PREFACE

The present study is an attempt to evaluate the achievement of William Radice as a Tagore translator in the light of translation theories. A bilingual study of this nature involving the twin disciplines of Translation Studies and Tagore Studies requires, on the one hand, an acquaintance with the history of translation theories and the ‘poetics’ of translation studies. It also requires, on the other, a first-hand acquaintance with the original and the translated works of Rabindranath Tagore as well as the critical works on him. In order to preserve the bilingual nature of the present study I have followed the principle of bilingual documentation in the “Works Cited” section. Tagore formed his own concept of translation and its evaluation on the basis of his experience of translating Gitanjali poems. Surprisingly, his reflections on translations are, in many respects, similar to those of Western translation theorists; but they have not yet received the importance they deserve from the translation critics. While evaluating Radice’s Tagore translations I have included in my discussion Tagore’s translation thoughts alongside the views of the Western translation theorists.

The seminal idea of the title of this study comes firstly from Roman Jacobson’s definition of translation as ‘interpretation’ (Kelly 1) and secondly from Axel Buhler’s article “Translation as interpretation” included in Translation Studies (2002) edited by Alessandra Riccardi and published from Cambridge University Press. Translation, as understood by William Radice, is not the mere transfer of literal meanings of words or expressions from one language to another; it is an ‘imaginative insight’ into the life, the creative works and the thought processes of a writer one is translating. In “The Task of the Translator” (1923) Walter Benazmin identifies something ‘unfathomable’, ‘imaginative’, and ‘poetic’ about the creative works of a great writer and a literal or word-for-word translation is incapable of capturing the spirit and essence of their originals (Schultz and Biguenet 71). In the Introduction to his book On Translation (1959) Reuben Arthur Brower refers to the translator as a “creator” equating him with the “original author” (Brower 7). He also adds, “ […] in spite of the fact that the study of “the creative process” has been a matter of speculation since Plato, and has become increasingly fashionable since Coleridge, it is surprising how little attention has been given to
the obscure business of *re-enacting some one else’s creation*” (emphasis added) (Ibid 4).

According to Brower, the translation critic is theoretically concerned with the re-enactment of some one else’s creation whereas the translator re-enacts it in another language performing a parallel act of creation (Arrowsmith and Shattuck 62). This seems to go against the basic task of a translator who sacrifices himself so completely to the work that his personality completely disappears. But translators and translation critics down the ages have glorified the subjective role of the translator in the act of translating a work from one language to another. In his epoch-making book *Toward A Science of Translating* (1964) Eugene A. Nida unequivocally says, “[...] *the human translator is not a machine, and he inevitably leaves the stamp of his personality on any translation he makes*” (emphasis added) (Nida 154). This ‘stamp of personality’ unconsciously colours the interpretation of a translator. Again, in the Preface to *The Translator’s Art* (1987) William Radice and Barbara Reynolds rightly observe, “[...] however self-effacing the translator’s art may be, *the translator’s personality is never wholly suppressed, nor should it be*” (emphasis added) (Radice and Reynolds 7). In “Ten Rules for translating Tagore” (1986) Radice seems to have mentioned the interpretative role played by the translator in the act of translating: “*The personality of the translator always comes into play; a translation of a poem can never be like a photo or carbon copy of the original*” (emphasis added) (Rao 34). What Radice implies here is that the intrusion of the ‘personality of the translator’ into a translation makes it interpretative as well as creative.

According to Buddhadev Bose, Rabindranath Tagore is “one of the most elusive poets of the modern times” (Bose 411) and the rendering of such an ‘elusive’ poet undoubtedly presents formidable challenges for a translator. Literal or word-for-word translation, translation theorists opine, cannot capture the spirit of the creative works of such an ‘elusive’ and imaginative poet like Rabindranath Tagore. It is only the free and interpretative mode of rendering that is capable of exploring the spirit and essence of his creativity. In “The Challenge of Translating Tagore” (2012) Radice sums up the true nature of his Tagore translation: “But as a poet myself, and one for whom the sounds and rhythm of poetry have always been immensely important..., I found myself responding to the sounds of Rabindranath’s poems in an instinctive and intuitive way. I cannot claim, even now, that I hear the poems in quite the same way as a native speaker would hear them, but they
immediately get ‘translated’, from the very first reading, into sounds and rhythms that are natural to me in my mother-tongue” (Chakravarty 445). It is now abundantly clear from the above observation that in his translations Radice makes the intuitive and imaginative interpretation of Tagore in English. In “Confessions of a Poet-Translator” (2003) he does not hesitate to describe his approach to Tagore translations as ‘imaginative and intuitive’ (Radice 139). I have therefore tried to highlight this aspect of Radice’s translations in my dissertation.

I am extremely grateful to my friend-turned supervisor Dr. Chandanashis Laha, Associate Professor of English, of North Bengal University, who brought me back to the world of academic research at the fag end of my career. Aware of my interest in Tagore he suggested sometime in 2004 that I should work on William Radice’s Tagore translations. I jumped at his suggestion and made up my mind to pursue the job. He made an arrangement for me to meet Mr. William Radice when he had come to Kolkata in 2008 at the invitation of Dr. Damayanti Basu Singh, Buddhadev Basu’s youngest daughter, to deliver the Buddhadev Basu centenary lecture at Rotary Sadan, Kolkata. In this connection, I would like to express my gratitude to my revered teacher Dr. Basu Singh, ex-Reader in the Department of English of North Bengal University, for giving me the kind permission to attend the centenary lecture. I am also grateful to Dr. Radice who took time off his busy schedule to meet me and talk to me about his Tagore translations. Chandan also requested Dr. Basudev Chakravarty, Professor of English of Kalyani University and an authority on Tagore translation, to allow me to have photocopies of some of the rare books on translation that he had in his possession. I am thankful to Dr. Chakravarty for the help I received from him. Besides, Chandan made available to me for my use some of the important books on translation from his personal collection. I am also thankful to Prof. Mohit Kumar Roy of Burdwan University and Prof. Fakrul Alam of Jahangirnagore University, Dhaka, Bangladesh for their help.

I extend my heartfelt thanks and gratitude to the librarian and the library staff of National Library, Kolkata and Rabindra Bhavan Library, Santiniketan, for giving me access to the books and journals required for my research. I shall be failing in my duty if I do not acknowledge with thanks and gratitude the services I had received from the librarian and the library staff of Raiganj College (University College) throughout the entire period of my
research. I would also like to convey my gratitude to all the authors and publishers included in the "Works Cited" section of this study.

I am grateful to my brother-in-law Shri Prodyut Kumar Sinha who, from time to time, made enquiries about the progress of my work and was never tired of encouraging me. His son Somnath also deserves my sincere thanks for collecting some rare books for me. I am also thankful to Shri Ranjit SenGupta of Raiganj College for discussing with me many problems of Tagore translations from time to time and for supplying me with ready solutions.

My loving daughter Samhita also helped me a lot by collecting some important books from College Street and Kolkata Book Fair. My wife-cum-colleague Surnita took upon herself the burden of day-to-day domestic chores lest they should have interfered with my work. As I am not good at Bengali computer typing, she did the entire Bengali typing work for me. No word of appreciation is sufficient for the unfailing support and constant encouragement that I received from her at every stage of my research.

I extend my heartfelt thanks to Dhar Brothers, Kolkata, for the meticulous care they have taken in printing and binding my thesis.

Finally, I would like to convey my gratitude to the authority of North Bengal University and the Teacher-in-Charge of Raiganj College (University College) for granting me Study Leave for eight weeks for the completion and submission of my Ph.D. thesis.

Strategies. Taking into account the process and product of translation, Jaaskelainen (2005) divides strategies into two major categories: some strategies relate to what happens to texts, while other strategies relate to what happens in the translation rather than oral translation (the latter is commonly known as interpreting or interpretation), although the overlaps make a clear distinction impossible (cf. Gile 2004). The term translation itself has several meanings: it can refer to the general subject field, the product (the text that has been translated) or the process (the act of producing the translation, otherwise known as translating). Yet the study of translation as an academic subject has only really begun in the past sixty years. In the English-speaking world, this discipline is now generally known as.

Consecutive interpretation, which is a kind of interpreting performed by an interpreter consecutively, i.e. passages of the SL speaker are interpreted one after another in pauses (these messages may be sentences or paragraphs long enough to convey a complete meaning and short enough for an interpreter to remember or/and to take notes of them). The interpreter sits at a conference table, listens to a speech, takes notes and then renders the meaning of the speaker's message into the target language. Simultaneous interpretation performed by an interpreter almost simultaneously (i.e. the most common difficulty in translation studies has traditionally been the dilemma between the historical and synchronic approaches in the analysis and description of the culture of translation. On the one hand the culture of translation might be presented as the sum of various kinds of translated texts (repertoire of culture), on the other hand it might be described as the hierarchy of the various types of translations themselves. The first approach assumes plenty of languages for such description, in the latter one suggests only one language for the same representation. A cultural critic f