

Nudity of the Translator**Nudité du traducteur****Sandeep SHARMA**

GBPM Govt College, Rampur Bushahr (India), profsandeepsharma@gmail.com

Received: 04/11/2020**Accepted:** 15/11/2020**Published:** 28/12/2020**Abstract:**

Rasa needs as much emotional focus as is required in premature ejaculation (*Shiv Drishti*. 1986, p. 09). Perhaps this desired emotional state is the result of the reflective presence of the self and attention. Out of the many known and unknown Indian writers on this topic, there are two critics of dramaturgy, namely Shilaleen and Krishashava, who wrote about the theory of drama even before Bharata. Along with Bharata's *Natyashastra* (of the first century?), Abhinav Gupta's *Abhinay Bharti* is also available to us in Hindi by Archaraya Vishveshawar. Abhinav is one of the most ancient and authentic authors of the critical *Tikas* (paraphrases) on *Natyashastra*. This paper shall re-read the roles of the translator, the reader and the author through the Indian theories of Rasa, which is the domain in question, in particular by Bharata and Abhinav Gupta, the authors of the aforementioned texts.

Keywords: Rasa; Anuvaad; Terahvad. The Rasuttama Translator; Kaushiki vritti

Résumé :

Parmi les critiques de la dramaturgie en Inde, il ya deux noms : Shilaleen et Krishashava. Ils écrivaient sur la théorie du théâtre, même avant Bharata. Bharata's *Natyashastra* (du premier siècle ?) et Abhinav Gupta's *Abhinay Bharti* sont disponible pour nous en Hindi grâce à Archaraya Vishveshwar. Abhinav est l'un des plus anciens et authentiques écrivains de la critique *Tikas* (paraphrase) sur *Natyashastra*. Cet article, donc, est une lecture critique des rôles du traducteur, du lecteur et de l'auteur à travers les théories indoues de *Rasa*, particulièrement dans les deux textes susmentionnés de Baharata et Abhinav Gupta.

Mots clés : Rasa ; Anuvaad ; Terahvad ; The Rasuttama Translator ; Kaushiki Vritti

1. Introduction:

Rasyante iti Rasa.

If I say that the above ancient Sanskrit phrase (“Which can be tasted are Rasas”) tells us about the theory of Juices it wouldn’t be a hyperbole. But in Indian aesthetics, “Juice” refers to the delicate trajectory of juices, which automatically appears in the Amygdala of the brain after watching drama on stage. This juice appears in the form of emotional/sentimental saliva not unlike the postmodern silk worms of Derrida in . “A Silkworm of One's Own” (which date remains unrelated to Rasas) (Derrida, 1996). Both Rasa and the term, aesthetic juice, whichever you prefer to call it, are correct.

Rasa needs as much emotional focus as is required in premature ejaculation (*Shiv Drishti* 1986, p. 09). Perhaps this desired emotional state is the result of the reflective presence of the self and attention. But even before Bharata’s mammoth explanation contained in the entire thirty six chapters of *Natyashashtra* (in the first century AD?), many published, yet lost, scholars and their sizeable works from ancient India had already mentioned Rasas multiple times without mentioning any translational consequences of their theories of art.¹ and ² Gnoli confirms, but with doubt: “Bhatta Nâyaka was perhaps the first to associate aesthetic experience” (Gnoli, 1968, p. 48).

¹ The first chapter entitled "*Natyopati-Adhayaye*" deals with the structure of the stage and the deities, who govern different spaces on the stage. The second chapter, titled "*Rangdhavet-Pujan*," gives instructions to appease the governing deities of the stage before the beginning of a dramatic performance. The fourth chapter, titled "*Tandav-Lakshana*," contains 320 verses. This chapter explains the various types of gestures involved in acting and presentation of drama. In the fifth chapter, titled "*Porvandvidhan*," In the sixth chapter, titled "*Rasadhayay*," and the corresponding seventh chapter, titled "*Bhav-Vyanjak*," the theory of Rasa and the principles governing Rasas are elucidated. The sixth chapter, titled "*Rasa Adhyay*," is the most important chapter from the point of view of aesthetics. This chapter exclusively narrates different kinds of Rasas. "*Bhavvyanjak Adhyay*," which is the seventh chapter, explains the concepts of *Bhava-Anubhava* and *Sthayi Bhavas*. The eighth chapter, titled "*Anganibhanaya*," explains the movement of hands and other gestures involved in a dramatic performance. In the eighth chapter, the detailed explanation of the character and his/her gaze is given. The ninth chapter "*Upangabhinaya*" explains uses of different parts of body in acting, like tongue, abdomen, and so on... The tenth chapter, titled "*Charividhan*," deals with *Charis* (the movement of body on the foot). In the eleventh chapter, titled "*Mandalvikalpam*," Bharata explains his theory of Mandalas, which, according to him, are two---"*Bhoom*" (belonging to the earth) and "*Akashiya*"(belonging to the sky). The twelfth chapter, titled "*Gati prachar*," Bharata explains the procedure of entry on the stage by actors. Here, again, Bharata relates different types of movements on the stage to the corresponding diverse types of Rasas. He even explains the different ways in which women sit on the stage. The thirteenth chapter, titled "*Kakshyapravriti Bharmiyanjak*," elaborately discusses uses of acting, and so on.

² Raja Bhoj of the 11th Century, in the chapter twelve of *Shringar-Prakash*, deals with drama, whereas, his *Saraswati-Kanthabharan* and its chapter five also has specific reference to dramatic art. These rare books have been thoroughly read by Shriyut Vishveshwar Nath in his book *Raja Bhoja*.

Out of the many known and unknown writers on this topic, there are two Indian critics of dramaturgy, namely Shilaleen and Krishashava, who wrote about the theory of drama, even before Bharata. Their lost works have been referred to in Panini's *Ashtadhyayi*, specifically in chapters "*Parashrya-Shilalibhyam bhishko Natsutryo*" (4.3.110) and "*Kamnand-Krishashvadini*" (4-3-111).¹ Along with *Natyashastra*, *Abhinav Bharti* is also available to us (the title is an amalgam of Abhinav Gupta [*Abhinav*] and his guru Bharata Muni [*Bharti*]) by Abhinav Guptapad (a name which a very few are aware of) or Abhinavgupta (his commonly accepted name). He is one of the most ancient and authentic authors of the critical *Tikas* (paraphrases) on *Natyashastra*. There is a long list of authors mentioned by Bharata in *Natyashastra*, such as Shandilya and Vatsya. In the same fashion, while critically examining *Natyashastra* through his *Tikas*, Abhinavgupta also mentions Kohal, Bhata Lolatta, Vatsya, Shandilya, Datil, Udbhat, Lolatta, Shankuka, Bhatnayaka and many other Indian scholars of his times and also of the previous times. But these authors will have no further references in this paper. Let us consider this paragraph as a glimpse of the Rasa Theory and the books *Natyashastra* and *Abhinav Bharti*. This paper shall re-read the roles of the translator, the reader and the author through the Indian theories of Rasa, which is the domain in question, in particular by Bharata and Abhinav Gupta, the authors of the aforementioned texts.

2. Review of the word *Anuvaad* (Translation) in Hindi:

The *being* of the word "translation" has its roots somewhere within the historical, ontological and etymological contexts of the Romantic languages and means: "carrying across" or "bringing across." On the other hand, what would be the real translation of the word *translation* within these Romantic languages, and also in the realities of other worlds and corresponding languages (beyond the Romantic languages), when this word already contains the phonemes /t/ in /tɑ:grɪt/ and /s/ and /s/ in /sɔ:s/? But no one can do a perfect translation of the word *translation* and find the real origin of the sounds and intonations in it (nor can we for any other word existing on this earth) and if the translation of *the translation*, and the sound it emits, is not perfect, then, there is no need of doing it because it would be a futile exercise (Douglas, 1991, p. 113). [NEW PARAGRAPH] All we need is imperfect translations

¹ See, for example, in detail, about these authors in the book *Hindi Abhinavbharti* specifically from page 09 to 11, where the author also mentions the names of ancient Indian authors, who were also Indian philosophers of art: Kohal, Dhurtil, Shandilya, Vatsya, Badrayana, Shakatkarni, Nandi (Nandikeshwar), Tumbro, Charayan, Sadashiv Padmbhu, Dohini, Vyas, Ajanyey, Katyanyan, Rahul, Garg, Shakligarbh, Ghantak, Vartikar, Matrgupt Acharaya, Subandhu, Acharaya Kirtikar, Bhavyakar Nanyadev, Bhatta Uddata, Bhatta Lolatta, Shri Shikunk, Bhatnayaka, Bhatyantra, Dhananyanjya, Sagarnandi, Shingbhupal, Roop Gowsami, Raja Bhoj, Vidyanaath and Vishwanath.

of the words and the corresponding phonemes and equally imperfect translations of the word *translation* and its sounds. But this goes completely against the ethics of translation. Now, let us take the case of Sanskrit and Hindi, two languages from entirely other parts of India. Hindi and English are not so far apart, as their language family is concerned, which is the Proto Indo-European Language Family. In Hindi, translators use the word *Anuvaad* /ʌnuva:d/ ('to repeat or imitate the sound') for translation. We must also see another possibility of translating the word *anuvāad* itself into *another* suitable synonym or homophone within *another* reality, which is/is not far away from the Indian reality. The Proto Indo-European word, the Sanskrit word per se, *terah* (/teɪrɑ:/) has perhaps an answer, which may, again, be very limited. But this limited edition of the word *terah* seems phonetically very close to *Trans* and both seem to confirm to some acceptable phonetic consensus (where the root phonic sound /trænz / has some affinity with the root phonic sound /teɪrɑ:/). There is the possibility that the history of these words might have coincided at some time, long ago. But this is just a possibility or hypothesis. The word *terah* suggests the other—your/yours. *Terah* is opposite of *merah* (mine) (/meɪrɑ:/). Through speech and actions (such as pointing the finger or clapping in order to attract attention of the other, which is common gesture in Southern India) *Terah* can be communicated with multitudes of emotions or Rasas. These Rasas from *terah* (the other) can further partially be captured in sound (through the echo) in sight, (through touch or smell) or in expressions, but they can be difficult to interpret in writing. With Martin Buber's "I and Thou" relation, this opposition takes us back to the Western philosophical tradition of oppositions that is: SL/TL or Author/Translator. This word 'Translation' (which comes from some ancient Romance language and its etymological source) and the Sanskrit word '*terah*' (which also originates from the etymological sources of Proto Indo-European Languages) have, without a doubt, phonetic and (the to SKIP) etymological affinities. Shouldn't scholars, then, propose the reality of the word 'Translation' in Hindi not as *Anuvaad* (some repetition [anu], of sound [vad]) but as *Terahvad*?

Abhinavgupta believes : "*Kaushiki vritti sabhi rason ka pran hai*" (Graceful style is the life force of all Rasas) (Abhinav, 1960, p. 15). But what is included in *Kaushiki vritti*? In order to solve the problematics of this riddle of style let's move a bit further into the Indian tradition of dramatics.

3. Attaining the *Purushuttama* State in Translation: The *Rasuttama* Translator

This paper will now dare to introduce the Translator as an actor of Rasas. In, *Ramlila*, the actors re-enact the lives of characters portrayed in *The Ramayana*. For example, if some actor has to act the Lord Rama on the stage, that same actor will start behaving like Lord Rama even before the final show begins. He will go vegan; he will prefer to sleep on the floor; his gait, his gaze (like Rama's glance) will be fixed and meaningful, and he will avoid every kind of vice, such as alcohol. The actor will not

be psychologically ready to act before he becomes convinced that he has finally attained the *Purushottama* State (the Ideal Man). In translation practices, it would be *Rasuttama* State (the ideal state achieved by the Translator), in simple terms! But this would also be the extremity of fidelity! We all know that fidelity has multidirectional designs: But can we really dream of *Rasuttama* State in translation? Should the translator attain (or try to attain) this state? Should the translator do this? Can the author of ST do this? Should the author of ST do this? ...and the same can be asked for the Readers too...

4. Making of the Movie: Is it all between *Reproduced* and *Reproducing*? (Unawareness of the ‘Readers Ltd’)

Is translation really perceived by the Reader, the Author and the Translator as an outcome of some real human activity not devoid of emotions or Rasas of ST or intimate relationship with the Rasas of ST (MT)?¹ It depends (this word ‘depends’ in the context needs much space for further elaboration). Is this fidelity to the Rasas of the ST appropriate and to what extent? Otherwise, is translation only perceived to be some professional work, a project, a highly confidential project perhaps or a *target* requiring receipt and transfer of a fee @ \$70 per 1000 words? Why are the Readers not made aware of these transactions, which happen in the isolated chambers of virtual-reality? And if the Reader comes to know, through declaration on any page of the book (if it is possible), that the translator has charged such and such amount from the author for translating ST into TT, will the amount make the TT more authentic and the reader more convinced and happy? Higher the fee, the more the authenticity, the greater the closeness to the meaning of the ST (this is what most of the people in Translation business possibly do today). But the Smart Reader (SR) will be indifferent to all this and to all the *declarations* and *acknowledgements* of the book. This Smart Reader will perhaps say, “It hardly matters how much fee has been charged. They will say, “We want to read the text in our language. That’s it. It is a silly question.” On the other hand, the people involved in this business will respond to this pesky “Theory of Declarations” with strong Rasas of contempt (on the *surface*, on their faces and deep within). Proof or Proofs: Other than these declarations, what kind of proof is needed to certify that ‘some’ work of translation is perfect? Do we need a ‘Meaning/Essence-Certificate’? Will the certificate, which ‘certifies’ the true meaning/essence of ST, then, show the authenticity of translation? If it is so, then, we will need two certificates: one for certifying the meaning and the other for certifying the certificate. But if the certificate is not authentic then the translation, even a very appropriate one, automatically becomes ‘inappropriate.’ Will a foreword or acknowledgement by the author of ST suffice the requirement of certification? In postmodern theory of Roland Barthes, the author has no power to communicate after the final writing is in the hands

⁴. MT here is Machine Translation.

of readers. But in translation, the case is entirely different. In translation, the author is resurrected! The author has complete control over the Target Text, and they can manipulate it according to their own whims and fancies. The author is the sole subject. The author authorizes and issues certificates to the Translator! The author outlives in translation, in interpretation. On the other hand, the translator or interpreter remains on the margin. The subject becomes the object.

5. The Transcendental Duty of the Translator: Nudity of the Translators:

Is translation a duty or a necessary obligation? Duty involves retention and responsibility.¹ Memory and responsibility are two sides of the same coin (the memory of technology is an exception here.). Now-a-days we can't even remember our own cell phone numbers or what we ate or wore yesterday or the day before yesterday. But there is no obligation on the Translator to memorize what the translator translates. Otherwise, in the ancient Indian traditions, it was believed that the real translation is where a translator remembers the texts available for study. He or she had to learn the ST by heart, word-for-word—this was also the first requirement of the *Tikakar* (Paraphraser). To remember the ST as *Tatvagyan* (knowledge of the Universal Being) was the basic requirement for becoming a true teacher for the scholars of Sanskrit texts. Perhaps that is why Bharata claims in his *Natyashashtra* that before translating and paraphrasing one has to remember each and every verse of his master by heart.

*Ghrehane dharnam gyane prayoge chasya satam.
Shakta bhagvan deva ayogya natyakarmin.
(Bharata, 1950, P. 72)*

According to Bharata, great efforts are needed in memorizing a text and wearing it as attire (*dharan*) in *natya*. Thus, for memorizing texts, Abhinavgupta suggests a healthy mind and healthy body through practices, like Yoga and meditation. In the contemporary world, there is nudity in translation. Today, the Translator doesn't wear the ST---the Translator, thus, is nude. It is partial nudity when the Translator is able to discuss it (this is perhaps the *duty of the Translator, too*), whereas, the performance of one's own translated text is its usage and is just like covering the vital organs of the external body.

6. Hybridity of ST:

Everyone knows that any word from ST should have the *Translation Element* in it. Students of translation might be familiar with the untranslatability of puns, proper

¹ See, for example, Carolyn Dicey Jennings. "Too much attention, too little Self" and Gnaeri's clarification of Pali terms *Sati* (retaining) and *centana* (executive control) which are "two roles of [attention] in experience " (Jennings, 1991, p. 475).

nouns, homonyms, homophones and some idioms. If a word is translatable, then, it cannot have a stable meaning. In different languages, even the gender of a word changes from ST to TT (and we all know how much regenerative power some words have once they are transformed from the masculine into the feminine, in particular—in Sanskrit). If we can find the meaning of a word in another language or language within itself, then, obviously, we can find it everywhere. Generally, it is the lack of meaning proper, which makes translation possible. Translation happens from the already ‘known,’ not the ‘unknown’ or the impossible. We can’t create ST without TT. That is why there’s no denying the fact that it is not the TT, but the ST, which appears first. The origin of TT is ST. Here, the dichotomy of the origin is, perhaps, fully controlled.

But I’m proposing one more step towards the human element between the cleavages of these binaries. Nonetheless, the one who translates is equally important as what is being translated. Cleavages within the abstract binaries are: Translating a woman author by a man or a man by a woman (for example, works of Virginia Woolf by Dr Johnson [and is there any need for the translator to kill a man and a woman within?])¹, a transgender by a straight or vice versa (for example works of Lili Ilse Elvenes by J.K. Rowling [and is there, again, a requirement to kill/dismantle the voice of other gender or transgender within or recall the transgender from the psyche?])², a nonliving author by a living, a powerful and influential individual by a poor, colonizer (where, for example, the word ‘terrorist’ might be translated by a colonizer as ‘freedom fighter’), a portion of God’s words by human folly, and so on. In all such cases, it would be tempting to see the economic calculations of the publishing industry.

7. Conclusion:

But at the end of the day, *the* translator is *a* translator. He is, like a male actor in Shakespearean times, acting as a woman on the stage. Is it legitimate for the Translator to self-motivate, by self-talk, of such kind: “I’m not a translator but the *author of the original text*? I’m *the one* who is reproducing the *Kaushiki Vritti* and the corresponding Rasas of the original texts.” But these lines appear like some fictional text embellished with the techniques of Stream-of-Consciousness. This translation-fiction can be true if the translator, Mr. A, as a Rasa actor had been on the stage performing ditto like the *first actor* (say Shakespeare’s Hamlet, the first actor of The Globe Theatre). The audience, or the Reader, knows that he is looking at some Mr. A but he, on the hand, is representing Shakespeare’s Hamlet to his best. Mr. A weeps in

¹ Virginia Woolf openly contradicts Dr Johnson’s attitude and his anti-feminist stance in her *Room of One’s Own*.

² J.K. Rowling in her recent *Troubled Blood* (2020) portrayed transgender Dennis Creed as a ‘psychopathic serial killer’.

the way Hamlet would weep; he is confused in the way Hamlet would be confused. There is a relationship between the reproduced and the reproduction: If the Translator reproduces the mental state/*Bhavas* of the text, it would really be impossible for the Translator to translate the intimate *Bhavas* of the Author while the author was penning down the drama. The audience can also relate to Mr. A's acting, "Mr. A also wept in the way the *first actor* at the Globe Theatre wept. There is a similarity." His Rasas are faithful to Hamlet but not to Shakespeare, nor even to himself. The translator is not reproducing something new, but there is a strong need to defy his own voice. Finally, it is like the deconstructive dilemma, which states: what is the Subject in "To be or not to be?" Is it Hamlet, the Actor, Shakespeare, the Translator, the Audience, you or I?

8. References:

- Bharata Muni. (1950). *Natyasastra*. Trans. Manmohan Ghosh. Calcutta: The Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- Derrida, Jacques, and Geoffrey Bennington. (1996). "A Silkworm of One's Own (Points of View Stitched on the Other Veil)." *Oxford Literary Review*. vol. 18, No. ½. pp. 3–65.
- Gnoli. G. (1968). *The Aesthetic Experience*. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series.
- Gupta, Abhinav. (1960). *Hindi Abhinav Bharti*. Ed and Trans by Acharaya Vishweshwar Sidhhantshiromani. Delhi: Delhi University.
- Jennings, Carolyn Dicey. (2020). "Too much attention, too little Self." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. Vol 101. Issue 2. pp. 475-480.
- Robinson, Douglas. (1991). "The Tropics of Translation." *The Translator's Turn*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rowling, JK. (2020). *Troubled Blood*. London : Sphere Books.
- Shiv Drishti. (1986). Trans. Radheyshayam Chaturvedi. Varanasi : Varanasai Sanskrit Sansthan.
- Vishveshwar Nath, Shriyut. (1932). *Raja Bhoja*. Allahabad: Kayastha Pathshala Press.
- Woolf, Virginia. (1935). *A Room of One's Own*. London: Hogarth Press.