UNIT - I

World Literature In Translation – SHS5013

1. Nature and Scope of Translation.

The role of translation can hardly be over-emphasised in a multilingual country like India with 22 languages recognised in the eighth schedule of the constitution, 15 different scripts, hundreds of mother-tongues and thousands of dialects. One can very well say that India's is a translating consciousness and the very circumstances of their real existence and the conditions of their every day communication have turned Indians bilingual if not multilingual. One can even add without exaggeration that India would not have been a nation without translation and we keep translating almost unconsciously from our mother-tongues when we converse with people who use a language different from ours.

Our first writers too were translators. Indian literature is founded on the free translations and adaptations of epics like RaMayana and Mahabharata. Upto the nineteenth century our literature consisted only of translations, adaptations, interpretations and retellings. Translations of literary works as well as knowledge-texts: discourses on medicine, astronomy, metallurgy, travel, ship-building, architecture, philosophy, religion and poetics from Sanskrit, Pali, Prakrit, Persian and Arabic had kept our cultural scene vibrant and enriched our awareness of the world for long. Most of our ancient writers were multilingual: Kalidasa's Shakuntala has Sanskrit and Prakrit; poets like Vidyapati, Kabir, Meerabai, Guru Nanak, Namdev and others each composed their songs and poems in more than one language.

Translation has helped knit India together as a nation throughout her history. It brought, and still brings languages closer to one another and introduces to one another diverse modes of imagination and perception and various regional cultures thus linking lands and communities together. Ideas and concepts like 'Indian literature', 'Indian culture', 'Indian philosophy' and 'Indian knowledge systems' would have been impossible in the absence of translations with their natural integrationist mission.

Translation also plays a role in extending the scope of language and reframing the boundaries of the sayable. New terms and coinages necessitated by translation create new vocabulary and contribute to greater expressibility. One thus learns not only to understand foreign literature and philosophy through the mother-tongue, but also to speak about modern knowledge, from

quantum physics to nano-technology and computer-science to molecular biology in the regional language.

Translation strengthens democracy by establishing equality among different languages and questioning the hegemony of some over the others as it proves that all ideas and experiences can be expressed in all languages and they are exchangeable in spite of their uniqueness. It also enables the weaker sections of the society to be heard as they can speak in their own dialects or languages and then get translated into other languages that are more widely spoken and understood. Thus translation contributes to the empowerment of the marginalised or deprivileged sections like the poor, women, dalits, tribals, minorities, the disabled and others.

Translation also helps fight colonial prejudices. For example, by translating our works of literature and knowledge into English, we prove to the world that the coloniser is in no way superior to us as we too have a long history of great writing and research. The British had translated from India only what suited their taste; but now the empire is writing back , telling them what they have to read to understand our peoples and cultures, thus changing their old 'orientalist' conceptions of India.

No doubt translation also promotes the growth of indigenous literature and knowledge by bringing into our languages the great wealth of other literatures and cultures. By translating masterpieces from other Indian languages as also from foreign ones, we enrich our own literatures. Thus we also raise our writing standards: this happens especially when we translate great masters of world literature like Shakespeare, Homer, Dante, Vyasa, Valmiki, Kalidasa and Bhasa or more contemporary writers from Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Kafka, Beckett, Lorca, Eliot and Thomas Mann to Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Mario Vargas Llosa, Orhan Pamuk, J. M. Coetzee, Pablo Neruda, Octavio Paz and others. These exchanges also create new movements and trends.

We are living in an age of translations and the avenues for translators are constantly expanding. Some of these areas and vocations are indicated below:

Literary translation: There are many institutions here and abroad dedicated to literary translation. Translating foreign literature into Indian languages, Indian literature into foreign languages and Indian literature in one language into other Indian languages are all gainful activities in every sense. Sahitya Akademi, Ntional Book Trust, regional literary

associations and publishing houses both in English and the languages are on the lookout for capable translators. There is a new interest in Indian literature abroad as the young non-resident Indians who do not know their languages are eager to read their literatures in translation in the languages they know and also as foreign readers are eager to know what is happening in Indian literature. The recent spate of literary festivals all over the world from Berlin to Jaipur and book fairs like the ones held annually at Frankfurt, Paris, London, Bologna, Abu Dhabi etc have contributed to this rising fascination.

The Government of India has also recently responded to this new interest by launching a new mission, Indian Literature Abroad (ILA). Big Indian publishing concerns like Penguin, Macmillan, Orient Longman, Oxford University Press, Harper-Collins, Hatchett etc as well as smaller houses are encouraging translations of literary and discursive works in a big way.

Our freedom struggle and later democratic struggles for change had received great impetus from the translations of the works of Victor Hugo, Tolstoy, Rousseau, Gandhi, Tagore, Emile Zola, Maupassant, Gorky, Premchand, Subramania Bharati

2. Concept of translation in the West and in the Indian tradition.

Knowledge Translation: The National Translation Mission, a brain-child of the National Knowledge Commission intends to translate textbooks and classical works in areas like sociology, history, geography, geology, medicine, chemistry, physics, mathematics, linguistics and political science into the Indian languages in order to raise the standard of education done in mother tongues and to render accessible current and cutting-edge knowledge so far available only in English to the rural poor and the backward sections of the society. The Commission is looking for competent translators from English into all the Indian languages and there is evident scarcity in the area.

Media Translation: The print, electronic, visual and auditory media- newspapers, magazines, radio, television, cinema etc- need plenty of translators from one language into another. Many media houses publish papers and journals or run television channels in several languages at the same time and they need quick yet communicative translations of news, serials, film scripts and programmes. Dubbing and subtitling are other areas

It is widely agreed to be the case that translation and translation studies have never had it so good. Over the last two or three decades, translation has become a more prolific, more visible and more respectable activity than perhaps ever before. And alongside translation itself, a new field of academic study has come into existence, initially called Translatology (but not for long, thank God!) and now Translation Studies, and it has gathered remarkable academic momentum. There has of course always been translation, for almost as long as there has been literature. But the historical reasons for the present boom are probably traceable back to three distinct moments across the span of the twentieth century.

The first of these was the concerted movement of translating Russian fiction into English which began in the 1890s and went on until the 1930s, which revealed to readers in English a body of imaginative work from an area outside Western Europe which was so new and exciting as to be shocking and indeed to induce a state of what was then called the "Russian fever," with writers as diverse as Virginia Woolf and D. H. Lawrence not only enthusing about the newly discovered nineteenth-century masters of Russian fiction but actually helping to translate them in collaboration with the Russian emigre S. S. Koteliansky. The other two moments belong to the other end of the twentieth century, occurring as they did in the 1970s and the 1980s when two other bodies of literature from hitherto unregarded parts of the world were translated into English and caused a comparable sensation: from Latin America, and from the East European countries lying behind the Iron Curtain.

Unlike with Russian literature, these latter literatures when made available in translation helped to transform globally our very expectations of what literature looks like or should look like. If I may digress for a moment to touch native ground, perhaps the first instance when readers in English and in other European languages were similarly shocked and exhilarated by the discovery of an alien literature was in the last two decades of the eighteenth century when Charles Wilkins, Sir William Jones and other orientalists began translating from Sanskrit, and caused in Europe what Raymond Schwab has called *The Oriental Renaissance* and J. J. Clarke *The Oriental Enlightenment.* But those were different times, and what that discovery through translation led to was not any enhanced interest in translation but rather the founding of the discipline of comparative philology, and of course, if we are to believe Edward Said, further and more effective colonization.

As comparative philology and colonialism are by now both areas of human endeavour which

may be regarded as exhausted, the three newer flashes of translational revelation have given rise instead to a worthy impulse to look more closely at the process and effect of translation itself. Though translators themselves and some rare literary critics too had for a long time been reflecting on the practice of translation, such activity was, as we say now, theorized into an autonomous field of academic enquiry only about two decades ago, in or about the year 1980. In England and in many other parts of the Anglophone world, the birth of Translation Studies was signalled, insomuch as such gradual consolidation is signaled by any single event, by the publication of a book under the very title *Translation Studies* by Susan Bassnett-McGuire (now Susan Bassnett) in 1980. This short introductory handbook has had remarkable circulation and influence, being reprinted in a second edition in 1991 and in an updated third edition in 2002.

But a new field of study is seen in our times to have become well and truly established when not only monographs but Readers (or anthologies of primary and critical materials) and Encyclopedias of the subject begin coming out, and this has been happening steadily in Translation Studies over the last few years: for example, the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* edited by Mona Baker (1998), the *Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English* edited by Olive Classe (2000), the *Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation* edited by Peter France (2000), and the five-volume "History of Literary Translation into English" projected by the Oxford University Press, as well as a seven-volume Encyclopedia now in progress for some years in Germany. To these one may add anthologies of theoretical and critical statements such as *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida* edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (1992), *The Translation Studies Reader* edited by Lawrence Venuti (2000), *Western Translation Theory: from Herodotus to Nietzsche* by Douglas Robinson (2001) and critical surveys of such materials, such as *Contemporary Translation Theories* by Edwin Gentzler (1993; updated edition 2001), not to mention a *Dictionary of Translation Studies* by Mark Shuttleworth and Moira Cowie (1997). New journals exclusively devoted to the subject such as *The Translator* have been founded, publishers big and small such as Routledge and Multilingual Matters have launched their Translation Studies series, and a whole new publishing house exclusively devoted to the subject, St Jerome, has not been doing too badly.

My assiduous citation of this select bibliography (such as is generally relegated to the end of a

paper) is intended to show not only the new embarrassment of riches available in the field but also a tendency to push the range of the discipline as wide and retrospectively as far back as possible (to Dryden and to Herodotus, for example), so as to give it a more respectable scholarly lineage. It is all reminiscent of the ways in which Postcolonial Studies emerged as an area of study just a few years before Translation Studies and, in fact, the resemblance here is not only incidental but interactive, for at least four studies have been published in recent years making an explicit connection between these two newly burgeoning areas: *Sitting Translation: History, Post structuralism and the Colonial Context* (1992) by Tejaswini Niranjana, *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan* (1997) by Eric Cheyfitz, *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained* (1997) by Douglas Robinson, and *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice* (1999), a collection of essays edited by Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi. Altogether, the newly won pre-eminence of translation and translators is itself reflected, wittingly or unwittingly, in the titles of two recent books, *The Translator's Turn* (by Douglas Robinson, 1991), which it now seems to be, and *The Translator's Invisibility* (by Lawrence Venuti, 1995), which now seems to have been replaced by a fore grounded, lime-lit visibility.

Before these new developments took place, any study of translation was subsumed under either of two different subjects or disciplines: Linguistics and Comparative Literature. Traditionally, translation was seen as a segment or sub-field of Linguistics, on the basic premise that translation was a transaction between two languages. J. C. Catford's book *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics* (1965) was perhaps the last major work written on this assumption, in which he defined translation as comprising a "substitution of TL [i.e., Target Language] meanings for SL [i.e., Source Language] meanings" (quoted in Bassnett:2000, 15)

Thus, in a paradigmatic departure, the translation of a literary text became a transaction not between two languages, or a somewhat mechanical sounding act of linguistic "substitution" as Catford had put it, but rather a more complex negotiation between two cultures. The unit of translation was no longer a word or a sentence or a paragraph or a page or even a text, but indeed the whole language and culture in which that text was constituted. This new awareness was aptly described as "The Cultural Turn in Translation Studies" in the title of a chapter jointly written by Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere in their book *Translation, History and Culture*

(1990). It was precisely the formulation and recognition of this cultural turn in Translation Studies that served to extend and revitalize the discipline and to liberate it from the relatively mechanical tools of analysis available in Linguistics.

As it happened, it was about the same time that Translation Studies achieved a similar liberation from subservience to another discipline of which it was for long considered a subsidiary and merely instrumental part, Comparative Literature. But this had as much to do with the decline of Comparative Literature itself, especially in the United States where the energising impulse and vision of multilingual European emigres from before and during the Second World War, such as Rene Wellek, had spent itself out, as with the rise of Translation Studies. It was Susan Bassnett again, who had for many years headed virtually the only full-fledged Comparative Literature department in the U.K., at Warwick University, who in her book titled *Comparative Literature* (1993) declared, "Today, comparative literature in one sense is dead" and "Comparative literature as a discipline has had its day" (pp. 47, 161), going on to explain that while the rise of Postcolonial Studies had stolen the thunder of its thematological concerns, the rise of Translation Studies had left it bereft of much of its methodological preoccupations. Increasingly now, comparative studies of literature across languages have become the concern of Translation Studies; it is the translational tail now that wags the comparative dog.

Through the 1990s, alongside the rise of Translation Studies, we also saw interestingly the rise of a larger and more influential field of study, Cultural Studies, without however any perceptible overlap or interaction between the two. This lack of convergence or imbrication was again taken note of by Bassnett and Lefevere in their next book, *Constructing Cultures* (1998), in which they now had a final chapter titled, "The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies." They noted that these "interdisciplines," as they called them, had moved beyond their "Eurocentric beginnings" to enter "a new internationalist phase," and they identified a four-point common agenda that Translation Studies and Cultural Studies could together address, including an investigation of "the way in which different cultures construct their images of writers and texts," a tracking of "the ways in which texts become cultural capital across cultural boundaries," and an exploration of the politics of translation (Bassnett and Lefevere 138). Finally, they pleaded for a "pooling of resources," and stressed again the commonality of the

disciplinary method and thrust between Translation Studies and Cultural Studies:

. . .in these multifaceted interdisciplines, isolation is counter-productive. The study of translation, like the study of culture, needs a plurality of voices. And similarly, the study of culture always involves an examination of the processes of encoding and decoding that comprise translation. (Bassnett and Lefevere 138-39)

However, this plea for a joining of forces has apparently fallen on deaf ears. The clearly larger and certainly more theoretically undergirded juggernaut of Cultural Studies continues to rumble along its way, unmindful of the overture made by Translation Studies to be taken on board. One possible reason may be that for all the commonality of ground and direction pointed out by Bassnett and Lefevere, one crucial difference between the two interdisciplines is that Cultural Studies, even when concerned with popular or subaltern culture, nearly always operate in just the one language, English, and often in that high and abstruse variety of it called Theory, while Translation Studies, however theoretical they may get from time to time, must sully their hands in at least two languages only one of which can be English. Meanwhile, instead of a cultural turn in Translation studies, we have on our hands a beast of similar name but very different fur and fibre – something called Cultural Translation. This is a new collocation and in its specific new connotation is not to be confused with a stray earlier use of it in the old-fashioned sense of translation oriented towards the target culture, what may be called a reader-oriented or "domesticating" translation. In fact, the term Cultural Translation in its new and current meaning does not find an entry or even mention in any of the recent encyclopedias and anthologies of translation listed above.

It would thus seem to be the case that while wishing for the practitioners of Cultural Studies to come and join hands with them, those engaged in Translation Studies have not even noticed that something called Cultural Translation has already come into existence, especially in the domain of postcolonial and postmodernist discourse, and represents something that could not be further from their hearts' desire. For, if there is one thing that Cultural Translation is not, it is the translation of culture. In fact, it spells, as I shall go on to argue, the very extinction and erasure of translation as we have always known and practised it.

The most comprehensive, sophisticated and influential formulation of the concept of Cultural

Translation occurs in the work of probably the foremost postcolonial-postmodernist theorist of our times, Homi Bhabha, in the last chapter (bar the "Conclusion") of his book *The Location of Culture* (1994), titled "How newness enters the world: Postmodern space, postcolonial times and the trials of cultural translation." In Bhabha's discussion, the literary text treated as the pre-eminent example of cultural translation is Salman Rushdie's novel *Satanic Verses*, a novel written originally in English and read in that language by Bhabha. A clue to the new sense in which the term translation is here being used is suggested by a remark made by Rushdie himself (which Bhabha incidentally does not cite) in which he said of himself and other diasporic postcolonial writers: "we are translated men" (Rushdie 16). Rushdie was here exploiting the etymology of the word "translation," which means to carry or bear across, and what he meant, therefore, was that because he had been borne across, presumably by an aeroplane, from India and Pakistan to the United Kingdom, he was therefore a translated man. He neglected to tell us as to whether, before he became a translated man, he was at any stage also an original man.

But a second and overriding sense in which too Rushdie claimed to be a translated man is precisely what is expounded by Homi Bhabha in his essay, with specific reference to *The Satanic Verses*. Bhabha begins with an epigraph from Walter Benjamin's classic essay on translation: "'Translation passes through continua of transformation, not abstract ideas of identity and similarity'" (qted. in Bhabha 212). Later, in a key passage, Bhabha brings in Derrida's deconstruction of Benjamin's concept of translation as an after-life or survival, in order to deploy it in a wholly new context unintended by either Benjamin or Derrida, i.e., the context of Rushdean migrancy and hybridity. To quote Bhabha:

If hybridity is heresy, then to blaspheme is to dream it is the dream of translation as "survival" as Derrida translated the "time" of Benjamin's concept of the after-life of translation, as sur-vivre, the act of living on borderlines. Rushdie translates this into the migrant's dream of survival; an *initiatory* interstices; an empowering condition of hybridity (Bhabha 226-27).

A little later Bhabha says: "Translation is the performative nature of cultural communication" (Bhabha 228), and he goes on, in another new figurative equation, to speak of the residual cultural unassimilability of the migrant as an instance of what Benjamin called "untranslatability."

Here, as indeed at numerous other places, one may get the feeling that one is still trying to catch Bhabha's shadow while already living in it. What is nevertheless clear and indisputable in Bhabha's formulations of what he calls cultural translation is, firstly, that he does not at all by this term mean literary translation involving two texts from two different languages and cultures, and secondly, that what he means by translation instead is the process and condition of human migrancy. To evoke an irresistibly alliterative and beguiling, mantra-like phrase that Bhabha elsewhere uses more than once, what he is talking about is the "translational transnational" (Bhabha 173) i.e., the condition of Western multiculturalism brought about by Third World migrancy.

Since Bhabha first articulated it, the distinctly postmodernist idea of cultural translation in this non- textual non-linguistic sense has found an echo in much contemporary writing, both critical and creative. To cite a few select examples, the first of which is perhaps an ur-illustration or an analogue from a work which was written before Bhabha's essay was published, Tejaswini Niranjana in her book *Siting Translation* uses the term "translation" by and large to denote the colonial power-play between the British rulers and Indian subjects, and herself conscious of the fact this is not what translation normally means, she resorts early in her work to the Derridean deconstructive ruse of claiming that she has used the term translation "under erasure" (Niranjana 48 n.4) to suit her own chosen context and purpose.

As for creative writing, Hanif Kureishi seems to represent in his career a phase of cultural translation even more acute and advanced than that exemplified by Rushdie. Unlike Rushdie, Kureishi had one English parent, was born in England, and grew up in the "home county" of Kent, thinking of himself as quite and completely British rather than Indian/Pakistani or even hybrid. "I was brought up really as an English child," he has claimed; "... I wasn't influenced by Asian culture at all" (qtd. in Ranasinha 6). As he forthrightly put it in another interview, "I am not a Pakistani or an Indian writer, I'm a British writer" (qted. in Ranasinha 6). It is true that, unlike Rushdie's, Kureishi's work contains no reference to popular sub-continental culture such as Hindi films and film-songs; instead, Kureishi has co-edited *The Faber Book of Pop* (1995), meaning of course British and American pop. Nearly all Kureishi's works are set in London or in the suburbia, and one of them, titled *Sleep with Me* (1999), has only white British characters.

The only difficulty with such demonstrable Britishness of Kureishi is that in the literary and cultural world of London in the 1970s, when Kureishi was beginning to come into his own as a writer, he was nevertheless slotted by commissioning editors for theatre and television into the role of an Asian cultural translator. As he recounts, "they required stories about the new [immigrant] British communities, by cultural translators, as it were, to interpret one side to the other," and though Kureishi knew that as a non-migrant true-born Britisher he was not by upbringing and sensibility "the sort of writer best-suited to this kind of work," he did it nevertheless because "I just knew I was being paid to write" (qted. in Ranasinha 12). In this version, cultural translation is not so much the need of the migrant, as Bhabha makes it out to be, but rather more a requirement of the society and culture to which the migrant has travelled; it is a hegemonic Western demand and necessity.

For an even more thoroughgoing and self-induced example of a cultural translator, we may look at Jhumpa Lahiri, whose first book of fiction, *Interpreter of Maladies: Stories of Bengal, Boston and Beyond*(1999), made her the first Indian-born writer to win the Pulitzer prize for fiction. She was born of Bengali parents in London, grew up in America, became an American citizen at age 18, is by her own admission not really a bilingual though she would like to think she was, and has written fiction not only about Indians in America but also some stories about Indian still living in India. In answer to the criticism that her knowledge of India as reflected in these stories is demonstrably erroneous and defective, she has said, "I am the first person to admit that my knowledge of India is limited, the way in which all translations are" (Lahiri 118). This gratuitous trope is sustained and further highlighted by her going on to say that her representation of India is in fact her "translation of India" (Lahiri 118). It soon transpires that not only is Lahiri as author a translator but so are the fictional personages she translates into existence: "Almost all of my characters are translators, insofar as they must make sense of the foreign to survive" (Lahiri 120). This echoes, probably unwittingly, the Benjaminian-Derridean *sur-vivre*, in the sense seized upon by Bhabha, just as Lahiri's assertion that "translation is not only a finite linguistic act but an ongoing cultural one" (Lahiri 120) reiterates Bhabha's central premise. And at the conclusion of this essay which Lahiri clearly means to serve as her manifesto and apologia, she declares:

And whether I write as an American or an Indian, about things American or Indian or otherwise, one thing remains constant: I translate, therefore I am (Lahiri 120).

And this from a writer who, like Kureishi, has never translated a word, and who admits that when one of her short stories was published in translation into Bengali, which is her parents' mother-tongue (even if it was not quite her own) and which was therefore the (other?) language of her childhood, she could not understand the translated version – or as she herself put it, seeming to shift the responsibility from herself on to the translation, it proved "inaccessible to me" (Lahiri 120).

If this is cultural translation, we perhaps need to worry about the very meaning of the word "translation." One wonders why "translation" should be the word of choice in a collocation such as "cultural translation" in this new sense when perfectly good and theoretically sanctioned words for this new phenomenon, such as migrancy, exile or diaspora are already available and current. But given the usurpation that has taken place, it may be time for all good men and true, and of course women, who have ever practised literary translation, or even read translation with any awareness of it being translation, to unite and take out a patent on the word "translation," if it is not already too late to do so.

Such abuse or, in theoretical euphemism, such catachrestic use, of the term translation is, as it happens, mirrored and magnified through a semantic explosion or dilution in popular, non-theoretical usage as well. Newspapers constantly speak of how threats could "translate" into action or popularity into votes; there is a book titled *Translating L. A.*, which apparently means no more than describing L.A., and Susan Bassnett herself has recently written that Edwin Gentzler's book *Contemporary Translation Theories* is not only a critical survey but "effectively also a translation, for the author transforms a whole range of complex theoretical material into accessible language" (in Gentzler vi). But it is of course the same language, English, in which such theoretical complexity and such accessibility both exist. Even when these are not instances of "cultural translation" in the sense expounded by Bhabha, these are still instances of a kind of translation which does not involve two texts, or even one text, and certainly not more than one language. These are still examples of what Bhabha, with his usual felicity, has in another context called "non-substantive translation" (in personal conversation). One could perhaps go a step further and, without any attempt at matching felicity, call it simply non-translation.

In conclusion, one may suggest that there is an urgent need perhaps to protect and preserve

some little space in this postcolonial-postmodernist world, where newness constantly enters through cultural translation, for some old and old-fashioned literary translation. For, if such bilingual bicultural ground is eroded away, we shall sooner than later end up with a wholly translated, monolingual, monocultural, monolithic world. And then those of us who are still bilingual, and who are still untranslated from our own native ground to an alien shore, will nevertheless have been translated against our will and against our grain. Further, translation itself would have been untranslated or detranslated, for it would have come under erasure in a sense rather less deconstructive than Derrida's but plainly more destructive. The postcolonial would have thoroughly colonized translation, for translation in the sense that we have known and cherished it, and the value it possessed as an instrument of discovery and exchange, would have ceased to exist. Rather than help us encounter and experience other cultures, translation would have been assimilated in just one monolingual global culture.

All the recent talk of multiculturalism relates, it may be noted, not to the many different cultures located all over the world, but merely to expedient social management of a small sample of migrants from some of these cultures who have actually dislocated themselves and arrived in the First World, and who now must be melted down in that pot, or tossed in that salad, or fitted as an odd little piece into that mosaic. These stray little flotsam and jetsam of world culture which have been washed up on their shores are quite enough for the taste of the First World. Migrancy, often upper-class elite migrancy as for example from India, has already provided the First World with as much newness as it needs and can cope with, and given it the illusion that this tiny fraction of the Third World has already made the First World the whole world, the only world there is. Those of us still located on our own home turf and in our own cultures and speaking our own languages can no longer be seen or heard. All the politically correct talk of ecodiversity and biodiversity concerns a harmless and less problematic level of species below the human; there is no corresponding desire that one can discern for cultural or linguistic diversity. Funds from all over the world are being poured in to preserve and propagate the Royal Bengal Tiger, for example, which is declared to be an endangered species, but no such support is forthcoming for the Indian languages, which seem to be equally endangered by the increasing decimation of world languages by the one all-devouring, multinational, global language, English. It occurs to me that no international agency might want to save the Royal Bengal Tiger if it actually roared in Bengali; there may be the little

problem then of having to translate it into English first. In any case, the World Wildlife Fund is committed to saving only wild life, not cultured life.

In this brave new dystopian world of cultural translation, translation ironically would have been translated back to its literal, etymological meaning, of human migration. In early Christian use of the term, in fact, translation in the sense of being borne across took place when a dead person was bodily transported to the next world, or on a rare occasion when his body was transferred from one grave to another, as happened famously in the case of Thomas a Beckett, who was actually murdered and initially buried near the crypt of the Canterbury Cathedral but then, about 150 years later, when the trickle of pilgrims had swollen into a mainstream, moved and buried again within the same cathedral in the grand new Trinity Chapel. In both these senses, of bodily removal to the next world or to the next grave, we are talking of someone who is truly dead and buried. The many indigenous languages of the world and the channel of exchange between them, translation, may seem headed for the same fate in the time of cultural translation: to be dead and buried.*

3. PROBLEMS IN TRANSLATION

TRANSLATION PROBLEMS

Translators usually have to deal with six different problematic areas in their work, whether they are **translating technical documents** or a **sworn statement**. These include: lexical- semantic problems; *grammar*; *syntax*; *rhetoric*; and *pragmatic* and *cultural problems*. Not to mention administrative issues, computer-related problems and stress…

LEXICAL-SEMANTIC PROBLEMS

Lexical-semantic problems can be resolved by consulting dictionaries, glossaries, terminology banks and experts. These problems include terminology alternatives, neologisms, semantic gaps, contextual synonyms and antonyms (these affect polysemic units: synonyms and antonyms are only aimed at an acceptance which depends on the context to determine which meaning is correct), semantic contiguity (a consistency procedure which works by identifying semantic features common to two or more terms) and lexical networks.

GRAMMATICAL PROBLEMS

Grammatical problems include, for example, questions of temporality, aspectuality (the appearance indicates how the process is represented or the state expressed by the verb from the point of view of its development, as opposed to time itself), pronouns, and whether to make explicit the subject pronoun or not.

SYNTACTICAL PROBLEMS

Syntactical problems may originate in syntactic parallels, the direction of the passive voice, the focus (the point of view from which a story is organized), or even rhetorical figures of speech, such as a hyperbaton (the inversion of the natural order of speech) or an anaphora (repetition of a word or segment at the beginning of a line or a phrase).

RHETORICAL PROBLEMS

Rhetorical problems are related to the identification and recreation of figures of thought (comparison, metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, oxymoron, paradox, etc.) and diction.

PRAGMATIC PROBLEMS: AN EXAMPLE OF A MARKETING TRANSLATION

Pragmatic problems arise with the difference in the formal and informal modes of address using "you", as well as idiomatic phrases, sayings, irony, humor and sarcasm. These difficulties can also include other challenges; for example, in the translation of a marketing text from English into French, specifically with the translation of the personal pronoun "you". The translator must decide whether the formal or the informal "you" is more appropriate, a decision which is not always clear.

CULTURAL ISSUES: AN EXAMPLE OF A FINANCIAL TRANSLATION

Cultural issues may arise from differences between cultural references, such as names of food,

festivals and cultural connotations, in general. The translator will use language localization to correctly adapt the translation to the culture targeted. A very simple example is a financial translation which includes dates. If the text is in English, it is most likely, but not absolutely certain, that 05/06/2015 will mean June 5. However, as everyone knows, the same sequence in another language refers to May 6.

Translation demands a deep understanding of both grammar and culture. Translators need to know the rules of a language as well as the habits of the people who speak it. And even for the most experienced professionals, confusion and frustration are familiar feelings.

Some of the most common challenges of translation include:

Language Structure

Every language sits inside a defined structure with its own agreed upon rules. The complexity and singularity of this framework directly correlates to the difficulty of translation.

A simple sentence in English has a subject, verb, and object — in that order. For example, "she eats
pizza." But not every language shares this structure. Farsi typically follows a sequence of subject, then object, then verb. And in Arabic, subject pronouns actually become part of the verb itself.

As a result, translators frequently have to add, remove, and rearrange source words to effectively communicate in the target language.

Idioms and expressions

Idiomatic expressions explain something by way of unique examples or figures of speech. And most importantly, the meaning of these peculiar phrases cannot be predicted by the literal definitions of the words it contains.
Many linguistic professionals insist that idioms are the most difficult items to translate. In

fact, idioms are routinely cited as a problem machine translation engines will never fully solve.

Ideally, publishers should try to limit the number of idiomatic expressions contained in content they hope to translate. But if they insist on keeping these potentially confusing phrases, cultural familiarity must be a priority in translator recruitment.

Compound Words

Compound words are formed by combining two or more words together, but the overall meaning of the compound word may not reflect the meaning of its component words. It's usually best to think of them in terms of three separate groups.

The first group of compound words mean exactly what they say. "Airport," "crosswalk," and "seashore," are all familiar examples.The second group of compound words mean only half of what they say — at least in a literal sense. While a "bookworm" may enjoy burrowing into a good story, these avid readers don't suddenly become an invertebrate species in the process.

The third group of compound words have meanings that have nothing to do with the meanings of the individual words involved. For instance, the English "deadline" refers to the final acceptable time to receive or deliver something. It has nothing to do with death or a line. And a "butterfly" is neither a fly nor butter.

Missing Names

A language may not have an exact match for a certain action or object that exists in another language. In American English, for instance, some homeowners have what they describe as a "guest room." It is simply a space where their invited guests can sleep for the night.

This concept is common in other languages as well, but often expressed quite differently. Greeks describe it with the single word "*ksnona*" while their Italian neighbors employ a three-word phrase "*camera per gliospiti*" instead.

Two-Word Verbs

Sometimes a verb and a preposition will take on a separate, specific meaning when used together. Two-word verbs are common in informal English. “Look up,” “close up,” “fill out,” “shut up,” “bring up,” “break down” and “break in” are everyday examples. In many cases, though, it is neither necessary nor appropriate to translate the preposition separately.

Multiple Meanings

The same word may mean multiple things depending on where it’s placed and how it’s used in a sentence. This phenomenon typically follows one of two patterns.

There are homonyms (i.e. *Scale* the fish before weighing it on the *scale*), which look and sound alike but are defined differently. And then there are heteronyms (i.e. I drove down the *windy* road on a *windy* day), which look alike but are defined and pronounced differently.

Sarcasm

Sarcasm is a sharp, bitter, or cutting style of expression that usually means the opposite of its literal phrasing. Sarcasm frequently loses its meaning when translated word-for-word into another language and can often cause unfortunate misunderstandings.

Ideally, a publisher would remove sarcasm from the source text prior to translation. But in cases where that style is central to the content requirements, the publisher should explicitly underscore sarcastic passages. That way, translators will have a chance to avoid literal misunderstandings and suggest a local idiom that may work better in the target language.

TRANSLATION THEORIES

The study of proper principle of translation is termed as translation theory. This theory, based on a solid foundation on understanding of how languages work, translation theory recognizes that different languages encode meaning in differing forms, yet guides translators to find appropriate ways of preserving meaning, while using the most appropriate forms of each language. Translation theory includes principles for translating figurative language, dealing

with lexical mismatches, rhetorical questions, inclusion of cohesion markers, and many other topics crucial to good translation.

Basically there are two competing theories of translation. In one, the predominant purpose is to express as exactly as possible the full force and meaning of every word and turn of phrase in the original, and in the other the predominant purpose is to produce a result that does not read like a translation at all, but rather moves in its new dress with the same ease as in its native rendering. In the hands of a good translator neither of these two approaches can ever be entirely ignored.
Conventionally, it is suggested that in order to perform their job successfully, translators should meet three important requirements; they should be familiar with: the source language the target language the subject matter Based on this premise, the translator discovers the meaning behind the forms in the source language and does his best to produce the same meaning in the target language - using the forms and structures of the target language. Consequently, what is supposed to change is the form and the code and what should remain unchanged is the meaning and the message. (Larson, 1984)

One of the earliest attempts to establish a set of major rules or principles to be referred to in literary translation was made by French translator and humanist Étienne Dolet, who in 1540 formulated the following fundamental principles of translation ("La Manière de Bien Traduire d'une Langue en Aultre"), usually regarded as providing rules of thumb for the practicing translator:

The translator should understand perfectly the content and intention of the author whom he is translating. The principal way to reach it is reading all the sentences or the text completely so that you can give the idea that you want to say in the target language because the most important characteristic of this technique is translating the message as clearly and natural as possible. If the translation is for different countries besides Mexico, the translator should use the cultural words of that country. For example if he/she has to translate "She is unloyal with her husband" in this country it can be translated as "Ella le pone los cuernos" but in Peru it can be translated as "Ella le pone los cachos". In this case it is really important the cultural words

because if the translator does not use them correctly the translation will be misunderstood.

The translator should have a perfect knowledge of the language from which he is translating and an equally excellent knowledge of the language into which he is translating. At this point the translator must have a wide knowledge in both languages for getting the equivalence in the target language, because the deficiency of the knowledge of both languages will result in a translation without logic and sense. For example if you translate the following sentence "Are you interested in sports?" as "¿Estás interesado en deportes?" the translation is wrong since the idea of this question in English is "¿Practicas algún deporte?"

The translator should avoid the tendency to translate word by word, because doing so is to destroy the meaning of the original and to ruin the beauty of the expression. This point is very important and one of which if it is translated literally it can transmit another meaning or understanding in the translation.

For example in the sentence.- "In this war we have to do or die", if we translate literally "En esta guerra tenemos que hacer o morir" the message is unclear. The idea is, (.) "En esta guerra tenemos que vencer o morir."

The translator should employ the forms of speech in common usage. The translator should bear in mind the people to whom the translation will be addressed and use words that can be easily understood. Example. "They use a sling to lift the pipes" if the translation is to be read by specialists we would translate it "Utilizan una eslinga para levantar la tubería". If the text is to be read by people who are not specialists we would rather translate it "Utilizan una cadena de suspension para levantar los tubos".

4. Cultural Turn in Translation Studies

The culture turn of translation studies was initially put forward by Bassnett and Lefevere (1990) cultural approach in 1990. As important representatives of cultural approach in translation studies, Bassnett and Lefevere attached great importance to the role of culture in translation, the social background, the influence that cultural tradition imposed on translation, the subjectivity of translators and researching shift from linguistic to culture, thus improving

the literariness of translated texts. Such method of study expanded the scope of translation studies enormously, opened a new field of study, thus it enhanced a further and more comprehensive development of translation studies. This paper will present a brief introduction of the history of translation studies, analyzing the social causes of culture turn and especially discuss the series shifts brought by culture turn in status of translated texts and translators, and the methods of translation analysis. In the end, some personal viewpoints will be showed about the culture turn in translation studies.

5. TRANSLATION AND MULTILINGUISM

Though multilingualism has emerged as a very influential field of discourse in the recent past, the intersection of multilingualism and translation has not been seriously probed in academic debates and researches. Since translation is embedded in a multilingual context, it accomplishes the dynamics of multilingualism. It is considered to be very essential for the operation of a multilingual world.

For a long time translation was deemed to be an unimportant exercise attached to the departments of Comparative Literature and Linguistics. It was deemed to be a minor linguistic skill rather than a meaningful component to understand language dynamics. However, translation by definition, is a comprehensive interdisciplinary endeavour which endlessly mediates between different languages, identities and cultures. As Munoz Calvo and others argue “Translation is a cultural fact that means necessarily cross-cultural communication because translation enables language to cross borders and helps intercultural exchange and understanding. This border-crossing in particular signifies the translation’s ability to rise above any limitations to produce communication across different cultures.” (Munoz Calvo, M and Buesa Gomez, C. 2010). Thus, successful translation is contingent not only on the linguistic proficiency of the translator, but also on the expertise in the cultural context of both the source and the target languages. As it is impossible to imagine literary comprehension and critical practice without translation, even the modes of cultural exchange are incomplete without a meaningful interaction occasioned by it.

This conference intends to explore the larger functions of translation as it negotiates the issues of linguistic diversities, ideologies, language policies, identities and cultural exchange in

multilingual settings.

In recent times, the proliferation translation enterprise has reduced it to be a mere vertical transfer of ideas from bhasha languages 'into' English, creating monolithic perceptions about languages, cultures and identities. Parallel translations from one Indian language to the other, which makes cultural diffusion possible is on the verge of extinction. The proposed conference intends to examine these issues related to multilingualism, translation, cultural diversity, language policies, identities and the inter-relationships between them.

REFERENCES:

1. Bassnett, Susan. 2002. Translation Studies. London: Routledge.
2. Bassnett, Susan and Andre Lefevere. 1998. Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
3. Barnstone, W. 1993. The Poetics of Translation: History, Theory, Practice. Yale: Yale University Press.
4. Venuti, Lawrence ed. 2000. The Translation Studies Reader, London: Routledge
5. D. A. Russell and Michael Winterbottom. Classical Literary Criticism, University of Oxford, 2015.

UNIT - II

World Literature In Translation – SHS5013

Dante : The Divine Comedy - Paradiso Canto XXI

In this part of the poem, Dante ascends with Beatrice to the seventh Heaven, which is the plat Saturn. Here a golden ladder is place and the height of the ladder is infinite and the top of the ladder is not visible to Dante who is mortal. The narrator of the epic poem is Dante himself. Beatrice, the ideal beautiful woman guides the narrator through Heaven.

Dante turns to the face of Beatrice, but she is not smiling. She tells Dante that if she smiles, Dante will be reduced to mere ashes. She tells Dante of the tragedy of a woman named Semele who is the mother of Dionycious, the Greek God of fertility and wine by Jove had been turned to ashes when smiled. This is why the spirit of Beatrice did not smile at Dante. Her smile has the intensity of God's love which will destroy mortal beings. The reason was that they have climbed so high on the heavenly ladder and they have reached the point where Dante's senses cannot bear the great power of God's love reflected through spirit of Beatrice.

The beauty of Beatrice is more glorified and powerful when they reached the top step of the divine ladder and God's power and glory is reflected on the face of Beatrice, will burn the mortal senses of Dante when he looks at her. She says that Dante will be become like a leaf of tree which is burned to ashes when lightning and thunder strike it. Beatrice now announces that they have reached the Seventh Heaven. It is just below the Constellation of Leo which is always burning and light flashes everywhere downwards with the power and glory of God. Beatrice again warns Dante to listen and concentrate his mind and eyes and look where he usually look and he sees the reflected image of what comes next. So Dante looks at the bright eyes of Beatrice. There the narrator sees the wonderful landscape of Saturn reflected. Dante says that he is really grateful to his beautiful guide Beatrice and he blindly obeys every word of his ideal companion. When he looks at her, his joy is unlimited and she is also very happy on seeing the pleasure of the narrator. The narrator then saw a golden ladder slowly coming up and the sunlight is reflected on it. The ladder is going up so high that the narrator cannot see its top because he is mortal. When he looks down the steps, it is so bright that all the lights in the heaven seem to be appeared there. It is an amazing sight for Dante.

Thousands of souls are climbing up and down the steps of the golden ladder every minute just like the flocks of rooks (jackdaws) fly away in the bright morning to various parts of the sky in

order to warm their cold feathers in the bright sunlight. Some of them fly off without return, some others come back to where they started from and some others are flying round here and there. A multitude of shining spirits are moving on the steps of the golden ladder and one spirit comes so near Dante and Dante wants to talk to the spirit and must get permission from Beatrice. At this unspoken thought, Beatrice promptly gives the signal and Dante speaks to the soul why he comes so near and why there is perfect silence in this place, whereas, every other sphere is full of God's glorious music. The soul answers Dante for the 2nd question first and says that it is quite silent here because if they were to sing, the power of the song would break the ear-drums of Dante who is a mortal. In other words, Dante's mortal hearing could not bear the glory and power of the divine song at this level of heaven. Now the soul answers the first question of Dante.

The soul says that he has descended the golden ladder with the emergency purpose of meeting Dante. He adds that the soul is fully governed by God's love and will, and therefore the soul is asked to move down the ladder to meet Dante. Before the soul can even say the last words, the spirit begins spinning at a lightning speed and its spinning only makes the soul grow brighter and more beautiful and it says that its sight is very good and this is why God blesses him with so much grace. No one can know the mine of God, the soul warns Dante and advises Dante to report this important matter to the people when he returns home to the earth.

The warning of the spirit trembles Dante with fear and he is silent. The spirit is willing to reveal his identity. The brightly burning soul tells Dante once long ago he was a monk in a monastery at Catria in Italy. It was called Santa Croce di Forte Avellan. He came to the monastery as a sinner and became a saint soon. He worshipped God in meditation and prayer and lived on a simple vegetable diet cooked in olive juice. At that time the monastery supplied truly virtuous souls, but now the monastery is corrupted and barren. When he entered the monastery, he was called 'Peter the Sinner'. But now he is known as St. Peter Damian. Dante nods in agreement. St. Peter Damian continues his story. From the monastery he was dragged out to become a Cardinal. He preferred his monastery life to the Papal dignity of glory and power. St. Peter Damian recalls that one upon a time Popes were good and they led very simple and holy life, strictly following the teachings of the Bible and St. Paul wore the hat of the Cardinal and he walked "barefoot" and was lean, simple and holy.

But now, shaking his head, Peter Damian says that the Pops are plump and corrupted and that

they need a lot of servants and helpers to do everything because they love luxurious life. Peter's words have attracted other souls who are now gathered round a spectacle of light. When Peter Damian stops talking, the spirits cry out in agreement and Dante drops like an anchor because their combined voices have the power of thunderbolt in the blue sky and he was trembled with fear, as his senses are paralyzed with shock.

Paradise Canto XXI: (Seventh Heaven: Sphere of Saturn)

- Dante turns to face Beatrice, but she is not smiling.
- She explains that were she to smile, Dante would turn to ashes because they've climbed so high that they've reached the point where Dante's mortal senses cannot bear the brilliance of God's reflected love.
- She announces that they are now in the Seventh Heaven.
- Beatrice tells him to look where he'd usually look and he'll see the reflected image of what comes next.
- So Dante looks at Beatrice's eyes. There he sees the landscape of Saturn reflected. And rising from it is a magnificent golden ladder extending so high that Dante cannot see its top.
- Climbing down the steps of the ladder are thousands upon thousands of souls. Dante compares their movements, gathering together and flitting about once they reach the surface of Saturn, to the movement of a flock of jackdaws.
- Dante turns his attention to the nearest soul and thinks that he is so bright, he must be eager to speak. But he must await permission from Beatrice before speaking to the soul.
- At this unspoken thought, Beatrice promptly gives the signal and Dante's words are unleashed.
- Dante asks the aforementioned soul why he stepped up so close and why there's an unnatural silence in this sphere, whereas every other sphere has thundered with glorious music.
- The soul chooses to answer the second question first. It's quiet here, he says, because were we to sing, we'd burst your eardrums. In other words, Dante's mortal hearing could not handle the glory of song at this level of Heaven.
- In response to the first, the soul answers that he descended the golden ladder with the express purpose of meeting Dante. But he qualifies his answer with a humbling remark: it's not that God particularly favors this soul more than the others, only that this soul is governed by

God's will and thus obeys when told to move down the ladder.

- Okay, says Dante, I understand that you've aligned your will with God's, but I still don't understand why you in particular were predestined to meet me.
- Before he can even say the last words, though, the spirit begins spinning as fast as it can go.
- Predictably, his spinning only makes the soul grow brighter, and he replies, my sight is good which is why God blesses me with so much grace, but stop asking why, Dante. Nobody can know the mind of God. And you would do well to remind your fellow men of that when you return below.
- His haughty words make Dante take a step back. Thoroughly humbled, Dante meekly asks the soul his identity.
- The blazing soul responds that he once worshipped God in a place called Catria, specifically in the monastery of Santa Croce di Forte Avellana. In his meditation there, he was happy to live on a diet of veggies cooked only in olive juice.
- That monastery, the soul continues, used to turn out virtuous souls like clockwork, but "it is now barren." Then he names himself as St. Peter Damian. Dante nods in realization.
- St. Peter Damian continues his story. He was called "Peter the Sinner" when he first came to the monastery. From this place, he was reluctantly dragged out and eventually became a cardinal.
- This gives Peter an opportunity to blast the Papal Seat. He recounts how popes were once good, as when St. Paul wore the hat; he walked "barefoot" and was "lean." But now, Peter shakes his head, the popes are "so plump / that they have need of one to prop them up / on this side, one of that, and one in front, / and one to hoist them saddleward."
- Peter's words have attracted the souls, who are now gathered round in a spectacle of light; when Peter stops speaking, they cry out in agreement. And Dante drops like an anchor. Their combined voices have overwhelmed his senses, as St. Peter warned before.

2. THE BATTLE OF SALAMIS AESCHYLUS

The Battle of Salamis was a naval battle between the Greek city-states and Persia, fought in September, 480 BC in the straits between Piraeus and Salamis, a small island in the Saronic Gulf near Athens, Greece.

Background

The Athenians had fled to Salamis after the Battle of Thermopylae in August, 480 BC, while the Persians occupied and burned their city. The Greek fleet joined them there in August after the indecisive Battle of Artemisium. The Spartans wanted to return to the Peloponnese, seal off the Isthmus of Corinth with a wall, and prevent the Persians from defeating them on land, but the Athenian commander Themistocles persuaded them to remain at Salamis, arguing that a wall across the Isthmus was pointless as long as the Persian army could be transported and supplied by the Persian navy. His argument depended on a particular interpretation of the oracle at Delphi, which, in typical Delphic ambiguity, prophesized that Salamis would "bring death to women's sons," but also that the Greeks would be saved by a "wooden wall". Themistocles interpreted the wooden wall as the fleet of ships, and argued that Salamis would bring death to the Persians, not the Greeks. Furthermore some Athenians who chose not to flee Athens, interpreted the prophecy literally, barricaded the entrance to the Acropolis with a wooden wall, and fenced themselves in. The wooden wall was overrun, they were all killed, and the Acropolis was burned down by the Persians.

Preparations

The Greeks had 371 triremes and pentekonters (smaller fifty-oared ships), effectively under Themistocles, but nominally led by the Spartan Eurybiades. The Spartans had very few ships to contribute, but they regarded themselves the natural leaders of any joint Greek military expedition, and always insisted that the Spartan general would be given command on such occasions. There were 180 ships from Athens, 40 from Corinth, 30 from Aegina, 20 from Chalcis, 20 from Megara, 16 from Sparta, 15 from Sicyon, 10 from Epidaurus, 7 from Eretria, 7 from Ambracia, 5 from Troizen, 4 from Naxos, 3 from Leucas, 3 from Hermione, 2 from Styra, 2 from Cythnus, 2 from Ceos, 2 from Melos, one from Siphnus, one from Seriphus, and one from Croton.

The much larger Persian fleet consisted of 1207 ships, although their original invasion force consisted of many more ships that had since been lost due to storms in the Aegean Sea and at Artemisium. The Persians, led by Xerxes I, decided to meet the Athenian fleet off the coast of Salamis Island, and were so confident of their victory that Xerxes set up a throne on the shore, on the slopes of Mount Aegaleus, to watch the battle in style and record the names of commanders who performed particularly well.

Eurybiades and the Spartans continued to argue with Themistocles about the necessity of fighting at Salamis. They still wanted to fight the battle closer to Corinth, so that they could retreat to the mainland in case of a defeat, or withdraw completely and let the Persians attack them by land. Themistocles argued in favor of fighting at Salamis, as the Persian fleet would be able to continually supply their army no matter how many defensive walls Eurybiades built. At one point during the debate, spirits flared so badly that Eurybiades raised his staff of office and threatened to strike Themistocles with it. Themistocles responded calmly "Strike, but also listen". His eloquence was matched by his cunning. Afraid that he would be overruled by Eurybiades despite the Spartan's total lack of naval expertise, Themistocles sent an informer, a slave named Sicinnus, to Xerxes to make the Persian king believe that the Greeks had in fact not been able to agree on a location for battle, and would be stealthily retreating during the night.

Xerxes believed Sicinnus and had his fleet blockade the western outlet of the straits, which also served to block any Greek ships who might be planning to escape. Sicinnus was later rewarded with emancipation and Greek citizenship.Artemisia, the queen of Halicarnassus in Asia Minor and an ally of Xerxes, supposedly tried to convince him to wait for the Greeks to surrender, as a battle in the straits of Salamis would be deadly to the large Persian ships, but Xerxes and his chief advisor Mardonius pressed for an attack. Throughout the night the Persian ships searched the gulf for the Greek retreat, while in fact the Greeks remained on their ships, asleep. During the night Aristides, formerly a political opponent of Themistocles, arrived to report that Themistocles' plan had worked, and he allied with the Athenian commander to strengthen the Greek force.

The battle

The next morning (possibly September 28, but the exact date is unknown), the Persians were exhausted from searching for the Greeks all night, but they sailed in to the straits anyway to attack the Greek fleet. The Corinthian ships under Adeimantus immediately retreated, drawing the Persians further into the straits after them; although the Athenians later felt this was due to cowardice, the Corinthians had most likely been instructed to feign a retreat by Themistocles. Nevertheless none of the other Greek ships dared to attack, until one Greek trireme quickly rammed the lead Persian ship. At this, the rest of the Greeks joined the attack.

As at Artemisium, the much larger Persian fleet could not manoeuvre in the gulf, and a smaller contingent of Athenian and Aeginan triremes flanked the Persian navy. The Persians tried to turn back, but a strong wind sprang up and trapped them; those that were able to turn around were also trapped by the rest of the Persian fleet that had jammed the strait. The Greek and Persian ships rammed each other and something similar to a land battle ensued. Both sides had marines on their ships (the Greeks with fully armed hoplites), and arrows and javelins also flew across the narrow strait. The chief Persian admiral Ariamenes rammed Themistocles' ship, but in the hand-to-hand combat that followed Ariamenes was killed by a Greek foot soldier.

Only about 100 of the heavier Persian triremes could fit into the gulf at a time, and each successive wave was disabled or destroyed by the lighter Greek triremes. At least 200 Persian ships were sunk, including one by Artemisia, who apparently switched sides in the middle of the battle to avoid being captured and ransomed by the Athenians. Aristides also took another small contingent of ships and recaptured Psyttaleia, a nearby island that the Persians had occupied a few days earlier. It is said that it was the Immortals, the elite Persian Royal Guard, who during the battle had to evacuate to Psyttaleia after their ships sank: they were slaughtered to a man. According to Herodotus, the Persians suffered many more casualties than the Greeks because the Persians did not know how to swim; one of the Persian casualties was a brother of Xerxes. Those Persians who survived and ended up on shore were killed by the Greeks who found them.

Xerxes, sitting ashore upon his golden throne, witnessed the horror. He remarked that Artemisia was the only general to show any productive bravery ramming and destroying nine Athenian triremes, saying, "My female general has become a man, and my male generals all become women."

Aftermath

The victory of the Greeks marked the turning point in the Persian Wars. Xerxes and most of his army retreated to the Hellespont, where Xerxes wanted to march his army back over the

bridge of ships he had created before the Greeks arrived to destroy it (although they had in fact decided not to do this). Xerxes returned to Persia, leaving Mardonius and a small force to attempt to control the conquered areas of Greece. Mardonius recaptured Athens, but the Greek city-states joined together once more to fight him at the simultaneous battles of Plataea and Mycale in 479 BC. Because the Battle of Salamis saved Greece from being absorbed into the Persian Empire, it essentially ensured the emergence of Western civilization as a major force in the world. Many historians have therefore ranked the Battle of Salamis as one of the most decisive military engagements of all time.

3. THE WAGON OF LIFE A.S.PUSHKIN

Notes:

Life goes on despite of the changes that happen, more happiness more worries and heavy load embedded, yet time and life go on, without any stops. Our life has three stages, young, middle age, old age- time has three stages, morning noon and evening.

In the morning time, that is during our young age one feels that time goes very slower, not much things are happening, so we will usually order the wagon to go very fast.

The wagon of life travels fast and by noon (when we become old) we lose that courage, that power and also due to the ups and downs we meet, we order the wagon to go slow, we call the wagon of life as lunatic.

The speed is not altered in the evenings. But we are used to it. We know how to go on with it, we are tired of travelling, we want to take rest, stop the wagon (death) and sleep for a while. We don't shout faster or slower, the horses go on with their speed without alternation.

An Elegy by Alexander Pushkin

The key creator of modern literary Russian, Pushkin is the author of such superb long poems as "The Prisoner of Caucasus," "The Gypsies," "The Fountain of Bakhchisaray," "The Bronze Horseman" and, of course, the glorious "novel in verse" "Eugene Onegin." He has also given us the lean prose, golden and translucent like Baltic Sea amber, of "The Captain's Daughter," "The Tales of Belkin" and "The Queen of Spades." He wrote the drama "Boris Godunov," as

well as "Mozart and Salieri," "The Miserly Knight," "The Stone Guest" and "A Feast During the Plague," the last four compressed by the enormous weight of Pushkin's talent into the diamonds of one-act "little tragedies."

But to the Russians Pushkin is first and foremost the author of short lyrical poems, many known by heart by every educated Russian. Almost two centuries later, they are still the brightest stars in the firmament of Russian belle-lettres. In Vladimir Nabokov's superb autobiographical novel, "The Gift," the main character "fed on Pushkin" and "inhaled Pushkin." "The reader of Pushkin has the capacity of his lungs enlarged," Nabokov wrote.

Written on Sept. 8, 1830—autumn being Pushkin's favorite season, to which he penned several odes and during which he was often almost inhumanely productive, usually lying in bed till noon, filling a notebook propped on his knees—"Elegia" was created at the very end of the six-year period between 1824 and 1830 in which he wrote his finest lyrical poetry. (In later years Pushkin largely shifted to prose and histories). Prince Dmitry Svyatopolk-Mirsky, the author of the finest one- volume history of Russian literature from the 10th to early 20th century, called these short poems "a body of lyric verse unapproached in Russian and unsurpassed in any poetry." Their beauty, Svyatopolk-Mirsky continued, is austere, largely free from metaphor or imagery—a classic "Greek beauty" that depended so much on what's left unsaid as on what is said, and "on choice of words, on the adequacy of rhythm and intonation," and "on the complex texture of sound—a wonderful alliteratio Pushkiniana, so elusive and so all-conditioning."

The two sestets (six-line stanzas) of "Elegia" are meticulously metered and rhymed. The meter is an iambic pentameter: five rhythmically stressed syllables on each line, with stress on the second syllable. The rhyme scheme is AABBCC, with feminine rhymes (the rhymed syllables are penultimate on the line) alternating with masculine ones at the end of the line.

None of the existing translations is anywhere near the original. So here's my attempt at what Nabokov called a "lexical," or literal translation.

Thirty-one years old at the time—and, by contemporary life expectancy, having gone well "over half"—Pushkin begins with a merciless probing of middle-age angst:

The burnt-out gaiety of reckless years Lies heavy on me like a bleary hangover.
But, like wine, the sadness of the bygone days In my soul grows stronger the older it is.
My path is bleak. Labor and sorrow is promised me By the future's churning sea.
Is this all? Wouldn't, then, death be welcome, or at least, unobjectionable? Not quite.

But I don't want, o my friends, to die;

In the case of Pushkin, who was notoriously and recklessly brave in duels and, at least once, on a battlefield in the Caucasus, the desire to live is far more than the fear of death. There follows a magical line: "Greek," in Svyatopolk-Mirsky's sense of the word, but not only in its laconic austerity but also in its bottomless oracular depth:

I want to live to think and to suffer.

Then, on the reader still despairing over the first stanza, Pushkin bestows what is almost certainly among the shortest and most powerful inventory of life's immutable treasures penned by a poet:

I know there shall be enjoyments for me Amid sorrows, cares and anxieties:
At times I again will be intoxicated by harmony, Weep over my fantasy's creation,
And perhaps on my sad sunset Love will shine its farewell smile.
In the six years he had left to live (Pushkin was mortally wounded in a duel in January 1837), the poet would again unflinchingly confront the reality of the human condition yet continue to hold out the "blessings" still available to him (and us). "There is no happiness on earth yet there is peace and freedom," he wrote in "'Tis time, my friend, 'tis time" (1834). Whether one was subject to the despotism of the czar (in Russia) or the vagaries of the crowd's moods (in Western democracies), one was still able to "admire the divine beauties of Nature and to feel one's soul melt in the glow of man's inspired design" ("From Pindemonte," 1836, translated by

Nabokov).

But there would never be another poem like "Elegia"—filled as beautifully with so concentrated a dose of bitter truth, the courage to meet it head-on, and the hope that art, work and love make life worth our while even on the downslope.

The poem “An Elegy” deals with the past memories and pain in the poet’s heart.

Metaphor Alcohol = pain

Future – troubled ocean

His pain has destroyed his happiness and is suppressed.

Past, present and future are filled with worries.

Inspite of all mental disturbances, he wishes to live and not to leave.

Loves to share his happiness amongst his anxiety.

He desires to accept his worries and to lead his life.

Few drops of tears would let one move on.

Be optimistic.

A poem written in the genre of philosophical lyrics. This is an elegy, and despite the sadness of a bygone youth, it is filled with love of life.

The poet is looking forward. He is inspired by the upcoming change of life, but there is no, no, sad notes on his bygone youth, and they affect his impressionable soul.

These sad notes are a kind of hangover after a fun night (youth) and influenced the creation of the work. The metaphor of the “exciting sea” makes the reader understand that the poet does not expect a quiet life.

He realizes that life is continuous waves, a change of mood in a relationship, joy and anxiety, concern for tomorrow, the payment for which will be pleasure in love.

A.S. Pushkin wrote this elegy in 1830. It refers to philosophical lyrics. Pushkin turned to this genre as a poet, already middle-aged and wise in life and experience.

This poem is deeply personal. Two stanzas make a semantic contrast: the first discusses the drama of the life path, the second sounds the apotheosis of creative self-realization, of the poet’s high purpose. We can very well identify the lyrical hero with the author himself.

His works are full of optimism and faith in a brighter future, despite the fact that he wrote them, experiencing pain, sadness, and exile.

The Water-Nymph

Notes:

A prince and a miller's daughter have been involved in a romance together, but now the prince tells her that he must break it off. After the prince leaves, the distraught young woman attempts to drown herself.

When the prince's wedding day arrives, he is tormented by her image, which appears wherever he goes. Eventually, he is compelled to return and to try to find out what happened to her, regardless of the consequences.

Water-nymphs like to drag people to the bottom of the water with them so that they can never leave, therefore even though they are very beautiful; people tend to stay away from them.

Greek mythology

A water nymph came to earth, attracted a man and they fell in love with each other and later the man forsakes the water nymph

Later she realizes that she is pregnant

The water nymph then takes him from the shore with her, not as a revenge but out of love

“The Water Nymph” deals with the love of a water nymph and a monk

“In a lakeside with leafy groves, a friar escaped all worries”

The friar lives happily in the lakeside and spends his summer time there.

He is so pious and is on eternal past.

He has also dug a grave for himself awaiting for death considering, death to be a blessing.

One day, the entire place was covered by mist.

A mermaid appears and sits on the shore and disappears the next second.

The friar gets disturbed and his prayer life has changed.

That night, the maid comes again, smiles at him and splashes the water on him. Disappears again.

Next morning, the friar was awaiting for mermaid’s presence.

He went in search of the mermaid in the lake.

The monk disappeared.

His dead body was found by the fishermen.

Religious Life - Life with God

Worldly Pleasure - Life without God

REFERENCES:

1. Dante's Divine Comedy presented by the Electronic Literature Foundation. Multiple editions, with Italian and English facing page and interpolated versions.

2. The Comedy in English: trans. Cary (with Doré's illustrations) (zipped HTML downloadable from Project Gutenberg), Cary/Longfellow/Mandelbaum parallel edition.

3. Strauss, Barry (2004). The Battle of Salamis: The Naval Encounter That Saved Greece—and Western Civilization. New York: Simon and Schuster (hardcover, ISBN 0-7432-4450-8; paperback, ISBN 0-7432-4451-6).

4. Janko Lavrin, Pushkin and Russian Literature (1947, reprinted 1969), discusses Pushkin’s place and significance in the development of Russian literature.

UNIT - III

World Literature In Translation – SHS5013

I Will Marry When I Want-Ngũgĩwa Thiong'o

I Will Marry When I Want is one of the famed Kenyan playwright Ngugi wa Thiong'o's most revered plays. Set in post-independence Kenya, the play is a searing look at the legacies of colonialism and the myriad difficulties Kenyans faced in the aftermath of their successful overthrow of British colonial rule. It is renowned for its Marxist critique as well as its interweaving of lyrical and metaphysical elements. The play was written in Gĩkũyũ and was entitled Ngaahika Ndeenda.

Ngugi co-wrote the play with another Kenyan playwright, Ngugi wa Mirii. It was first performed in Kenya in 1977 at the Kamiriithu Community Education and Cultural Centre, an open-air theater in Limuru, Kenya. Ngugi stressed a particular form of theater in which the actors' attempts to embody their characters were visible to the audience, thus bringing about more unity between spectator and actor. He recruited village peasants to attend the performance.

The play was very successful and ran for a good amount of time before the Kenyan authorities shut it down. Many believe it also led to Ngugi's imprisonment, in which he was held in the Kamiri Maximum Security Prison in Nairobi from December 1977 to December 1978. There, he composed the play Devil on the Cross. He eventually left the country for fear for his safety, and did not return for several decades.

The play is set in post-colonial Kenya. Kĩgũũnda and his wife Wangeci, two poor peasants, are waiting for a visit from the wealthy Kĩoi and his wife, Jezebel. While they are waiting they argue with their daughter, Gathoni, who they believe to be to lazy and disrespectful on account of being influenced by modernity.

Two of their friends, Gĩcaamba and his wife Njooki, stop by before the visit. Gĩcaamba is very radical, and speaks of how oppressed the Kenyan people are by the Kenyan authorities and the

foreigners with whom they collaborate, as well as the deleterious Western religions that infiltrate their land. He decries the wealthy and their avarice, and how they consistently take from the poor to line their own pockets.

Gĩcaamba and Njooki leave as Kĩoi and his wife arrive. Wangeci and Kĩgũũnda secretly wonder if they are there because Gathoni is romantically involved with Kĩoi and Jezebel's son, John. Kĩoi and Jezebel, as well as two other upwardly- mobile Africans, Ndugĩre and his wife Helen, sit down and begin to inform Kĩgũũnda and Wangeci that they need to have a lawful Christian marriage and join

the church. They are both hesitant, and Kĩgũũnda practically shouts them out of his hut.

After they leave, Kĩgũũnda and Wangeci think about what the rich man and his wife said. Eventually Wangeci comes to believe that they want the marriage because then it would be fine for Gathoni and John to marry. Kĩgũũnda agrees, and they plan to go to Kĩoi's house to tell them they agree with the plan.

Before they go, Gĩcaamba and Njooki return and warn them about throwing their lot in with those people. Gĩcaamba says Kĩoi ought to have come with a wage increase, not with an invitation to join the Christian church. He says his friends' marriage in valid because it was done in the Kenyan way. Gĩcaamba urges them to remember how Christians were complicit with the enemies of the Kenyan people during the independence struggle.

Kĩgũũnda and Wangeci ignore these entreaties and decide to go to Kĩoi's house. They arrive and are treated rudely by Jezebel, not being allowed to eat with them, but when they announce their desire to have a Christian wedding, the rich couple is pleased.

Kĩgũũnda and Wangeci say they are happy to do this but have no money, and wonder if they can borrow a bit to pay for the ceremony and reception. Kĩoi and Jezebel laugh and say Kĩgũũnda is wealthy because he gets paid more than others and has a title deed to one and a half acres. Kĩoi finally says he will insure a loan at the bank for Kĩgũũnda, using the title deed

as collateral.

Kĩgũũnda and Wangeci are happy, and buy a lot of things for their house and for the wedding. They imagine the ceremony in their heads, but it all comes crashing down when Gathoni returns and cries that she is pregnant but John has jilted her.

They go to Kĩoi, assuming he will want the children to marry, but he viciously calls Gathoni a whore and says John is guilty of nothing. Kĩgũũnda is enraged and pulls out a sword he wears under his clothing. He threatens Kĩoi, who cowers in fear, but a home guard and Jezebel enter the house, with Jezebel brandishing a gun. She orders them to leave, and as Kĩgũũnda and Wangeci turn to go, Kĩgũũnda turns back for his sword and is shot by Jezebel.

After this incident, Wangeci wails to Gĩcaamba and Njooki about her family's troubles. Gathoni has left to become a barmaid, and Kĩgũũnda, recovered from being shot, is drunk and depressed. It seems that Kĩoi used his powers at the bank to call in the loan, which took away their title to their land, and then bought it himself so a foreign company could build a factory on it. Kĩgũũnda comes back from the bar and is angry, fighting with Wangeci.

Gĩcaamba says they must not fight amongst themselves, but instead rise up against their oppressors. All sing and pledge themselves to wake up, to fight back. They proclaim that the trumpet of the masses, of the poor, has been blown.

Kĩgũũnda

A passionate but occasionally brash man, Kĩgũũnda is the husband of Wangeci and father of Gathoni. He is frustrated with his lack of money and autonomy, but allows himself to be seduced by Kĩoi and his lifestyle. This leads to his eventual humiliation and loss of precious title deed, pushing him into temporary drunkenness, but he is eventually saved by Gĩcaamba's revolutionary rhetoric; by the end of the play, he devotes himself to the struggle against traitorous Kenyan elites and foreign influences.

Wangeci

The wife of Kĩgũũnda and mother of Gathoni, Wangeci is grudgingly aware of the class struggle but is wary of doing anything to compromise her daughter's happiness and her own standing in the eyes of her betters. She is ambivalent about independence, more rooted in the everyday than the universal struggle. She is weary, though, from poverty, and is resentful of foreigners and being humiliated by her betters. She comes to agree with the others that there must be a new movement of the people.

Gathoni

The beautiful but superficial daughter of Kĩgũũnda and Wangeci, Gathoni falls in love with John. Her desire to be admired and rich leads her to ignore class differences, and she ends up pregnant and jilted. She eventually leaves her family to become a barmaid.

Kĩoi

A wealthy, greedy, and devious Kenyan who has embraced the religion and values of the white man, Kĩoi is the antagonist of the play. He encourages Kĩgũũnda to convert to Christianity and eventually swindles him out of his small parcel of land. He is depicted as a traitor to his people.

Jezebel

The snobby wife of Kĩoi and mother to John, Jezebel -- as her name implies -- is an immoral woman because of her association with foreigners and her place within the rapacious colonial elite.

Gĩcaamba

A poor laborer and the husband of Njooki, Gĩcaamba is articulate, passionate, and intelligent.

He advocates the Marxist class struggle, comparing it to his days of being a Mau Mau rebel fighting the colonial oppressors. He encourages Kĩgũũnda and Wangeci to not have any dealings with Kĩoi and Jezebel, and, once his friends' fortunes go downhill, to rise up against foreigners, the Kenyan elite, Western religions, etc.

Njooki

The wife of Gĩcaamba, she is almost as radical as her husband; she encourages Wangeci to be aware of class differences and push back against elite oppressors.

Ndugĩre

Husband to Helen, Ndugĩre is a newly rich Kenyan who is now friends with Kĩoi on account of his social status. He is Christian as well, but is clearly blinded by Western values and is betraying his fellow Kenyans.

Helen

The wife of Ndugĩre, Helen is also Christian and smugly ignorant of the class struggle since she and her husband now have money.

Ikuua wa Nditika

A portly, irreverent, and wealthy Kenyan who works with Kĩoi. He is loud and dissolute, but is ostensibly Christian.

John Mũhũũni

The son of Kĩoi and Jezebel, John romances Gathoni, but ultimately abandons and criticizes her when he learns she is pregnant. He is morally bankrupt, like his parents.

2. Oedipus Rex

King Oedipus of Thebes sends his brother-in-law Creon to identify the cause of the mysterious plague that has struck the city. Creon reports that the plague will be lifted if the man who killed the former king, Laius, is brought to justice.

- Queen Jocasta doesn't believe Tiresias when he says Oedipus is the murderer. Once, an oracle told her that her husband would be killed by their child, and because (she thinks) that hasn't come true, she doesn't believe Tiresias.
- To prevent her child from killing her husband, Jocasta left the baby to die on the side of the road. Oedipus suspects that he was that abandoned baby. When he first came to Thebes, he met and killed a man on the road who

turned out to be Lauis, his father. He then met and married the widowed Jocasta, his own mother.

- A messenger and a servant confirm the tale. Jocasta hangs herself out of shame. Oedipus discovers her body and uses the pins of her brooches to stab out his own eyes.

In Oedipus Rex, Creon is the brother of Laius; he brings back Apollo's prophecy that the murderer of King Laius must be exiled. Oedipus suspects that Creon is competing for the throne, but Creon denies this and acts with compassion after Oedipus is revealed to be the source of Thebes's woes.

Jocasta is Oedipus's wife and mother, as well as the mother to his children. She defends Creon and tries to shield Oedipus from his true identity; in the end, she kills herself.

Oedipus is the protagonist and the epitome of a tragic character as defined by Aristotle: he is the victim of a hereditary curse that leads him to kill his father and marry his own mother. Once he realizes his true identity, Oedipus blinds himself and goes into exile.

Teiresias is a blind prophet and servant of Apollo who reluctantly reveals that Oedipus is the

murderer of Laius and foreshadows Oedipus's fate.

Summary:

Oedipus the King unfolds as a murder mystery, a political thriller, and a psychological whodunit. Throughout this mythic story of patricide and incest, Sophocles emphasizes the irony of a man determined to track down, expose, and punish an assassin, who turns out to be himself.

As the play opens, the citizens of Thebes beg their king, Oedipus, to lift the plague that threatens to destroy the city. Oedipus has already sent his brother- in-law, Creon, to the oracle to learn what to do.

On his return, Creon announces that the oracle instructs them to find the murderer of Laius, the king who ruled Thebes before Oedipus. The discovery and punishment of the murderer will end the plague. At once, Oedipus sets about to solve the murder.

Summoned by the king, the blind prophet Tiresias at first refuses to speak, but finally accuses Oedipus himself of killing Laius. Oedipus mocks and rejects the prophet angrily, ordering him to leave, but not before Tiresias hints darkly of an incestuous marriage and a future of blindness, infamy, and wandering.

Oedipus attempts to gain advice from Jocasta, the queen; she encourages him to ignore prophecies, explaining that a prophet once told her that Laius, her

husband, would die at the hands of their son. According to Jocasta, the prophecy did not come true because the baby died, abandoned, and Laius himself was killed by a band of robbers at a crossroads.

Oedipus becomes distressed by Jocasta's remarks because just before he came to Thebes he killed a man who resembled Laius at a crossroads. To learn the truth, Oedipus sends for the

only living witness to the murder, a shepherd.

Another worry haunts Oedipus. As a young man, he learned from an oracle that he was fated to kill his father and marry his mother. Fear of the prophecy drove him from his home in Corinth and brought him ultimately to Thebes. Again, Jocasta advises him not to worry about prophecies.

Oedipus finds out from a messenger that Polybus, king of Corinth, Oedipus' father, has died of old age. Jocasta rejoices — surely this is proof that the prophecy Oedipus heard is worthless. Still, Oedipus worries about fulfilling the prophecy with his mother, Merope, a concern Jocasta dismisses.

Overhearing, the messenger offers what he believes will be cheering news. Polybus and Merope are not Oedipus' real parents. In fact, the messenger himself gave Oedipus to the royal couple when a shepherd offered him an abandoned baby from the house of Laius.

Oedipus becomes determined to track down the shepherd and learn the truth of his birth. Suddenly terrified, Jocasta begs him to stop, and then runs off to the palace, wild with grief.

Confident that the worst he can hear is a tale of his lowly birth, Oedipus eagerly awaits the shepherd. At first the shepherd refuses to speak, but under threat of death he tells what he knows — Oedipus is actually the son of Laius and Jocasta.

And so, despite his precautions, the prophecy that Oedipus dreaded has actually come true. Realizing that he has killed his father and married his mother, Oedipus is agonized by his fate.

Rushing into the palace, Oedipus finds that the queen has killed herself. Tortured, frenzied, Oedipus takes the pins from her gown and rakes out his eyes, so that he can no longer look upon the misery he has caused. Now blinded and disgraced, Oedipus begs Creon to kill him, but as the play concludes, he quietly submits to Creon's leadership, and humbly awaits the oracle that will determine whether he will stay in Thebes or be cast out forever.

3. Maurice Maeterlinck's The Intruder, the Blind and the Seven Princess

Maurice Maeterlinck (1862 - 1949) changed the course of European theatre, introducing Symbolism, and won the Nobel Prize for Literature, but none of his works has been in print in English for many years; the last English translations were done in the 1890s. At the premiere of his first play, La Princess Maleine (1889), Verlaine, Gauguin and Octave Mirbeau were among the audience; Mirbeau's championing of the ''Belgian Shakespeare' brought him worldwide fame and the early plays were performed in England and the United States at the time but he is best remembered now for Pélléas et Mélisande (1892), set as an opera by Claude Debussy, and his fairy-play L'Oiseau Bleu (The Blue Bird). Among his early works are a series of short works Maeterlinck called ''Marionette Plays'. They are static tableaux, showing fragile figures at the mercy of fate, but heavily charged with atmosphere.

The Intruder premiered in Paris, France on May 20th, 1891. And in 1891, France was in its Third Republic. This time period is commonly defined as 1870-1940, beginning with the fall of the Second Empire in 1870 and ending during World War II in 1940 when the National Assembly voted to create decrees that would ultimately result in a new constitution for France (Pinkney 357-358). The Third Republic, in spite of party struggles, became "accustomed to the practice of parliamentary democracy, developed its economic potential, created a colonial empire, and by shrewd diplomacy forged the alliances that enabled it to resist German might in 1914" (Pinkney 305). More specifically, within the Third Republic is the time period from 1871-1914, before World War I, which is known as La Belle Époque or "The Beautiful Era." La Belle Époque was full of optimism; peace in Europe encouraged a thriving arts community and technological advancements. It was considered "one of the great ages in French literature, art, and science" (Pinkney 319). This era produced great works by poets such as Arthur Rimbaud and Paul Verlaine, and painters such as Claude Monet, Edgar Degas, Pierre Renior, Henri Matisse, and Pablo Picasso (Pinkney 319). And, these writers and artists were deemed the "Decadents" in regards to the decadence of the prospering arts scene (Deak 2). Also during this time, chemist Louis Pasteur and physicists Pierre and Marie Curie found success within the scope of French science (Pinkney 319).

Maeterlinck's The Intruder was a product of this era, an era of great innovation in the arts and sciences. This climate fostered the growth of the Symbolist Movement, which lasted from 1885-1895 (Deak 3). The Intruder's premiere, being 1891, was introduced to the public at the "privileged moment of symbolism;" it was called such due to the extreme popularity and height of the movement in the 1890s (Deak 3). In fact, the premiere of The Intruder was held at Théâtre d'Art, one of the two prominent symbolist theaters, the other being Théâtre de l'Oeuvre. These theaters were considered prominent because of the number of symbolist shows they housed; Between the two, they were home to at least 40 symbolist productions from the years of 1890 to 1897 (Deak 4). Specifically, The Intruder's opening was held at the Théâtre d'Art as a part of a benefit for the French poet Paul Verlaine and Paul Gaunguin, a French Post-Impressionist painter whose bold art greatly affected the symbolist Movement (Knapp). Paul Gaunguin is known to have said, "Art is an abstraction. Derive it from nature even as you dream before it, and think more about creating than about the outcome." (le Pichon 73). Just as this statement of Gaunguin shows, a symbolist belief was that the invisible or dream world could become visible by means of creating symbols (Symons). This is important to The Intruder because the "Intruder" is an invisible force throughout the duration of the play. Additionally, Maeterlinck's work was showcased for these prominent symbolists, which only reiterates the strength of the ties The Intruder has to symbolism.

The Symbolist Movement was primarily a European movement which found its heart in France. The symbolism that characterized this movement was "suggestive rather than cut-and-dried" (Hovey). As seen in The Intruder, the Dutch clock increasing its noise suggests that something unexpected is going to happen soon, but no character or stage direction explicitly states why the Dutch clock becomes so noisy. Along with it being suggestive, the movement, in particular, brought forth "literature in which the visible world is no longer a reality, and the unseen world no longer a dream" (Symons). Behind every word, every phrase, every action, everything was "lurking universality, the adumbration of greater things" (Hovey). Meaning was more than abundant in symbolist plays; it was everywhere. Anything could mean something, and it probably did mean something. A Sister of Mercy appears at the end of the play, but she never states her purpose. Even she, as a character, has the ability to be a symbol.

The Intruder has no set time period; Maeterlinck gives no year in which the play is to occur or any indication that it necessarily needs to be in the late 19th century, the time when he wrote the play and it first appeared on stage. The world of the play, therefore, has a universal time period. This timelessness was characteristic of symbolist plays, and Maeterlinck was influenced by the works of Mystics such as Meister Eckhart and Jakob Boehme to delve into "areas where feelings and sensations were no longer restricted to the phenomenological realm" (Knapp 31). The visible world was only one part of reality, the other was the invisible world (Knapp 31). Also, the world of the play is defined by Maeterlinck's sparce stage directions at the top of the first page of the play. Even though he is not extensive in his description of the setting, what he does mention holds value in relation to the symbolic nature of the play. Maeterlinck sets the play in an "old country house." The location does not change throughout the entirety of the play. He specifies that there is a "Dutch clock" and "stained-glass windows, in which the color green predominates." By making certain to mention these in particular, Maeterlinck gives weight and significance to these items. A Dutch clock is defined by its pendulum, and the inventor was Christian Huygens in 1656, a Dutch astronomer, physicist, and mathematician of note. Huygens may be important in respect to the play because he published works on the subject of optics, which essentially is the study of light and its properties — the behavior of the visible and the invisible (Bell). Because light in is one of Maeterlinck's heaviest symbols in The Intruder, and because the symbolists and mystics held a fascination with seen versus unseen realities, the Dutch clock could be a direct reference to the scientific exploration of the visible and invisible, especially because the La Belle Époque era was a time of growth within both the sciences and arts (Knapp 31). Additionally, the stained-glass being mostly green may be linked to the standard religious interpretation of green in stained-glass; green "symbolizes faith, immortality and contemplation; spring; triumph of life over death." (Knight). Because Maeterlinck has a death at the end of the play at the same time a Sister of Mercy appears, the green, in this case, could be representative of the triumph of spiritual life over and beyond that of worldly death.

Moreover, the drama surrounds a family in a stage of waiting. The world of the play is their world, their home, and the audience waits with them as the play goes on. Maurice Maeterlinck

(1862-1949) wrote the play Les Aveugles in 1890, twenty-one years before he would be awarded the Nobel Prize for literature. Many have argued that this play and his other Symbolist works for the theatre are essentially language plays (or, perhaps better, "silence plays," fundamentally suspicious of language). Without a doubt, however, Maeterlinck wrote his plays for performance. His Pelléas et Mélisande opened the Théâtre de l'Œuvre in Paris in 1893 and the production theatrically underscored the general Symbolist investment in dreamscapes, hallucination, myth, and ritual. The Symbolist rejection of representationalism in art was rooted in the belief that truth is beyond the sensory world and can only be intuited through a rich use of allusory symbols to evoke a meditative state of mind. Much of Pelléas and Mélisande was staged in semi-darkness with the actors moving like sleepwalkers, gesturing solemnly in a highly stylized manner. The actors spoke in a staccato and monotone chant, broken by long pauses and repetition, and the audience viewed the entire performance through gauze stretched across the proscenium as if "through the mists of time." In an essay outlining his approach to theatre titled "The Tragical in Daily Life," Maeterlinck wrote that he was not interested in a theatre of action, where plot and event are key, but in a "static" theatre: "It is not in the actions but in the words that are found the beauty and greatness of tragedies." But interestingly, for Maeterlinck it is not great words that make tragedy great. With a twist that had resonance in Naturalism as well as Symbolism
-- that is, in the Modern theatre -- Maeterlinck argued that "the only words that count in the play are those that at first seemed useless, for it is therein that the essence lies."

It is common to say that the Symbolists did not engage with social problems or the relationship between humans and their environment (that was a Naturalist preoccupation). But such a claim would be shortsighted. Politically motivated directors, such as Vsevolod Meyerhold, would craft productions of Maeterlinck and other Symbolist works as, precisely, productions aimed at political change (though the degree of their success is topic for a different set of notes). The point here is that this play has struck our production team in 2007 as not only deeply invested in its own time, but pertinent to a contemporary set of fears and concerns about society, ethical engagement, the environment, and the coming of the future.

Maeterlinck wrote The Blind at the turn of the 20th century and his play expresses an

enormous sense of anxiety. For example, the importance of the baby to the play begs the question: What would the new century bring? Will the young, born on the threshold of the new century, be able to "see"? That is, will they be able to navigate what is coming their way (literally in the approach of footsteps from the future)? The twelve blind people who find themselves stranded on an island with weather out of control and birds migrating erratically are waiting for a Priest whom Maeterlinck has scripted as lying dead on stage -- dead from the very beginning. Even more than in Beckett's Godot, the arrival of the awaited figure is a predetermined endgame. However, the blind, being blind, cannot "see" that their leader is a corpse. They continue to invest in his return, though they are increasingly terrified about their future. To late 19th-century audiences, the parable would not be hard to interpret: Had God really died, as Nietzsche had proclaimed, leaving humans to fend for themselves?

Right away, we felt that staging this play seven years into the 21st century would be a fascinating project. Might blindness mean both literal blindness and the refusal to see? Can we be "blinded" through inundation with images? That is, does our dependency on screens in so-called visual culture promote a kind of blindness? In an age of increased surveillance, is vision displaced? Is surveillance a mode of disciplining citizens, as Foucault has claimed –- indeed disciplining us to act blind (what Diana Taylor has called "percepticide")? If hyper-visibility is a contemporary reality, what account can we give for those kept solidly from sight -- those lost in the prison industrial complex, or those robbed of rights as so-called detainees? Can we see those who have been denied even their names? To ask this question, we have employed a shadow ensemble alongside Maeterlinck's blind, as you will see.

Maeterlinck's dead Priest is clearly provocative, and arguably still resonant. The matter of God, dead on stage, is an interesting one for our time. Are we still afraid that God is dead? Or are we perhaps afraid that God is not dead, judging from the acts of violence that continue to take place in his names? We asked ourselves these questions repeatedly. Should we place a live actor on stage feigning death? Or, make a dummy appear as if it were once alive? Perhaps death, like God, is sometimes less decidable, less complete, less corporeal, less obvious. But the God figure was not the only staging puzzle. How should we stage the "Big Dog" that somewhat randomly "enters the forest"? And then, what about the crying baby? Everyone

knows that children and animals and corpses are huge “No Nos” in the theatre. They are very distracting. Then again, so is video -- and we've employed several projection surfaces.

Finally, what about the cast? Maeterlinck called for six blind men and six blind women. In Maeterlinck’s play, the men are vastly dominant, wielding a huge percentage of the lines. Three of the “older women” do nothing but pray and one “mad woman” never speaks. We decided to cast gender blind (though not entirely, as some sense of Maeterlinck’s gender divide remains), and we also worked to divide the lines more evenly between the “men” and the “women.” We worked to retain Maeterlinck’s humor -- he is very funny at times -- and we hope that our adaptation is essentially true to the original text. Please visit the April adaptation and February original script posts on this blog.

Maeterlinck wrote during the First World War that “No nation can be deceived that does not wish to be deceived ... No nation permits herself to be coerced to the one crime that man cannot pardon. It is of her own accord that she hastens towards it.” The coming century that terrified Maeterlinck’s twelve blind parishioners lies behind us now. Were the fears of Maeterlinck’s Blind well-founded? What about today? What are we afraid of? What are we afraid to see? Will the 21st century be as violent as the 20th? Does all of Maeterlinck’s weather imagery -- storming, flooding, seas rising, great ice forming -- carry a contemporary urgency, perhaps more literal than symbolic? This production explores these issues and while we make some obvious (and troubling) suggestions, we (like Maeterlinck) offer no answers. We hope that our production provokes questions as we trust, perhaps blindly, that questions themselves can be productive.

REFERENCES:

1. "I Will Marry When I Want (by Ngũgĩ wa Thiongo'o and Ngũgĩ wa Mĩriĩ)". Africa Book

Club. 2014-07-03. Retrieved 2018-12-08.
2. wa Thiong'o, Ngugi; Ngugi wa Mirii (1980). I Will Marry When I Want. Heinemann Educational Books. p. 1. ISBN 0-435-90246-6.
3. Mulroy, David. trans. “Introduction”. Sophocles, Oedipus Rex. Univ of Wisconsin Press, (2011) ISBN 9780299282530. p. xxviii
4. Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. Introduction and trans. Sophocles: Ajax, Electra, Oedipus Tyrannus. By Sophocles. Loeb Classical Library ser. vol. 20. Harvard University Press. ISBN 978-0674995574.
5. Spelled Maurice (Mooris) Polidore Marie Bernhard Maeterlinck on the official Nobel Prize page

UNIT - IV

World Literature In Translation – SHS5013

SIDDHARTHA

In the novel, Siddhartha, a young man, leaves his family for a contemplative life, then, restless, discards it for one of the flesh. He conceives a son, but bored and sickened by lust and greed, moves on again. Near despair, Siddhartha comes to a river where he hears a unique sound. This sound signals the true beginning of his life—the beginning of suffering, rejection, peace, and, finally, wisdom.

Siddhartha, the handsome and respected son of a Brahmin, lives with his father in ancient India. Everyone in the village expects Siddhartha to be a successful Brahmin like his father. Siddhartha enjoys a near-idyllic existence with his best friend, Govinda, but he is secretly dissatisfied. He performs all the rituals of religion, and he does what religion says should bring him happiness and peace. Nonetheless, he feels something is missing. His father and the other elders have still not achieved enlightenment, and he feels that staying with them will not settle the questions he has about the nature of his existence. Siddhartha believes his father has already passed on all the wisdom their community has to offer, but he longs for something more.

One day, a group of wandering ascetics called Samanas passes through town. They are starved and almost naked and have come to beg for food. They believe enlightenment can be reached through asceticism, a rejection of the body and physical desire. The path the Samanas preach is quite different from the one Siddhartha has been taught, and he believes it may provide some of the answers he is looking for. He decides to follow this new path. Siddhartha's father does not want him to join the Samanas, but he cannot dissuade Siddhartha. Govinda also wants to find a path to enlightenment, and he joins Siddhartha in this new life.

Siddhartha adjusts quickly to the ways of the Samanas because of the patience and discipline he learned in the Brahmin tradition. He learns how to free himself from the traditional trappings of life, and so loses his desire for property, clothing, sexuality, and all sustenance except that required to live. His goal is to find enlightenment by eliminating his Self, and he successfully renounces the pleasures of the world.

Sunburned and half-starved, Siddhartha soon ceases to resemble the boy he used to be. Govinda is quick to praise the Samanas and notes the considerable moral and spiritual

improvements they both have achieved since joining. Siddhartha, however, is still dissatisfied. The path of self-denial does not provide a permanent solution for him. He points out that the oldest Samanas have lived the life for many years but have yet to attain true spiritual enlightenment. The Samanas have been as unsuccessful as the Brahmins Siddhartha and Govinda left behind. At this time, Siddhartha and the other Samanas begin to hear about a new holy man named Gotama the Buddha who has attained the total spiritual enlightenment called Nirvana. Govinda convinces Siddhartha they both should leave the Samanas and seek out Gotama. Siddhartha and Govinda inform the leader of the Samanas of their decision to leave. The leader is clearly displeased, but Siddhartha silences him with an almost magical, hypnotizing gaze.

Siddhartha and Govinda find Gotama's camp of followers and are taken in. Siddhartha is initially pleased with Gotama, and he and Govinda are instructed in the Eightfold Path, the four main points, and other aspects of Buddhism. However, while Govinda is convinced to join Gotama and his followers, Siddhartha still has doubts. He has noticed a contradiction in Gotama's teachings: Siddhartha questions how one can embrace the unity of all things, as the Buddha asks, if they are also being told to overcome the physical world. Siddhartha realizes Buddhism will not give him the answers he needs. Sadly, he leaves Govinda behind and begins a search for the meaning of life, the achievement of which he feels will not be dependent on religious instruction.

Siddhartha decides to embark on a life free from meditation and the spiritual quests he has been pursuing, and to instead learn from the pleasures of the body and the material world. In his new wanderings, Siddhartha meets a friendly ferryman, fully content with his simple life. Siddhartha crosses the ferryman's river and comes to a city. Here, a beautiful courtesan named Kamala entrances him. He knows she would be the best one to teach him about the world of love, but Kamala will not have him unless he proves he can fit into the material world. She convinces him to take up the path of the merchant. With her help, Siddhartha soon finds employment with a merchant named Kamaswami and begins to learn the trade. While Siddhartha learns the wisdom of the business world and begins to master the skills Kamaswami teaches him, Kamala becomes his lover and teaches him what she knows about love.

Years pass, and Siddhartha's business acumen increases. Soon, he is a rich man and enjoys the benefits of an affluent life. He gambles, drinks, and dances, and anything that can be bought in the material world is his for the taking. Siddhartha is detached from this life, however, and he can never see it as more than a game. He doesn't care if he wins or loses this game because it doesn't touch his spirit in any lasting way. The more he obtains in the material world, the less it satisfies him, and he is soon caught in a cycle of unhappiness that he tries to escape by engaging in even more gambling, drinking, and sex. When he is at his most disillusioned, he dreams that Kamala's rare songbird is dead in its cage. He understands that the material world is slowly killing him without providing him with the enlightenment for which he has been searching. One night, he resolves to leave it all behind and departs without notifying either Kamala or Kamaswami.

Sick at heart, Siddhartha wanders until he finds a river. He considers drowning himself, but he instead falls asleep on the riverbank. While he is sleeping, Govinda, who is now a Buddhist monk, passes by. Not recognizing Siddhartha, he watches over the sleeping man to protect him from snakes. Siddhartha immediately recognizes Govinda when he wakes up, but Govinda notes that Siddhartha has changed significantly from his days with the Samanas and now appears to be a rich man. Siddhartha responds that he is currently neither a Samana nor a rich man. Siddhartha wishes to become someone new. Govinda soon leaves to continue on his journey, and Siddhartha sits by the river and considers where his life has taken him.

Siddhartha seeks out the same content ferryman he met years before. The ferryman, who introduces himself as Vasudeva, radiates an inner peace that Siddhartha wishes to attain. Vasudeva says he himself has attained this sense of peace through many years of studying the river. Siddhartha expresses a desire to likewise learn from the river, and Vasudeva agrees to let Siddhartha live and work beside him. Siddhartha studies the river and begins to take from it a spiritual enlightenment unlike any he has ever known. While sitting by the river, he contemplates the unity of all life, and in the river's voice he hears the word Om.

One day Kamala the courtesan approaches the ferry along with her son on a pilgrimage to visit Gotama, who is said to be dying. Before they can cross, a snake bites Kamala. Siddhartha and Vasudeva tend to Kamala, but the bite kills her. Before she dies, she tells Siddhartha that he is

the father of her eleven-year-old son. Siddhartha does his best to console and provide for his son, but the boy is spoiled and cynical. Siddhartha's son dislikes life with the two ferrymen and wishes to return to his familiar city and wealth. Vasudeva believes Siddhartha's son should be allowed to leave if he wants to, but Siddhartha is not ready to let him go. One morning, Siddhartha awakens to find his son has run away and stolen all of his and Vasudeva's money. Siddhartha chases after the boy, but as he reaches the city he realizes the chase is futile. Vasudeva follows Siddhartha and brings him back to their home by the river, instructing him to soothe the pain of losing his son by listening to the river.

Siddhartha studies the river for many years, and Vasudeva teaches Siddhartha how to learn the many secrets the river has to tell. In contemplating the river, Siddhartha has a revelation: Just as the water of the river flows into the ocean and is returned by rain, all forms of life are interconnected in a cycle without beginning or end. Birth and death are all part of a timeless unity. Life and death, joy and sorrow, good and evil are all parts of the whole and are necessary to understand the meaning of life. By the time Siddhartha has learned all the river's lessons, Vasudeva announces that he is through with his life at the river. He retires into the forest, leaving Siddhartha to be the ferryman.

The novel ends with Govinda returning to the river to seek enlightenment by meeting with a wise man who lives there. When Govinda arrives, he does not recognize that the wise man is Siddhartha himself. Govinda is still a follower of Gotama but has yet to attain the kind of enlightenment that Siddhartha now radiates, and he asks Siddhartha to teach him what he knows. Siddhartha explains that neither he nor anyone can teach the wisdom to Govinda, because verbal explanations are limited and can never communicate the entirety of enlightenment. Instead, he asks Govinda to kiss him on the forehead, and when Govinda does, the vision of unity that Siddhartha has experienced is communicated instantly to Govinda. Govinda and Siddhartha have both finally achieved the enlightenment they set out to find in the days of their youth.

Siddhartha - The novel's protagonist. Siddhartha sets out on a quest for enlightenment and tests the religious philosophies he discovers. Siddhartha's most defining characteristic is his desire for a transcendent, spiritual understanding of himself and the world. He devotes himself wholeheartedly to the pursuit of this understanding, even when the path is difficult. Outside forces do not easily sway Siddhartha, and he follows his heart. A man dedicated to his personal

quest for knowledge, Siddhartha will abandon a course if he feels it is flawed. Siddhartha has a son, who is also named Siddhartha.

Vasudeva - The enlightened ferryman who guides Siddhartha to a transcendent understanding of himself and the universe. Vasudeva is spiritually and socially flawless, and he ferries true seekers of wisdom to enlightenment. He is closely linked to the river, and he helps Siddhartha learn how to listen to the river's secrets. Siddhartha achieves enlightenment only because of his association with Vasudeva.

Govinda - Siddhartha's best friend and sometimes his follower. Like Siddhartha, Govinda devotes his life to the quest for understanding and enlightenment. He leaves his village with Siddhartha to join the Samanas, then leaves the Samanas to follow Gotama. He searches for enlightenment independently of Siddhartha but persists in looking for teachers who can show him the way. In the end, he is able to achieve enlightenment only because of Siddhartha's love for him.

Kamala - A courtesan who instructs Siddhartha in the art of physical love. In addition to being Siddhartha's lover, Kamala helps him learn the ways of the city and leave his ascetic life as a Samana behind. Just before she dies from a snakebite, she reveals that Siddhartha is the father of her son.

Gotama - An enlightened religious leader with many followers. Also known as the Buddha, Gotama is said to have attained Nirvana. He teaches the Eightfold Path to his many followers as the way to achieve true enlightenment. Siddhartha and Govinda seek him out, but while Govinda becomes a follower, Siddhartha ultimately rejects him. Siddhartha concludes that while Gotama has achieved enlightenment, his teachings do not necessarily help others find enlightenment.

Kamaswami - An older businessman who teaches Siddhartha the art of business. Kamala refers Siddhartha to Kamaswami, and with Kamaswami's guidance, Siddhartha successfully insinuates himself into the society of city-dwellers. Nonetheless, the lessons he learns from Kamaswami about the material world lead only to unhappiness. Money and business are just a game for Siddhartha, and they do not lead to fulfillment.

Young Siddhartha - Siddhartha's son with Kamala. Young Siddhartha poses the final test Siddhartha must pass before enlightenment. When Kamala dies, young Siddhartha resists starting a new life with Siddhartha. He is a materialistic city- dweller, dislikes his father, and

wants to return to his familiar city life. Siddhartha loves his son, and he must overcome this potentially binding love in order to achieve enlightenment. Just as Siddhartha's own father had to let him go out on his own, Siddhartha must let his son discover the world for himself.
Siddhartha's Father - A respected Brahmin in Siddhartha's boyhood community. Siddhartha's father familiarizes Siddhartha with many basic religious teachings, but he is unable to provide Siddhartha with the answers he needs, which leads to Siddhartha's quest for enlightenment through other religious traditions. When the Samanas arrive to tempt Siddhartha away, Siddhartha's father initially resists but eventually lets him go.

The Samanas - A group of traveling ascetics who believe that a life of deprivation and wandering is the path to self-actualization. The Samanas initially captivate Siddhartha and Govinda, but the two eventually forsake them to follow the teachings of Gotama. When Siddhartha eventually leaves the Samanas, he appears to have attained a superior level of spirituality.

This novel is one of Hesse's finest and, certainly, is the finest product of Hesse's so-called psychoanalytic period. Begun in 1919, with its first section (through "Awakening") dedicated to the pacifist author Romain Rolland, the book's composition spanned nearly three years. The second section (through "By the River") was written during 1919-20, and the rest was completed eighteen months later. The entire work is loosely based on the life of Gotama Buddha. It also, however, bears a relationship to Hesse's own life for, like Siddhartha, Hesse decided to choose another career than that which his father suggested. Siddhartha left the strict bonds of his Brahmin father to seek his own salvation; Hesse left the strict bonds of his Pietist-Lutheran father to become a writer. Pietists, like Calvinists, believed that man is basically evil and thereby placed heavy emphasis on austere disciplinarianism. Likewise, Siddhartha's father was persistently performing ablutions at the river.

As for a similarity between the lives of Hesse's Siddhartha and the actual Buddha, we may observe that as a child Siddhartha, like Buddha, was an outstanding pupil and athlete. He also left his wife and unborn son for the life of an ascetic, as did Buddha. Moreover, Buddha reportedly practiced yoga and meditated by the side of a river for six months. Also, as

Siddhartha's most important decision comes to him under a mango tree, the most important decisions of the Buddha come to him in what are reported to be three visions under a Bo tree. In each case, it was beneath a tree by a river that the vision of all previous existences emerged in a revelation of the simultaneity of all things. Thus both men, by attaining Nirvana, were liberated from the vicious circle of metempsychosis and thereby attained salvation.

The Christian influence on Siddhartha may not be immediately obvious, but it is, nevertheless, unmistakable. To attain salvation, Siddhartha must once again regain his innocence, becoming once again as a little child before entering the Gates of Heaven.

2. CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

Rodion Romanovich Raskolnikov, a former student, lives in a tiny garret on the top floor of a run-down apartment building in St. Petersburg. He is sickly, dressed in rags, short on money, and talks to himself, but he is also handsome, proud, and intelligent. He is contemplating committing an awful crime, but the nature of the crime is not yet clear. He goes to the apartment of an old pawnbroker, Alyona Ivanovna, to get money for a watch and to plan the crime. Afterward, he stops for a drink at a tavern, where he meets a man named Marmeladov, who, in a fit of drunkenness, has abandoned his job and proceeded on a five-day drinking binge, afraid to return home to his family. Marmeladov tells Raskolnikov about his sickly wife, Katerina Ivanovna, and his daughter, Sonya, who has been forced into prostitution to support the family. Raskolnikov walks with Marmeladov to Marmeladov’s apartment, where he meets Katerina and sees firsthand the squalid conditions in which they live.

The next day, Raskolnikov receives a letter from his mother, Pulcheria Alexandrovna, informing him that his sister, Dunya, is engaged to be married to a government official named Luzhin and that they are all moving to St. Petersburg. He goes to another tavern, where he overhears a student talking about how society would be better off if the old pawnbroker Alyona Ivanovna were dead. Later, in the streets, Raskolnikov hears that the pawnbroker will be alone in her apartment the next evening. He sleeps fitfully and wakes up the next day, finds an ax, and fashions a fake item to pawn to distract the pawnbroker. That night, he goes to her apartment and kills her. While he is rummaging through her bedroom, looking for money, her

sister, Lizaveta, walks in, and Raskolnikov kills her as well. He barely escapes from the apartment without being seen, then returns to his apartment and collapses on the sofa.

Waking up the next day, Raskolnikov frantically searches his clothing for traces of blood. He receives a summons from the police, but it seems to be unrelated to the murders. At the police station, he learns that his landlady is trying to collect money that he owes her. During a conversation about the murders, Raskolnikov faints, and the police begin to suspect him. Raskolnikov returns to his room, collects the goods that he stole from the pawnbroker, and buries them under a rock in an out- of-the-way courtyard. He visits his friend Razumikhin and refuses his offer of work. Returning to his apartment, Raskolnikov falls into a fitful, nightmare-ridden sleep. After four days of fever and delirium, he wakes up to find out that his housekeeper, Nastasya, and Razumikhin have been taking care of him. He learns that Zossimov, a doctor, and Zamyotov, a young police detective, have also been visiting him. They have all noticed that Raskolnikov becomes extremely uncomfortable whenever the murders of the pawnbroker and her sister are mentioned. Luzhin, Dunya's fiancé, also makes a visit. After a confrontation with Luzhin, Raskolnikov goes to a café, where he almost confesses to Zamyotov that he is the murderer. Afterward, he impulsively goes to the apartment of the pawnbroker. On his way back home, he discovers that Marmeladov has been run over by a carriage. Raskolnikov helps to carry him back to his apartment, where Marmeladov dies. At the apartment, he meets Sonya and gives the family twenty rubles that he received from his mother. Returning with Razumikhin to his own apartment, Raskolnikov faints when he discovers that his sister and mother are there waiting for him.

Raskolnikov becomes annoyed with Pulcheria Alexandrovna and Dunya and orders them out of the room. He also commands Dunya to break her engagement with Luzhin. Razumikhin, meanwhile, falls in love with Dunya. The next morning, Razumikhin tries to explain Raskolnikov's character to Dunya and Pulcheria Alexandrovna, and then the three return to Raskolnikov's apartment. There, Zossimov greets them and tells them that Raskolnikov's condition is much improved. Raskolnikov apologizes for his behavior the night before and confesses to giving all his money to the Marmeladovs. But he soon grows angry and irritable again and demands that Dunya not marry Luzhin. Dunya tells him that she is meeting with

Luzhin that evening, and that although Luzhin has requested specifically that Raskolnikov not be there, she would like him to come nevertheless. Raskolnikov agrees. At that moment, Sonya enters the room, greatly embarrassed to be in the presence of Raskolnikov's family. She invites Raskolnikov to her father's funeral, and he accepts. On her way back to her apartment, Sonya is followed by a strange man, who we later learn is Svidrigailov—Dunya's lecherous former employer who is obsessively attracted to her.

Under the pretense of trying to recover a watch he pawned, Raskolnikov visits the magistrate in charge of the murder investigation, Porfiry Petrovich, a relative of Razumikhin's. Zamyotov is at the detective's house when Raskolnikov arrives. Raskolnikov and Porfiry have a tense conversation about the murders. Raskolnikov starts to believe that Porfiry suspects him and is trying to lead him into a trap.

Afterward, Raskolnikov and Razumikhin discuss the conversation, trying to figure out if Porfiry suspects him. When Raskolnikov returns to his apartment, he learns that a man had come there looking for him. When he catches up to the man in the street, the man calls him a murderer. That night Raskolnikov dreams about the pawnbroker's murder. When he wakes up, there is a stranger in the room.

The stranger is Svidrigailov. He explains that he would like Dunya to break her engagement with Luzhin, whom he esteems unworthy of her. He offers to give Dunya the enormous sum of ten thousand rubles. He also tells Raskolnikov that his late wife, Marfa Petrovna, left Dunya three thousand rubles in her will. Raskolnikov rejects Svidrigailov's offer of money and, after hearing him talk about seeing the ghost of Marfa, suspects that he is insane. After Svidrigailov leaves, Raskolnikov and Razumikhin walk to a restaurant to meet Dunya, Pulcheria Alexandrovna, and Luzhin. Razumikhin tells Raskolnikov that he is certain that the police suspect Raskolnikov. Luzhin is insulted to find that Raskolnikov, contrary to his wishes, is in attendance at the meal. They discuss Svidrigailov's arrival in the city and the money that has been offered to Dunya. Luzhin and Raskolnikov get into an argument, during the course of which Luzhin offends everyone in the room, including his fiancée and prospective mother-in-law. Dunya breaks the engagement and forces him to leave. Everyone is overjoyed at his departure. Razumikhin starts to talk about plans to go into the publishing business as a family, but Raskolnikov ruins the mood by telling them that he does not want to see them anymore. When Raskolnikov leaves the room, Razumikhin chases him down the stairs. They stop, face-

to-face, and Razumikhin realizes, without a word being spoken, that Raskolnikov is guilty of the murders. He rushes back to Dunya and Pulcheria Alexandrovna to reassure them that he will help them through whatever difficulties they encounter.

Raskolnikov goes to the apartment of Sonya Marmeladov. During their conversation, he learns that Sonya was a friend of one of his victims, Lizaveta. He forces Sonya to read to him the biblical story of Lazarus, who was resurrected by Jesus. Meanwhile, Svidrigailov eavesdrops from the apartment next door.

The following morning, Raskolnikov visits Porfiry Petrovich at the police department, supposedly in order to turn in a formal request for his pawned watch. As they converse, Raskolnikov starts to feel again that Porfiry is trying to lead him into a trap. Eventually, he breaks under the pressure and accuses Porfiry of playing psychological games with him. At the height of tension between them, Nikolai, a workman who is being held under suspicion for the murders, bursts into the room and confesses to the murders. On the way to Katerina Ivanovna's memorial dinner for Marmeladov, Raskolnikov meets the mysterious man who called him a murderer and learns that the man actually knows very little about the case.

The scene shifts to the apartment of Luzhin and his roommate, Lebezyatnikov, where Luzhin is nursing his hatred for Raskolnikov, whom he blames for the breaking of his engagement to Dunya. Although Luzhin has been invited to Marmeladov's memorial dinner, he refuses to go. He invites Sonya to his room and gives her a ten-ruble bill. Katerina's memorial dinner goes poorly. The widow is extremely fussy and proud, but few guests have shown up, and, except for Raskolnikov, those that have are drunk and crude. Luzhin then enters the room and accuses Sonya of stealing a one-hundred-ruble bill. Sonya denies his claim, but the bill is discovered in one of her pockets. Just as everyone is about to label Sonya a thief, however, Lebezyatnikov enters and tells the room that he saw Luzhin slip the bill into Sonya's pocket as she was leaving his room. Raskolnikov explains that Luzhin was probably trying to embarrass him by discrediting Sonya. Luzhin leaves, and a fight breaks out between Katerina and her landlady.

After the dinner, Raskolnikov goes to Sonya's room and confesses the murders to her. They have a long conversation about his confused motives. Sonya tries to convince him to confess to the authorities. Lebezyatnikov then enters and informs them that Katerina Ivanovna seems to have gone mad—she is parading the children in the streets, begging for money. Sonya rushes

out to find them while Raskolnikov goes back to his room and talks to Dunya. He soon returns to the street and sees Katerina dancing and singing wildly. She collapses after a confrontation with a policeman and, soon after being brought back to her room, dies. Svidrigailov appears and offers to pay for the funeral and the care of the children. He reveals to Raskolnikov that he knows Raskolnikov is the murderer.

Raskolnikov wanders around in a haze after his confession to Sonya and the death of Katerina. Razumikhin confronts him in his room, asking him whether he has gone mad and telling him of the pain that he has caused his mother and sister. After their conversation, Porfiry Petrovich appears and apologizes for his treatment of Raskolnikov in the police station. Nonetheless, he does not believe Nikolai's confession. He accuses Raskolnikov of the murders but admits that he does not have enough evidence to arrest him. Finally, he urges him to confess, telling him that he will receive a lighter sentence if he does so. Raskolnikov goes looking for Svidrigailov, eventually finding him in a café. Svidrigailov tells him that though he is still attracted to Dunya, he has gotten engaged to a sixteen-year-old girl. Svidrigailov parts from Raskolnikov and manages to bring Dunya to his room, where he threatens to rape her after she refuses to marry him. She fires several shots at him with a revolver and misses, but when he sees how strongly she dislikes him, he allows her to leave. He takes her revolver and wanders aimlessly around St. Petersburg. He gives three thousand rubles to Dunya, fifteen thousand rubles to the family of his fiancée, and then books a room in a hotel. He sleeps fitfully and dreams of a flood and a seductive five-year-old girl. In the morning, he kills himself.

Raskolnikov, who is visiting his mother, tells her that he will always love her and then returns to his room, where he tells Dunya that he is planning to confess. After she leaves, he goes to visit Sonya, who gives him a cross to wear. On the way to the police station, he stops in a marketplace and kisses the ground. He almost pulls back from confessing when he reaches the police station and learns of Svidrigailov's suicide. The sight of Sonya, however, convinces him to go through with it, and he confesses to one of the police officials, Ilya Petrovich.

A year and a half later, Raskolnikov is in prison in Siberia, where he has been for nine months. Sonya has moved to the town outside the prison, and she visits Raskolnikov regularly and tries to ease his burden. Because of his confession, his mental confusion surrounding the murders,

and testimony about his past good deeds, he has received, instead of a death sentence, a reduced sentence of eight years of hard labor in Siberia. After Raskolnikov's arrest, his mother became delirious and died. Razumikhin and Dunya were married. For a short while, Raskolnikov remains as proud and alienated from humanity as he was before his confession, but he eventually realizes that he truly loves Sonya and expresses remorse for his crime.

Raskolnikov, an impoverished student, conceives of himself as being an extraordinary young man and then formulates a theory whereby the extraordinary men of the world have a right to commit any crime if they have something of worth to offer humanity. To prove his theory, he murders an old, despicable pawnbroker and her half-sister who happened to come upon him suddenly. Immediately after the crime, he becomes ill and lies in his room semi-conscious for several days. When he recovers, he finds that a friend, Razumihkin, had looked for him. While he is recovering, he receives a visit from Luzhin, who is engaged to Raskolnikov's sister, Dunya. Raskolnikov insults Luzhin and sends him away because he resents Luzhin's domineering attitude toward Dunya.

As soon as he can be about again, Raskolnikov goes out and reads about the crime in all the newspapers of the last few days. He meets an official from the police station and almost confesses the crime. He does go far enough in his ranting that the official becomes suspicious. Later, he witnesses the death of Marmeladov, a minor government official, who is struck by a carriage as he staggers across the street in a drunken stupor. Raskolnikov assists the man and leaves all his money to the destitute widow. When he returns to his room, he finds his mother and sister who have just arrived to prepare for the wedding with Luzhin. He denounces Luzhin and refuses to allow his sister to marry such a mean and nasty man. About the same time, Svidrigailov, Dunya's former employer, arrives in town and looks up Raskolnikov and asks for a meeting with Dunya. Previously Svidrigailov had attempted to seduce Dunya and when Raskolnikov had heard of it, he naturally formed a violent dislike for the man.

Raskolnikov hears that the police inspector, Porfiry, is interviewing all people who had ever had any business with the old pawnbroker. Therefore, he goes for an interview and leaves thinking that the police suspect him. Since he had met Sonya Marmeladov, the daughter of the

dead man that he had helped, he goes to her and asks her to read to him from the Bible the story of Lazarus. He feels great sympathy with Sonya who had been forced into prostitution in order to support her family while her father drank constantly. In her suffering, she becomes a universal symbol for Raskolnikov. He promises to tell her who murdered the old pawnbroker and her sister who was a friend of Sonya's.

After another interview with Porfiry, Raskolnikov determines to confess to Sonya. He returns to her and during the confession, Svidrigailov is listening through the adjoining door. He uses this information to try to force Dunya to sleep with him. She refuses and he kills himself later in the night.

Porfiry informs Raskolnikov that he knows who murdered the pawnbroker. After talking with Sonya, Raskolnikov fully confesses to the murder and is sentenced to eight years in a Siberian prison. Sonya follows him, and with her help, Raskolnikov begins his regeneration.

3. SAMSKARA

The first chapter begins narrating the routine activities of Praneschacharya. His activities are divided into domestic and religious. He begins a day by doing his regular duty of helping his wife in getting bathed. It is understood from the first line, “He bathed Bhagirathi’s body…”, that she is almost a vegetable. It is he who bathes her, dresses her up, feeds her with the essential food and administers with regular medicine.

After completing his domestic duties, he then crosses a stream to worship at Maruti temple and comes back home for his recitation of holy legends. The Brahmins of the agrahara (the place a Brahmin community lives) regularly assembles in front of his house to listen to his recitation, both in the morning and in the evening. He is a scholar and his recitations are new every day.

Praneschacharya sacrifices his life for the sake of his wife and she understands his pain and the marital bliss that he lacks. Therefore she asks him to marry again and bring forth children, to make his house a home. Nevertheless, Praneschacharya refuses to marry, believing in Lord Krishna’s will, that one should not expect reward for his/her toil. Moreover everyday when they eat, both of them request the other to eat first. These instances show the mutual love and concern they have for each other.

One day before eating his meal, he places fodder in front of his cow, Gowri and is about to get into his house. At that time, he hears the sound of Chandri behind him calling 'Acharya'. Chandri is a dalit. If Praneshacharya talks to her, he would be polluted and should take bath before eating his meal. Nevertheless, he listens to her and she informs that Naranappa is dead after having fever for four days.

There is a belief that it is wrong to eat food before doing the funeral rites for the dead. So, Praneshacharya runs to Garudacharya's house to stop him from eating his meal and then both of them inform others in the agrahara. Everyone in the agrahara thinks, "Alive, Naranappa was an enemy; dead a preventer of meals; as a corpse, a problem, a nuisance."

The men and their wives assemble in front of Praneshacharya's house to hear his directions to solve the problem of Naranappa's rites. The women are with fear that their husbands should not accept to do the funeral rites. Praneshacharya informs the people that there are two problems to be solved. The first problem is doing funeral rites for Naranappa and second is deciding the person for doing the rites, since Naranappa doesn't have children. Garudacharya, Dasacharya – a poor Brahmin of the agrahara, and Lakshmanacharya acknowledge to the words of Praneshacharya. When Praneshacharya says that only relatives should do the rites, everyone starts looking at Garuda and Lakshmana. Lakshmana, not wanting to do the rites, closes his eyes but Garuda gives explanation for not wanting to do the rites. He says he and Naranappa's father had quarrel over an orchard and the Dharmasthala Monastery decreed in his favour but Naranappa defied the order. Therefore he says that he severed all relationships with him. Moreover he also says that Naranappa cannot be considered a Brahmin because of his relationship with a lowcaste woman, Chandri.

Durgabhatta immediately reply to Garuda that a Brahmin will not lose his identify because of his relationship with a lowcaste woman. This he says to test the orthodoxy of the Madhva Brahmins, as he is a Smarta Brahmin.

Praneshacharya, noticing that the discussion is moving away from the central point, asks Lakshmanacharya why not he does the rites. Immediately Lakshmana quotes the reason Garuda has given. He says that he cannot do the rites as Naranappa had relationship with a lowcaste woman, Chandri and also ate the food she cooked. Then he says that Naranappa abandoned his legal wife and when she died he did not attend her funeral. Moreover he says that he does not observe the death anniversary of his parents. In addition to all these sacrileges

acts, he has also brought Muslims to the front yard of the agrahara to eat and drink forbidden things. Anasuya, wife of Lakshmana, feels proud of her husband for his reply, and curses Chandri for all the problems she has caused in her family.

Praneshacharya is confused whether to proclaim Naranappa as Brahmin or non- Brahmin. Fearing that the Brahmins might not do the funeral rites for Naranappa, Chandri places all her gold ornaments in front of Praneshacharya, to be used for the expense of Naranappa's funeral rites.

The wives of those Brahmins present there avariciously look at the ornaments. And their husbands think that some other Brahmin should not do the funeral rites and take away all the ornaments. Durgabhatta, on the other hand waiting for an opportunity to expose the Madhva Brahmins, keenly observes whether they would do funeral rites for Naranappa, lusting after the gold ornaments.

While everybody thinks of a way out to do the funeral rites for Naranappa, Dasacharya suggests the idea of requesting the Parijatapura Brahmins to do the funeral rites for two reasons. The first reason is; Naranappa was friendly with the Parijatapura Brahmins and the other reason is that the Parijatapura Brahmins are not as orthodox as the Madhvas. The Parijatapura Brahmins are pleasure lovers and some of them are rich as they run betelnut farms.

Durgabhatta being a Smarta does not like the idea of requesting the Parijatapura Brahmins to do the funeral rites. Durgabhatta identifies himself with the Parijatapura Brahmins, as he is also a Smarta. Therefore he does not like the Madhva Brahmins looking down upon the Smarta Brahmins. He reacts that the Smarta Brahmins are not inferior to the Madhvas. In order to stop the Madhvas from requesting the Smartas, he says that it is wrong to ask someone to do something that the other would hesitate to do. But Praneshacharya requests Durgabhatta to be silent as it is necessary to inform about the death of Naranappa, since he was their friend.

The family of Lakshmanacharya and Garudacharya are perturbed by the decision of Praneshacharya because the golden ornaments would be taken away by the person who does the funeral rites. Lakshmanacharya's wife Anasuya begins to claim the ornaments for her family as they are her dead sister's jewelry. But Garuda says according to the verdict of Dharmasthala guru(chief), the ornaments should go to him. Praneshacharya silences both of

them saying that cremation of Naranappa's body is more important and asks them to be patient about the ornaments.

CHAPTER 2:

Description of Agrahara and Rejection of Naranappa's rites by Smarta Brahmins

The second chapter describes the houses in the agrahara – the place dominated by houses of Brahmins. Most of the houses resemble the same except for the kind of flowers grown at the backyard. The Brahmins go to each other's house and get flowers for worship and they also get to know the welfare of others. Naranappa's house differs from other houses in this aspect. No one goes to his house and neither does he go to others' houses. Moreover the flowers grown in Naranappa's house are only for Chandri's hair. Unlike other houses, Naranappa grows a bush in front of his house which is a favourite of snakes. Some people believe that Naranappa keeps snakes in order to protect the gold in his house.

Naranappa's house is the biggest of all the other houses in the agrahara. The Brahmins lead a very simple and contended life. The Tunga river runs at one end of the agrahara and during summer when the water dries to a trickle, they cultivate cucumber. It is a favourite vegetable of their diet. All through the year, they have some function or the other and thus their life move in a cycle every year.

The name of this agrahara is Durvasapura because of a legendary story behind it. It was believed that Durvasa, a sage did penance on a hillock in the river, Tunga.

The place became famous because of the legendary story and also because of Praneshacharya.

The Madhwa Brahmins, sent by Praneshacharya from this well known place of Durvasapura, go to Parijatapura to inform about Naranappa's death and also to know whether they would be willing to do the funeral rites for him. They go first to Manjayya's house and he receives them warm and asks his wife to treat them as their guests.

When Garuda informs about Naranappa's death, the Parijatapura Brahmins are happy to do the rites because he moved with them without any caste pride and also they considered it a pride doing rites for a high caste Brahmin.

Shankaraya, the Parijatapura priest also shows interest and displays his knowledge of their

religious texts. He says according to a Brahmin, even snakes are born twice and so proper funeral rites should be done. And so, he stresses that it is important to do the rites immediately for a Brahmin. But when Durgabhatta subtly raises the question whether Naranappa is a Brahmin, Sankaraya hesitates because he does not want his people to do anything non-brahminical. Therefore he says that they can do the rites according to Praneshacharya's instruction. And Manjayya offers to pay money for the funeral rites.

CHAPTER III

Praneshacharya Recollects Naranappa's Past Praneshacharya goes through the palm leaf texts to find a solution to Naranappa's funeral rites while the Madva Brahmins are in Parijatapura to inform about Naranappa's death.

The thought of Naranappa makes Praneshacharya realize how he has been a problem all through his life. Praneshacharya recollects a bitter conversation when he went to Naranappa's house to meet him. Naranappa disrespected and treated him with contempt. He also remembers how Naranappa made Garuda's son Shyama and Lakshmana's son-in-law Shripati to go astray from Brahminical tradition. Shyama ran away from home and joined the army, while Shripati almost took the lifestyle of Naranappa. He even remembers the day when he brought Muslims with him to the Ganapathi temple stream and caught the sacred fish. During their heated conversation Naranappa has said, "I'll destroy Brahminism, I certainly will. My only sorrow is that there's no brahminism really left to destroy in this place – except you."

Chapter IV

Naranappa's relatives vying with each other to do funeral rites for him The Brahmins come back from Parijatapura. There are different views prevail for Garudacharya's son Shyama deserting his home. Garudacharya's enemies blame him for punishing Shyama severely. Naranappa's enemies blame Naranappa for inciting Shyama to run away from home. Lakshmanacharya blames Garudacharya for the black magic Garuda used against Naranappa's father. He believes that the black magic Garuda used against Naranappa's father boomeranged on himself.

Shyama's parents Garudacharya and Sitadevi are left in the lurch, not knowing the whereabouts of Shyama. Sitadevi, Shyama's mother, fasts on Friday nights hoping that he would become a better person but Garudacharya is furious about his son. After a gap of about three months, they receive a letter from him informing that he has joined the army and if he has to be relieved a penalty of six hundred rupees has to be paid. Thus only through his letter they come to know about his whereabouts.

Sitadevi does not have sufficient money to pay the penalty and get her son relieved from the army but her hope brightens as she thinks that her husband might get a chance to do the funeral rites for Naranappa and legally get Chandri's golden ornaments.

Garudacharya does not want his situation to become like that of Naranappa. He hates his son for running away from home. Nevertheless he needs to redeem his only son so that on his death his son would do funeral rites for him. Hence he sneaks into Praneshacharya's house and tries to persuade him to allow him to do the funeral rites for Naranappa. If so, he would get the golden ornaments of Chandri and that would help him to redeem his son from the army. Hence on entering Praneshacharya's house, he tries to cajole and persuade Praneshacharya and make him say that he could do the rites for Naranappa. He cites what Praneshacharya once said, that even though it is not proper (for a Brahmin) to eat cow's meat, one can be fed with that if his life is depended on that. He tries to make him understand that for the sake of dharma, a requirement could be fulfilled. He speaks about dharma and life because 'The motive: gold". But Praneshacharya is stubborn in going through the texts to find a solution.

Meanwhile Anasuya also tries to get the golden ornaments. Anasuya is related to Naranappa as he is her maternal uncle's son. Moreover, Anasuya's sister is Naranappa's first legal wife. Anasuya does not want her husband to do funeral rites for Naranappa earlier but after knowing that she would get Chandri's gold, she sheds tears saying, "O God, O God, whatever he (Naranappa) might have done, how can we cut the family bond that binds?"

Anasuya harbours anger against Naranappa because he has spoiled her son-in- law, Shripati. Shripati was an orphan but she married him to her daughter, Lilavati. But soon he takes to the life style of Naranappa and gets spoiled. He roams everywhere and stays at home about two days a month.

When Lakshmanacharya, her husband, comes home tired from Parijatapura, Anasuya urges

him to go to Praneshacharya's house and convince him to get the permission to do the funeral rites for Naranappa. Lakshmanacharya is an epitome of parsimony. He tries to get even oil for his head without spending money. He also has the habit of stealing banana leaves from others farms, dries them up, makes them into cups and sells them. Now he fixes his eyes on Chandiri's gold.

Lakshmanacharya and Garudacharya vie with each other in getting the gold. Lakshmanacharya tries to get the permission for doing funeral rites quoting that Naranappa is his wife's uncle's son. Garudacharya thinking that he should not get the gold, agrees with Lakshmanacharya's argument but says that the gold should be submitted to the court or given to him according to the decree given by Dharmasthala (local court)

Meanwhile Dasacharya comes there and urges Praneshacharya to do something to dispose Naranappa's body as he could not stay in his house due to bad smell coming out from the decaying body. He suggests that Praneshacharya can use the gold for the Maruti God and they could dispose the body. Garudacharya who does not like Dasacharya's suggestion but fears to object it openly says that executing such an idea might bring bad name to Praneshacharya. Praneshacharya then asks all of them to go home saying that he would go according to the ancient religious texts. Then he asks Chandri to come inside the house and sit and gives medicine to his wife. Then with the help of a kerosene lantern, he begins to read ancient religious books to find a solution. It becomes evening.

Chapter VI

Lakshmidevemma – the Oldest Woman in the Agrahara

Lakshmidevemma, above 70 years old, is the oldest living person in the agrahara. She was given in marriage at the age of eight but at the age of ten, she became a widow. At the age of fifteen, she lost her father-in-law and mother-in-law and at the age of twenty, she lost her parents. She is a fatal lady to all those who associate with her and hence the people of the agrahara keep away from her. But after Lakshmidevemma became an orphan, Garudacharya's father in order to take her property, took her into his house and took care of her. After the death of Garudacharya's father, the responsibility of taking care of Lakshmidevemma fell on him. But Garudacharya's wife is very stingy and never feeds Lakshmidevemma properly. The

incessant quarrel between Garuda's wife and Lakshmidevemma makes Garuda keep Lakshmidevemma in a separate dilapidated house and gives one rupee every month for her sustenance. Lakshmidevemma takes the matter to Praneshacharya but Garudacharya doesnot relent. Therefore whenever she gets angry with Garudacharya, she stands in front of his house and curses him from the bottom of her heart.

As she curses him on a particular night, she sees somebody running out of Naranappa's house and she thinks, it is Naranappa's ghost fleeing out of his house. Lashmidevemma bangs at the door of the houses in agrahara and tries to inform the people. But it is Shripati fleeing out of Naranappa's house after seeing Naranappa's dead body. He is shell-shocked, crosses the Tunga river and reaches Nagaraja's house at Parijatapura.

Chandri, lying in the verandah of Praneshacharya, notices that it is Shripati fleeing out of her house. She is able to notice him as she is awake and unable to sleep due to hunger. She has never slept without having food at night, hence she goes to the backyard and eats ripe plaintain left on the tree. Then goes to the Tunga river and drinks water. She, being afraid of going to her house, goes back to Praneshacharya's house and curls up on the veranda to sleep, covering her face with her sari.

Praneshacharya, meanwhile, riffles through the religious texts but he does not find any solution. He walks up and down the veranda and thinks to himself the reasons for not excommunicating Naranappa. There are two reasons for not excommunicating him. The first reason is Naranappa threatened that he would convert himself to a Muslim and the other reason is Praneshacharya's compassion toward Naranappa. Compassion is a trait of Praneshacharya which is obvious in his family life as well. He is so compassionate towards his invalid wife. His mind then shifts to another solution, as going through religious texts for a solution has gone in vain. He thinks of going to the temple of Maruti God early next morning and fall at the feet of God to get a solution to Naranappa's funeral rites. The thought of going to Maruti temple relaxes his stressed mind. Then he gives Chandri, who is in the verandah, a mat and a pillow to sleep and he gets inside his house. Again he gets another thought that he should give all her jewels back to her and he acts accordingly. Then he goes to his bed.

Chapter VII

Praneshacharya Visits the Temple of Maruti God in the Forest

The stench of dead rats and Naranappa's dead body makes the night sleepless for many in the agrahara. In Dasacharya's house, except him, everybody smells the stench. Belli is also not able to sleep in her hut. After they burn the hut of Pilla in order to cremate him and his wife, there is darkness. Belli, as she needs light in her hut, goes to a nearby bush where she sees fireflies (glowworm) twinkling in the dark night. In order to catch the fireflies, she removes the only piece of cloth on her body and remains naked collecting fireflies and brings them to her hut. She finds dead rats in the feeble light, illuminated from the fireflies.

In the morning of the second day of Naranappa's death, the women, thinking that Naranappa's ghost roams the agrahara and it might touch their children, keep them inside their homes. But then Venkataramanacharya's children disobey their mother's order and they are excited seeing rats dying.

The Brahmins of the agrahara, meanwhile, gather to find a quick solution to Naranappa's funeral rites. They are unable to bear the stench emanating from dead rats and from the decaying body of Naranappa. Durgabhatta and Dasacharya blame the rest of the Brahmins for the delay in Naranappa's funeral rites. Therefore, Garudacharya decides to set aside the problem of claiming Chandri's gold in order to give funeral rites for the dead Naranappa.

The Brahmins depend on Praneshacharya for every decision. Hence they gather in front of his house and when he comes out, he expresses his desire to visit the temple of Maruti, the monkey god, in the forest. The Brahmins accept his decision, hoping he will do the best for the agrahara.

Praneshacharya then goes to the forest to visit the Maruti temple. He takes with him Jasmine and Champak flowers and basil leaves. After a bath in the Tunga river, he changes his old sacred thread for a new one and walks two miles into the forest. At the temple, he cleans the idol and smears sandal paste all over it. Then sitting in front of the idol, he presents his conflicts in his mind to the idol. To go ahead with funeral rites as an answer from the idol, he asks Maruti god to give the flower at its right. And if the answer is 'no' for the funeral rite, then he asks the idol to give the flower at its left. He sits in front of the idol for a long time, without an answer.

Chandri, meanwhile, unable to face the angry Brahmins in the agrahara follows Praneshacharya to the forest. While coming to the forest, she takes bananas in the lap of her saree. She also takes a dip in the Tunga river and her body is completely wet. She sits at a distance from the temple, watching Praneshacharya.

Chapter IX

Vultures hovering over the Agrahara

The author gives the reason for Belli not going to pick up cow dung in the agrahara. The readers understand that Belli is regular in picking cow dung in the

agrahara and that she has not come as her parents become victim of the ongoing mysterious malady of Durvasapura. When Chinni returns back to her hut, she hears the sound of Belli's parents crying out loud in agony. When Chinni enters Belli's hut, she sees Belli sitting near her parents. As they don't know the reason behind the sickness, they attribute that to demoniac power. Chinni and Belli's talk reveal that Pilla, his wife, and Chowda are also dead.

The time is around 2 pm when the Brahmins of the agrahara were waiting for Praneshacharya to return from Maruti Temple but then there is no sign of his return. Meanwhile, Sitadevi finds a dead rat in her house and throws it out of her house on to the street. The dead rat attracts a vulture which sits on the roof of Sitadevi's house. She considers vulture on her house top as an oman of death and she is afraid that something might happen to her son who has joined the army without the knowledge of her and her husband Garudacharya. Garudacharya thinks in his mind that God Maruti is trying to punish him for thinking in his heart that Chandri's gold should not go to Maruti temple but come to him. But as they were trying to chase the vulture, many vultures descend on the agrahara and they perch in pairs on each house top. This brings solace to Sitadevi as she thinks that the oman is not only to her house but something common to the agrahara. According to the suggestion given by Dasacharya, the people bring sacred gongs and conches. The loud sound of gongs and conches scares away the vultures.

Chandri meanwhile sits under the shade of a tree, quite far away from Praneshacharya and watches him worshiping God Maruti to get an answer from the god whether to do funeral rites for Naranappa according to Brahmin rituals or not. Chandri is tired and hungry. Though she

feels like eating the bananas that she has with her, she hesitates to eat when she thinks of the pain Praneshacharya undergoes all for her sake. Nevertheless hunger overpowers her decision of not to eat, and she eats a banana and justifies her situation. It begins to get dark and Chandri remains in the forest and the people in the agrahara continue to wait for Praneshacharya.

Chapter X

The Unpriestly Act of Praneshacharya

This short chapter talks about the unpriestly act of Praneshacharya with Chandri. The second day after Naranappa's death, Praneshacharya is in the forest late in the evening imploring God Maruti to give an answer whether to have funeral rites according to Brahmin rituals or not. After a while, he is so frustrated and becomes tired as the god does not give him any reply. Praneshacharya wonders whether the god thinks that he does not deserve any reply. Being a highly respected priest in Durvasapura, he does not want to face his people without an answer from god. Nevertheless when it is pitch dark he gets up and thinks of returning home as he realizes that he has to give medicine for his ailing wife.

Chandri who was sitting behind Praneshacharya, without his knowledge while he was imploring God Maruti, now gets up and follows him and the sound of bangles in the dark night attracts him. When he turns back, he sees Chandri. She followed him to the forest as she could not face the angry Brahmins in the agrahara in the absence of Praneshacharya. She, now, out of gratitude bends to touch his feet but in the dark her breast hits his knee making her blouse open revealing her breasts. The priest who never had such an experience being alone with a young lady begins to touch her hair and Chandri responds positively leading to physical act which the author puts it decently, "Then she took off her sari, spread it on the ground, and lay on it hugging Praneshacharya close to her, weeping, flowing in helpless tears."

4. The beggar and the Hare

Tuomas Kyrö is one of the new voices in Finnish literature whose talents were first showcased in his debut novel, Leather Jacket (Nahkatakki). Kyrö draws on the long tradition of Finnish prose to tell compelling, even tragic stories with great authority. He is also a prolific cartoonist and columnist.

Vatanescu, an impoverished Romanian construction worker, wants a future for himself and a pair of football boots for his son. So he decides to head north to a cold, dark country where there is money to be made. Finding his way to Finland, he takes up with Russian human trafficker Yegor Kugar and joins the bottom rung of a begging ring. Before long Vatanescu is on the streets of Helsinki, earning a small percentage on spare change.

But Yegor – a crook interested only in status and screwing – has strict views on what it means to be a beggar, and when Vatanescu enjoys a sumptuous feast from the contents of a dumpster, a conflict ensues. Soon he is on the run from both an international crime organisation and the Finnish police.

Vatanescu, a working class Romanian construction worker, who wants, according to the publisher, “a future for himself and a pair of footballs for his son.” That’s all there is to it. At least, on the surface.

My English teacher once said to me that the key to a novel’s success, at least in the way it tells a story, is to have a memorable character at its centre. Someone you care about. Someone you’d go out for a meal or a drink with. Someone you want to share things with.

With Vatanescu as its central character, The Beggar and the Hare succeeds admirably. Ambitious, caring, a little naïve, a touch melancholy, he engages you in the way he always puts his son and his sons wishes and wants right before his own. This leads him on a journey from Romania through the length and breadth of Finland. He is in search of work. He is in search of money. He is in search of hope. He is in search of happiness, or, at least, the happiness he hopes that all or each of these three things will bring him.

And yet, there are the slightest flickers of desperation and danger in the corners of his mind, which keeps things both frightening and exciting for him and us. In Vatanescu’s quest for money, he encounters the ruthless and even more ambitious Yegor, a Russian human

trafficker, who seems at first to be his salvation. Yegor, however, as we soon discover, also has a twisted sense of morality and values which brings Vatanescu and he into direct conflict with each other.

Money is to be made. Money has to be made. But, the author, Thomas Kyro, asks at each turn, at what cost is this to our country and ourselves? This is what Vatanescu and Yegor find out during the course of the novel. Kyro's great trick in keeping us reading is keeping things deceptively simple.

The hare Vatanescu befriends during his journey through the geography, society and class system of modern day Finland (although, in truth, it could be almost any modern-day country) appears as just that: a hare. But both it and Vatanescu are, when one dares to read more closely, so much more.

Vatanescu is a fine representation of the modern day European working man, with all his naïveté, honesty and human flaws. The Hare stands in well for that which represents hope and luck in this world (and ours). Yegor, meanwhile, stands for all that is wrong in a corrupt and capitalist western state and the excitement in this novel lies in seeing how the author uses these characters as mouthpieces and pawns in a far bigger, grander and more ambitious game plan.

We follow Vatanescu because we warm to him, in all his innocence and sheer good heartedness. We see why he would look up to, and come to fear someone like Yegor and yet—and this is perhaps Kyro's finest trick in his box—we never judge either of them. We come to see both characters as products of their backgrounds and circumstances. While their deeds may either sicken or sadden us (or in many cases, both at the same time), they never lose our interest.

In this respect, the novel which The Beggar and the Hare most calls to mind is Anne Holm's classic 1963, I Am David. Both have protagonists who are unsure of themselves and their surroundings, both are ambitious and curious in equal measures and both have a light of hope running throughout their stories.

In this respect also, The Beggar and the Hare calls to mind films such as Jakob the Liar (1999) and Life Is Beautiful (1997). The darkness and fear may be all around, but if you peer into the distance, you will find light to see you through. If the The Beggar and the Hare has a weakness, it is that, at times Vatanescu is just a little too sentimental and optimistic for his

own good and also, Yegor comes across as a bit too much of a James Bond bad guy for him to be truly and consistently frightening. These, however, are minor gripes with what is, overall, a riveting read.

Striking up a friendship with a fellow outcast, a hare fleeing Helsinki pest control, Vatanescu travels the length and breadth of Finland, crashing into other people's lives, fumbling his way from the streets into the upper echelons of Finnish politics.

From a hugely popular, award-winning Finnish author, this entertaining, profound, and satirical tale follows a Romanian beggar living on the streets of Helsinki. Vatanescu, a young Romanian construction worker, desires two things: a future for himself and a pair of football boots for his son. So off he goes to a cold, dark country to beg. Despite reading about Finland in the novels of Arto Paasilinna, Vatanescu has no idea what he is in for, and soon he is living on the streets of Helsinki, throwing feasts from the contents of a dumpster with his fellow beggars. Little does he realize, however, that his employer is about to ruin his bacchanal, and much, much more... As Vatanescu flees from international crime organizations as well as the Finnish police, he finds an unlikely companion: a hare who has been sentenced to death for living within Helsinki's city limits. Together, Vatanescu and his new fellow fugitive set on a journey from Lapland to the National Idea Park construction site, to the upper echelons of Finnish politics. Known for his satirical humor and picaresque style, Tuomas Kyro offers an unusual tale in the vein of Jonas Jonasson's The Hundred-Year-Old Man and Rachel Joyce's The Unlikely Pilgrimage of Harold Fry.

REFERENCES:

1. "Siddhartha: eine indische Dichtung by Hermann Hesse - Project Gutenbe…". gutenberg.org. 24 May 2012. Archived from the original on 24 May 2012. Retrieved 6 April 2018.
2. "The Life of Siddhartha Gautama". Webspace.ship.edu. Retrieved 2008-03-27.

3. Hardy, James D. Jr.; Stanton, Leonard J. (1999). "Introduction". Crime and Punishment by Fyodor Dostoyevsky. Signet Classic. ISBN 0-451-52723-2.
4. Chandra Holm. "Samskara". Online Webpage of OurKarnataka.com. Retrieved 8 August 2007.
5. Ananthamurthy, U. R., "How I wrote Samskara" in Boral, Rao, Rath: Samskara, a critical reader, Delhi, 2005.
6. "Tuomas Kyrön Urheilukirja myös Vuoden urheilukirja ('Tuomas Kyrö's Urheilukirja is also the Sports Book of the Year')"

UNIT - V

World Literature In Translation – SHS5013

Bama : Karukku

Karukku is an autobiography that chronicles Bama's life, from her childhood to her early adult life as a nun, and beyond. The book was originally written by her in Tamil in 1992 and translated into the English version. Karukku is one of the first autobiographies of a Dalit woman written in Tamil.

It was in 1992 that Bama left the convent that she had been a member of for seven years. As she writes, "That book was written as a means of healing my inward wounds; I had no other motive." We see Bama, standing at this moment in her life, trying to make sense of her many identities; as a Dalit, as a Christian, as a woman.

Unlike most autobiographies, Bama's narrative is not linear. She does not describe events only in terms of the impact they had on her later life, but writes of the experiences she had as moments of oppression that composed her daily lived reality. In the book, one sees Bama's quest to understand and present how her multiple identities as Dalit, Christian and woman have impacted her oppression.

Karukku is an elegy to the community Bama grew up in. She writes of life there in all its vibrancy and colour, never making it seem like a place defined by a singular caste identity, yet a place that never forgets, and is never allowed to forget its caste identity. She writes simultaneously of humorous incidents she remembers from her childhood, the games she used to play with her friends, good meals with her family and the oppression of her community by the police, upper-castes, and the convent. In this manner, she presents the pervasiveness of caste oppression – how it not only punctuates everyday life, but is an integral part of it, even in the memory of a community.

As Ambedkar writes, "Caste is not just a division of labour, it is a division of labourers." Bama's work speaks to this statement as she describes the servitude

with which her family members were bound to the upper-caste families they worked for, including the beseeching obedience they had to show to them. “All the time I went to work for the Naickers [upper-caste] I knew I should not touch their goods or chattels; I should never come close to where they were. I should always stand away to one side. These were their rules. I often felt pained and ashamed. But there was nothing that I could do,” she writes, of her experience working for a Naicker household in high school. “To this day, in my village, both men and women can survive only through hard and incessant labour,” she notes.

Bama also speaks of the humiliation she experienced in high school, being Dalit and poorer than her classmates. What struck me, in particular, is the symbolic importance of clothing as a marker of social capital that she writes of. She describes a college party that she did not attend because she could not afford to buy a new saree, hiding in the bathroom until it was over. While education spaces are supposed to be emancipate, free of all markers of identity and privilege, equalising spaces, they are anything but. The same oppression that Bama faced outside, she faced in school and college, making it all even harder to pursue an education she could barely afford and that she had to fight hard for as a woman. Her narrative is nuanced in exploring her intersecting identities as Dalit and woman in detail. As Bama says in this interview with Githa Hariharan, Dalit women are exploited ‘thrice,’ on account of their caste, class and gender – ‘triple monsters.’

"OUR village is very beautiful." This was the opening line of Karukku, the childhood memoirs written in Tamil by Dalit writer Bama. Karukku, (which in Tamil means the sharp-edged stem of the palmera tree) voiced the joys and sorrows of her people, oppressed by higher castes in India. "We were very poor. I was witness to many instances of violence against Dalits. I also saw the humiliation my grandmother and mother faced in the fields and homes of the landlords. Despite the misery, we had a carefree childhood."

In 2001, Lakshmi Holmstorm's English translation of Karukku won the Crossword Award in

India and established Bama as a distinct voice in Indian literature. (Dalits are members of India's most marginalised and oppressed castes.) Bama didn't really plan to be a writer. Born in 1958, as Faustina Mary Fatima Rani (her grandfather had converted to Christianity) in a village called Puthupatti in Tamil Nadu (southern India), her landless ancestors and parents worked as labourers for the landlords. She and her four siblings spent a lot of time playing in the fields. "Sometimes we were cops and robbers, sometimes husband and wife. But my favourite game was kabaddi (a team wrestling game played in many Indian villages). I liked the whole business of challenging, crossing over and vanquishing the opponent," says Bama, recently in New Delhi to attend a writer's meet.

Perhaps it was this game which trained Bama to face many challenges in life and come out victorious. Bama's father, who was in the Indian army, was very particular about the children's education. "If he had not joined the army, we would never have had the regular income for education. Education also gave us freedom to get away from the clutches of the landlords and lead our own lives," says Bama.

Her brother Raj Gautaman, also a writer, introduced her to the world of books. "I read Tamil writers like Jayakantan, Akhilan, Mani and Parthasarthy. In college I read my favourites - Khalil Gibran and Rabindranath Tagore. I didn't have many books to read so I read the same ones again and again," she recalls. In college she also wrote poetry. But after college Bama became a schoolteacher and chose to educate very poor girls.

Her life took a big turn when at the age of 26 she took the vows to become a nun. This was an attempt to break away from caste bonds and further pursue her goals to help poor Dalit girls. "I felt that at the seminary I would be able to carry forward my work with the poor," she says. But seven years later, in 1992, Bama walked out of the seminary. Her family insisted she get married and settle down. "I had lost everything. I was a stranger to society. I kept lamenting about life and harked back to my happy childhood days in the village," narrates Bama.

Struggling to find herself again, Bama followed a friend's advice and started to write her

childhood memoirs. She also created her pen name - Bama - a blend of different sounds from her Christian name. She completed the book in six months. This slim volume, a semi-fictional account of the growing awareness of a Dalit, created a stir in literary circles for its uninhibited language and bold vocabulary. "Some critics cried out that a woman should not have used such coarse words. But I wrote the way people speak. I didn't force a literary language on myself," says Bama.

Today, at 45, Bama teaches in a primary school in Uthiramerur, near Chennai. Her works, which include two collections of short stories, Kissubukkaran and Sangathi, have also been translated into French. Though Bama began by writing about the condition of Dalits in rural India, she now plans to focus on communal clashes. After school, Bama spends most of her time talking to young Dalit women about religion, oppression and social change. She shares her experiences as a student, nun and a writer to encourage them to build something anew.

Why did she choose to remain single? "The existing family system would not give me the space I needed to do my kind of work. So I chose to stay single," she explains. "My ambition is to communicate the dreams and aspirations of my people, who have remained on the fringes for centuries in Indian history."

Bama is the pen-name of a Tamil Dalit woman, from a Roman Catholic family. She has published three main works: an autobiography, Karukku, 1992; a novel, Sangati, 1994; and a collection of short stories, Kisumbukkaran 1996.

Karukku means palmyra leaves, which, with their serrated edges on both sides, are like double-edged swords. By a felicitous pun, the Tamil word Karukku, containing the word hare, embryo or seed, also means freshness, newness. In her foreword, Bama draws attention to the symbol, and refers to the words in Hebrews (New Testament), "For the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two- edged sword, piercing to the division of soul and spirit, of joints and marrow, and discerning the thoughts and intentions of the heart." (Hebrews, 4:10)

Karukku is the first autobiography of its kind to appear in Tamil, for Dalit writing in this language has not produced the spate of autobiographies which have appeared, for example, in Marathi. It is also in many ways an unusual autobiography. It grows out of a particular moment: a personal crisis and watershed in the author's life which drives her to make sense of her life as woman, Christian, Dalit. Many Tamil authors, both men and women, use the convention of writing under a pseudonym. In this case, though, this convention adds to the work's strange paradox of reticence and familiarity. It eschews the "confessional" mode, leaving out many personal details. The protagonist is never named. The events of Bama's life are not arranged according to a simple, linear or chronological order, as with most autobiographies, but rather, reflected upon in different ways, repeated from different perspectives, grouped under different themes, for example, Work, Games and Recreation, Education, Belief, etc. It is her driving quest for integrity as a Dalit and Christian that shapes the book and gives it its polemic.

The argument of the book is to do with the arc of the narrator's spiritual development both through the nurturing of her belief as a Catholic, and her gradual realization of herself as a Dalit. We are given a very full picture of the way in which the Church ordered and influenced the lives of the Dalit Catholics. Every aspect of the child's life is imbued with the Christian religion. The day is ordered by religious ritual. The year is punctuated by religious processions and festivals which become part of the natural yearly cycle of crops and seasons. But parallel to this religious life is a socio-political self-education that takes off from the revelatory moment when she first understands what untouchability means. It is this double perspective that enables her to understand the deep rift between Christian beliefs and practice.

Bama's re-reading and interpretation of the Christian scriptures as an adult enables her to carve out both a social vision and a message of hope for Dalits by emphasizing the revolutionary aspects of Christianity, the values of equality, social justice, and love towards all. Her own life experiences urge her towards actively engaging in alleviating the sufferings of the oppressed. When she becomes a nun, it is in the stubborn hope that she will have a chance to put these aspirations into effect. She discovers, however, that the perspectives of the convent and the

Church are different from hers. The story of that conflict and its resolution forms the core of **Karukku.**

In the end, Bama makes the only choice possible for her. But she also sees the beginnings of an important change, if not in the Church's practice, yet in the gradually growing awareness among Dalits, of their own oppression:

But Dalits have also understood that God is not like this, has not spoken like this. They have become aware that they too were created in the likeness of God. There is a new strength within them, urging them to reclaim that likeness which has been repressed, ruined and obliterated; and to begin to live with honour and respect and love of all humankind. To my mind, that alone is true devotion.

Clearly she understands that her own experience is part of a larger movement among Dalits. Yet, it is interesting that she appears to come to this awareness of her own accord. She does not, for example, seem to have access to liberation theologians (as does Vidivelli, in a parallel autobiography, Kalakkal.) She refers neither to Ambedkar nor to Periyaar, who not only attacked the caste system, but whose remarkable speeches and writings against the oppression of women were published in 1942 under the title Pen Yenh Adimaiynanat? (Why did woman become enslaved?) Nor indeed does Bama — again unlike Vidivelli — make a connection between caste and gender oppressions. Not in Karukku at any rate; she does so, abundantly, in Sangati and elsewhere. Karukku is concerned with the single issue of caste oppression within the Catholic Church and its institutions and presents Bama's life as a process of lonely self-discovery. Bama leaves her religious order to return to her village, where life may be insecure, but where she does not feel alienated or compromised. The tension throughout Karukku is between the self and the community: the narrator leaves one community (of religious women) in order to join another (as a Dalit woman). Sangati takes up the story of that new community.

Dalit writing — as the writers themselves have chosen to call it — has been seen in Tamil only in the past decade, and later than in Marathi and Kannada. It has gone hand in hand with political activism, and with critical and ideological debate, spurred on by such events as the Ambedkar centenary of 1994, and the furore following the Mandal Commission report.

The Tamil equivalent of the Marathi "dalit" is taazhtapattor, used in this specific sense by Bharati Dasan in the 1930s, when he was working for the Self Respect Movement. He uses it in the poem Taazhtapattor samattuvapaattu ("Song for the equality of the oppressed"). Indeed the new Tamil Dalit writing constantly refers to the anti-caste, anti-religious speeches of E.V. Ramaswamy Naicker (Periyaar), founder of this movement. All the same, although the Tamil words taazhtapattor or odukkappattor are used in much of the literature by both — writers and critics, it is significant that the preferred term is Dalit, implying militancy, an alliance with other repressed groups, and a nation-wide — or even universal — identity. ("Who are Dalits? All those who are oppressed: all hill peoples, neo-Buddhists, labourers, destitute farmers, women, and all those who have been exploited politically, economically, or in the name of religion are Dalits." from the 1972 Manifesto of the Dalit Panthers, quoted in Tamil translation in Omvedt 1994).

More recently, Raj Gautaman (1995) points to the different functions of Tamil Dalit writing, and the different local and global readerships it addresses. First, he says, it is the function of Dalit writing to awaken in every reader, a consciousness of the oppressed Dalit, and to share in the Dalit experience as if it were their own. (Karukku, he says, is a singular example of a piece of writing which achieves this.) At the same time, according to Gautaman, the new Dalit writing must be a Tamil and an Indian version of a world-wide literature of the oppressed; its politics must be an active one that fights for human rights, social justice and equality .

I think that it would also be true to say that while much of the new Tamil Dalit writing does indeed function as Gautaman claims, and is centrally concerned with raising an awareness of the Dalit experience, Bama's work is among those (like the work of Vidivelli, Imayam and Marku) that are exploring a changing Dalit identity. There is, in this writing, a very powerful sense of the self and the community as Dalit, which rejects outright the notion of varna; and which on the other hand refuses to "sanskritize," to evaluate Dalit life-style according to mainstream Hindu values. But there is also a powerful sense of engagement with history, of change, of changing notions of identity and belonging. Bama captures a moment that contains

a paradox: she seeks an identity, but seeks a change which means an end to that identity.

I must conclude by commenting briefly on Bama's use of language. Bama is doing something completely new in using the demotic and the colloquial regularly, as her medium for narration and even argument, not simply for reported speech. She uses a Dalit style of language which overturns the decorum and aesthetics of received upper-class, upper-caste Tamil. She breaks the rules of written grammar and spelling throughout, elides words and joins them differently, demanding a new and different pattern of reading. Karakku also, by using an informal speech style which addresses the reader intimately, shares with the reader the author's predicament as Dalit and Christian directly, demystifying the theological argument, and making her choice rather, a matter of conscience.

As well as this subversion of received Tamil, all Dalit writing is marked by certain other characteristics. It reclaims and remains close to an oral tradition made up of workchants, folk-songs, songs sung at rites of passage, as well as proverbs—and some of this tradition belongs particularly to the women's domain. Karakku, very interestingly, also tells a story of Tamil Dalit Catholicism in the vocabulary that it uses, particularly in the central chapter which describes her spiritual journey from childhood faith to her return home after departing from the convent. There is often a layering of meaning in certain words, where a Tamilized Sanskrit word is given a new Catholic meaning. For example, Tamil mantiram (sacred utterance, but also popularly, magic charm or spell) from Sanskrit mantra becomes "catechism" in Catholic use. Hence often there is a spin or a turn-around of meaning; a freshness in some of the coinages, and different routes and slippages in the way Catholicism has been naturalized (and sometimes not) into the Tamil of the text. It is also important to note that Bama consistently uses the language of popular Catholicism, eschewing very largely, the terminology of theologians.

Bama's work is not only breaking a mainstream aesthetic, but also proposing a new one which is integral to her politics. What is demanded of the translator and reader is, in Gayatri Spivak's terms, a "surrender to the special call of the text."

This is certainly not comfortable reading for anyone. Bama is writing in order to change hearts

and minds. And as readers of her work we are asked for nothing less than an imaginative entry into that different world of experience and its political struggle.

2. Jean-Jacques Rousseau : Confessions

Rousseau begins his Confessions by claiming that he is about to embark on an enterprise never before attempted: to present a self-portrait that is "in every way true to nature" and that hides nothing. He begins his tale by describing his family, including his mother's death at his birth. He ruminates on his earliest memories, which begin when he was five, a dawning of consciousness that he traces to his learning to read. He discusses his childhood in the years before his father left him and his own decision to run away to see the world at the age of sixteen. He often dwells for many pages on seemingly minor events that hold great importance for him.

Throughout the Confessions, Rousseau frequently discusses the more unsavory or embarrassing experiences of his life, and he devotes much of the early section to these types of episodes. In one section, he describes urinating in a neighbor's cooking pot as a mischievous child. He also discusses the revelatory experience he had at age eleven of being beaten by an adored female nanny twice his age—and desiring to be beaten again, which he analyzes as being his entry into the world of adult sexuality.

Rousseau continues to describe his life and eventually reaches adulthood. The narrative continues in a similar vein in the later sections, with Rousseau focusing less on places traveled and jobs held than on his personal trials, unrequited loves, and sexual frustrations. He speaks at length of his significant relations with women, including his rather unremarkable longtime companion Thérése le Vasseur and the older matron Madame de Warens, at whose home he often stayed as a young man.

In the last of the twelve books that make up the work, Rousseau speaks about his intellectual work, his writing, and his relations to contemporary philosophers. Rousseau concludes the Confessions in 1765, when he is fifty-three. At this point, all his major philosophical works

have been published, and his fears of persecution are growing.

Analysis

A few notable autobiographies existed in Europe before Rousseau published the Confessions, but his work in many ways represented an entirely new literary form.

Although works such as St. Augustine's own Confessions (a.d. 397) had previously been widely read and celebrated, religious works of that kind differed greatly from Rousseau's own, since they sought to convey an inspirational story of religious virtuosity. By contrast, Rousseau's Confessions sought to bare the entire life of its author subject, detailing all his imperfections, virtues, individual neuroses, and formative childhood experiences as a means of explaining and justifying the views and personality of his adult self.

Although Rousseau states that The Confessions should not be read as an unerring account of dates and events and admits that most likely he often gets such factual data wrong when his memory fails him, dates and exact events are not the point of the work. He says that though he may mix up the dates of certain happenings, he will never get wrong his feelings about them, and his feelings—and what his feelings have led him to do—are the subject of his story. He does not engage in the comprehensive unburdening of his whole self, with all its frailties, prurient desires, and natural failings, as an act of pure humility and self-deprecation. Rather, he does it as a way of saying that even with all his weaknesses, he is, as we all are, fundamentally a good and honest being. This principle is at the heart of Rousseau's entire philosophy, and it connects The Confessions to the rest of his work. The Confessions is key to understanding Rousseau's work as a whole.

The influence of The Confessions reaches well beyond philosophy. As a work of literature, it inaugurated the modern genre of autobiography and influenced narrative technique in the great novels that would appear in the following century. Rousseau's emphasis on the effects of childhood experiences on adulthood, especially in relation to the development of sexuality,

foreshadows the revolutionary psychological work of Sigmund Freud. The Confessions is also the work considered most responsible for Rousseau's frequent accreditation as the father of the romantic movement, for the degree to which he emphasizes the importance of subjective, individual, and sensory experience of the world.

Rousseau's lengthy and sometimes anguished dossier on the Self is one of the most remarkable and courageous works of introspection ever undertaken. Some readers may be repelled by his tendency to revel in embarrassing accounts of humiliation and fiasco, as if he were striving too hard to achieve an ultimate nakedness, a nakedness of the soul perhaps. Others may recall the compulsive self-searching of the narrator of Proust's A la recherche du temps perdu, who also rather dwelt on the co-existence in the individual of the vile and the virtuous.

The two opening volumes of the Confessions, presented in this inevitably censored edition of 1903, deal with the author's childhood and callow adolescence.

- Our guy Jean-Jacques Rousseau is about to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth… about himself. His goal is to give his readers a totally true portrait.
- First, the basics: Rousseau is born in 1712 to a mom named Susanne and a dad named Isaac.
- Rousseau's mom and dad have an epic love story. Even though they knew each other as kids, they didn't get together until they were both mature enough to handle it.
- Sadly, Rousseau's mom dies in childbirth. Isaac, his dad, is distraught.
- Rousseau doesn't remember a lot until his fifth or sixth birthday. But he does remember what a huge impact reading had on him. Score one for the books.
- All that reading gives Rousseau plenty of insight into human passion.
- Rousseau has a brother, but the guy up and disappears early in Rousseau's childhood.

- Rousseau is basically an only son after his brother moves away permanently—poor guy.
- Little Rousseau gets the royal treatment from everyone around him, but he's a bit of a brat.

- He urinates in his neighbor's cooking-pot while she's at church one day (classy, Rousseau).
- Rousseau's aunt is a huge influence in his life. He still remembers her beautiful voice singing songs.
- When Rousseau is still a kid, his father is almost thrown in jail for drawing his sword against a French captain named M. Gautier—intense.
- Rousseau's dad gets the heck out of Dodge rather than go to jail. In other words, he leaves Geneva permanently.
- Rousseau stays behind under the charge of his kindly uncle, Bernard.
- Rousseau also has a cousin named Bernard, which gets a little confusing. The two kids get to be best friends.
- Together, the kids are sent to a village called Bossey to learn Latin from a pastor, M. Lambercier.
- The pastor's wife, Mlle Lambercier, lets both boys sleep in her bed regularly.
- While it's all innocent, Rousseau is sure that this experience led him down the path to perversity.
- Rousseau gets in hot water when Mlle Lamberciers's comb turns up broken.
- Everyone just assumes that Rousseau has committed the crime, but he holds strong and refuses to confess.
- To this day, Rousseau remembers this comb incident. Still, he maintains his innocence.
- Rousseau and his cousin Bernard plant a walnut tree on a terrace one fine day.

- The cousins rig an aqueduct to keep water running straight towards the tree.
- M. Lambercier spots the boys' construction and promptly wrecks it, yelling "An aqueduct! An aqueduct!"
- This turns out to be one of Rousseau's dearest memories (go figure).
- Little Rousseau starts flirting with some older girls: Mlle de Vulson and Mlle Goton. They see him as a little kid, but he's totally in love.
- Rousseau is furious when Mlle de Vulson ends up getting married to another guy. Tough luck, dude.

- After a brief stint as an apprentice for a pettifogger, Rousseau sets out to become an engraver.
- Rousseau kind of loves his new job. Too bad his boss accuses him of trying to use his mad skills to forge money.
- Rousseau isn't guilty of that crime, but he does get himself involved in a crime ring—an asparagus-stealing crime ring, to be more specific.
- Thinking back about his involvement in this (cough) terrible crime, Rousseau remembers how he's always been materialistic. Tell it to Madonna, dude. Around this time, Rousseau discovers the joys of lending libraries. He goes through books at Mme La Tribu's library lickety-split.
- At the age of sixteen, Rousseau is told he'll be fired if he doesn't make it back on time in the evening. It looks like our guy has a little tardiness problem.
- What happens next? You guessed it: while hanging out with some buddies, Rousseau doesn't make it back on time before the bridge goes up for the day.

- Rather than face his master in shame, R. decides to just up and quit, despite his cousin Bernard telling him to pull it together.

- Rousseau is as free as a bird. Well, at least he's not apprenticed to an engraver anymore.
- Rather than experience Fear of Missing Out (FOMO), our guy travels abroad to Confignon, close to his childhood home of Geneva.
- There, he seeks some advice from a priest named M. de Pontverre.
- Pontverre tells Rousseau that he knows a pious lady named Mme de Warens, who will definitely take pity on his poor jobless friend.
- It doesn't hurt that Mme de Warens is super-pretty. Rousseau catches a glimpse of her and is instantly starstruck.
- Still, Rousseau wants to get a proper job. Although he's under the support of Mme. de Warens, he heads to Turin to see if he can drum something up.
- Rousseau happens to meet up with his long-lost dad while he's job-hunting.

- Once our buddy Rousseau gets to Turin, he presents Mme. de Warens's letters of introduction and gets admitted into a community of converts to Catholicism.
- That's cool, but Rousseau isn't actually Catholic. He's Protestant, but he's willing to fib in order to get special treatment.
- Rousseau figures that he won't actually have to fully convert for a while, so he can play a game of cat-and-mouse.
- Rousseau gets a full education in the Catholic faith. After all, the guy doesn't mind getting a good education.
- He goes before the Inquisition to receive absolution for the crime of heresy. It's a little rough going, but he passes muster.
- After passing the test, Rousseau figures that it's time to hang out for a bit. He has a little bit of money to live on, so he finds lodging and kicks back.
- While wandering around one day, he meets a pretty saleswoman named Mme Basile. She's married, but that doesn't stop Rousseau from flirting.

- One day, while visiting Mme Basile, the two have an especially flirty moment.
- Rousseau throws himself at her feet and wants to kiss her, but the two are interrupted.
- Mme Basile kisses his hand twice, but that's all she wrote for Rousseau's first real romance.
- Still, Mme Basile invites Rousseau to dinner to introduce him to one of her priest friends… and coincidentally, her husband.
- The dinner does not go well. Even though Rousseau is young, the husband gets super-jealous.
- Luckily, Rousseau's landlady finds him a job at the Countess de Vercellis's house.
- Basically, the Countess de Vercellis dictates letters in French to Rousseau. She has breast cancer, which makes it totally impossible for her to write comfortably.
- Finally, the Countess de Vercellis dies of her disease.
- Rousseau steals a little pink and silver ribbon in the hubbub after the Countess's death, and pins it on a sweet servant girl.
- He feels super-bad about it, even to this day.

- Young Rousseau is starting to think about sex a lot.
- One day, he explores an underground passage by a well where lots of girls come to hang out.
- Every once in a while, he tries to hit on the girls who come to the well.
- A big guy with a sword catches Rousseau being rude to the girls and asks what he's up to.
- Rousseau doesn't really have a good answer, so he makes something up.

- He claims to be a young nobleman suffering from a mental disorder. Sure… that's convincing, Rousseau.
- The stranger dude lets Rousseau go, but he's awfully skeptical.
- Whenever the stranger sees Rousseau out and about, he makes fun of him.
- Rousseau gets to know a vicar named M. Gaime who gives him some solid advice about how to go about life.
- The late Countess's nephew, Count de la Roque, introduces Rousseau to the Count de Gouvon, who immediately introduces Rousseau to his well-off children. It's basically LinkedIn for rich folks.
- Rousseau works a bit writing letters for the Count de Favria (yet another Count), but most of his time is his own.
- Rousseau meets Mlle de Breil, a lovely young lass who doesn't even register Rousseau's existence.
- That is, Mlle de Breil ignores Rousseau until he spills some water on her— poor guy.
- Luckily, Rousseau still has a few more connections in high society. The Abbe de Gouvon, Count Gouvon's son, allows Rousseau to work for him as a letter-writer. It looks like Rousseau is developing a specialty.
- Rousseau's heart isn't really in the work, though. He's pleased as punch when he gets fired for behaving like a pompous fool.
- The Count de Favria gives Rousseau a severe talking-to for screwing up.
- Since Rousseau is a young guy who wants to see the world, he makes plans to travel with his old pal Bacle.

- Alas, Bacle's not as interesting to Rousseau as Mme de Warens. Remember her? She's the pretty lady who's sponsoring Rousseau.
- Mme de Warens welcomes Rousseau back to her house. The guy is over the moon with happiness.

- As the Mme de Warens and Rousseau get—ahem—reacquainted, they give each other nicknames.
- Mme de Warens is "Mama" and Rousseau is "Little One." Rousseau is nineteen (no comment).
- Rousseau begins to imagine their lives together. He's definitely getting attached.
- He gets some reading done during this time period, too. The Spectator is of particular interest to this literary teenager.
- A friend of Mme de Warens's, M. d'Aubonne, basically runs Rousseau through a mock job interview.
- Rousseau flunks the test. M. d'Aubonne thinks he's not a total idiot, but he's not smart enough to do anything worthwhile.
- Rousseau admits that he has a tough time developing ideas. It takes a long time for him to develop anything worthwhile while he's writing. (Rousseau, we feel you.)
- He's also more awkward than the Silicon Valley guys when trying to make conversation.
- Mme de Warens has a plan. She thinks Rousseau should study at seminary with a priest named M. Gros.
- Rousseau doesn't have the best time at seminary, especially because he hates his Latin teacher.
- Luckily, M. Gros puts Rousseau in the care of a much nicer teacher—a guy named M. Gatier.
- Even though Rousseau likes Gatier, he doesn't make much progress in Latin. It's a tough subject.

- Rousseau recounts that, after he left seminary, Gatier got himself into quite a scandal. Rousseau's old teacher got a girl pregnant and was imprisoned for breaking his vows.

- One dramatic day, the building next to Mme de Warens's house catches on fire.
- Her house nearly goes up in flames, but the wind blows the fire in the other direction. Phew!
- Years later, Rousseau writes an account of a priest praying for the wind to blow the fire in the opposite direction. In Rousseau's eyes, the event is a miracle.
- Mme de Warens loves to throw weekly musical parties. Rousseau meets a choirmaster named M. le Maitre at one of these parties and moves to his house for the winter.
- One chilly evening in February, M. le Maitre invites in a poor musician in raggedy clothes. The guy's name is M. Venture.
- M. Venture sings beautifully for the company, moving Rousseau deeply. After this, M. Venture and Rousseau start a bromance. Venture's a bit of a rake (a hellion, nogoodnik, or otherwise morally loose dude), but Rousseau admires him nonetheless.
- Mme de Warens decides Venture's too much of a bad influence. She sends Rousseau to Lyons as M. Maitre's travel buddy.
- While in Lyons, M. Maitre is overtaken by a fit.
- Rousseau rushes for help while his friend lies in the street, foaming at the mouth.
- Rousseau misses "Mama" (Mme de Warens) too much. He heads back to Annecy to see her again.

- Too bad she's taken off for Paris. Rousseau never figures out the secret reason for her journey.
- M. d'Aubonne guesses that she wanted to secure a place at the French court.
- Rousseau's not too happy when he finds Mama gone.
- He feels especially bad for abandoning M. Maitre in Lyons.
- M. Maitre's precious box of music is seized by a dastardly Count who disputes his ownership of it.
- At least Rousseau can reunite with his pal Venture.
- Rousseau tries to distract himself with Mama's friends, but it's no use. They're no replacement.
- One day, Rousseau journeys into the country to see the sunrise.

- Two of Mama's friends, Mlle de Graffenreid and Mlle Galley, run into Rousseau on horseback.
- Rousseau can't help but notice that Mlle Galley is pretty cute.
- After Rousseau helps them cross a stream, the ladies jokingly tell Rousseau that he's their "prisoner of war."
- Rousseau's into that. The group heads to Toune for dinner at an old castle belonging to Mlle Galley.
- At one point, Rousseau is so bold as to kiss Mlle Galley's hand—ooh-la-la.
- Rousseau is as happy as a clam, but he's also poor as dirt.
- Venture takes Rousseau to dine at a friend's house: Lord Justice M. Simon. After an enjoyable dinner, Rousseau decides to write to Mlle de Graffenried. (That's not the lady whose hand Rousseau kissed, but the other one.)
- When Rousseau delivers the letter to Mlle Giraud, she immediately guesses his secret: Rousseau has a crush.
- Rousseau is quite a popular guy, as it turns out. Mlle Giraud and Mlle Merceret are also into him.

- Mlle Merceret takes Rousseau along as a traveling companion as she goes back to visit her father.
- Although the two frequently stay in the same room along the journey, nothing romantic happens.
- On the way to their final destination, Rousseau stops to see his own dad. It's quite the emotional reunion.
- Finally, Mlle Merceret and Rousseau arrive safely at Fribourg, the home of Mlle Merceret's father.
- On the way back, Rousseau stops at the beautiful Lasanne Lake. He's broke as a joke, but a kind innkeeper allows him to stay for free.
- There, he has a revelation: his luck will change if he changes his name. Bye- bye Rousseau, hello Vaussore de Villeneuve!
- After meeting a music-loving law professor named M. de Treytorens, Rousseau decides

to compose a piece for his concert.

- His piece is performed. It sounds absolutely terrible, though. Well, at least the minuet part sounds okay.
- Rousseau picks up two music pupils. He's finding some way of making money.
- One day, Rousseau meets a man with a large beard while dining at an inn. It turns out that the guy is a Greek priest.
- The fellow asks Rousseau along on a tour of Jerusalem. Rousseau happily agrees.
- On their way, they stop by Soleure to see the French ambassador. Surprisingly, the French ambassador is a dude from Rousseau's past. It's M. de Bonac.
- Bonac and his wife persuade Rousseau to stay at the embassy and work, not travel to Jerusalem. Score one for Rousseau.

- Rousseau is put up to stay in a room where another famous writer with his same name stayed. This lights a fire under him to start writing.
- After only a brief time, Rousseau gets restless and wants to head to Paris.
- Rousseau has a fantastic time in the City of Lights. It's the most gorgeous place he's ever been.
- He makes friends with a lady named Mme de Merveilleux, who tells him that his beloved Mama left the city long ago.
- Always the restless one, Rousseau spends a little time talking about his journey through Lyons.
- Two men proposition him for sex on the way through Lyons, but he turns them down.
- Rousseau receives some news that Mama is at Chambery. She sends him some cash to come see her, at long last.
- By the end of Book 4, Rousseau is on his way to see Mama.
- When he arrives, she's with the Intendant General. Mama has convinced him to give Rousseau a livelihood—major life moment, right here.
- He apologizes to the reader for including so many "childish" stories up to this point in his memoir, but they're all important to his adult life.
- It's the first day of the rest of his life. Rousseau starts a career as a surveyor in the King's

service, thanks to Mama's persuasiveness.

- Rousseau lives in Annecy, with Mama. He scores big and gets a beautiful room in her house.
- Claude Anet is Mama's lover, which makes it a little weird for everyone. Like Rousseau, he's totally devoted to Mama.
- Okay, now we take a quick break from some historical context, courtesy of our guy Rousseau: although it's a peaceful time for him, it's crazy in Europe.

- France and the Emperor have just declared war on each other and, for the first time, Rousseau is really and truly proud to be a Frenchman.
- And now back to our story: Rousseau suggests to Mama that she sponsor a little concert every month. You know, a chance for all the musicians in the area to get together and show off.
- Lots of people love these concerts, but some protest because Mama is living off the King's charity.
- Rousseau meets Father Caton at one of these concerts. He's a Franciscan monk who loves taking part in the monthly party.
- Unfortunately, Father Caton meets a tragic end. His fellow monks are so jealous of him that they make him miserable. The poor guy dies of grief in his cell.
- In the meantime, Rousseau is becoming obsessed with music. He persuades Mama to let him quit his job and devote his life fully to the arts.
- While he's not working, Rousseau studies pretty girls. He's particularly interested in Mlle Mellarede, his young neighbor.
- Rousseau starts taking pupils to earn some extra cash. Those pupils all turn out to be pretty girls—coincidence?
- One of his pupils is a pretty grocer's daughter, Mlle Lard.
- Mlle Lard's mom is more interested in Rousseau, though.
- Mama's still around, though. Reminder time, Shmoopers: "Mama" is Mme de Warens, Rousseau's older lady friend who might be interested in him. It's a little… complicated.
- Mama offers to have sex with Rousseau. Of course, she puts it a little more delicately

than that.

- She gives Rousseau eight days to think about her offer, although he has his answer ready immediately.

- Here's the tricky part: Mama is already Claude Anet's mistress. Still, Rousseau decides to accept Mama's offer, despite the complications.
- Although it's a little weird for him, Rousseau feels like the experience brings him closer to his friend.
- Life continues to pass. Mama is dedicated to a cool new project: creating a royal botanical garden.
- One day, tragedy strikes. Claude is in search of a rare plant for the garden when he's overcome by the heat. He dies within five days.
- Rousseau is devastated. Well, he says he is. But he can't help thinking that he'll inherit Claude's favorite black coat.
- Now, it's Rousseau's job to watch over Mama and her monetary affairs. Cue an evil laugh.
- Influenced by his old pal Venture, Rousseau decides to take some music lessons in Annecy from Venture's composition master. Of course, he'll need lots of money for travel.
- Unfortunately, his traveling trunk is seized and confiscated at a French customs office.
- They've found evidence that Rousseau is reading some heretical material. In other words, he's got some stuff that's against the law.
- Rousseau loses a lot of money from this mishap. He loses Mama's money, to be specific.
- Now, Rousseau is getting to a point in his story where his present overlaps with his past.
- He has one special friend from those days: a guy named M. de Gauffecourt.
- Another fellow, M. de Conzie, shares Rousseau's interest in music and reading Voltaire.

- Rousseau does a lot of traveling, thanks to Mama's money. He's trying to figure out how to help cut her expenses on these journeys. (It sounds like a likely story to us, Rousseau.)
- Rousseau learns chess from a dude named M. Bagueret. The guy beats him every time without any mercy.

- Every time Rousseau dedicates his life to playing games (like gambling), he becomes very ill.
- He gets sick, just like clockwork, after playing lots of chess with Bagueret.
- Only Mama's care can save him. She nurses him back to health.
- Rousseau proposes that Mama move away with him. The two head off in the sunset to Les Charmettes, a secluded nearby estate where nothing will disturb them. But Rousseau's got more in store for his readers than a simple happy ending.

REFERENCES:

1. Venuti, Lawrence ed. 2000. The Translation Studies Reader, London: Routledge

2. "Karukku was my healing: Bama Faustina". National Herald. Retrieved 14 March 2019.

3. "On a wing and a prayer: Tamil Dalit writer Bama on 25 years of Karukku". The Indian Express. 21 January 2018. Retrieved 16 March 2020.

4. Rousseau, Jean-Jacques (1987). Rousseau: Confessions. Cambridge University Press. pp. 9–. ISBN 978-0-521-31500-5.

5. The Confessions of Jean-Jacques Rousseau at Project Gutenberg – English translation. Note that this is an expurgated translation; certain incidents in the original, chiefly erotic, are not present.