



RESEARCH PAPER

Translation, (post) Coloniality, and the Work of Vilas Sarang

Saeed Ur Rehman

Associate Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, University of Lahore,
Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan, saeed.rehman@ell.uol.edu.pk

DOI

[http://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2022\(6-III\)34](http://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2022(6-III)34)

ABSTRACT

Translation, literary or cultural, is always a political project because it makes one language and culture accessible to the speakers and subjects of another. Vilas Sarang has attempted to destabilise the idea of the translator and the translator's work by self-translating his works from Marathi to English. He has insisted that his writings, originally written in English, be also labelled as translated works. In the absence of an original text, the original English work is declared secondary so that the global consumers of literature do not forget the Marathi linguistic origins of the author. This position of Vilas Sarang is analysed, in this paper, as a strategy to minoritise the English language, a global literary medium.

Keywords

Colonialism, Minority Literature, Postcolonialism, South Asian Literature, Translation

Introduction

We are digging the pit of Babel.

— Franz Kafka, *The Pit of Babel*

The dictionary is based on the hypothesis – obviously an unproven one – that languages are made of equivalent synonyms.

— Jorge Luis Borges, *Translation*

The word 'translation,' etymologically speaking, has the idea of crossing a boundary. This boundary may exist between two cultures, two languages, life and death, health and disease, the unknowable and the knowable or two geographic spaces. *The Oxford English Dictionary* (1971) lists the following meanings of the verb 'translate': (a) to bear, to convey or remove from one person, place or condition to another; to transfer, transport (b) to remove the dead body or remains of a saint, or, by extension a hero or great man, from one place to another (c) to carry or convey to heaven without death (d) to remove the seat of (a disease) from one person or a part of the body to another (e) to turn from one language to another (f) to express in other words, to paraphrase. The idea of crossing, taking something away or bringing something home is common in all of the above meanings. Crossing the boundaries of one's culture/language and bringing the other home – domesticating the signs and texts of the foreign culture – is one of the many forms in which colonialism manifests itself.

Vilas Sarang has translated his work both ways across English and Marathi. He has also translated Marathi writers, especially 'Dalit' writers and written a doctoral

dissertation at Indiana University about linguistic differences between Marathi and English. Moreover, as a teacher of English writing in Marathi, who has taught in Bombay, Basra, and Kuwait, he is a translated subject. I propose to examine the politics of translation in a post-colonial context as another way of assessing Sarang's place in South Asian literature.

Translation deals with polarities and binarisms and the spaces between them; it is the grey bridge between white and black. In the context of colonialism, translation is the grey bridge between white and brown, yellow and/or black, for it serves the purpose of depriving the other of its uncanniness (Bhabha, 1994) and inscribing its texts with familiar signs. In a colonial encounter between two different cultures and societies, translation functions in two ways: on the one hand, it makes the colonising subject's culture accessible to the colonised subject by expressing it in terms of the other's experience and, on the other, it appropriates the cultural texts of the colonised subject by assigning them the signs that are familiar to the colonisers. The colonisers' practice of translating the other is ambivalent in the mobility of its desire and objectification by that desire. While trying to fix the signs and the play of the signs of the other, it aims at beginning a new play – the play of the familiar signs and (con) texts. The meaning of the signs familiar to the colonising subject is itself displaced, incomplete, constantly revising and contingent because of the foreignness of the original texts. However, the paranoia that results from the uncanny signs of the other is repressed under familiar signs and also deprives the cultural texts of the other of their alterity. Like any other mode of knowledge production, the practice of translation operates within the power/knowledge framework, and the materially dominant culture employs it as a means of mobilising its political ideologies.

Translation served the colonising project of the Western self as a tool for appropriating and homogenising the other (Niranjana, 1992). Translation helped open the body of the other for the panoptical gaze of the self and, in return, helped the self feel secure in the 'dark' continents, which could otherwise make it feel threatened because of its inability to appropriate the other. For the representation of the other, translation meant the difference between the knowable corpus and the unknowable corpus of the other. The European self could not compartmentalise the unknowable. The translatable stood for the knowable – the part of the corpus of the other that could be brought home, that could be carried across, domesticated: "any Englishman will say of himself and his fellow citizens that it is they who rule the East Indies" (Hegel, 1975, p. 103).

Translation was the source of the certainty that the self can represent the other. As Edward Said has pointed out, the Orient was 'revealed to Europe in the materiality of its texts, languages and civilisations' (Said, 1995, p. 77). The idea of employing translation to appropriate the other, as expressed in the writings of William Jones, shows that translation was considered an instrument that could help "domesticate the Orient and thereby turn it into a province of European learning" (Said, 1995, p. 78).

This Western desire to assimilate the other into the self is accompanied by a need to first/simultaneously represent the other as fixed in its difference. Hegel, for example, "brings home" a 'universal' truth to the West by isolating a homogenised other: "China and India have a settled existence of their own, and they play no active part in historical progress" (Hegel, 1975, p. 216). Hegel does not find India a historical site: "It is obvious to anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of the treasures of Indian

literature that this country, so rich in spiritual achievements of a truly profound quality, nevertheless has no history (Hegel, 1975, p.136).

The inability of the Western self to have a dynamic relationship with the Orient, without coopting the Orient, seems to reveal more about the Western self than the othered Orient. This denial of the self to the Orient suggests the absence of the professed psychological and rational maturity of the Western self that informs the Hegelian justification of the colonising project.

The self-conscious anxiety-ridden self desires to fix, arrest, fossilise the play of difference and 'meaning' to the other and, thus, assign it the status of a knowable and known corpus which does not have any capacity to change because its body is already known, mapped and fully explored— ravished and unthreatening. The muted vegetative other cannot communicate to the self unless the self translates and appropriates the signs of the other. The only signs of the other are the signs that can be translated —brought home, Euro-morphed. The only way for the other to have a self is to have a 'mirror self' — a self which is not threatening and uncanny because it reflects, doubles and extends the spatial boundaries of the 'real self' — and be an extension of the self. If it is not a 'mirror self', it is an object, debased and outside the history of the self.

Colonisation is not limited to the inscription of the geographical and cultural bodies of the other. The lexical and syntactical corpus of the language of an-other culture is domesticated and normalised in translation. The panoptical gaze transforms the lingual materiality of the other into familiar signs; the signs that are already tools of the colonial reason become more mobile, more encompassing, subjugating more lingual and cultural foreign spaces. The translatability of the signs of the other validates the colonial desire to translate, to bring home, the other, and signifies the desire of the other to be translated and understood. The muted other cannot progress without being understood. If the body of the other shows any signs of contestation, dynamism, of moving away or splintering, it can also be normalised through translation as the other that asks for civilisation.

The only representation of the other can be by the self. To acknowledge, or to assign, the other's ability to speak for itself is to acknowledge the presence of a self of the other. If the other can speak for itself, the boundaries between the self and the other will blur, the colonial discourse will turn upon itself, and the teleology of colonisation will disperse. The repression of the voice of the other is the site of anxiety and paranoia. Jones's emphasis on the translation of Oriental texts by Western scholars because of the unreliability of natives as interpreters (Niranjana, 1992, p. 13) shows the anxiety that results from the fear of the possibility of dynamism in the vegetative other. If an Indian translates his/her cultural texts into English, there is always a possibility of re-appropriation and infiltration of the coloniser's language. If the other is dynamic, it cannot be fully known at any given moment and, thus, can subvert the colonising project. Jones' distrust of the native interpreter and demand for Western translators (Ibid.: 11) betrays the anxiety and paranoia that results from the possibility of the presence of a dynamic self that can negotiate, redefine and represent itself and its relation with another self. Mill's idea that Hindus "need to be understood before they can be properly ruled" (Mill, 1972, p. 22) and Jones' statement that Hindus are "incapable of civil liberty" (Jones, 1970, p. 712) are informed by the desire to objectify and control the other.

The phallic desire to 'know' and 'explore' the corpus of the other and to create a 'mirror self' through 'spreading the seeds/words' resulted in translating the Bible into many regional languages of India. The missionary zeal for translation was informed by the Biblical narrative of the creation of the universe – for "In the beginning was the word" (John 1:1) – and then God, the eternal translator, translated the sacred sound of his word into the cosmos and the earth (Barnstone, 1993, pp. 130–131). The impact of Bible translations has been so powerful on translation theories that it has made "Bible translation a necessary part of any study on the theory of translation (Gentzler, 1993, p. 45). The fact that missionary zeal and translation studies are difficult to separate in Western thought is visible in the translation theory of Eugene Nida. According to Nida, the most effective translation is that which can establish a link not between the receiver and the message but between the receiver and God (Nida in Gentzler, 1993, 53).

According to the Biblical story, as Barnstone remarks, "self-translation is a mark of divine, universal power" (Barnstone, 1993, p. 144). In light of this remark, Jones' distrust of the native translator can be read as Christian/colonialist arrogation of authority and creative agency over the creative passivity of the pagan/colonised.

The logocentric assumption supports translation theories of this kind that the message/meaning exists prior to language and can be translated into any language. The belief that meaning is an ahistorical timeless (and universal) given rather than a contingent construct validated translations of certain kinds of texts (law and religion) over others. Thus, the Eurologocentrism of Western thought encouraged the practice of translation to 'civilise' the other, fostered the colonising projects, and resulted in translations of the Bible into the regional languages of India and of the Vedas into European languages. Nationalistic/regionalist cultural/language programs rely on essentialist, autonomous, one-way conceptions of language and meaning – on the consolidation of the self and the inability of the other to be anything other than totally foreign or a version of the self. Sarang's position as a 'real' translator who can have a dynamic relationship with the other is strategically important because, in this way, he can approach the other without depriving it of its foreignness.

Because the colonised subject is considered either in terms of or outside the master narrative of the history of the Western self, he or she is denied the power to represent himself and his/her texts must be translated and interpreted by Europeans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's point of the exclusion and silencing of the subaltern voice in her article "Can the Subaltern Speak" is based on the same reasoning. Niranjana argues that appropriation and manipulation of native texts through imperial interpreters and translators is paradoxical because the native texts enter the master narrative of Western history through translation. The monolithic structure of the master narrative is fissured because the presence of the appropriated contaminates it (Niranjana, 1992).

The power to contaminate, fissure and dismantle the hegemonic narrative of the Western self gives translation its importance in the post-colonial project. Ashcroft et al. in *The Empire Writes Back* discuss and praise the presence of untranslated words (pp. 64-66) in post-colonial texts as a device for "conveying the sense of cultural distinctiveness" but ignore the problematics of translation as a crucial element in such a post-colonial theory by confining their field to variants of English. The "cultural distinctiveness" that is signified by untranslated words is a problematic concept. On the one hand, *The Empire Writes Back* refuses separatist theories of race/culture and essentialist alignments of language and cultural identity. However, on the other, a

location of distinctive difference in untranslated words suggests binarised essentialism, which generally locks the centre/periphery struggle into a mutually exclusive 'unspeakable' difference. The desperate attempt to valorise the distinctive identity of a post-colonial text/culture gets its validity by maintaining the binarism between Europe and its others. The insistence on a distinctive national and cultural reality that is distinct from the colonising West also arrests the post-colonial project by making it a counter-discourse that continuously places the colonial discourse at the centre and, therefore, does not let new discourses replace the colonial discourse. The irony of the post-colonial situation lies in its sheer insistence on the colonial; as Paranjape has remarked, "real post-coloniality...may even be defined as that which is not contained in the discourse of post-colonialism (Paranjape, 1996, p. 37).

Bilingualism is the most dominant feature of post-colonial writers and their world. This linguistic and cultural hybridity can help replace the imperial and counter-discourses and demands a non-essentialist position for a post-colonial critique. While translation assimilates the texts of different cultural realities, it can also function as a non-essentialist strategy of resistance, a third space or 'grey' area, because of its revisionary potential. Following Homi Bhabha, Tejaswini Niranjana sees the task of the post-colonial translator in the disruptive terms of post-structuralism. For her, the post-colonial translator must "distrust essentialist anti-colonial narratives" and "attempt to deconstruct them, to show their complicity with the master narrative of imperialism" (1992, p. 167).

As a bilingual writer and translator from an erstwhile colonised society, Sarang is a person whose work does not place the imperial discourse at the centre by being anti-imperialist, nor does it attempt to construct an idealised, essentialist version of pre-colonial or post-colonial Indian reality. Instead, it is possible to say that his work is characterised by a specific type of amnesia of imperialism, which can serve the politics of post-colonialism. Sarang's work suggests, as Homi Bhabha has also asserted, the possibility of liminality and hybridity through cultural translation:

the sign of translation continually tells, or 'tolls' the different times and spaces between cultural authority and its transformative practices. The 'time' of translation consists in that movement of meaning, the principle and practice of a communication that in the words of de Man 'puts the original in motion to decanonise it, giving it the movement of fragmentation, a fragmentation, a wandering of errance, a kind of permanent exile. (Bhabha, 1994, p. 228)

With Sarang, translation from Marathi into English or vice versa does not have the nostalgia for the original and is characteristically non-essentialist. In the prefatory note to his collection of poems, *A Kind of Silence* (1978), he blurs the boundaries of the indigenous and the foreign/colonial languages and essences with the following words:

I find it difficult, however, to maintain a distinction between poems written in Marathi and those written in English. For instance, "Cockroaches" was written in Marathi but the lines "cockroaches on the floor of the night, / Struck by the light" originally came to me in English. (Sarang, 1978, Prefatory Note)

Sarang's use of the English language in his poems is disruptive and is loaded with deconstructive potential because it points at the aporia and the absurdity of essentialist categorisation. With an unsettling and aggressive syntax and focus on the decadence of Indian urban spaces, his poems subvert not only classical Western notions of representation but also the obsession of Indian critics of Indian Literature

in English with the question of the choice of English language for conveying Indianness.

Sarang's statement that he has difficulty maintaining the distinction between his writings in English and Marathi is a sign of what can be called, to use a Deleuzian and Guattarian idea, an 'anti-oedipal' post-colonialism. Deleuze and Guattari's idea of rhizomatic thought envisions a space that is free of the root-trunk-branch or centre-periphery thinking underlying many resistance or post-colonial theories and texts. Such models preserve the centralist power relations that they ideally seek to dismantle:

at some point the post-colonial becomes the uncontrollable Manichean tendency to divide all literature into that produced by the oppressors and that produced by the oppressed (Williams, 1989, p. 26).

The kind of post-colonial practices described in *The Empire Writes Back* are, in terms of Deleuze and Guattari, the oedipal structures of "State philosophy" which seek truth and justice. On the other hand, genuinely *post*-colonial writers like Arun Kolatkar, Dilip Chitre and Vilas Sarang create a smooth motile space where nomadic thought gathers speed and does not even need any mobilisation from the origin of the colonial centre:

Nomad space is "smooth," or open-ended. One may rise up at any point and move to any other side. Its mode of distribution is the *nomos*: arraying oneself in an open space (hold the street), as opposed to the *logos* of entrenching oneself in a closed space (hold the fort). (Massumi, 1987, p. xiii)

And Deleuze and Guattari remark that

There is always something genealogical about a tree. It is not a method for the people. a method of the rhizome type, on the contrary, can analyze language only by decentering it onto other dimensions and registers. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1978, p. 8)

"Fugitive Poem" by Sarang, in *A Kind of Silence*, expresses thoughts similar to rhizomatic/nomadic thought. The poem does not only present a verbal text but also presents a visual text as the words are arranged on paper in such a way that they look like a grenade or a vase and are difficult to reproduce here exactly:

We walk between the end and the beginning.
 Steps are uttered word for word, eye for eye. Feet
 count their coins and rhymes.
 Lepers on both sides, we walk by the upright road.
 Then the ways branch out.
 We take short cuts, set our hearts upon
 dug-up streets, hope to rename bylanes.

(Sarang, 1978, p. 30)

As Kafka, a Czech author writing in German, and Beckett, an Irishman writing in French and self-translating into English, invented a minor use for the major language (Deleuze, 1994, p. 25), Sarang is also inventing a minor use of a major language which also happens to be the lingua franca in his own country and a reminder of the colonial past. Such writers “are big by virtue of minorisation,” Deleuze remarks, because “they cause language to flee, they make it run along a witch’s course, they place it endlessly in a state of disequilibrium” (Deleuze, 1994, p. 25).

Sarang, writing about his career as a Marathi writer and as a self-translator from Marathi into English, says that he wrote his first short story titled “Flies” in English and then translated it for a Marathi magazine *Abharruchi* in 1965. The original English story was published in *The London Magazine* in July 1981. By that time, his other stories that were originally written in Marathi had been published in English as translations. Therefore, he reveals, he “allowed this story [“Flies”] to appear in *LM* as ‘Translated from the Marathi’” (Sarang, 1994a, p. 309). In this way, multiple translations and a mixed publication history disperse the notion of an original text.

This process of Sarang’s creative output operates against the underlying centristic ‘canonising’ principles of literary judgement, whether of the nationalist or ‘writing back’ schools of criticism and has precluded him from more than a marginal literary acceptance as a ‘minor’ writer. From the publishing industry’s perspective, translation is not an original product and, therefore, has less attraction for the consumer/reader. As Vanderauwera has pointed out, sometimes the fact that the writing is a translated piece of work is not even mentioned because “translations have a potential of not selling well at the target pole” (Vanderauwera, 2014, p. 202). Lawrence Venuti is also of the view that translation is an “offence against the prevailing concept of authorship” and authorship is marked by “originality, self-expression in a unique text” (1995, p. 26). André Lefevere sees translation as a sign that opens the way of a literary system to both subversion and transformation. But it seems that Sarang is wary of rigid patterns of thought; he wants to foreground the fact that the classical theories of originality and representation are forms of containment, and any effort at containment is dismissed by recourse to nihilism and the absurd. His continuous interest in the absurdist schools of thought and existentialist nihilism has definitely helped him in being able to dislodge ordinary discourses. This transgression of ordinary notions of representation by a writer who is not based in the metropolis and who does not write back to the centre seems to have less cultural value than the transgression of the post-colonial writers who are based in the metropolis or those whose writings address the metropolis and employ the same theoretical vocabulary as the dominant Western discourses.

This discussion of Sarang’s writings and translation does not refer to the qualities of Sarang’s writing because the value assigned to the qualities of a piece of writing is not an ahistorical autotelic entity as Vanderauwera has propounded while discussing the politics of reception of translated literature:

the reception and appreciation of literary works is not primarily a matter of their inherent qualitative inferiority or superiority, but hinges on a series of interrelated factors ranging from poetics to economics, from prestige to profit (2014, p. 209).

Aijaz Ahmad, in his book *In Theory*, has also commented upon how the writings of some of the fiction writers of Latin America find their way to India after

critical patronage in Western academic journals. Most of these writings are also translations, but these translations are undertaken by professional Western translators commissioned by the Western publishing industry. It is not a surprise that the reception of the works of a writer who does not conform to the West's homogenising, exoticising and commodifying view of India does not cause any commotion in the corridors of Western academia. There is hardly any reference to the writings of Vilas Sarang in the Western critical discussion of modernist writing in India. Even when William Walsh gives a long list of the experimental, modernist and avant-garde poets of India who write in English, there is no mention of Sarang (Walsh, 1990).

Adele King begins the review of Sarang's collection of short stories by referring to Dilip Chitre and Arun Kolatkar, two writers who are also from Maharashtra and who also write in an experimental and modernist style. Sarang's work has many stylistic and thematic similarities with the works of Dilip Chitre and Arun Kolatkar. However, there is a crucial difference in that Sarang foregrounds the fact that his writings are translated from Marathi into English and that this process also occurs with the collaboration of Breon Mitchell. It seems that the capitalistic modes of production exclude what does not subscribe to the values and aesthetics of the dominant majority. In Kostelanetz's words:

in totalitarian societies, a book is censored at the point of production; in literary-industrial societies, censorship occurs at later points along the communication line (1974, p. 196).

This insistence of Sarang on 'foreignising' his writings through foregrounding the fact of translation can also be seen as an example of nomadic thought that deterritorialises itself to move away from rooted/grounded thought. This deterritorialisation of one's writing by emphasising the dispersed origins can be a vital radical strategy. Sarang, as a post-colonial nomad, is exploring what Deleuze and Guattari have found as a forceful Kafkaesque strategy of a minor literature: "How to become a nomad and an immigrant and a gypsy in relation to one's own language? Kafka answers: steal the baby from its crib, walk the tightrope" (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986, p. 19). Sarang is of that minority of post-colonial writers who do not find any solace in national, bourgeois, pre-colonial, anti-colonial and oedipal reality; they are not canonised because they do not have any "abstract universal in the form of a single national language, a single ethnic affiliation, a single pre-fabricated cultural identity" (Bensmaia, 1994, p. 215; original emphasis). Sarang not only fissures the monolithic Indian national structures with his writings, but he also translates from Marathi into English, contaminating the lingua franca of India with the untouchables' thoughts and words, opening the gaps for the subalterns' screams through his translation.

The subaltern voice, while being appropriated into the terms of national civility as authorised social protest under the sponsorship of the modernised English-speaking elite, disrupts the world of the elite readership and textuality. Translating Dalit literature into the country's lingua franca also disrupts fundamentalist vernacular regionalism. Because of their uncontainability within any marked territory, Sarang's translations belong to the realm of *nomos* (nomadic) rather than *polis* (State).

The colonial hegemony can be seen as the Oedipus complex of Indian Literature in English, where most of the critical discourses are concerned with the questions of an essential Indianness and its relationship with the English language because he does not attempt to justify his use of the English language. Sarang

becomes the Indian example of an ideal anti-Oedipus, to use a Deleuzian and Guattarian term. His writings overstrain the indigenous Brahminic narratives to the point of breaking. Like Caliban, the only use he finds for coercive structures is that he knows how to abuse them.

In “Anil Rao’s Metamorphosis”, Anil Rao turns into a gigantic phallus. Anil Rao’s new form of existence mocks Shiva’s lingam, the Indian source of the dance of creation. The bilingual post-colonial nomad cannot be canonised. Instead, Sarang writes, “it is the unenviable fate of the bilingual writer to be turned away from both houses he considers his own. People everywhere have a very possessive and exclusive attitude to what they consider their language” (1994, p. 310; original emphasis). The fate of a bilingual writer is the fate of a displaced/displacing mode of thought, like the fate of Kafka’s character Gregor Samsa—the travelling salesman who turns into an insect, a permanently horizontal body that crawls and creeps. Deterritorialised/deterritorialising thought cannot find a secure place in any society’s hierarchical/vertical structures. It can only point out the obscenity of hierarchies—the naked lie. The fissures caused by rhizomatic thought are the sites of subversion.

To Sarang, nativist discourses are simplistic and parochial because they see the world in an “Indian-versus-Western dichotomy” and leave “no scope for the writer’s individuality and originality” that is transgressive of both Indian and Western reality (Sarang, 1994a, p. 311). Sarang’s writings do not write back to the centre from the periphery; they are manifestations of a nomadic thought that travels in a post-colonial labyrinth between the centre and periphery and everywhere: “my geographic journeying—to Bloomington, Indiana, to Basra in Iraq, and now in Kuwait. I stay away... maintaining an ambiguous relationship to home” (Sarang, 1994a, p. 311). It is not only the deterritoriality of the writing body. It is the deterritoriality of thought that finds expression in this statement.

His poem “To A Crossword Fan” celebrates the potential of spaces not marked by linguistic and cultural signs. The spaces not inscribed by the signs of any language are the spaces that fissure the homogenising narratives, whether they are of Brahminic origin or Imperial. The poem warns a crossword-puzzle fan about the black squares in a crossword puzzle, for they are “numb unfathomable voids / dense with unmeaning / they don’t need you to fill them out” (Sarang, 1978, p. 11). Later in the poem, he says:

don’t mistake this for a game of black and white
the blacks are not in the game
they will just watch and wait
some day
they will overwhelm you
will strike you dumb
on your familiar cross of words. (Sarang, 1978, p. 12)

This “cross of words” is the site for the enunciation of the in-betweenness of the translated/translating subject that is beyond the binaries and polarities—that can “strike you dumb.” This in-betweenness calls for a revisionary post-colonial criticism. A critical practice that does not place colonial history at the centre by being “post”

and “anti” colonial. Translation, as a metaphor and strategic device, can displace the containing discourses by pointing at the absurdity of the classical notions of representation. Translation can be an effective decolonising strategy because it refuses to refer to the essence of any cultural reality.

In Indian English criticism, translation is not a neatly categorised space. Verbatim translations from regional languages into English are not included in Indian English literature, and only creative translations are considered qualified for a place in Indian English literature:

Indian English literature may be defined as literature *originally* written in English by authors Indian by birth, ancestry or nationality...translations from the Indian languages into English cannot also form part of Indian English literature, except when they are creative translations by the authors themselves. (Naik, 1982, p. 2)

By the above standards, Sarang’s creative translations from Marathi into English may not be entirely acceptable as forming a part of Indian English literature because he does not translate them alone, and his co-translator is not an Indian by birth, ancestry or nationality. Sarang’s work deliberately fuses the figure of the author and the translator and, thereby, creates a new kind of postcolonial function of the cultural producer.

References

- Barnstone, W. (1993). *The Poetics of Translation: History, Theory, Practice*. Yale University Press.
- Bensmaia, R. (2017). On the concept of minor literature from Kafka to Kateb Yacine. In *Gilles Deleuze and the Theater of Philosophy* (pp. 213–228). Routledge.
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. Routledge.
- Deleuze, G. (1986). *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature* (Vol. 30). University of Minnesota Press.
- Felix, G., & Guattari, D. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. by Massumi, B.), U of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). He Stuttered. In C. V. Boundas & D. Olkowski (Eds.), *Gilles Deleuze and the Theatre of Philosophy* (pp. 23–29). Routledge.
- Gentzler, E. (1993). *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Routledge.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1991). *The Philosophy of History*. Prometheus Books.
- Jones, W. (1970). *The Letters of Sir William Jones*. Garland Cannon (ed.). Clarendon Press.
- Kostelanetz, R. (1974). *The End of Intelligent Writing: Literary Politics in America*. Sheed and Ward.
- Massumi, B. (1987). "Translator's Foreword." *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, by Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. Trans. Brian Massumi. The Athlone Press.
- Massumi, B. (1987). Foreword. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. By Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. Trans. with a foreword by Brian Massumi. University of Minnesota Press.
- Mill, J. (1972). *A History of British India*. Associated Publishing House.
- Naik, M.K. (1982). *A History of Indian English Literature*. Sahitya Akademi.
- Niranjana, T. (1992). *Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism and the Colonial Context*. University of California Press.
- Paranjape, M. (1996). Coping with Post-colonialism. *Interrogating Post-colonialism: Theory, Text and Context*, 40.
- Said, E. (1995). *Orientalism*. Penguin Books.
- Sarang, V. (1978). *A Kind of Silence*. Writers Workshop.
- Sarang, V. (1994). Confessions of a Marathi writer. *World Literature Today*, 68(2), 309–312.
- Vanderauwera, R. (2014). The response to translated literature: a sad example. *The Manipulation of Literature (Routledge Revivals)* (pp. 198–214). Routledge.
- Walsh, W. (1990). *Indian Literature in English*. Longman.

Williams, M. (1989, April). Looking Sideways: English Studies, Tradition, and Cross-Cultural Comparisons. In *Span* (Vol. 28, pp. 22-39).