Prachi was her way in to the camps, and so the story of the camps is as much a story of Prachi. The fact that it was Prachi who gave her access is brought to the fore when Pahuja remarks, in another interview, that “when Prachi told me about her camps, it turns out to be the same thing. It’s exactly the same, except their idea of India is totally different” (Parker). Here, the ‘thing’ in question is women being fashioned in a particular way in the service of a specific ideologically-charged vision of India. Pahuja seems to suggest that without Prachi she would not have known that these camps existed. This production history is important both in that Pahuja and Prachi developed a relationship based on trust and that Prachi being the “heroine” was not accidental. The camps were in many ways seen through her eyes, from her point of view.

In the film, Prachi’s compelling presence and affect are highlighted from the opening moments where we see her on the terrace. Not only is Prachi the first person to speak in the movie, but she does so while the Indian national anthem is playing in the background, a detail that would only be evident to Indian audiences or those familiar with India. This is important because since Modi’s election in 2014 the national anthem, and the ways in which it is deployed in India, have become a contested site where ideas of Indian-ness are negotiated. In November 2016, the Supreme Court of India mandated that the national anthem should be played in cinemas before the screening of every movie and subsequently people were arrested for sitting during the anthem (Biswas). Although in January 2018 the Supreme Court reversed this decision (BBC), the national anthem, and Prachi’s words that reflect on India’s “glorious” past suggest that the filmmakers are setting her up as a figure who represents a very specific nationalist idea of India.

It is against this Hindu nationalist backdrop that Prachi proudly declares, “I am a Hindu”, which given her remarks on Indian history, allows the idea of India or Indian to be subsumed under the category “Hindu”. This is much like the formulation of “Hindi Hindu Hindustan” and the rhetoric analyzed in chapter three. This declarative is important in parsing Katyal’s thoughts on “doubleness” using Prachi. He speaks of the tensions between specifically “contoured” gay and lesbian subjects and the ways in which their positions, as lived experiences, are “open-ended and contested, always forming and unforming” (Katyal 1)⁵⁵. In this opening scene Prachi presents herself as a contoured “Hindu” subject, fixed and legible in a way that her declarative makes sense. But through the movie, some audiences see her queerness, her rejection of the very heteropatriarchal norms that her brand of Hinduism is invested in, as interrupting the very constitution of a fixed, uncontested, female Hindu subject that Prachi herself invokes. Furthermore, and not without a certain degree of irony, this militant right-wing camp opens a space in which Prachi can live a queer life, even if that is in contradistinction to her declaration of being a “proud Hindu”. So, her lived experiences offer up a more “open-ended and contested” position for Prachi, both as a Hindu and as a queer girl, a position that is constantly “forming and unforming” through and despite the limitations of the film as a documentary.⁵⁶ Before turning to a scene from the movie that exemplifies the “doubleness” that marks Prachi, I want to think through the implications of reading Prachi as a queer figure, especially given that the words “queer” or “lesbian” never appear in the film.

⁵⁵ While “doubleness” an inherent part of many identities, what makes it particularly important to sexualities in India, is that the doubleness, particularly that between the activist discourse and the lived experience, is situated in a complex caste-class matrix. See Vqueeram Aditya’s analysis of the use of privacy in the fight against Section 377 for a more in-depth analysis of this point (Aditya).

⁵⁶ Brian Winston argues that the ‘real difficulties of ethical documentary production’ rests ‘far more on the relationship between documentarist and participant than between the documentarist and audience’ (Winston 1). Later in this paper I show how Pahuja’s relationship enables Prachi’s queer articulation which in turn is in excess of their relationship.

To do this, I draw on an essay by Maria do Mar Castro Varela, Nikita Dhawan and Antke Engel called “Hegemony and Heteronormativity: Revisiting ‘The Political’ in Queer Politics” which is in conversation with Lisa Duggan’s work on homonormativity and Jasbir Puar’s work on homonationalism. Drawing on a careful analysis of Gramscian and post-Gramscian (particularly post-structuralist) notions of hegemony,⁵⁷ they write:

Queer politics may very well be complicit in reproducing classical hegemonic structures, yet this does not mean that counterhegemonic queer politics is impossible. Rather one may be able to imagine forms of politics that overcome simple antagonisms and that exert political power by virtue of being implicated in the very relations they seek to transform. If queer politics and hegemonic structures are complex, contradictory, permanently articulated and re-articulated processes that are interconnected, then it is essential to develop an understanding of (queer) resistance and political transformation as engagement with the irreducible simultaneity of complicity and subversion (Castro Varela, Dhawan and Engel 11).

This unpacking of what it means to do, imagine, or even, as in my case, to read queer politics is important. Several queer studies and queer media studies scholars like Schoonover and Galt, problematize “queer”, and are never quite able to define it, but still assume queerness to be inherently universal, radical and counterhegemonic (Schoonover and Galt 8-9). In contrast Castro Varela et al adopt a different perspective. They recognize that queer politics can be used to bolster traditional hegemonic structures (so queer politics could be used to bolster the heteropatriarchal nationalist structures of the Hindu right) and that any radicality needs to reckon with the inherent “doubleness” of “queer”. In his work, Katyal talks about the tension between the conceptual/theoretical and the lived. In the case of *The World Before Her* the tension is between Prachi’s concept of a Hindu and the life she lives that is foreclosed by that concept or

⁵⁷ Tanika Sarkar notes that the model the Hindu right uses is one that is an inch by inch, person by person mode of advance which brings to mind the Gramscian model of molecular hegemony (Sarkar 187).

conversely the tension between not identifying herself as a queer and the queer, non-heteronormative life that she is, as an individual, living. Castro Varela et al also foreground the tension between “complicity and subversion” which is particularly pertinent here. In Prachi’s case, the tension is between her complicity in the hegemonic ideology imposed by the Hindu right and her personal subversion of it.

The film ends with the interviewer prompting Prachi to talk about her complicity. She asks Prachi, “How do you put the two together in your head? Because you are fighting for a belief system that’s actually controlling you. Do you see what I mean?” The “two” that the interviewer is referencing is the Hindu ideology that the *Durga Vahini* espouses where a girl becomes a real “woman” by getting married and having children – i.e. reproductive heteronormativity – and Prachi’s desire to not get married, to live life as, I would argue, a queer girl.⁵⁸ Prachi looks straight at the camera, with the interviewer offscreen, and says, “Yes, I know that. I completely know that. That whatever I’m thinking, whatever I want to do, whatever decision I’m trying to make, whatever I’m thinking for my life is against the system for which I’m working”. The film cuts back to her washing dishes in her house and the first-person voiceover narration continues, “I’m going to tell these girls who come after me that you have to live this life, that you have to get married, when you are going to get married you are going to give birth to children”. The film, then, switches back to a classroom where she says “these generations is going to get good teachings from us. I know that I’m going to say it”. It is significant that the audio is juxtaposed with the visuals of her performing a traditionally female

⁵⁸ The complicity is also in the maintenance of what Narula calls “the illusion of liberation from normative gender roles” which is an inherent part of the *Durga Vahini* “where Hindu women are taught how to be independent, given fiscal aid and other resources to be independent while remaining under direct control of the Hindu man” (Narula 2018). Prachi is aware of the illusory nature of the promises of the camp. Interestingly Narula (or the website *Feminism in India* on which the article was published) chose a screenshot from this movie to go along with the article.

domestic task and the classroom where she preaches this domesticity. Then it cuts to her, alone in an auto rickshaw heading somewhere on a dark night. The voiceover ends with her saying “But being a girl, you can’t do anything. So, I have to”. The movie ends with this image of Prachi in the auto rickshaw heading somewhere. In these moments of reflection, as forced as they may be, Prachi recognizes the flaw of her declaration that opened the film. She may be a proud Hindu, but only in so far as this pride allows for her to know what she is, to do what she wants to do. She recognizes and embraces the doubleness, the contradictions within herself (the tension between the Hindu rhetoric and her lived experience, and that between her complicity in maintaining the heteropatriarchal system and her personal subversion of it). In the end she is leaving home, and returning to the camps, though it seems intentional that her destination is unknown, indeterminate. This indeterminacy, as I argue later in this chapter, puts the liberal investments of the filmmaker at the forefront.

It is worth returning to Castro Varela et al who note that recognizing the complicity and subversion inherent in both queer politics and resistance also “entails acting from positions that cannot be captured under a stable name or label or that are operating from a defined position as hegemonic, marginalized or subaltern. Accordingly, these positions should be read as relative, shifting and not mutually exclusive” (Castro Varela, Dhawan and Engel 11). Prachi is acting from one such unstable, undefinable position. She is relatively marginalized as she is a “sexual subaltern” to use Ratna Kapur’s term⁵⁹ and in terms of her class position. The film sets up a

⁵⁹ Drawing on the work of the subaltern studies collective, Ratna Kapur uses the term “sexual subaltern” to refer to “gays, lesbians and sex workers” who “are challenging dominant sexual and cultural norms”. She does go on to note that “the term sexual subaltern is intended to bring together the disparate range of sexual minorities within postcolonial India, without suggesting that it is either a homogenized or stable category. Indeed, the location and politics of the sexual subaltern in postcolonial India is mediated by class, caste and religion, producing a complex and at times even contradictory politics” (Kapur 16). While Kapur acknowledges the contradictory position that a sexual subaltern can occupy, by framing it as a dichotomy between the subaltern and the elite, her framework privileges the minoritarian identity one occupies owing to one’s sexuality in postcolonial India. By doing so she

class-based contrast between her world in Aurangabad, which is small town, traditional lower middle-class India, and the glitzy world of the Miss India pageant, which occurs in the cosmopolitan urbanscape that is Mumbai. At the same time, Prachi also occupies positions of privilege. She is a Hindu in a majoritarian Hindu country, especially one where the Hindu right has considerable influence, and she is an upper caste Hindu (evidenced by the sacred thread her father wears when he prays). At a community level this is best seen in the scene where the *Durga Vahini* graduation parade has the girls wearing saffron sashes. “Just like Miss India, Miss World”, a girl remarks offhandedly. They march through a “communally sensitive” area. The police bear witness. We hear pro-Hindu and anti-Muslim rhetoric from the girls, both through their chants as well as through their answers to an invisible interviewer and her inaudible questions. We see a Muslim man, wearing his *taqiyah topi*, his skullcap, watch from the sidelines and then walk away, gesturing with his hands that he is fed up with the rhetoric. Walking away signals his marginalized position in this situation. In contrast, Prachi’s privileges allow her access to the camps in the first place, a space that ironically allows her to live her non-heteronormative life. So, Prachi is not operating from a subject position that can be easily defined as majoritarian or minoritarian, hegemonic or counter-hegemonic.

While this tension or doubleness between complicity and subversion can be seen fairly easily within Prachi, as she is portrayed in this film, it is also one that plays out at the level of the filmmakers’ queer/not queer framing of Prachi and my queer/not queer reading of the film. A few important points to note about the former is that the film was presented by Telefilm Canada, The Rogers Group of Funds through the Theatrical Documentary Program, and Kinosmith. It

disregards the other privileges one may occupy, which in terms of everyday lived experiences, can sometimes be much more significant.

played at major film festivals in the United States, including the Tribeca film festival where it won the Best Documentary Award in 2012. It then played on PBS as a part of their POV series and was nominated for an Emmy for “Outstanding Coverage of a Current News Story — Long Form” in 2014 (Storyline Films). It is worth noting here that the Emmy was in the category of a “current news story”. It suggests that the story the film is telling is pressing at the time it was released. A “news story” also creates expectations that the film is an account of recent events. Given that the film tracks the Miss India contestants in 2011, it seems a bit factitious to call it a “current news story” in 2014. This sort of labelling elides the fact that making the documentary was a multi-year project that began in 2008. Furthermore, as will be apparent through this paper, suggesting that this is a news story ignores the fact that the filmmakers are not invisible,⁶⁰ even if they may be off-screen, and that there is an ideological thrust behind their questions as well as their modes of structuring and editing the film.

At this juncture it is important to note that the film’s divergent responses in its Indian versus North American reception were in part due to its theatrical release in India soon after Narendra Modi was elected Prime Minister in 2014. In North America, for instance, most reviewers applauded the film and saw it as way to discover who “the modern Indian woman is” (Rothe) and witness “a culture working hard to exorcise its demons” (Kohn). In both these instances India and Indianness, be it describing women or a culture, is seen as something singular and discoverable. John Anderson, of the trade magazine *Variety*, goes even further to suggest that the film is making a universal claim. He writes

⁶⁰ As Bill Nichols notes, in a documentary “voice...attests to how the filmmaker engages with the historical world in the course of making a film and how he or she conveys that engagement to us” (Nichols 50). In this case then, the film is more about Pahuja’s engagement with the world before her in 2011, rather than being a transparent account of events in Mumbai and Aurangabad. So, calling and framing *The World Before Her* as a news story does a disservice both to the audience and to the documentary form itself.

Women and India are the ostensible subjects of “The World Before Her,” but Nisha Pahuja’s docu hangs a big, fat question mark over the future of humankind itself. Will the world grow increasingly Westernized and, some would say, licentious, à la the Miss India competition chronicled in the film? Or will fundamentalist zealotry turn back the clock on individual freedom, as per the extreme Hindus who provide the film’s counterweight (Anderson)?

By extrapolating on the “future of humankind itself” Anderson exposes, perhaps unwittingly, the ideology that lies beneath the movie, and indeed his words themselves. This ideology is one that subscribes to enlightenment ideals like “modernity” and valorizes “individual freedom” and choice above all else. It is explicitly articulated in the film by Ruhi, one of the contestants in the Miss India Pageant. She is the second character we are introduced to in the film after Prachi, with a medium long shot tracking her walking in Jaipur, in a sleeveless dress. This tracking shot is important because her “modern” dress sets her apart from the women around her. As a medium close-up shot focuses on her face looking straight ahead, perhaps looking to the future, her first-person voiceover narration says, “I think of myself as a very modern young girl and I want freedom”. Anderson latches on to what Ruhi says and runs with it to extrapolate on the “future of humankind”. His use of the phrase “turn back the clock” indicates a teleology where progress is measured in terms of the amount of individual freedom one has, and the assumption is that “westernization” allows for more freedom than “fundamentalist zealotry”. Such a reading of the film clearly ignores the “individual freedom” that Prachi has access to through the camps, even as they are manifestations of “fundamentalist zealotry”.

In India, there was a broader range of responses – positive and negative, all of which had one thing in common: they focused primarily on the *Durga Vahini* camps. Mihir Fadnavis for *Firstpost.com* and Paloma Sharma for *Rediff.com* were, primarily, singing praises of the film calling it “important”, “provocative” and “a disturbing watch” (Fadnavis) (Sharma). One striking

thing is that no review of the film was published in *The Times of India* (TOI), or any of its sister publications. According to the blog *The Single Screen*, the news conglomerate “black-listed” the film because “the film takes a critical look at the ‘beauty obsession’ culture promoted by Miss India Pageant, an event TOI group has a stake in” (The Single Screen). This indicates that the film had more real-world repercussions in India unlike in North America, where it was primarily received in a voyeuristic manner as a glimpse into another culture. The real-world implications of the film are clearest in one scathing review – Meena Menon’s article titled “An Uncritical Eye” published in the left-leaning, English language Indian newspaper *The Hindu*. In the article, Menon recounts a Question and Answer Session with Nisha Pahuja where Pahuja

confessed that she was feeling a bit like Leni Riefenstahl, the infamous director of that mother of all propaganda films on the Nazis-- *Triumph of the Will*. The reason, she said, was that the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP) was planning to screen her film minus the sections on the beauty contests, as part of their motivational programmes in camps (M. Menon).

While Pahuja expresses surprise, Menon remarks that “with her uncritical eye and sympathy she evinces for all the characters she films in the *Durga Vahini*, she shouldn’t have really been surprised” (Menon). Two things of note are that it is Pahuja, at least in this account, who compares herself to Reifenstaghl, and that she is “surprised” by the VHP’s response. Menon goes on to argue that Pahuja’s “uncritical eye” and the “sympathy” that she evokes through the “character” of Prachi, led to this being a propaganda film. For me, the “sympathy” serves a different function, but I think the idea of an “uncritical eye” is useful to flag in the context of production, distribution, and reception, especially when it is intentional.⁶¹ What are the stakes for

⁶¹ In the quote from the interview with her after the Tribeca film festival, Pahuja says, “I wanted to do it in a way that was not sensationalist or wasn’t painting them in a bad light” (Despointes). This sentence is important because it highlights that she was intentionally being “neutral”, perhaps under the guise of objectivity, but while some modes

such a production to go to India, make a film like this, and present it as a news story in North America? For my purposes here, Pahuja's and the filmmakers' "uncritical eye" contributed to their complicity in reinforcing hegemonic structures through the questions they ask.

These structures are ones that valorize choice and individual freedom – values that are promoted in the neoliberalized present. They resonate with questions that Castro Varela et al ask:

Consequently, what happens when sexual individualism, self-definition and flexibility become the norm? How far is hegemony from proposing a version of heteronormativity that no longer relates to rigid binary gender norms and compulsory heterosexual desire but embraces transgender, intersexuality and a broad variety of desires (Castro Varela, Dhawan and Engel 19)?

For them, then, choice and freedom can lead, and perhaps have already led, to a hegemonic heteronormativity that does not minoritize other genders and sexualities, but "embraces" a "broad variety of desires" as long as they are funneled through an agential individual's free choice. The questions that the interviewer (I'm assuming this is Pahuja) asks, and indeed doesn't ask Prachi, play into this. For instance, at the end of the film the interviewer questions her about her complicity, a question that she doesn't ask the contestants who participate in the Miss India pageant, even though they are complicit in an ideology that seeks to "control" them too.

Furthermore, structurally, the film opens and closes with Prachi, and the "sympathy" that is evoked (that Menon is critical of) stems in no small part to the narrative being structured as Prachi's "coming out" story. From exercising at dawn on the roof of her house declaring that she is a proud Hindu, the narrative takes us through her journey and her struggles with her father who wants to see her married and have children. It culminates with her in the evening "out"

of the documentary can give the "impression of objectivity", it is my belief that objectivity is an impossible desire (Nichols 127)

alone, in an auto-rickshaw, as a “girl” who has actively rejected the heterosexual life that was being presented to her, not a Hindu, not a woman, just a (queer) “girl”. This narrative arc frames Prachi’s story as an individual’s coming out story – with “coming out” being a queer, homonormative rite of passage in the West,⁶² instead of situating her within a community of women, leaders of the Hindu right, in a space that would allow her to live a non-heteronormative life. In an essay on the “Real Women of Hindu Nationalism”, Amrita Basu looks at three leaders of the Hindu Right – Vijayraje Scindia, Uma Bharati and Sadhvi Rithambara, who “have all transgressed gender roles in both private and public domains. Unlike the vast majority of Indian women, none of these three women is economically dependent on fathers, husbands or sons; none of their identities is defined by their roles as wives and mothers” (Basu 167). The film has a clip of Uma Bharati protesting the 1996 Miss World pageant. So, even though Prachi says at the end of the film that what she wants for her life is “against the system for which I am working” – a system that defines a woman’s identity through her roles as wife and mother – in fact she is one in a long line of women who have found a space to “transgress” gender roles within this system. Particularly noteworthy is the figure of the *sadhvi* within the Hindu right. As Basu highlights, “Uma Bharati and Sadhvi Rithambara are *sanyasins* (*Sadhvi* means celibate).⁶³ Their chastity heightens their iconic status for it is deeply associated in Hinduism with notions of spirituality, purity and otherworldliness; these qualities also make these women reliable spokespersons for the future Hindu *rashtra* (nation)” (Basu 161). In the film Prachi refers to Sadhvi Pragya, another

⁶² In Pavitra Sundar’s article on Falguni Pathak she begins by highlighting the fact that in the movie *Fire* and “in liberal strands of LGBT activism, it matters not only that one is out, but that one is seen as such”. Much like the tension between Prachi’s rhetoric and her actions, Sundar highlights the dissonance between Pathak’s “apparent tomboyishness” and “the hyper-femininity and heteronormativity of the narratives in her music videos” (Sundar).

⁶³ A *sanyasin* is a woman who has taken religious vows including that of celibacy.

leader of the Hindu right, who was implicated in the 2008 Malegaon blasts⁶⁴. Prachi says, “I am thinking to trying to be the next Sadhvi Pragya Singh” and that “she’s a saint. She’s a *sadhvi*”. So, not only is Prachi clearly aware of the legacies of *sadhvis* and women before her, but she sees them as her role models. By aspiring to be the next Sadhvi Pragya Singh, she is consciously choosing to embrace a sanctioned non-(reproductive) heteronormative space – that of a celibate *sadhvi*.

If her narrative arc foregrounded this, instead of creating a clear-cut dichotomy between Prachi’s individual life and the system of Hindutva, Prachi’s story would no longer be a coming “out” story but rather a going “in” story. If the film had ended with her in the camp to highlight that she had chosen a sanctioned, systemic non-heteronormative life, instead of her in an auto-rickshaw seemingly having made an individual choice to free herself from reproductive heteropatriarchy, she might have been much less compelling and empathetic. I would like to suggest that perhaps it is this particular construction of Prachi’s narrative that made the movie appealing as propaganda for the VHP, especially in the context of a country where Narendra Modi is the Prime Minister. This argument is closely tied to a critique levelled at the film by Simon Chambers and Alpa Shah. In writing about the alternating structure of the film where scenes at the *Durga Vahini* camp are intercut with scenes from the Miss India pageant they note that:

Perhaps because of this alternating structure, a perception develops that these worlds are being portrayed as being diametrically opposed to each other. Anyone who knows about contemporary India and party politics will know, for example, that the Hindu fundamentalist Narendra Modi, running for prime minister at the time we are writing, is

⁶⁴ On September 9 2006 thirty-one people were killed and over 100 injured in two bomb blasts in Malegaon in Nashik district of Maharashtra (The Hindu Mumbai Bureau)

India's strongest proponent of Western neoliberal development, American-style presidential campaigns and the cult of the personality (Chambers and Shah 663).

This critique highlights the fact that “Western neoliberal development” and “Hindu fundamentalism”, or indeed Hindutva politics are not at odds with each other, and that one of the exemplars of this duality is Narendra Modi, who both courts foreign investments in India on the one hand and promotes religious leaders to political positions (a case in point being Yogi Adityanath as the Chief Minister of the State of Uttar Pradesh) on the other. Similarly, Prachi, as portrayed in this film, becomes a hero for the VHP, a star of their propaganda narrative. She is at once someone who espouses a vehemently pro-Hindutva rhetoric, ready at any moment to kill “whoever goes against my religion”, as well as, by the end of the film, an embodiment of the “free woman” – an icon of “Western neoliberal development”.

Thus far, I have focused on how certain elements of the narrative structure expose the filmmaker's complicity. Next, I reflect on how Pahuja's presence in the film, as invisible as it may be, and the tension it evokes, allows for the film to have its subversive moments through Prachi, and through instances of linguistic and affective excess. Excess is something that can be detected but not fully known, and in the case of the film the “different regime”, to borrow from Keeling, is one where Prachi's doubleness (here I'm using doubleness as being a “marked sexuality”) disrupts the regime where the epistemological, ontological and empirical category of an Indian, a Hindu, and perhaps even a queer girl is fixed and knowable. A key moment in this regard, is a series of scenes thirty minutes into the film. The sequence begins with a long shot of the area from a car's point of view. There's a white temple in the background, which foregrounds the Hindu-ness of the geographical space, thereby drawing our attention to, perhaps unintentionally, Prachi's privileges. Then we have a medium close-up shot of one side of Prachi's face as she's looking straight ahead. We don't know where the car she's in is coming

from or where it's going, who's in the car with her, or indeed what she's thinking. In her first-person voiceover narration, she states the most direct articulation of her queerness in the film: "I'm different from girls, I'm different from boys". As a viewer we don't even really know when, and in what context this was said. As the narration continues, a few moments later, the film cuts to her in the classroom of the camp, a medium close-up shot of Prachi looking straight at the camera and speaking, suggesting that she said this in the physical space of the *Durga Vahini*. It then cuts back to an extreme close-up of her in the car, with Prachi's voiceover narration saying that her father "grew" her "up like a boy and a girl both". Then, the interviewer, who is offscreen, but is presumably Pahuja, is heard for the first time in the film, asking Prachi in English: "What's life about for you?" Prachi's response is "the parishad" (the *Vishwa Hindu Parishad* – VHP, the right-wing Hindu "movement"). Given that this exchange is placed directly after Prachi's expression of her queerness, I am highlighting it for two reasons: the first is that it's in English, and the second is that life, and desire are framed in the idiom of "being about something". In the South Asian context Katyal notes that:

Gay and lesbian identity in the subcontinent is shot through and made more complicated and exciting by other idioms of same-sex desire which interact with them; these idioms neither confer as much definite identifiability or isolability to a people like homosexuality does, nor might they be politically mobilizable in the same way that the idiom of gay and lesbian identities are. These are widely present and often specifically social and cultural idioms, be that of habits (*aadat*, *lat*, *baazi*), of friendship (*dost*, *Saheli*, *yaar*), of play (*masti*, *baazi*, *shauk*) of love (*ishq*, *dil*, *pyaar*), through which same sex desire operates in common discourse, through which it finds shape in language and through which it is often framed, understood, appasioned and lived out to varying degrees of happiness and duress (Katyal 2).

I am not suggesting that Prachi is necessarily a lesbian, and that's really not the point either, but I think, while her "life" may be about the VHP, about being a Hindu, perhaps questions about her *aadats* (habits), her *sahelis* (friends), her *shauks* (interests) or indeed what her *dil* (heart/love) is

into,⁶⁵ might have lent itself to a different expression, and articulation of the queer manner in which she sees, interprets and inhabits the world, which is not easily “identifiable” as lesbian, homosexual or even trans. The kinds of questions being asked, the use of English in the movie foreclose certain expressions of Prachi’s “doubleness”, and reflect the filmmaker’s complicity in a wider, neoliberal hegemonic heteronormativity. At the same time, it also opens interpretative possibilities of excess for the “queer diasporic spectator”, or critic (i.e. me) to borrow Gopinath’s phrasing.⁶⁶

Interestingly, the scene then shifts to the house, and to Hindi, when Pahuja begins to question Prachi’s father about his opinions on Prachi’s wants and choices. Here, there are a few moments of linguistic ‘excess’ for the Hindi speaking audience. Hindi as a language has linguistic gender so the verbs used are conjugated based on the gender of the speaker. The conversation revolves around Prachi’s father talking about her future and her duty to leave the natal home and get married. Prachi, when she talks about leaving the home, and worrying about the future says “*jaane ke liye kuch nahin hai, jaata hai*” (there’s nothing to leaving, I’ll leave) and “*woh main dekhega*” (I’ll see to it). “*Dekhega*” and “*jaata*” are both masculine verb conjugations, a nuanced articulation of her self-expression, given that a few minutes earlier she said that she is neither a girl nor a boy. This nuance is lost in the epistemological regime created by the translation in the English subtitles. A few moments later, after Prachi’s father declares that he has no intention of allowing her to dedicate her life to the VHP, Prachi turns to the

⁶⁵ Unlike Pahuja, documentary filmmakers like Paromita Vohra provide a nuanced reading of desire and sexuality in contemporary India.

⁶⁶ In Gopinath’s work she talks about how popular Bollywood films circulate in the diaspora in “less predictable ways” that allow the “queer diasporic” spectator to “reimagine and reterritorialize ‘the homeland’ by making it the locus of queer desire and pleasure” (Gopinath 284). I am using the term here to reference my own, current positionality, as writing from outside India, and reading queerness in a text, which hasn’t been read or received as a queer one in mainstream reviews.

interviewer/camera and says in English, “Can’t we have any other topics? Because this is the thing I hate the most to talk. Please, because I get annoyed at this thing”. At this moment Prachi is pointing her finger vigorously at the interviewer as if to say that she has overstepped her mark. Prachi does not spell out exactly what the “thing” refers to. Interestingly, the English word “thing” is used to articulate in Keeling’s words the “presence of the unknowable” (Keeling 569). As audience members who have witnessed an expression of her queerness, we can sense that there is something more, something intangible, something excessive, in this scene. We feel it, but in keeping with Keeling’s framework, we can’t know it, at least not with any degree of certainty.

The camera continues to be focused on Prachi, and her reactions, even as we can hear her father ask in English “How did you ask this question?” Prachi, then, says to the interviewer, “I get literally annoyed on this topic. I don’t have a discussion with these people. I’ve told them not to talk to me”. Throughout this exchange, Prachi’s mother who is sitting next to her, closest to her, is laughing awkwardly. Prachi’s “annoyance”, spoken in English, is directed at the interviewer for probing, for asking these questions in this space, in the presence of “these people”. It is also perhaps targeted at the viewer, who wants to know her desires, when words are inadequate.

In this moment Prachi doesn’t treat her parents, particularly her father, with the deference and respect that she feels she ought to. At a later point in the film when the filmmaker asks her whether she gets angry with her father when he hits her, Prachi says that he only hits her when she is “wrong” and that in any case “he has the right. He has given birth to me knowing that I am a girl child, he let me lived”. The gratitude that she feels in this moment does not, however, translate into deference and respect when she is being probed about her future. A few scenes later, Prachi says, “Parents, they both should actually understand because they have brought me

into this world. They should not expect what they were telling yesterday [the scene in the house where Pahuja probes Prachi and her parents]. Father tells every time that he understands me more, but somewhere I feel that he's still not understood what I am". Prachi's frustration and annoyance are apparent here. What is also interesting is that Prachi is talking about what she is, and not, as Pahuja was trying to ask her, about what life is for her. Given that this is the case, the annoyance seems to stem from the fact that even though her parents have known her all her life, even though her father "grew her up like a boy" (as she says earlier in the film), her parents don't seem to understand who she is – or perhaps it's not so much understanding that she is after but rather acceptance. An acceptance that is, I think, reflected in her mother's reaction to the discussion on "annoyance". A reaction that can also be read as a tacit acknowledgement of Prachi's "difference". The scene ends with Prachi looking down and sighing, and in that moment, we or at least I, as a viewer, could feel that there was more, a subversive more that was left unsaid, and perhaps a more that can only be unknown. In this film, therefore, there was a subversive "felt presence of the unknowable" – a linguistic, affective, and cultural unknowable – that exceeds the complicity of the news story, documentary vehicle of film (Keeling 569). It is through this excess that the shades, nuances and contradictions of the "doubleness" of Prachi's sexuality and her life as a Hindu can be read.

Here I want to pause and ask what does it mean for me to read 'double', to read 'queer' into this film? For the moment, I think it means to sit in the pile of contradictions, in the tension between complicity and subversion, in the fraught kinship I feel with Prachi, and acknowledge, as Castro Varela et al so nicely put it, "dilemmas, ambivalences, and double binds are at the heart of postcolonial queer politics. Any claim to being uncontaminated by hegemony is a disavowal of postcolonial, queer complicities in the sustenance of hegemonic orders" (Castro Varela,

Dhawan and Engel 20). Through Prachi's coming out narrative, not only does the film play into the neoliberalized Hindutva logics of the Modi era, but it also foregrounds a queer complicity that helps sustain the right wing "hegemonic order" of the VHP. Yet, even this complicity is not "uncontaminated" by that which cannot be contained, that which cannot be articulated, that which cannot be known: the linguistic, translational and affective messiness that is an intimate part of the lived everyday experiences of people.

In the rest of this chapter I will look further at the intertwined forces of Hindutva and neoliberalism, queer complicity, and the messiness of everyday life through the figure of Romeo. In particular I will focus on the real-life phenomenon of anti-Romeo squads as well as the web series adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet* titled *Romil and Jugal*. As I have already mentioned in this chapter Yogi Adityanath, a religious Hindu leader, was appointed as the chief minister of Uttar Pradesh (UP) in March 2017. Upon becoming the chief minister, he created anti-Romeo squads to fulfil one of the Bhartiya Janata Party's (BJP) election campaign promises.⁶⁷ While forms of moral policing existed prior to his appointment, they were not explicitly called anti-Romeo squads. The goal of these squads was "to protect the honour of women" and per their election manifesto to "ensure the safety of college-going girls" and "check eve-teasing" (News18.com)⁶⁸. In contrast, *Romil and Jugal* is a Hinglish web-series adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet*, produced by Ekta Kapoor for Alt-Balaji, Balaji Telefilms' online streaming platform. Hinglish is a Hindi-English hybrid commonly spoken in urban areas in North India. In the ten-episode series the two leads Romil and Jugal, express both romantic love and sexual desire towards each other.⁶⁹ Balaji Telefilms has been a major household name in Indian soap operas, which have to do with

⁶⁷ The BJP is the right-wing political party that Prime Minister Narendra Modi belongs to

⁶⁸ Eve-teasing refers to the harassment of women, particularly in public places like streets and parks.

⁶⁹ The episodes range from 19 minutes to 24 minutes in length.

different kinds of love – heterosexual, parental, familial – but not queer love, so this was definitely an “alt” for them. It stars Manraj Singh, as Jugal, a Tamil-Brahman young man, who has accepted his queerness even though he hasn’t come out as gay to his parents. He falls in love with Romil, a newly arrived, super-macho, aggressively straight Punjabi played by Rajeev Siddhartha. They live in what seems like a gated community, called Eden Meadows, in an imaginary town called Colwynganj in Uttarakhand. Uttarakhand is also a state ruled by the BJP and the state next to Uttar Pradesh. The name Colwynganj evokes McLeodganj, a neighborhood in Himachal Pradesh, another state in North India. Both McLeodganj and Colwynganj represent a British-Indian hybrid, with McLeod⁷⁰ and Colwyn being British names, and *ganj* being an Indian word for neighborhood. These British-Indian hybrids resemble the Shakespeare-India hybrid that the Hinglish web-series represents. In the series Jugal directs an English-language production of *Romeo and Juliet*, in which Romil is cast as Romeo. The love sonnets of the play become a means by which the love between the two men is expressed. The play within the web series, an ode perhaps to Shakespeare’s many plays within plays, functions as a vehicle for both Indian love for Shakespeare, and forbidden love between the protagonists.

So, we have an Eden on the one hand and “eve-teasing” on the other: perhaps Romeo is Adam after all. Adam cannot be divorced from Christianity – a religion that is time and time again cast as “foreign” by right-wing groups in India even though Christianity in India is said to date back to the 6th century CE. Adam aside, what does the right-wing deployment of Romeo have in common with a seemingly progressive web series that depicts a gay romance? In post/neo colonial India, is Romeo, is Shakespeare – nothing more than a straw man, easily deployable but ultimately hollow? Perhaps we should return to Juliet’s oft-quoted lines, “What’s

⁷⁰ Sir Donald Freill McLeod was a Lieutenant General of Punjab

in a name? That which we call a rose/ By any other word would smell as sweet;” (II.2 46-47).

Can that which we call Romeo be called by any other word?

“O Romeo, Romeo, Wherefore art thou Romeo?”⁷¹

This line from Act II, Scene 2 of the play is one of the play’s most famous. Juliet’s rhetorical question echoes in an article on the anti-Romeo squads, published in the Indian Express on April 2, 2017. In “Why art thou Romeo” Jonathan Gil Harris traces how, through several vernacular and Bollywood iterations, Romeo has transformed from a romantic hero, albeit a foolish one at the start of the play, who is in a consensual relationship with Juliet, to an eve-teaser. So, why is this the case? Do we just accept that Romeo in India is no longer Shakespeare’s young tragi-romantic hero? Perhaps an empty signifier? Why isn’t it Majnun of Laila Majnun fame, or Ranjha of Heer Ranja fame, who are the eve-teasers, the embodiment of an undesirable machismo?

In the introduction to a collected volume on love in South Asia, Francesca Orsini writes about the four main “repertoires” of love that developed in South Asia and “have been active over a very long period of time”, largely syncretically, in the region (Orsini 1). These four “repertoires” are

the Sanskrit and Prakrit repertoire centering on *shringara* and *kama* and comprising epics, lyrics, plays, collections of stories and treatises, on philosophy, conduct (including sexual conduct) and medicine; the oral repertoire of folk epics, tales and songs; the Perso-Arabic repertoire centering on *ishq* and *muhabbat* comprising religious injunctions, Sufi poems and interpretations, worldly texts on ethics and conduct, poetic romances (*masnavis*), eulogies (*qasida*) and lyrics (*ghazal*), and stories of adventure and chivalry; and the repertoire of devotional bhakti poetry and philosophy. To these must be added the modern repertoires of *prem* and ‘love’ (Orsini 4)

⁷¹ (II.2.36)

So, *prem* and ‘love’ are the modern iterations or strands of love devoid of the religious, scriptural and “traditional” connotations of the earlier strands of love. Interestingly, while Orsini distinguishes between *prem* and Sanskrit repertoires of love, John T. Platts who compiled a *Dictionary of Urdu, Classical Hindi and English* in 1884, foregrounds the usage of *prem* in Sanskrit rather than in Hindi or Hindustani (the vernaculars popular in North India)⁷². He defines *prem* as “Love, affection, kindness, tender, regard, kindliness, friendship” (Platts 260). This definition, even while being from a Briton’s perspective, is symptomatic of Victorian ideals of love – tenderness and kindness over passion. Perhaps modern love and *prem*, then, is a love tied closely to the profane – the domestic sphere and matrimony – where the earlier repertoires tended to have a spiritual component too. Thus, Romeo is an embodiment of this repertoire while Ranjha and Majnu belong to the earlier ones.

In an attempt to trace a genealogy of love and *Romeo and Juliet* I turn briefly to two early translations, or *anuvads*, of the play which center the notion of ‘*prem*’ by incorporating it in their titles – Gopinath Mishra’s 1898 translation is called *Premmila* and Lala Sitaram’s, published in 1931 is titled *Prem Kasauti*. Mishra’s is particularly interesting in this regard because unlike Sitaram who Indianizes the entire play, the rest of Mishra’s play is not Indianized⁷³. For instance, while in Sitaram’s play Romeo is Ramya, Juliet is Jalaja and Verona is Varnagar, in Mishra’s play all character names remain as they are in Shakespeare’s play and the action takes place in Verona. However, in the preface to his translation Mishra notes that “*Nayak aur nayika ke naam ke karan angrezi me is natak ka naam Romeo and Juliet hai parantu maine is anuvad ka naam*

⁷² Sitaram, Gopinath and Platts were more or less contemporaries in the sense that they would have participated in the British educational infrastructure in the late nineteenth century, whether as student or teacher.

⁷³ In translation studies Mishra’s would probably be called a translation and Sitaram’s an adaptation, but I consider them both to be translations, in the words iterative sense, since both translators use the word *anuvad* to describe what they are doing.

natak ke ashay ke aadhar par prem lila rakh diya hai ki jo is ko padhne se purn sarthak pragat hoga (Because of the hero and heroine the play is called Romeo and Juliet in English, however I have named this translation *Premlila* on the basis of the play's intent and meaning which will be revealed by reading it)" (G. Mishra 2). Clearly, for Mishra, *Romeo and Juliet* by another name, does have a function, as explicatory as it may be, and this function is to foreground the notion of *prem*, with its "modern" connotations perhaps. Further, *premlila*, the title of his translation, is assonant with *ramlila* and *raslila* (traditional performances of the stories of the gods Rama and Krishna respectively). On the one hand, this problematizes the dichotomy set up between "older", "traditional" repertoires of love and the "modern", less sacred repertoire. On the other, it creates an equivalence between Shakespeare and the classic religious epics, and in doing so, grants epic status to this exploration of "modern" love.

In terms of the repertoires and the nuances of the word "love", I turn to a brief comparison of the two translations focusing on a few lines spoken by Romeo in Act I Scene 1.

Shakespeare:

Why, such is **love's** transgression.

Griefs of mine own lie heavy in my breast,

Which thou wilt propagate to have it pressed

With more of thine. This **love** that thou hast shown

Doth add more grief to too much of mine own (I.i.192-196)

Mishra:

kyun? Yeh sab mohvrt **prem** ka parinam hai. Me sweekar karta hun ki mere dukh mere hrday

me bharpurvak stith hain ki jinko tum apne dukhon se vishesh badhaya chahte ho. Mujhpar **sneh** pragat karke tum mere atyant dukh ki vishesh vridhi kar rahe ho.

(why? This is the result of despicable **prem**. I admit that my grief lies heavy in my heart which you want to especially increase with your griefs. By showing me **sneh** you have particularly added to much of my grief) (G. Mishra 13)

Sitaram:

Yahi to **prem** ki badi chaal hai. Hum jis dukh se dukhi hai woh hamara hi kamaya hua hai. Tum bhi dukhi hoge to hamare dukh ka bojh aur humko daba dega. Tumne jo yeh **prem** dikhaya isse humare **prem** ka dukh aur bhi bad gaya.

(This is **prem's** big trick. The grief that grieves us is that which we have earned. If you are aggrieved then the weight of my grief will further stifle me. This **prem** you have shown me, it has increased my **prem's** grief) (Sitaram, Prem Kasauti 11)

While there are many differences between the two translations, I want to highlight the difference between the heterosexual love Romeo feels for Rosalind and the homosocial love that Benvolio shows to Romeo. Carla Freccero suggests that work in queer theory and sexuality studies, particularly of the early modern period, has made possible a “reading of this tale as a romantic comedy gone awry, a story about a young man struggling to leave the homosocial pack whose bonds of blood (-sport) militate against the normative demands of adult heterosexual marriage” (Freccero 303).⁷⁴ By using the same word “love” to describe both emotions, Shakespeare is

⁷⁴ In *Romil and Jugal*, Jugal moves from a heterosocial friendship with Meher to a homosexual relationship with Jugal.

creating a continuum between homosocial and heterosexual love, though this may in fact be due to a dearth of vocabularies of love in the English language. Mishra uses the expansive vocabulary of love available to him in Hindi to distinguish between a “modern” romantic love – *prem* – and a platonic love – *sneh* – that is associated with friendship. Sitaram, however reverts back to using *prem* for both categories of love, even doubling down on this by including the word a third time in his rendering. Perhaps these translations indicate a tension between the large repertoires of love that exist in the region and an all-encompassing modern “love/*prem*”.

In his analysis of translations and adaptations of *Romeo and Juliet*, Harish Trivedi takes this argument further by suggesting that the western concept of love and selfhood was translated into Hindi, into Indian languages, through the translations of Shakespeare’s plays, such that Romeo and Juliet’s love was a colonizing one. In doing so, he asks the rather provocative question, “Did the English language and Western civilization penetrate so deeply into our culture as to colonize our very notion of love?” (Trivedi, *Colonizing Love: Romeo and Juliet in Modern Indian Disseminations* 75) While the West versus India dichotomy that Trivedi sets up might be too simplistic, could it be that the bastardization of Romeo (from a romantic hero to an eve-teaser) is a form of empire writing back? Perhaps it is, but it is also a way to “other”, to foreignize, certain kinds of love. The Heer Ranjhas and the Laila Majnus belong to the earlier strands of love, while “Romeo”, as a symptom of “modern” love, needs to be eliminated. In the context of the anti-Romeo squads and the fact that they have emerged in UP, against the backdrop of love-jihad and Ghar-wapsi⁷⁵, which are movements against inter-religious marriage, particularly between Hindus and Muslims, Romeo becomes a stand-in for “cross-communal

⁷⁵ Since 2009 “Far-right Hindu groups allege that “Love Jihad” is a conspiracy by Muslim groups to lure Hindu women into marriages with Muslim men and to convert them to Islam” (Khalid). Ghar Wapsi is a program of the Vishwa Hindu Parishad, a right-wing organization, and one that Adityanath and the BJP are affiliated with. The program seeks to ““reconvert” people who it claims had changed their religion from Hinduism” (PTI).

love” (Harris 80). This makes Romeo’s being reframed as an eve-teaser something to be wary of. If translating *Romeo and Juliet* into Hindi was the result of colonial education, and perhaps even indoctrination, then imbibing Romeo with new meanings could be seen as an anticolonial move, one that is decolonizing our love and ridding our culture of the English language.

While Adityanath and the BJP’s rhetoric might be about eve-teasing, newspaper reports have shown that the anti-Romeo squads often target consenting heterosexual couples who are out in public without ever asking the woman whether or not she is being harassed by the man in question. Perhaps expressing love for an individual of the opposite sex in public is modern love, is western love, is Romeowala love, because it is assumed to be without parental consent. Another kind of love that is often seen as a western import is homosexual love. Suresh Kumar Koshal, who filed a motion against Naz Foundation and others in order to overturn the Delhi High Court ruling of 2009⁷⁶ that decriminalized homosexuality, believes that India should not be swayed by acceptance of homosexuality in the West. In an interview with NPR (for an American audience) he said, “ ‘Your society is totally different,’ ‘Our society, in spite of a total onslaught by Western culture, we have a deeply religious society — and homosexuality is seen as undesirable’ ” (Frayer, Pathak and Khan). Several binaries are being set up here: you versus us, Western culture versus our culture, not deeply religious versus deeply religious, homosexuality as desirable/ or certainly not undesirable versus homosexuality as undesirable. Similarly, Yogi Adityanath, the chief minister of Uttar Pradesh who instituted the anti-Romeo squad, stated in 2013 that “homosexuality is dangerous to social morality” (K. Singh). If the anti-Romeo squads

⁷⁶ The Delhi high court ruled in favor of Naz Foundation in *Naz Foundation vs Government of NCT Delhi* thereby decriminalizing homosexuality (Section 377) in 2009. The Supreme Court overturned this decision and reinstated section 377 in 2013 ruling in favor of Suresh Kumar Koshal. In 2018, however, this ruling was overturned in *Navtej Singh Johar versus the Union of India*, thereby striking section 377 and decriminalizing homosexuality. *Romil and Jugal* was released in 2017, when homosexuality/sodomy was still illegal.

are a kind of moral police, Shakespeare the epitome of Western literature, and Romeo, his most well-known romantic hero, perhaps it is not too much of a stretch to see Romeo as also embodying homosexuality and homosexual desires from the right wing's point of view. In fact, the anti-Romeo squads have been targeting gay couples too, or indeed any men they perceive as being gay. For example, in April 2017, an "anti-Romeo" police squad in Rampur, in Uttar Pradesh, arrested an uncle and his nephew, mistakenly believing the pair to be a gay couple. They had to pay 5000 rupees each to secure their release (Benedict).

Against such a backdrop, the Eden of the web-series is a far cry from reality. The first episode was released on April 15, 2017, just two weeks after the uncle and nephew were arrested. Be that as it may, just as in *The World Before Her*, the series enacts what Akhil Katyal calls the "doubleness of sexuality", and the complicated matrix of the idioms of homosexual desire in South Asia. Much like the interplay between English and Hindi in Prachi's articulation of her desires, the two languages perform differing functions in *Romil and Jugal*. Jugal acknowledges that he is gay, using that word in English, right from episode one. However, even before Jugal acts on his desire for Romil, and before Romil admits that he is gay, the vocabulary of friendship that Romil uses stands out. He makes it a point to say "*tu mera yaar hai*", "*tu mera dost hai*", "come on bud", even when the occasion doesn't really necessitate it. Using Freud, Dinah Holtzman argues that "Bollywood gay humor is an exposure of desire between *yaars*. Romantic/sexual attraction to a *yaar* maybe deeply repressed in the unconscious but is nevertheless present, in some form, within the psyche" (Holtzman 113). While *Romil and Jugal* doesn't peddle in the kind of homophobic gay humor that Bollywood, especially masala films, are wont to do, the language of *yaari* that Romil uses could in an unconscious way express his romantic desire for Jugal. Several scholars of queerness in South Asia, like Ruth Vanita and

Shohini Ghosh, have used metaphors of continuum, or overlap, to express the ways in which homosociality intersects or is imbricated with homosexuality, especially in their reading of masculine friendships in Hindi cinema. For Vanita, for example, there is no “rigid homosocial/homosexual divide” in Hindi cinema, rather “there is a fluid continuum from friendship to eroticism” (Vanita 149). Katyal argues that the “continuum is too easy an analytic” to fully capture the interruptions, the complexity, that different situations demand (Katyal 152). Here I think it is useful to track Romil’s use of language. He does not slide from the vocabulary of friendship, of *yaari*, to that of expressing a gay identity directly or fluidly, as the image of a continuum suggests. Rather, the detour, or perhaps interruption is via a sense of unknowability, unsayability, and perhaps even untranslatability. In Episode five, a day after Romil has kissed Jugal for the first time, and indicated that he reciprocates Jugal’s feelings, Romil says, “*Khud to samajh nahin pa raha main tujhko kya samjhaun* (I can’t understand [it] myself, what can I make you understand).” In this moment, the continuum is interrupted. But, perhaps it’s the pressures of the narrative, the filminess, or maybe even of *Romeo and Juliet* where love just is, and then is clearly expressed in beautiful romantic sonnets, that Romil says, “*Saalon se mein koshish kar raha hun to understand*. I mean I’ve always known that I am, you know, different (I’ve been trying to understand for years).” Hindi fails him, and he turns to English and the vocabulary of “difference” as a placeholder, a placeholder for the untranslatable. This is similar to the work that the word “thing” does for Prachi. This clip, where Romil says, “I’ve always known that I am, you know, different” is one chosen by AltBalaji for their YouTube channel and maybe for other promotional purposes with the tagline “love is love”. “Love is love” is the slogan of LGBTQ pride across the globe that goes along with political mobilization and allows for transnational identifiability. After they have sex for the first time, in Episode 6, Romil and Jugal

are lying together under the stars and talking about the first times they knew they were gay. Romil, who in a previous episode was not able to say how he felt because he didn't have the vocabulary for it, is now able to articulate that he knew he was gay when he was 12 and he had a crush on a boy who was new to his class. He is doing something quite common in queer narratives, especially coming out narratives, i.e. retroactively giving yourself a queer birth.⁷⁷ Diana Fuss sees this as part of the tension in gay and lesbian literature, “between a view of identity as that which is always there (but has been buried under layers of cultural repression) and that which has never been socially permitted (but remains to be formed, created, or achieved)” (Fuss 100). In the case of *Romil and Jugal*, this tension is played out in the character of Romil. His hearkening back to knowing he was gay in school signals his gay identity as “that which is always there”. In episode five, the morning after Romil kisses Jugal for the first time, Romil is seen tearing posters of women that he had up on the walls of his bedroom, with an expression on his face that is half teary, and half filled with laughter – a literal manifestation of him excavating himself from the “layers of cultural repression”. At the same time, Section 377 has meant that a gay identity has not been legally or socially permitted. Yet, in Romil's case, with his unarticulatable feelings, and their unknown quality, a gay identity “remains to be formed, created or achieved”, even though, ultimately, the pressures of the plot, of the rom-com⁷⁸ genre, and perhaps of identity politics create a stable gay identity for Romil.

Does being a “gay” Romeo allow Romil to be legible to a wider transnational LGBTQ community? This may be particularly true, if one considers yet another articulation of “Romeo”,

⁷⁷ In this scene, it is Romil who asks Jugal when he first knew he was gay. Jugal replies uncertainly, “Maybe 13”. The difference between the Romil's certainty and Jugal's uncertainty is, I believe, owing to the fact that it is Romil and not Jugal whose story is a coming out narrative.

⁷⁸ The AltBalaji platform describes the series as a “young and never-seen-before rom-com version” of Romeo and Juliet (AltBalaji)

the website Romeo (formerly known as Planet Romeo). Created in 2002 Planet Romeo “is the world's most exciting network for gay and bi males, and trans people... [that seeks to] connect millions of gay guys all over the world - across borders, cultures, and languages” (Planet Romeo B.V.). While he does not analyze why they use “Romeo”, Katyal argues that the ways in which they describe their origins “sets the rhetorical stage for the projection of a worldwide ‘genuine gay community’, a phrase that the PR [Planet Romeo] team constantly uses in its promotional material whereby it proposes a deep affective resonance of the idiom of gayness among people all around the world” (Katyal 122). Perhaps this “deep affective resonance” is in no small part due to the global cultural capital of *Romeo and Juliet* as “the greatest love story of all time” (AltBalaji). Romil coming into a recognizable “gay” identity, as a gay Romeo, has access to this “genuine gay community” globally as well as nationally.⁷⁹

The utopian possibility evoked by the name Eden of a global gay community is enacted through the fact that the series does not end as the play does. In the play, the plot of Friar Lawrence to stage the young lovers’ deaths goes awry and Romeo and Juliet tragically die. While their deaths represent the epitome of star-crossed heterosexual love, it also allows for a queer reading of the play as one that “deconstructs reproductive futurism” by “killing those children in the name of whose futurity the social order of the play is organized” (Freccero 306). In the series Romil and Jugal’s plan to stage their death works, and the series ends with both sets of parents accepting their children’s sexuality, and the narrator says that Romil and Jugal have moved to New Zealand and have gotten married. One of the last scenes in the series is a wedding celebration in Colwynganj. In this instance, the protagonist’s death, a form of queer

⁷⁹ During his research in 2010, Akhil Katyal found that there were “about 50,000 Indian user profiles hosted on that website” (Katyal 122). Given that access to the internet has grown in the last decade, the number must be substantially more by now.

death, may have been expected from both Shakespeare purists looking for a “faithful” adaptation as well as the transnational LGBTQ community. Given that the show was produced before Section 377 was overturned, a tragic ending would have played into teleological, homonationalist⁸⁰ progressive narratives i.e. India needs to catch up with the west in terms of LGBTQ rights. Perhaps the ending subverts this, perhaps it doesn’t. The gay men get to live, and they get parental consent and family approval. However, they have no option but to build their lives away from India, whether with each other or alone.⁸¹ Their mobility is a marker of their class privilege, since a rural gay Romeo and Juliet might more likely have ended in tragedy.⁸² A queer Eden is impossible in India. In the end, Romil and Jugal and the anti-Romeo squads may not be that dissimilar in their outlook, even if one is in a progressive garb. Both displace a Romeowala love, especially a gay Romeowala love, from India to the West – returning the great British import along with it, the *prem*, the *sneh* forgotten. Perhaps, ‘prem’ is not the same as ‘love’ after all, even if they are both modern constructs.

So, what do these *anuvads* – the anti-Romeo squads, Romil and Jugal, Mishra and Sitaram’s versions, and indeed theories of translating Shakespeare – have in common? If we see them as part of a masala genealogy, with the keyword being masala, and as explanatory retellings, what are these (re)iterations seeking to explain? Perhaps it is authenticity – an authentic Indian relationship, a legible gay identity, or even an authentic Shakespeare, infinitely translatable with its universal qualities. But the masala shades of the iterations have shown that

⁸⁰ Jasbir Puar developed the framework of homonationalism “for understanding the complexities of how “acceptance” and “tolerance” for gay and lesbian subjects have become a barometer by which the right to and capacity for national sovereignty is evaluated” (Puar 336).

⁸¹ The series ends with a phone call suggesting that the two are getting a divorce. While this may not be a “happy ending” it is not really a tragedy either, in the way their deaths would have been.

⁸² One such instance is that of two women, Swapna and Sucheta, who committed suicide in rural West Bengal. This has been “chronicled” in the filmmaker Debalina’s documentary ‘...Ebang Bewarish’. Interestingly, an article written about this film is titled “Lovestruck Juliet” (Bag)

nothing is quite so *straightforward*, even when the pressures of the fact that it is *Romeo and Juliet* might make it seem *straight-laced*. *Romeo and Juliet*, or the idea of *Romeo and Juliet*, is so reified that its construction as a stable, authentic source text propels these masala iterations.

Carla Freccero suggests that

the greatest irony of all may reside, finally, in the work of memorialization and perpetuity performed not by the thematics of the play, but by its endurance as literature. A condition of the drive's representation, of the *frisson* generated in *Romeo and Juliet*'s death-driving readers, of the text's seemingly infernal ability to breed new iterations of the myth of heterosexual love – as well as counter-narratives to this myth – is its monumentalization as literature. (Freccero 307)

Romeo and Juliet as a memorial to a stable, easily definable, easily articulatable kind of love. A memorial – that which celebrates something that no longer exists. *Romeo and Juliet* as a monument dedicated to a myth, something solid to represent that which cannot be contained – the masala of Shakespeare, the unknowability of queer excess.

Epilogue: In Search for Portia

“the archive always holds a problem for translation” (Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression* 90)

This dissertation reflects a journey that culminates, for the moment, with self-isolation during a pandemic, thinking about new ways to forge solidarities, to build, what some might call, translational intimacies or even trans*anuvading intimacies. Even as we isolate ourselves, the need to communicate becomes stronger and the global nature of the pandemic urges us to think across and beyond individual languages. At the same time 2020 has also seen discussions on the Citizenship Amendment Act and the National Register of Citizens and the daily protests against these measures in several cities in India. There are numerous parallels between the contexts I discussed in chapters three and four, and India today. Take, for example, the issue of Hindi as a national language and the slogan of “Hindi, Hindu, Hindustan”. On September 13, 2019, the Home Minister of India Amit Shah, tweeted the following to mark the occasion of Hindi Diwas (Hindi Day). He wrote, “Bharat vibhinn bhashaon ka desh hai aur har bhasha ka apna mahatva hai parantu pure desh ki ek bhasha hona atyant aavashyak hai jo Vishwa me bharat ki pahchan bane. Aaj desh ko ekta ki dor me bandhne ka kaam agar koi ek bhasha kar sakti hai to vo sarvadhik bole jaane vali Hindi bhasha hi hai.” (India is a country of many languages and each language has its own significance however it is extremely essential for the entire country to have one language which can become its identity globally. If there is a language today which can do the work of tying the country in the string of unity, it is the most spoken language – Hindi) (Chakraborty). Even though he later walked this statement back, key here is the idea that a language can help project a unified identity that is globally legible and recognized.

Amid these parallels I have been reflecting on my subject and disciplinary position and the idea of accountability. Here, I find Radhakrishnan's phrasing of "participation anxiety" really helpful. In this epilogue, I want to meditate on what this phrase means to mean using the example of an archival journey to search for a woman translator of Shakespeare. I want to end with this, because much of this dissertation has been about parsing male voices and subject positions, and I did not want them to have the last word, so to speak. I do this with the belief that translation was integral to the constitution of the colonial archive and therefore, following on from Derrida, a journey in a colonial archive is at once a journey in translation and through translation.. At one level, I am telling the archival story of a particular translation by a woman to foreground the gendered nature of the archive it lays bare. I hope to attend to the anxieties manifested by the processes of archiving on the one hand, and archival research on the other especially in relation to the role played in the construction of disciplinary frameworks, particularly one like South Asian studies. At another level I am contending with the question of accountability, as it relates to one's subject and disciplinary position and the political backdrop from which the archival journey and the interpretation cannot be separated. I am referring to the resurgence of Hindu nationalism, and specifically the renewed efforts to establish Hindi as a national language. These efforts parallel the efforts seen in the nineteenth century to develop Hindi as a national language, and as such this resurgence is part of what motivates me to undertake this archival research.

I begin this archival journey with a description of my "archival space"⁸³ in terms of the physical location and the archival trail between the locations but also of archival space or field

⁸³ For Ann Laura Stoler, "Describing this archival space is not an attempt to define its outer limits, all that it includes and excludes and all that I have left out. My interest is not in the finite boundaries of the official state

amid which this translation lies. A central location, rather predictably for South Asian studies, is the British library, specifically the Asian and African studies reading room, which houses the India Office Records. A visit to the British library is almost like a rite of passage, a form of participation in a mythical collective project perhaps. It was here that I had found Hindi translations of Shakespeare's plays from the late nineteenth century through the twentieth century. I narrowed my focus to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and found translations by male writers like Bharatendu Harishchandra, Lala Sitaram, Seth Govind Das and countless others. It seemed like nearly every male civil servant, with a reasonable command of English was translating Shakespeare's plays into the vernaculars, be they Hindi, Bengali Tamil or Marathi. It really was an all-boys club. It made me wonder, whether an Indian woman, translating Shakespeare, at that time, was as impossible as Virginia Woolf's construction of Shakespeare's sister, and why this might be the case. In chapter 3 of *A Room of One's Own* Woolf imagines what would have happened if Shakespeare had had a sister, Judith Shakespeare, who was also a "genius". I won't quote this portion in its entirety but suffice it to say that without having access to a grammar school like her brother, she is forced to run away to London, sexually exploited by actors there (though Woolf doesn't use these exact words) she kills herself and fades into obscurity. Woolf goes on to say that

it is unthinkable that any woman in Shakespeare's day should have had Shakespeare's genius. For genius like Shakespeare's is not born among laboring, uneducated servile people. ... Yet genius of a sort must have existed among women as it must have existed among working classes... But certainly it never got itself onto paper. When, however, one hears of a witch being ducked, of a woman possessed by devils, of a wise woman selling herbs, or even of a very remarkable man who had a mother, then I think we are on the track of a lost novelist, a suppressed poet... I would venture to guess that Anon, who

archives but in their surplus production, what defines their interior ridges and porous seams, what closures are transgressed by unanticipated exposition and writerly forms." (Stoler 14)

wrote so many poems without signing them was a woman (Woolf 56-57)

Woolf's key points include highlighting the material resources that Shakespeare needed and suggesting that women's knowledges or creative outputs weren't always recognized within a male epistemological framework. Such an epistemological framework also includes processes of publishing and archiving. It made me also wonder whether there were any anonymous translations that may have been translated by women. Imagine my surprise, therefore, when I did find archival evidence that a woman had translated at least one of Shakespeare's plays. This is in some senses unsurprising because unlike the early modern period that Virginia Woolf is talking about the nineteenth century was a time that saw increased opportunities for education for women in both India and England. Here, I draw on Shefali Chandra's work who argues that,

Far from widening the reach of English to those castes and classes historically excluded from learning, British India's English-educated subjects taught English to their own women.... Bringing English to their wives and daughters, British India's English educated men successfully secured the language of power within their caste and class location; they turned English toward consolidating, even fixing, the standards of caste, sexuality and prohibition" (Chandra 5).

So, English education, which prominently included the study of literature as Gauri Viswanathan and others have shown, was used to consolidate caste-based gendered norms. In this epilogue, I try to piece together the persona of the one exception I found a woman in a male translational space through my archival journey. Second, using an example from the translated text, I read the translation as a part of the project to consolidate "the standards of caste, sexuality and prohibition".

The archival journey begins with a folio published in 1890 and archived in the British Library of "interesting and important donation from the Indian government" to the Shakespeare Memorial Library and includes "a complete list of the works, their titles, languages and

translators”. This document catalogues a list of books that were sent by the Government of India to the Shakespeare Memorial library “in a kindly and generous spirit of appreciation and in response to a letter addressed to Lord Dufferin as Viceroy of India, November 1887 by the late librarian (Mr. Hawley)”. The folio goes on to add, “the Government of India have been at considerable pains to collect all the translations from Shakespeare’s works published in our vast dependency and have transmitted them as a donation to the Shakespeare memorial theatre. They were received last week and represent all the translations that now exist in the different Indian languages”. A key word here is “all” which reflects the comprehensive nature of the list. This document also shows that the Government of India and the British enterprise was actively interested in translation, not just in terms of the Orientalist project of translating ancient Sanskrit texts⁸⁴, but also in terms of collecting and archiving vernacular translations of English texts. The list is organized by province and lists the plays, the language and in some cases the translator’s name and the translated title. Amid the various names of men, and the translations that lack a translator (Woolf’s remarks on anon come to mind), lies an outlier – a Miss Arya Nundy whose translation of *Merchant of Venice*, *Venice Nagar ka Beopari*, is listed under the North-Western Provinces and Oudh section.

This document led me to my second archival location – the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust library which now houses the collection of the erstwhile Shakespeare memorial library. Housed on the first floor above Shakespeare’s Birthplace museum, this archive is located in the mecca of bardolatry. The library has nine Hindi translations of works by Shakespeare. This includes the translation of *Merchant of Venice* by Mary Nundy.

⁸⁴ See for instance Tejaswini Niranjana’s work.

So, who was this woman? Arya Nundy or Mary Nundy? Does her name even matter? As Durba Ghosh notes, “Naming is a social practice that brings people into a particular community, while making distinctions between individuals of different names. Naming often reflects one’s kinship group, however that group is structured or located among other groups. At the level of an individual, a name is a common way of identifying and understanding a person’s subjectivity” (Ghosh 300). The text itself just lists her name as “Arya” and in doing so doesn’t connect her to her kinship group or a particular community. If we think of the politics of naming though, every name has some significance. Etymologically, the word “arya”, with its roots in Sanskrit has several meanings. John T Platts who compiled a dictionary of Urdu and Classical Hindi in 1884, primarily for British audience, notes that it means “an Aryan” (Platts 42). I wanted to include it here for two reasons. The first is that it was compiled at the same time as our Miss Arya Nundy lived. The second is that Arya, the person, had contact with Orientalists of the same ilk as John Platts. Edwin Arnold, the nineteenth century poet and journalist, and the author of *The Light of Asia*, wrote a preface to her translation. The Rajpal Hindi Shabdkosh has several meanings of the word. The first, especially when the word is used as an adjective is “uttam, shreshth” meaning someone noble or of a high order. A secondary definition is tied to religion and caste which reads, “unaryon evam shudron se bhinn ek sabhya jati” (a civilized caste that is different or set apart from non-Aryans and Shudras) (Bahri 90). These definitions are key because of the choice she made to be known only as “Arya” – some catalogue entries view this as a pseudonym and if this was the case, her choice of the word becomes even more significant owing to the fact that Aryanism was a core tenet of the emergent nationalism in the nineteenth century. As Romila Thapar notes, the theory of the Aryan race in India which was bolstered by the work of philologists and Indologists like Max Mueller,

coincided with the emergence of nationalism in the late nineteenth century in India, articulated mainly by the middle class, which was drawn from the upper caste and was seeking both legitimacy and an identity from the past. Origins therefore became crucial. To legitimize the status of this middle class, its superior Aryan origins and lineal descent was emphasized. It was assumed that only the upper caste Hindu could claim Aryan ancestry. This effectively excluded not only the lower castes but also the non-Hindus, even those of some social standing. Aryanism therefore became an exclusive status. In the dialogue between the early nationalists and the colonial power, a theory of common origins strengthening a possible link between the colonizers and the Indian elite came in very useful. (Thapar 9)

For a woman translating Shakespeare, where Shakespeare was intimately connected to colonial power, the choice of “arya” as a pseudonym seems to further enmesh her in within what Thapar calls “the dialogue between the early nationalists and the colonial power”. It also locates her as an upper caste Hindu and suggests that she was invested in a certain kind of Hinduism. The connection to Aryan Hinduism might seem like a stretch but the late nineteenth century was a time when there were growing Hindu religious movements particularly those connecting Hindi to Hinduism, and not just any Hinduism but a particular brand of Hinduism.

As I have shown in chapter three, an important figure in this regard is Bharatendu Harishchandra and the impact of this ideology can be seen in his translation of Merchant of Venice, Durlabh Bandhu. Here I want to highlight a fact that I did not in chapter three: this translation, which has been ascribed to Harishchandra was also published in 1888. Without archival traces and since Harishchandra died in 1885, it is impossible to know whether or not this translation was finished or published in his lifetime. We cannot know whether Arya had read Harishchandra’s translation or not, though she must have been familiar with Harishchandra and his work in general. This can be surmised because in her preface she acknowledges the support of “Professor Pandit Sitala Prasad Tripathi of the Benares Sanskrit College, and to Surya Prasad

Misra, Sahityopadhyaya⁸⁵ of Benares College”. The Benares connection is even greater when one considers that this translation was published by the Amar Press in Benares. Arya would go on to publish at least two other books with Amar Press – a textbook for Hindi and one for Sanskrit. Both these are published in conjunction with her colleague from Benares – Surya Prasad Misra.

Interestingly in these textbooks it is Arya’s name that is foregrounded along with the description “Author of Shakespeare’s Merchant of Venice into Hindi Prose” with “Shakespeare’s Merchant of Venice” being printed in larger font and in bold type. Surya Prasad Misra is never named except as the author of “Paninaya Tatvadarpan”. It is as though an engagement with Shakespeare and a “successful” translation gave Arya the cultural capital and cache to publish other books. Regardless, Arya’s collaboration with Amar Press and Surya Prasad Misra suggests at least some familiarity with the Benares literary scene, of which Harishchandra was the most prominent litterateur. It seems reasonable to assume that she would have had some exposure to, if not direct involvement with the cultural milieu and politics of the movement to make Hindi a national language. In fact, her textbook and her translation were likely part of the circuits involved in this movement. The epigraph from Arya Patrika which praises Arya’s translation suggests this. This quote was selected by Amar Press and published as part of the back matter in Arya’s Hindi textbook. The reviewer at Arya Patrika believes that “such translations... will aid materially in a wide diffusion of the Hindi language in our country”. The claim is not about Shakespeare or a love of the bard, but rather about the language. Shakespeare is a vehicle that is being used to spread the language.

⁸⁵ Literary educator

Here it feels imperative to return to Anjali Arondekar's remarks that I ended chapter three with:

These (new) reading practices emerge not against the grain of archival work, but instead from within the archive's own productions. Yet the imperative is not about founding presence, but rather about *confounding* our relationship to how and why we do archival work. The critical task lies in crafting an archival approach that articulates against the guarantee of recovery. The perspective I elaborate thus does not end with an argument for methodological reflexivity. It derives more importantly from an urgent need to complicate the very stakes of our archival mediations, especially given their mobilizations within a shifting (and often reactionary) language of political exigency. The continued efforts of the Hindu Right in India and the political Right in the United States, to mobilize the idea of the archive towards sectarian ends (most recently through the rewriting of textbooks) is a dangerous instantiation of the very logic I am referring to. (Arondekar 4-5)

Arondekar's comments urge me to reflect on the stakes of my work. Am I engaging in an act of recovery as I try to piece together an image of Arya? As I mentioned in chapter three, there are two competing impulses here – to not participate in the very logics I am trying to unearth by resisting the “guarantee of recovery” versus the need to participate in disciplinary conventions that require “evidence”, be it archival, textual or paratextual. This tension is, in some ways, participation anxiety manifest. This anxiety also takes the form of wondering whether and to what extent does it make sense to read the past through the eyes of the present? Is this different from mobilizing the archive towards sectarian ends as the right wing is wont to do? I believe that the political aims and ends of the project of recovery do matter, and a big part of the politics of my project is to weave together connections between movements in the nineteenth century and those in our contemporary moment. How and where does resisting the “guarantee of recovery” fit into this? Perhaps it also has to do with resisting the neatly tied narrative and sitting with the complexities of both the nineteenth century and the present.

Sitting with this anxiety, I return to my semblance of an archive. If we only had the translation, all we would know is that this was a young woman who, though based in Jabalpur (that is the place mentioned in Arya's preface), had some connection with Benares. But the archival document I mentioned before describes her as Miss Arya Nundy. The surname Nandy locates her within a Bengali family, of one of the Kayastha clans. Given that she was writing from Jabalpur, now in Madhya Pradesh, it seems very likely that her father was one of "British India's English educated subjects" likely to have been in one of the administrative services. Given that Bengali had a thriving literary scene, Arya's choice to publish in Hindi is striking. Considering the Hindi language learning textbooks Arya also wrote, she seems invested in the growth and development of Hindi as a language. Added to this is the fact that she ends the Preface to her translation thus: "I confess being utterly incapable of doing justice to so famous a play of Shakespeare as that of the Merchant of Venice; but should this Translation prove useful to Hindu students it will amply repay me for my feeble attempt" (Nundy ii). Apart from the bardolatry evidenced here, I want to draw our attention to the fact that she explicitly talks about "Hindu" students and not students of Hindi.

An educated Hindu woman promoting Hindi as a national language. The story seems so simple. And indeed, if we turn to the translation itself, we find more evidence to support this claim. Unlike Harishchandra who Indianizes the *Merchant of Venice* and transposes the Christian context to a Hindu one, Arya's translation is more literal (and I use this term without any judgmental connotation) in that the world depicted is a Christian one with Shylock being an outsider because he is Jewish. I want to posit however, that this translation nonetheless appeals to certain Hindu values and works to consolidate them, even if these processes are not as overt as in Harishchandra's translation. I want to end with a short example from Act 3, Scene 2 of

Merchant of Venice after Bassanio chooses the correct casket and “wins” Portia’s “hand in marriage”. In this speech Portia seems to surrender herself and her possessions to Bassanio, before the tone shifts and she challenges Bassanio to be loyal to her with the gift of a ring.

Merchant of Venice	Arya’s translation	My translation of Arya’s translation
PORTIA You see me, Lord Bassanio, where I stand, Such as I am. Though for myself alone I would not be ambitious in my wish To wish myself much better, yet for you I would be trebled twenty times myself, A thousand times more fair, ten thousand times More rich, that only to stand high in your account I might in virtues, beauties, livings, friends, Exceed account. But the full sum of me Is sum of something, which, to term in gross, Is an unlesioned girl, unschooled, unpracticed; Happy in this, she is not yet so old But she may learn; happier than this, She is not bred so dull but she can learn; Happiest of all, is that her gentle spirit Commits itself to yours to be directed As from her lord, her governor, her king. Myself, and what is mine, to	Portia He swami Bassanio, aap meri dasha to dekhte hain yadi main badhne ke liye sakanksha na hou, tathapi aap ke liye teenguna beesbar badhun, sundartai me sahasrabaar adhik, dhan me das sahasrabaar meri ichcha hai ki main aaphise dharm, sundartai, aur mitra mein badhkar gini jaun partanu mera sab – kuch nahin hai; sadharan riti se to main apathit, agya ladki hun bhala hai ki main adhik avastha ki nahin ho gayi hun ki shikshit na ho sakun; aur bhi bhala hai	Portia Oh swami Bassanio you look at me in my state if I don’t have ambition for myself to grow, however for you I will grow treble twenty times, a thousand times more beautiful, ten thousand times more in wealth/riches I hope that I am counted greater in dharm, beauty, and friends by you but my everything – is nothing; according to ordinary norms I am an unschooled, unlearned girl it is fortunate that I am not so old as to not be able to learn; even more fortunately that I

you and yours Is now converted. But now I was the lord Of this fair mansion, master of my servants, Queen o'er myself; and even now, but now, This house, these servants, and this same myself Are yours, my lord's. I give them with this ring, 「 <i>Handing him a ring.</i> ㄱ Which, when you part from, lose, or give away, Let it presage the ruin of your love, And be my vantage to exclaim on you. (III.ii.153-178)	ki aisi agya nahin hun ki padh na sakun; aur sab se bhala hai ki main apne hi ko aap ke adheen karti hun ki aap swami, adhipati aur Pradhanadhipati ke saman mujh ko satmarg me chalaven. Main aur jo mera hai vah sab ab aap ka aur aap ke kul ka hua; abhi to main is Manohar rajbhavan, sevakon aur man ki swamini thi! He mere swami ab yah rajbhavan, ye sevaken aur vahi main aap ki ho gayi hun. Yeh anguliyak ke saath me apna sarvakh aap ko deti hun yadi aap is se rahit hon va kisi ko de deven to vahi aapka aprem mere pratham ulhane ka karan pragat karega. (Nundy 47)	am not so unlearned that I cannot study; and most fortunate of all is that I give myself over to you so that you can like a swami, adhipati and pradhanadhipati lead me on the satmarg. Me and all that is mine is yours and your kuls. Now I was the swamini of this beautiful palace, servants and mind. Oh my Swami now this palace, these servants and myself is yours. With this ring I give you my all if you separated from it or give it so someone then it your lack of love will be the reason that my first complaint will be revealed.
--	--	---

There are two aspects of this translation I want to foreground. First is that she translates “Lord” as “Swami”. The Rajpal dictionary defines “swami” as “malik” (owner), “ghar ka pradhan vyakti” (head of household), “pati, shauhar” (husband), “sadhu, sanyasi” (holy man) and “Ishwar, prabhu” (god). Looking at the various meanings of the word, several senses of Lord translate as Swami, however the connotation of a Hindu religious man cannot be ignored.

The second aspect of the translation I want to highlight is the sentence “Happiest of all, is that her gentle spirit/ Commits itself to yours to be directed /As from her lord, her governor, her king.” It is translated as “aur sab se bhala hai ki main apnehi ko aap ke adheen karti hun ki aap swami, adhipati aur pradhanadhipati ke saman mujh ko satmarg me chalaven.” And best of all I give myself over to you so you can like a swami, an adhipati (lord) and a pradhanadhipati (headmaster) set me on the “satmarg” (path of truth?). While what she means as “satmarg” cannot be recovered, the word does important work in Hinduizing a supposedly Christian context.

The project of recovery could end here – a coherent narrative in place. However, this is not quite the full story. The catalogue entry at the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust throws a wrench in this by naming her Mary Nundy. Who gave her the name Mary? Had she been Baptized? What was her relationship to Christianity and how does that fit with the narrative that other aspects of the archive point towards? Did an archivist somewhere not know her name and instead of listing her pseudonym as the first name, give her the rather generic sounding name, Mary? These are questions that remain unanswered, a possibility I need to reckon with in keeping with the spirit to not assume that archival recovery is guaranteed. While discussing the case of native colonial companions Durba Ghosh notes that

Renaming a local woman with a European or Christian name was a kind of archival death that for the modern-day researcher obscures the history of who she was, where she came from, what kind of status she enjoyed in local society, and how her status changed when she cohabited with or married a European man. The renaming that a native woman experienced at the hands of the man she cohabited with or in the church involved *unnaming* her, perhaps severing some of her attachments from the community in which she originated or erasing a prior set of identifications. For women who named themselves, taking names representative of different cultural, social, and religious affiliations was a way of marking overlapping cultural locations and multiple, shifting subjectivities, but these acts of self-naming were often also shaped by demands placed by community and governmental structures. Naming practices were a crucial mechanism through which questions of subjectivity were being constantly constructed, negotiated, and managed by native women and by colonial institutions that made subjects legible, or illegible, as was the case here (Ghosh 315-316).

While Ghosh is talking about a specific context there are a few ways in which her remarks bear upon my archival journey. Just as the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust calls her Mary, the folio in the British library lists her as “Miss Arya Nundy” with the Miss signaling an unmarried state. Are these archival crumbs shedding light on the history of who she was, where she came from, what kind of status she enjoyed, or are they obscuring these? Rather than staging a kind of archival death do these moments stage an archival haunting leaving traces that give us a false sense of recovery? Her act of self-naming, after all, did not involve Mary, Nundy or even Miss. It was just Arya. Was this a way to assert a unified subject position, to self-consciously obscure “overlapping cultural locations and multiple, shifting subjectivities”? She is making herself legible in one way and illegible in others. Perhaps this is the *trouble de l’archive* and the *mal d’archive* to return to Derrida, or rather the anxiety that accompanies the archive fever. As Derrida notes in Eric Prenowitz’s English translation

Nothing is less reliable, nothing is less clear today than the word “archive.” And not only because of the two orders of *arkhe* we distinguished at the beginning. Nothing is more troubled and more troubling. The trouble with what is troubling here is undoubtedly what troubles and muddles our vision (as they say in French), what inhibits sight and knowledge, but also the trouble of troubled and troubling affairs (as they also say in French), the trouble of secrets, of plots, of clandestineness, of half-private, half-public

conjunctions, always at the unstable limit between public and private, between the family, the society, and the State, between family and an intimacy even more private than the family, between oneself and oneself. I thus name the *trouble*, or what is called in English the “trouble,” of these visions and of these affairs in a French idiom that is again untranslatable, to recall at least that the archive always holds a problem for translation. With an irreplaceable singularity of a document to interpret, to repeat, to reproduce, but each time in its original uniqueness, an archive ought to be idiomatic, and thus at once offered and unavailable for translation, open to and shielded from technical iteration and reproduction. (Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression* 90)

Arya’s (absent) archive and murky or perhaps troubled presence in a male translational field are at once “offered and unavailable” for my translational processes, for my comprehension of her history, and her role in a larger more contentious history. Her self-fashioning of a public persona along with the other archival traces push me, the modern-day researcher, to the unstable and troubling limits that Derrida describes, to and envelop me with the (participation) anxieties that the archive fever lays bare.

It seems apt to end with Derrida whose presence loomed large in chapter one, because it seems like this epilogue is in many ways an epilogue of chapter three, or rather it is that the specter of chapter three haunts the rest of this dissertation. In part, it is because in doing archival work, I unearthed an archive that is much larger than what could be accommodated into one chapter, an excess that lends itself to future projects and to spectral rewritings, revisions, anuvads, trans*anuvads.

Bibliography

- Abdel-Jaouad, Hédi. "Derrida's Algerian Anamnesis; or Autobiography in the Language of the Other." *Remembering Africa*. Ed. Elisabeth Mudimbe-Boyi. Porstmouth: Heinemann, 2002. 245-279.
- Aditya, Vqueeram. "In the Fight Against 377, Queer Politics Needs to Move Beyond Privacy." 9 July 2018. 11 July 2018. <<https://thewire.in/lgbtqia/in-the-fight-against-377-queer-politics-needs-to-move-beyond-privacy>>.
- AltBalaji. *Romil and Jugal: More Details*. 2019. 2 February 2019. <<https://altbalaji.com/show/129>>.
- Ambedkar, B. R. *Annihilation of Caste with A Reply to Mahatma Gandhi*. Bombay: Bharat Bhushan Press, 1937.
- Anand, Mulk Raj. *Caliban and Gandhi: letters to "Bapu" from Bombay*. New Delhi: Arnold Publishers, 1991. Print.
- Anderson, John. "The World Before Her." 1 May 2012. 14 May 2018. <<http://variety.com/2012/film/markets-festivals/the-world-before-her-1117947482/>>.
- Arondekar, Anjali. *For the Record: On Sexuality and the Colonial Archive in India*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2009.
- Bag, Shamik. "The Love Issue: Lovestruck Juliet." 8 February 2014. 2 February 2019. <<https://www.livemint.com/Leisure/H8xiB49bsya0wbmufESgzJ/The-Love-Issue--Love-struck-Juliet.html>>.
- Bahri, Hardev. *Rajpal Hindi Shabdkosh*. 15th Edition. Delhi: Rajpal and Sons, 2000.

- Bartscht, Waltraud. "From On The Different Methods of Translation." *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992. 36-54.
- Bassnett, Susan and Harish Trivedi. "Introduction." *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. 1-18.
- Basu, Amrita. "Feminism Inverted: The Gendered Imagery and Real Women of Hindu Nationalism." *Women and the Hindu Right: A Collection of Essays*. Ed. Tanika Sarkar and Urvashi Butalia. New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1995. 158-180.
- BBC. "India national anthem no longer compulsory in cinemas." 9 January 2018. 14 May 2018. <<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-42618830>>.
- Beames, John. *Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India: Vol 1*. London: Trübner and Co, 1872.
- Benedict, R.S. "India Police Arrest Uncle and Nephew After Mistaking Them for a Gay Couple." 3 April 2017. 2 February 2019. <<https://hornet.com/stories/anti-romeo-squad-gay-uncle-nephew/>>.
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." *Theories of Translation: An anthology of essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Trans. Harry Zohn. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992. 71-82.
- Bernofsky, Susan. "On Different Methods of Translating." *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 2nd Edition. New York and London: Routledge, 2004. 43-63.
- Biswas, Soutik. "Why are Indians being arrested for sitting during the national anthem? ." 14 December 2016. 14 May 2018. <<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-38298821>>.

Boas, Frederick S. *Shakespeare and the Universities and Other Studies in Elizabethan Drama*.

Folcroft, PA. : The Folcroft Press, 1969 [1903]. Print.

Castro Varela, Maria do Mar, Nikita Dhawan and Antke Engel. "Hegemony and

Heteronormativity: Revisiting 'The Political' in Queer Politics." *Hegemony and*

Heteronormativity: Revisiting 'The Political' in Queer Politics. Ed. Maria do Mar Castro

Varela, Nikita Dhawan and Antke Engel. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011. 1-24.

Chakraborty, Abhishek. "On Hindi Diwas, Amit Shah Appeals For Hindi As India's National

Language." 14 September 2019. *NDTV*. 29 February 2020. <<https://www.ndtv.com/india-news/hindi-diwas-2019-home-minister-amit-shahs-appeal-for-india-to-make-hindi-a-national-language-2100779>>.

Chambers, Simon and Alpa Shah. "The World Before Her." *Pacific Affairs* 87.4 (2014): 662-664.

Chandra, Shefali. *The Sexual Life of English: Languages of Caste and Desire in Colonial India*.

Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2012.

Chesterman, Andrew. *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory* .

Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997.

Chow, Rey. *Not Like a Native Speaker: On Language as a Postcolonial Experience*. New

York: Columbia University Press, 2014.

Conley, Verena. "Living in Translation." *Profession* (2010): 18-24.

Dalmia, Vasudha. *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions: Bhāratendu Hariśchandra and*

Nineteenth-Century Banaras. Ranikhet: Permanent Black, 2017 [1997].

- Dalmia, Vasudha. "Urban Theatre and the Turn towards 'Folk'." *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Indian Culture*. Ed. Vasudha Dalmia and Rashmi Sadana. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 206-225.
- Damrosch, David and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. "Comparative Literature/ World Literature: A Discussion with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and David Damrosch." *Comparative Literature Studies* (2011): 455-485. print.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Trans. Eric Prenowitz. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- . *Le monolinguisme de l'autre*. Paris: Galilee, 1996. Print.
- . *Monolingualism of the Other; or, The Prosthesis of Origin*. Trans. Patrick Mensah. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Desai, Vasant Shantaram. "Years of Glory (1880 -1920)." *The Marathi Theatre: 1843 to 1960*. Bombay: Popular Book Depot, 1961. 9-40.
- Despointes, Leopoldine Huyghues. "Director Nisha Pahuja on The World Before Her." 14 June 2012. 27 September 2018. <<https://filmmakermagazine.com/46418-nisha-pahuja-on-the-world-before-her/#.W60b3f5Kj-Y>>.
- Devi, Mahasweta and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. *Imaginary Maps*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. New York and London: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- El Hamel, Chouki. *Black Morocco*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Elkin, Lauren. "Foreword." Gansel, Mireille. *Translation as Transhumance*. New York: Feminist Press, 2017. ix-xiv.
- El-tayeb, Fatima. *European Others: Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011. Press.

Fadnavis, Mihir. "The World Before Her review: An important, provocative film." 8 June 2014.

18 May 2018. <<https://www.firstpost.com/entertainment/the-world-before-her-review-a-skillfully-made-provocative-film-1559161.html>>.

Frayar, Lauren, Sushmita Pathak and Furkan Latif Khan. "India's LGBTQ Activists Await Supreme Court Verdict On Same-Sex Intercourse Ban." 26 July 2018. 1 February 2019. <<https://www.npr.org/2018/07/26/631829366/indias-lgbt-activists-await-supreme-court-verdict-on-same-sex-intercourse-ban>>.

Freccero, Carla. "Romeo and Juliet Love Death." *Shakesqueer: A Queer Companion to the Complete Works of Shakespeare*. Ed. Madhavi Menon. Durham: Duke University Press, 2011. 302-308.

Fuss, Diana. *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature & Difference*. New York: Routledge, 1989.

Gansel, Mireille. *Traduire comme Transhumer*. Rennes: Caliligrammes, 2012.

—. *Translation as Transhumance*. Trans. Ros Schwartz. New York: Feminist Press, 2017.

Gentzler, Edwin. "Translation, Poststructuralism, and Power." *Translation and Power*. n.d. 195-218.

Ghosh, Durba. "Decoding the Nameless: Gender, Subjectivity and Historical Methodologies in Reading the Archives of Colonial India." *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840*. Ed. Kathleen Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 297-316.

Gopinath, Gayatri. "Queering Bollywood." *Journal of Homosexuality* (2000): 283-297. Print.

Government of India. "Constitution of India." n.d. <<https://www.india.gov.in/my-government/constitution-india/constitution-india-full-text>>.

- Hair, P. E. H. "Hamlet in an Afro-Portuguese Setting: New Perspectives on Sierra Leone in 1607." *History in Africa* (1978): 21-42. Print.
- Hair, P. E. H. *Sierra Leone and the English in 1607*. Institute of African Studies, University of Sierra Leone, 1981. Print.
- Hansen, Kathryn. "Language, Community, and the Theatrical Public: Linguistic Pluralism and Change in the Nineteenth-century Parsi theatre." *India's Literary History: Essays on the Nineteenth Century*. Ed. Stuart Blackburn and Vasudha Dalmia. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004. 60-86.
- . *Stages of Life: Indian Theatre Autobiographies*. London: Anthem Press, 2011.
- Harishchandra, Bharatendu. *Bharatendu Harishchandra ke Shresth Nibandh*. Ed. Krishnadutt Paliwal. new delhi: sachin prakashan, 1987.
- . *Durlabh Bandhu*. Patna: Khandvilas Press, 1888.
- Harishchandra, Bharatendu. "From 'Natak'." *Poetics of Modernity: Indian Theatre History, 1850 to the Present*. Ed. Aparna Bhargava Dharwadkar. Trans. Aparna Bhargava Dharwadkar and Anubha Anushree. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2019. 58-68.
- Harris, Jonathan Gil. *Masala Shakespeare: How a Firangi Writer Became Indian*. New Delhi: Aleph, 2018.
- Holderness, Graham. *Cultural Shakespeare: essays in the Shakespeare myth*. Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2001.
- Holtzman, Dinah. "Between Yaars: The Queering of Dosti in Contemporary Bollywood Films." *Bollywood and Globalization: Indian Popular Cinema, Nation and Diaspora*. Ed. Rini Bhattacharya Mehta and Rajeshwari V. Pandharipande. London: Anthem Press, 2010. 111-128.

- India TV News Desk. "Anti-Romeo Squad Back in Action." 29 August 2018. *India TV News*. 11 September 2018. <<https://www.indiatvnews.com/news/india-anti-romeo-squad-is-back-in-action-in-up-15-held-in-noida-460292>>.
- Jaikumar, Priya. *Cinema at the End of Empire: A Politics of Transition in Britain and India*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Johnson, W. J. "'daya'." 2009. *A dictionary of Hinduism*. 12 November 2019. <<https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780198610250.001.0001/acref-9780198610250-e-727>>.
- Jones, Eldred D. *The Elizabethan Image of Africa*. The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1971. Print.
- Joshi, Priya. "Reading in the Public Eye: The Circulation of Fiction in Indian Libraries, c. 1835-1901." *India's Literary History: Essays on the Nineteenth Century*. Ed. Stuart Blackburn and Vasudha Dalmia. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004. 280-326.
- Kapur, Ratna. "Law and the Sexual Subaltern: A Comparative Perspective." *Cleveland State Law Review* (2000): 15-23.
- Katyal, Akhil. *The Doubleness of Sexuality: Idioms of Same-Sex Desire in Modern India*. New Delhi: New Text, 2016.
- Keeling, Kara. "Looking For M--: Queer Temporality, Black Political Possibility, and Poetry From the Future." *GLQ* (2009): 565-582. Print.
- Khalid, Saif. "The Hadiya case and the myth of 'Love Jihad' in India." 24 August 2017. 2 February 2019. <<https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2017/08/hadiya-case-myth-love-jihad-india-170823181612279.html>>.
- Khatibi, Abdelkebir. *Amour bilingue*. Paris: Fata Morgana, 1983.

- . *Love in Two Languages*. Trans. Richard Howard. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990.
- Kilito, Abdelfattah. *Lan tatakallam lughati*. Beirut: Dar al-Taliah, 2002.
- . *Thou Shalt Not Speak My Language*. Trans. Wail H Hassan. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2008.
- Kliman, Bernice W. "At Sea about Hamlet at Sea: A Detective Story." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 62.2 (2011): 180-204.
- Kohn, Erik. "Why the Indian Pageant Documentary 'The World Before Her' Won the Top Jury Prize." 30 April 2012. 14 May 2018. <<http://www.indiewire.com/2012/04/tribeca-review-why-the-indian-pageant-documentary-the-world-before-her-won-the-top-jury-prize-47772/>>.
- Kothari, Rita. *Translating India: The Cultural Politics of English*. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2003.
- Kumar, Aishwary. *Radical Equality: Ambedkar, Gandhi and the Risk of Democracy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015.
- Larkosh, Christopher. "Introduction: Re-engendering Translation." *Re-engendering Translation: Transcultural Practice, Gender, Sexuality and the Politics of Alterity*. Ed. Christopher Larkosh. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing, 2011. 1-9.
- Laroui, Fouad. "Dislocation." Laroui, Fouad. *L'etrange Affaire Du Pantalon De Dassoukine: Nouvelles*. Paris: Julliard, 2012. 21-46.
- Lefevere, Andre. "Introduction." *Translation/History/Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992. 1-13.

- Lefevere, Andre. "On the Different Methods of Translating." Lefevere, Andre. *Translating Literature: The German Tradition*. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1977. 67-89.
- Liu, Lydia H. "Introduction." *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*. Ed. Lydia H. Liu. Durham: Duke University Press, 1999. 1-12.
- Loomba, Ania. "Shakespearian Transformations." *Shakespeare and National Culture*. Ed. JohnJ. Joughin. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997. 141. Print.
- Lowe, Lisa. *The Intimacies of Four Continents*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2015. Print.
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington. "Minute of the 2nd of February, 1835." Macaulay, Thomas Babington. *Speeches by Lord Macaulay with his Minute on Indian Education*. London: Oxford University Press, 1952 [1835]. 345-361. Print.
- Majeed, Javed. *Nation and Region in Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India*. London and New York: Routledge, 2019.
- Masten, Jeffrey. *Queer Philologies: Sex, Language and Affect in Shakespeare's Time*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.
- Menon, Madhavi. *Unhistorical Shakespeare: Queer Theory in Shakespearean Literature and Film*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Menon, Meena. "An Uncritical Eye - "The World Before Her"." 22 July 2014. 18 May 2018. <<http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/blogs/blog-free-for-all/article6237838.ece>>.
- Mishra, Gopinath. *Premila*. Microfilm. Benares: Chandraprabha Press Company Limited, 1898.
- Mishra, Jagadish Prasad. *Shakespeare's Impact on Hindi Literature*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1970. Print.

- Monier-Williams, Sir Monier. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary Etymologically and Philologically Arranged*. Delhi: Motilal Bansaridass, 1997 [1899].
- News18.com. "What are Anti-Romeo Squads." 22 March 2017. *News18.com*. 11 September 2018. <<https://www.news18.com/news/india/what-are-anti-romeo-squads-how-do-they-operate-points-to-know-1362855.html>>.
- Ngugi wa Thiong'o. *Globalectics: The Theory and Politics of Knowing*. New York: Coliumbia University Press, 2012. Print.
- . *Penpoints, Gunpoints and Dreams: Towards a Critical Theory of the Arts and the State in Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Print.
- Nichols, Bill. *Introduction to Documentary*. 3rd Edition. Bloomington: Indiana University Preaa, 2017.
- Nundy, Arya. *Venice Nagar Ka Vyapari*. Benares: Amar Press, 1888.
- Orsini, Francesca. "Introduction." *Love in South Asia: A Cultural History*. Ed. Francesca Orsini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 1-39.
- Pandey, Gyanendra. *The Construction of Communalism in North India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006 [1990].
- Parker, Andrew. "Interview: Nisha Pahuja." 8 November 2012. 27 September 2018. <<http://dorkshelf.com/2012/11/08/interview-nisha-pahuja/>>.
- Planet Romeo B.V. *About Us*. 2019. 2 February 2019. <<https://www.planetromeo.com/en/about/>>.
- Platts, John T. *A Dictionary of Urdu, Classical Hindi and English*. London: Oxford University Press, 1968 [1884].
- Polizzotti, Mark. *Sympathy for the Traitor*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2018.

- PTI. "Ghar wapsi to continue till conversions are banned: Adityanath." 24 February 2015. 2 February 2019. <<https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/other-states/ghar-wapsi-to-continue-till-conversions-are-banned-adityanath/article6929001.ece>>.
- Puar, Jasbir. "Rethinking Homonationalism." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 45.2 (2013): 336-339.
- Purchas, Samuel. *Hakhytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes*. Vol. IV. New York: AMS Press, 1965 [1625]. XX vols.
- Rabiyah, Amir. *Prayers For My 17th Chromosome*. Little Rock, Arkansas: Sibling Rivalry Press, 2017.
- Radhakrishnan, Rajagopalan. "Is Translation a Mode?" *European Journal of English Studies* (2008): 15-31. Print.
- . "World Literature, by Any Other Name?" *PMLA* (2016): 1396-1404. Print.
- Robinson, Douglas. "On the Different Methods of Translating." *Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Ed. Douglas Robinson. 2nd Edition. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2002. 225-238.
- Rothe, E. Nina. "The World Before Her : Just Who Is the Modern Indian Woman?" 24 April 2012. 23 October 2017. <https://www.huffingtonpost.com/e-nina-rothe/the-world-before-her-documentary_b_1446267.html>.
- Said, Edward W. *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Sarkar, Tanika. "Heroic Women, Mother Goddesses: Family and Organization in Hindutva Politics." *Women and the Hindu Right*. Ed. Tanika Sarkar and Urvashi Butalia. New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1995. 181-215.

- Satyanath, T.S. "How does Shakespeare become Sekh Pir in Kannada." *Translation Today* (2004): 44-99.
- Schoonover, Karl and Rosalind Galt. *Queer Cinema in the World*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2016. Print.
- Shankar, S. *Flesh and Fish Blood: Postcolonialism, Translation and the Vernacular*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.
- Sharma, Paloma. "Review: The World Before Her is a disturbing watch." 6 June 2014. 18 May 2018. <<http://www.rediff.com/movies/report/review-the-world-before-her-is-a-disturbing-watch/20140606.htm>>.
- Sharpe, Christina. *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2016. Print.
- Simon, Sherry. *Gender in Translation - Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Print.
- Simon, Sherry. "Germaine de Stael and Gayatri Spivak: Culture Brokers." *Translation and Power*. n.d. 122 - 140.
- Singh, Hardayal. *Sitaram Sangrah*. Prayag: Indian Press, 1939.
- Singh, Kuwar. "'Disease', 'dangerous,' 'curable': What key public figures in India think of homosexuality." 5 September 2018. 1 February 2019. <<https://qz.com/india/1380027/section-377-what-ramdev-adityanath-zakir-naik-think-of-gays/>>.
- Sisson, C. J. *Shakespeare in India: Popular Adaptations on the Bombay Stage*. London: The Shakespeare Association, 1926. Print.

- Sitaram, Lala. "A Brief History of the Hindi Language." Sitaram, Lala. *Selections from Hindi Literature, Book VI Part I*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1925. i-xv.
- Sitaram, Lala. "Foreword." Sitaram, Lala. *Jangal me Mangal*. Allahabad: Ramnarayan Lal Bookseller, 1923. 1-4.
- . *Prem Kasauti*. Prayag: Indian Press, 1931.
- . *Sitaram's Urdu Shakespeare: No. 1 King Lear*. Lucknow: Munshi Nawal Kishore, 1893.
- Sivaramkrishna, M. "Engendering Translation." *Translation: from Periphery to Centrestage*. Ed. Tutun Mukherjee. New Delhi: Prestige Books, 1998. 20-23. Print.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Death of a Discipline*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "From the Translator." Cesaire, Aime. *A Season in the Congo*. London; New York; Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2017. vii-viii.
- . *Other Asias*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "The Politics of Translation." Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. New York and London: Routledge, 1993. 200-225.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Translating into English." Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012. 256-274.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Translator's Preface." Devi, Mahasweta. *Imaginary Maps*. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. New York and London: Routledge, 1995. xxiii-xxix.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Afterword." Devi, Mahasweta. *Imaginary Maps*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995. 197-205. Print.

Stoler, Ann Laura. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*.

Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Storyline Films. *The World Before Her: About*. n.d. Web. 23 October 2017.

<<http://www.worldbeforeher.com/#!about>>.

Subramanyam, Kaa Naa. "Situation." *The Oxford Anthology of Modern Indian Poetry*. Ed. Vinay Dharwadker and A.K. Ramanujan. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1994. 101.

Sundar, Pavitra. "The Queer Sound of the Dandiya Queen, Falguni Pathak." 23 October 2017. 27 September 2018. <<https://soundstudiesblog.com/2017/10/23/the-queer-sound-of-the-dandiya-queen/>>.

Sundari, Jayshankar. "Some Blossoms, Some Tears." Hansen, Kathryn. *Stages of Life: Indian Theatre Autobiographies*. Trans. Kathryn Hansen. London: Anthem Press, 2011. 181-245.

Tagore, Proma. "Mahasweta Devi." *Who's Who in Contemporary Women's Writing*. Ed. Jane Eldridge Miller. London and New York: Routledge, 2001. 200-201. Print.

Tagore, Rabindranath. "To Shakespeare." Tagore, Rabindranath. *The English Writings of Rabindranath Tagore, Volume II: Poems*. Ed. Mohit K Ray. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2007. 599.

Taylor, Gary. "Hamlet in Africa 1607." *Travel Knowledge: European "Discoveries" in the Early Modern Period*. Ed. Ivo Kamps and Jyotsna G. Singh. New York: Palgrave, 2001. 223-248.

Thakur, Vikram Singh. "Parsi Shakespeare: The Precursor to "Bollywood Shakespeare"." *Bollywood Shakespeares*. Ed. Craig Dionne and Paramita Kapadia. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. 21-43.

- Thapar, Romila. "The Theory of Aryan Race and India: History and Politics." *Social Scientist* (1996): 3-29.
- The Hindu Mumbai Bureau. "31 killed, 100 injured in Malegaon blasts." 09 September 2006. 04 October 2018. <<https://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/31-killed-100-injured-in-malegaon-blasts/article3072993.ece>>.
- The Single Screen. "The Film Times of India Doesn't Want You To See." 7 June 2014. 18 May 2018. <<https://thesinglescreen.wordpress.com/tag/world-before-her/>>.
- Trivedi, Harish. *Colonial Transactions: English Literature and India*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.
- Trivedi, Harish. "Colonizing Love: Romeo and Juliet in Modern Indian Disseminations." *India's Shakespeare: Translation, Interpretation and Performance*. Ed. Poonam Trivedi and Dennis Bartholomeusz. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005. 74-91.
- Tymoczko, Maria. "Translation, Resistance, Activism: An overview." *Translation, resistance, Activism*. Ed. Maria Tymoczko. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2010. 1-22. Print.
- Vanita, Ruth. "Dosti and Tamanna: Male-male love, Difference, and Normativity in Hindi Cinema." *Everyday Life in South Asia*. Ed. Diane P. Mines and Sarah Lamb. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002. 146-158.
- Vaughan, Alden T. and Virginia Mason Vaughan. *Shakespeare's Caliban: A Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. Print.
- Viswanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1989.
- Wilson-Lee, Edward. *Shakespeare in Swahiland*. London: William Collins, 2016.

- Winston, Brian. *Lies, Damn Lies and Documentaries*. London: BFI Publishing, 2000.
- Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. London: Penguin Books, 2004 [1928].
- Yildiz, Yasemin. *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012.
- Young, Rober J. C. "That Which is Casually Called a Language." *PMLA* (2016): 1207-12221. Print.