

CHAPTER THREE

ANALYSIS AND COMPARATIVE STUDY OF WOMEN'S REPRESENTATION IN THE ORIGINAL AND ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF VAAD APPLYING LEFEVERE'S TRANSLATION THEORY

This chapter is an attempt to survey the representation of women in the novel *Vaad* (2011) by an eminent Gujarati woman writer Ila Arab Mehta (1938) with the aim to examine the altered connotation of gender representation in the Post-modern Gujarati literature, especially by women writers. Apart from this a comparative study of the original novel with its English translation *Fence* (2015) by Rita Kothari (1969) is conducted on the parameter of a translation theory advocated by Andre Lefevere – 'Translation as Rewriting' and his notion of 'four constraints' to observe the impact of TL on the source language and culture resulting, at times, in confusion or misrepresentation of the original culture, society and values. Even the translator's personal ideology or bias can affect the translation which has been analysed and discussed in detail in this chapter.

3.1 Introduction of the Author and the Translator

Ila Arab Mehta (1938) is a well-known Post-modern Gujarati writer and academician who has contributed tremendously to the field of literature. She has penned many novels like *Trikonni Tron Rekha* (1966), *Radha* (1972), *Ek Hata Diwan Bahadur* (1976), *Varasdar* (1978), *Shabne Naam Hotu Nathi* (1981), *Batris Putalini Vedana* (1982), *Parpotani Pankh* (1988), *Panch Pagala Prithvi Par* (1995), *Vaad* (2011), *Shanbukayan* (2020) along with a few short-story collections – *Ek Cigarette Ek Dhupsali* (1981), *Viena-Woods* (1989), *Bhagyarekha* (1995), *Balavo Balvi Balvu* (1998), *Yom Kippur* (2006). Along with these she has written essays, radio and television plays and has also edited short-stories of her sister and a famous writer Varsha Adalja as *Varsha Adaljani Shreshth Vartao* (1991) and a collection of works by many authors on the subject of death titled *Mrityu Naam Parpota Mare* (1984). The gamut of her literature is wide reflecting her experience of travelling to many countries, her skills to understand the human nature and observing the society and culture of different places. Her deep concern for the contemporary life and socio-political scenario is commendable and her observation and analysis of the life and struggles of women in the rapidly changing time calls for our special attention. She often exhibits her

witty side in her writing through the use of literary tools of humour and sarcasm to make it appealing to the readers.

Rita Kothari (1969), the translator of her novel *Vaad*, is a well-known bi-lingual (Gujarati and English) writer. These days she teaches at the Department of English, Ashoka University, Sonapat, Haryana. She has been an active translator with a number of translations from Gujarati into English to her credit which includes *Modern Gujarati Poetry* and *Coral Island: The Poetry of Niranjana Bhagat* (2002), *Speech and Silence: Literary Journeys by Gujarati Women* (2006), Joseph Macwan's *Angaliayat* as *The Stepchild* (2013) along with three of Munshi's novels *Patan Trilogy* (novels in three parts): *Patan Ni Prabhuta* as *The Glory of Patan* (2017), *Gujarat No Nath* as *The Lord and Master of Gujarat* (2018) and *Rajadhiraj* as *King of Kings* (2019). She has also penned a few books on the topics of translation and partition.

3.2 Summary of the novel

Vaad was published by Gurjar Granthratna Karyalaya, Ahmedabad in 2011. The title signifies the various obstacles – poverty, illiteracy, religious fanaticism and prejudices as well as gender bias – as faced by the female protagonist Fateema Lokhandwala and the novel deals with the theme of Fateema's unfailing courage to cope with these challenges and her emergence as a brave and independent woman at the end.

Fateema was born into a poor Muslim family of Maajidbhai and Khatijabi in a small village of Kathiawad district of Gujarat. She had three siblings – Kareem, Saira and Jamaal. The children used to attend a local school – Navprabhat School along with the children of mixed faiths. Both her parents were illiterate but they insisted on educating their children well realizing its importance for their better future. The parents also believed in gender equality and allowed the girls to study and later shift to a city for better educational and career avenues. Fateema was brilliant not only in studies but was also competent in co-curricular activities. She was a quick learner, an ardent reader with analytical skills and objective mind-set. Fateema often had to bear humiliating comments of the villagers on account of her being a lower class Muslim girl but she was never disheartened and continued in her endeavour to gain knowledge and dream for a better life for herself and her family. Her family shared a strong bonding regardless of financial struggle and the general atmosphere in the house was mostly cheerful and positive. The writer has portrayed the changing connotation

of family system in the modern times where despite differences, all the members respect the other's individuality and stand as a strong unit against all odds.

At times Fateema's parents were questioned by the other villagers and some people of their community regarding their decision to educate their children, especially the girls but they had always taken their stand unflinchingly in favour of education. Once Maajidbhai had been almost convinced by a fellow community member to arrange Fateema's *nikaah* at the tender age of fifteen and put an end to her education – the temptation was, a big *pukka* house and business for himself and his sons but Khatijabi along with the teacher Jani Sir came to Fateema's timely rescue and saved her life. This small incident proved that Khatijabi was not only a courageous woman but she was intelligent too to see through things. For a small term benefit she would not let go of a big opportunity to educate her daughter. The mother Khatijabi was like a thread uniting all the members, especially for Fateema she was a strong support system during thick and thin.

After completing twelfth grade, Fateema moved to Vadodara to get admission in the course of B. A. with History as her principal subject with an aim to pursue higher education and to provide better life to her family. During her college life she stayed in a hostel which later turned into her second home with a loving support of the warden Manuben who soon became her friend, philosopher and guide – imparting the lessons of self-respect and confidence. Fateema sincerely began her journey to pursue knowledge and earn a degree and she shone out as a bright student in her college gaining attention of her professors. She used to spend most of her time in college library where she tried to read many reference books to enhance her hold of the subject. She could develop reverence towards all the religions of the world and an objective perception towards her own through her reading, thinking and analytical abilities which came to her aid later and saved her from falling in hands of wrong people. Her education helped her come out of the cocoon of the stereotype role she was expected to play, made her more sensitive towards other women of her community who could hardly receive any education and were forced to lead a depended life (and this sensitivity later inspired her to work for the welfare of her fellow sisters) and brought a new sense of freedom to her. In views of Mary Anne Ferguson, "The liberated woman is aware of the choices open to her. This awareness frees her from the compulsiveness of traditional role playing and at the same time awakens her to the complexity of living and loving" (35).

Her elder brother Kareem came to Vadodara prior to her to earn B. Sc degree but unlike Fateema, he developed fanatic religious views through his unfortunate involvement with some anti-social elements. Through misconceptions regarding Islam, which was in danger according to them and only through 'Jihad' they could save it, Kareem developed militant religious views and was convinced to get involved in many terrorist activities and later to become a 'suicide bomber'. Unfortunately education couldn't open his eyes as well as consciousness and he became an easy prey to the plans of such troublemakers. He also tried to involve Fateema in these activities taking advantage of her education and gender but being an alert person with strong moral ground, Fateema resisted involvement in such inhuman activities. However, Kareem was unable to take his stand and lost his life later on as a result. Due to Fateema's connection with Kareem, she had to face much trouble, she even had to spend a few days behind bars but as she was innocent and the police could not gather any proof against her, she was released from jail soon. She was also involved with some social well-fare activities receiving support from many NGOs and political parties who stood by her during this tough time. Fateema was able to rescue herself through her ability to interpret the religious concept objectively while Kareem could not sustain due to his inability to understand religion impartially. Abdolkarim Soroush's views in this regard must be considered,

Our understanding of revealed texts is contingent upon the knowledge already set around us; that is to say that forces external to Revelation drag our interpretation and understanding of it in various direction... Believers generally conceive of religion as something holy or sacred, something constant. You cannot talk about change or evolution of religious knowledge. They stick to the idea of fixity. But ..., we have to make a distinction between religion on the one side and religious interpretation on the other. By religion here I mean not faith, which is the subjective part of religion, but the objective side, which is the revealed text. This is constant, whereas our interpretations of that text are subject to evolution. The idea is not that religious texts can be changed but rather over time interpretations will change. We are always immersed in an ocean of interpretations. The text does not speak to you. You have to make it speak by asking questions of it. (220-21)

In spite of Fateema getting a clean chit, the incident shook her completely and her courage failed her temporarily. But Fateema was not the one to give up so easily and within a few days she came out of it with a clear conscious. She continued to shine in studies even with many hardships at personal level – death of her parents one after the other, Kareem's involvement in terrorist activities, police inquiry and her experience of jail life. Still she fought back bravely and completed her studies with flying colours – first B. A, then M. A. and later Ph. D to be finally appointed as a Faculty of History in her own college. Getting the job was a very proud moment for her as with it Fateema was able to cut and cross the fence of poverty and illiteracy to gain a prestigious position in society.

The last struggle in her life was her search to find a house of her own. But being a single Muslim woman, no builder was willing to sell house to her. She struggled for almost four years, bearing humiliation in the builders' offices but she was determined to find a house in a building where people of all faith live harmoniously. After much struggle she was finally able to fulfil this dream with the help of one of her classmates who happened to be a builder but soon to realize that this dream had been fulfilled but only partially as out of the two buildings, the one (where she had booked a flat) would be allocated to only Muslim families while the other would be possessed by the people of mixed faiths and a wall would emerge between the two to separate the localities. She felt disappointed as she could not cross the fence of religious disharmony. She decided to return the agreement and cancel the deal but later she realized that how difficult it was to cut the fence of religious diversity and she needed to make more efforts with greater level of patience for it to materialize. The novel ends on a note of hope as Fateema decided to be a little practical, to have a house of her own first but she promised herself that she would continue her efforts in the direction of establishing communal harmony in society.

3.3 Analysis of the representation of Women in the novel

I would like to conduct an analysis of the images of women represented through this novel under a few categories like – patriarchal/anti-patriarchal, psychological and futuristic or idealistic.

Fateema – The portrayal of the central character of this novel – Fateema Lokhandwala is an attempt by Ila Mehta to depict the predicaments, challenges and ultimate success of a woman from a marginalized group whose circumstances are different from those of the mainstream

social classes and whose existence have been overlooked for centuries. Ilaben seems to answer the speculation made by another famous Gujarati writer Himanshi Shelat in her book *Gujarati Kathasahityama Narichetna* regarding the dearth of women characters from lower marginalized society when she had said, “Our literature has plenty of women characters from middle and upper classes of society. Even women characters from mythology and history are available. But depiction of the condition and mental struggle of the women belonging to the lower classes or marginalized group is rarely found” (10). through this novel and its protagonist and we can say that she has been quite successful in her efforts.

Ilaben has chosen her woman character from marginalized social background and decided to reflect the reality of the life as experienced by them along with the changing social scenario and the changing mind-set of women looking forward to a better life. Fateema is born into a poor family and brought up by completely illiterate parents still she finds her way to the uplifting life through sheer courage, maturity, morality and objective mindset. She is unconventional in many ways, for example, her striving to gain knowledge despite her humble background and conventional social norms, her pursuing higher studies against all odds, her refusal to get involved in any terrorist activity notwithstanding Kareem and Anwar’s persistence, her involvement in social welfare activities for the betterment of Muslim women and children, her choosing education and independence over materialistic luxuries and comfortable life with Anwar after their marriage – all these factors hint that although Fateema has reverence for social and religious systems, she could also notice their limitations and she tries to rise above them to reach to a higher level of consciousness. She also raises her voice against the patriarchal system, though in a modest way, and demanded for her rights as an individual devoid of any caste, gender or social background. Once when Kareem insisted Fateema to wear ‘*burkha*’ referring to it as her ‘identity’, she did not oppose him directly but was determined never to use it. She was well-aware of the ancient mentality of patriarchal society which compelled women to veil for the sake of their easy classification in form of ‘respectable’ and ‘disrespectable’ categories and to control their sexuality. In views of a noted feminist writer Leila Ahmed in her famous book *Women and Gender in Islam*, “...the veil served not merely to mark the upper classes but, more fundamentally, to differentiate between “respectable” women and those who were publicly available. That is, use of the veil classified women according to their sexual activity and signalled to men which women were under male protection and which were fair game” (6).

Her choices have never been easy as she is not fighting against individuals but the entire system of social hierarchy and religious fanaticism and she is also well-aware of the fact that being a woman, the intensity of her consequences will be doubled but she is prepared to take full responsibility of her decisions to be a fully liberated person. In words of Malashri Lal, “Traditionally men have ignored the barrier and partaken of both worlds whereas for women, a step over the bar is an act of transgression. Having committed the act, women may never re-enter the designated conventional space except by public “confession”, and must otherwise live in the “outer world” by their irretrievable choice” (109).

Through her character the writer wants to establish an ideal of a future image of a Muslim woman who is strong, educated and career-oriented. Through Fateema the writer wants to reflect her views on the condition of the daily struggles of the women of the neglected class, their aspirations, their personal and professional success and stress arising as a result along with the impact of women’s participation in public life. To understand the concept of gender, we need to take a full picture of women in our society in view including those classes who have been thrust aside for a long period of time and as my research particularly focuses on the issue of gender representation in Gujarati fiction by women writers, this representation of a woman from a Marginal group – Muslim background and from a lower class of society provides a better understanding of their life situation and their aspirations to provide the missing link to complete the picture of gender representation in all its aspects. I agree with Kumkum Roy when she said, “...a serious engagement with questions of gender requires us to be sensitive to multiplicity. We need to refine the categories of men and women to take into consideration intersections with caste, class, and cultural traditions, regional as well as religious” (89).

Khatijabi (Ba) – Another important character in the novel is Khatijabi (Ba), Fateema’s mother, who plays a pivotal role in Fateema’s life. Ba is truly a powerhouse of courage, confidence, practical wisdom and open minded mentality. She is an inspiration for so many mothers to encourage their children to gain education and move towards more fulfilling life. Unlike many parents, especially from Muslim community, who discourage their children to get Western education and not allowing girls to study at all or chose a career of their choice, Ba and Maajidbhai are like torch bearers who have proved that only through education and freedom they could secure a bright future for their children. Ba is an ideal wife and mother who works as a support system for the entire family. She is also very kind hearted, generous and helpful and these qualities were reflected in her character when she offered to help Jani

Sir's daughter-in-law during her pregnancy without any personal motif. Although completely illiterate and rustic in her attitude, her practical wisdom is commendable which has saved the family from trouble on a number of occasions. Her strong will-power can be witnessed when she criticised the religious leader and a rich businessman who came to their house on the pretext of helping them by arranging Fateema's untimely marriage but was trying to take advantage of their poverty in reality. Ila Mehta, being a Post-modern writer, reflects the tendency of depicting the oppression of women with a deep sense of involvement and consciousness and through the character of Ba, she makes efforts to project the changing social realities in form of strong, independent women characters who have the guts to challenge the unjust social and religious system irrespective of their background, without taking refuge in the strategy of the predecessors (Lilavati Munshi's depiction of the characters of Vanamala and Jasoda – refer to chapter four) who had eulogized and sanctified women's hardship in their literature. Sutapa Chaudhuri rightly comments of the women characters found in the works of Post-modern women writers, "By making choices, these women characters are challenging the system, questioning authority, searching for, negotiating, as well as appropriating their identities and their status both in the family setup and the larger social structure" (180).

Ba is also modern in her approach and aware of the rights of women and this gets reflected through her reaction to the movie *Umrao Jaan* where, according to her, Umrao and her mother should have raised their voices against the injustice done to them instead of meekly submitting to their fate. Her views inspire Fateema and help her stand up for her rights in the years to come. When Ba came to know of Kareem's involvement with terror groups, she criticized him harshly, despite being his mother, which exhibits her strong moral sense. Ba, like Fateema, is anti-patriarchal and utopian figure and through her the writer tries to portray an image of a Muslim woman – a wife, a mother to be found in our society in future.

Minor Characters – Two minor characters – Chandan, Fateema's best friend from her village and Komal, her room-mate in hostel – represent conventional ideology and they are like Fateema's counter images. Both of them accept the traditional patriarchal social system without questioning and seem unaware of their choices and rights. In Chandan's case, her indifference towards her right to choose a life partner and later her decision to marry without completing her studies exhibit patriarchal and conventional behaviour. While Komal's restlessness to find true love without taking any responsibility of life once again hint at the

conventional mentality. Through their characters Fateema's qualities, individual behaviour, unconventional way of thinking, anti-patriarchal behaviour, courage and confidence along with futuristic thinking are highlighted.

3.4 Limitations of the Narrative and Character Portrayal

Ila Mehta has created an exciting world of women characters where she has brilliantly portrait the women from various social backgrounds with various shades of personalities and characteristics but when examined closely, we can notice a few limitations in her manner of character portrayal. For example, the central character Fateema emerges well in the novel and she impresses the reader with her qualities and courage and earns their respect. However, when her character is analyzed on the parameter of reality, one can notice many setbacks in the way she has been presented. First of all Fateema seems a bit too perfect and idealistic. Regardless of any number of hardships, she is able to achieve success with her determination and sheer will power. Fateema is a Muslim lady but her views are secular – she does not think in terms of religion even after many harsh experiences like the racist comments of the villagers or her classmates, the insulting behaviour of builders, the behaviour of the inspector during the interrogation etc. She does not get involved into any terrorist activity despite tremendous pressure on her from her brother and a greed for better life after her *nikaah* with Anwar. The study of history seems to influence her thoughts and tune her into a true secular person. All these aspects of her character look more idealistic than real. It is true that education helps one liberate from traditional mindset but the religious identity and social norms are so deep rooted that it is almost impossible to overcome them totally with the mere tools of education, awareness and the knowledge of the history.

Fateema also carries the theme of communal harmony on her shoulder and she seems to get success in establishing it to a certain extent out of her sheer determination but we cannot neglect the other advantageous factors like her being educated, the support of her family, friends and acquaintances during hard times or some unexpected turn of event which came to her timely rescue to give her an upper hand compared to millions of other Muslim women who were not fortunate enough to have these privileges. At the same time, it is necessary to mention that in real life these factors may not work favourably during difficult times.

If considered from other angle we can realize that Fateema's qualities are also the ones which a Hindu or a person belonging to another faith would like to see in a Muslim

person. In reality how many Muslims or Hindus, so to speak, are truly secular or do not think in terms of religion? Her image is that of an ideal woman (without the consciousness of any religion) who treats and respects everyone equally. Fateema is like a future image of a Muslim lady, almost a Utopian character, who is educated, liberal minded, secular and intelligent at the same time. When asked about how she could think of the character of Fateema during a personal interview, Ilaben said,

I had read about an incident of a Muslim lady unable to find a house of her own. I didn't want to create any religious controversies so I consciously avoided any topic related to Hindu-Muslim subject. Muslim women's issues are worse than those of Hindu women. In Muslim community there are fanatics as well as peace loving people. I wanted to convey that the problems of various fancies like religious or political can be solved peacefully. I wanted to portray a homogenous Indian Muslim woman without getting into the religious and communist diversities and so I could think of Fateema in this light with the holy Koran in one hand and in the other hand holy books of other religions. A woman who is open minded and that is Fateema. (my tran,; 2020)

On the other hand the other Muslim characters like Kareem, Anwar, Moulviji, Ammiji etc. represent the negative stereotypical side of Islam. Their religious fanaticism stands as a clear contrast to Fateema and Ba's secular views. The Muslim characters are portrayed in black and white shades and the social and religious realities are replaced with ideal images to be expected in an ideal society.

The other minor women characters like Chandan or Komal are presented as Fateema's counter images – representing the stereotypes with their characteristics like easy submission to the tradition, apathy towards their rights, dreaming of romantic marriage etc. while Fateema is a model of modern, educated, self-dependent woman who raises her voice against any kind of injustice and is ready to fight for her rights. But the same Fateema had once started dreaming of a romantic life with the handsome fellow Anwar and at one point she was almost convinced of her attraction for him. It is only due to the change of circumstances and her realization of Anwar's involvement in terror activities that she changed her mind and cut off her relationship with him. So when Chandan or Komal behaved like romantic fools, what

right does Fateema have to question their choices? Of course, she did that out of her concern for them without realizing the impact of the deep-roots of the traditional social set up on the psychology of girls which inspire them to start thinking of marriage and children soon after puberty.

Thus, we can say that although the writer has decided to deal with the theme of the marginalized class and characters, her efforts got diverted towards presenting the ideal picture not only in the matter pertaining the characters but also in the cases of the selection of sub-themes like communal harmony, terrorism, upliftment of marginalized women etc. and in doing so she has set two extreme poles where the characters got divided into either extremely sensible or extremely insensible and although the readers might appreciate Fateema and her efforts to create an ideal society, they are convinced, at the same time, not to come across such character or situation in real life. From the thematic aspect and character portrayal found in this novel we can figure out that the writer, although educated and modern, has fallen in the same trap set by the male writers earlier that is to depict a picture of an idealistic woman (Govardhanram Tripathi and his depiction of ideal women, for example) and put other characters in the periphery in sharp contrast to highlight her qualities and goodness. In this case, however, the central character is a modern, educated and professional woman from a marginalized section who prefers to fight instead of surrendering to her circumstances and unjust rules of the patriarchal society still the tendency acquired somehow resembles to that of the male authors. This clearly indicates that although women writers of Gujarat have set a benchmark for themselves through their creative talent still they have not fully come to terms with their own creative sensibility. As Virginia Woolf has aptly observed and pointed out the issue faced by women writers when they begin their endeavour of writing, "...that they had no tradition behind them, or one so short and partial that it was of little help..." and how it was irrelevant to seek any help from the established male writers, "...though she may have learnt a few tricks of them and adapted them to her use" (82). The trick adapted here is in the matter of character portrayal, the formula so widely applied by male writers of merit that it seemed almost universal to women writers when they started their creative journey of becoming writers.

3.5 Women in Translation: Representation/Misrepresentation

Broadly speaking the main concerns of *Vaad* the novel revolve around the themes of education, self empowerment, caste and religious prejudice; holding them all together is the

bildungsroman narrative of Fateema the central character. In the following pages are listed select portions that have been taken from the original novel in Gujarati and from their translation in English for the purpose of comparison and translation analysis.

Passage 1.

Here is a passage from the first chapter of Illaben's *Vaad* both in the original Gujarati and in its translation in English. The passage describes an area where Fateema lives; (for the sake of convenience the passages are tagged and numbered):

જે લત્તામાં તે રેહતી હતી ત્યાં હતો ઘોંઘાટ, શાળાએ જતાં-ન-જતાં બાળકોનો કોલાહલ, મરઘાં ને બકરીઓના ચિત્કારો, પાણીના નળ આગળની સ્ત્રીઓની કતારમાં થતી મારામારી. (1)

In English translation it reads:

She lived in a noisy area – clamouring children, bleating goats, cackling hens, ferocious fighting women queuing upon to fill water from a common tap. (1)

In the above extract, the expression of શાળાએ જતાં-ન-જતાં બાળકોનો કોલાહલ '*shadae jata-na-jata balako no kolahal*' has been translated as 'clamouring children'. The condition of the poor, downtrodden Muslim children, most of whom are not fortunate enough to get a chance to attend school has been reflected in the original. In its rewriting, this expression loses its special reference as it is generalized. Even the quarrel of women over water in such locality has been exaggerated by the use of the words like 'ferocious fighting' while the original only hints at the common scene of tussle around the public tap. These fights for water are everyday affairs for them being a matter of survival. Here the status of the translator interferes and imprints itself making what is an ordinary squabble into 'ferocious fighting'. The common belief that poor, illiterate women are coarse and quarrelsome, ready to fight over trivial matters seems to have affected the translation and in both the above cases the constraints of ideology as well as poetics have played their role while rewriting them in English. The reader who is unfamiliar with these circumstances of poor locality will tend to misunderstand the whole situation. It can be observed, in this particular incident, that the translator is speaking from the space of what Adrienne Rich calls 'Token Woman' (3) – a privileged position – exercising colonial ideology regarding the matters pertaining her other underprivileged sisters of poor locality. In words of Spivak, "The translator has to make herself, in the case of Third World women writing, almost better equipped than the translator

who is dealing with the western European languages, because of the fact that there is so much of the old colonial attitude, slightly displaced, at work in the translation racket” (405).

The translator’s ideology and the general poetics have affected the translation strategy acquired by the translator. In views of Lefevere ideology and the dominant poetics of the receiving literature create an image of a work of translation. Ideology as explained by Jameson in his book *The Prison House of Language* is, “...that grillwork of form, convention, and belief which orders our actions” (107). The concept of ‘poetics’ is reflected upon by Lefevere in his famous essay ‘Mother Courage’s Cucumbers’ as, “The literary system also possesses a kind of code of behaviour, a poetics. This poetics consists of both an inventory component (genre, certain symbols, characters, prototypical situations) and a “functional” component, an idea of how literature has to, or may be allowed to, function in society” (236).

Passage 2.

One day Fateema’s neighbour came to their house to borrow something and she noticed that neither Fateema nor Saira help their mother in the household work. She started criticising Khatijabi in the following words –

એક વાર આલમચાચાની બીવી સાકરબાઇ સવારે કંઈ માગવા આવી હતી. તેણે ટોણો માર્યો, “અલી તારી બા કામ કરે છે ને તું ચોપડાં વાંચે છે? તમેય તે, ખતીજાભાભી, બે-બે છોડિયું છે ઘરમાં ને ઢસરડા તાણો છો!”

“કાંઈ મારે કામ નથી છોડિયું. આ ફાતિમા તો અંગરેજી ભણે છે. મારે કાંઈ છોકરાંવ પાંહે ઢોરાં નથી ચરાવવાં.”

અજબ થતાં સાકરબાઇ ગયાં. મનમાં થયું, “અંગરેજી ભણાવે છે! કાલ ઊઠીને ઓલા કાજીજી આવીને હકમ કરશે ઇ ભેળી છોકરીના નિકાહ થઈ જાશે. ચારશે ઢોરાં સાસરે જઈને. આ માજીદભાઈનું ઘર જ ગાંડું!” (17-18)

In English translation it is carried as :

Alam chacha’s wife Khusoomchachi visited them to borrow something. She ticked Fateema off. “Alee, your mother is toiling all day, all you can do is read books? Khatijabhabhi, what did I tell you? With two girls around, why should you have to slave away?”

“I don’t need the girls’ labour. They will not be taking the cattle to graze. In fact, Fateema is learning English now!”

A stunned Kulsoomchachi beat a retreat. ‘Learning English!’ she thought to herself. ‘The Kazi will issue orders for the girl’s marriage. Then she’ll be grazing cattle at her in-law’s house! This Majidbhai’s family is crazy.’ (15-16)

This incident reflects the attitude of the society towards educating a girl child. Education is considered secondary for girls and their primary duties are to mend the house and children. Formal education is of no use to them as once married they will not need any formal training except mending house hold chores. Also the neighbour predicted that Fateema, being a girl of a poor family, will be married to a poor household of cattle grazers and will have to graze cattle after marriage. It also reflects on the mentality of Muslim community towards the girls where the religious leader ‘Kazi’ could decide a girl’s future in accordance to the religious custom and norms without ever considering the wish of that girl. The translator has kept the original word describing a Muslim religious leader as it is without giving any footnote so the foreign reader who is unaware of this tradition might not be able to make a full sense out of it.

Even learning English is considered to be a privilege for poor children, especially girls, as many pre-supposed notions are attached with the knowledge of this language in India like a promise for a better future, an upper hand in society and in professional life etc. According to the neighbour Fateema and her likes do not require such kind of knowledge as they will not be allowed to step out of the house and pursue career after marriage. The narrow minded mentality of society towards girls from poor household could be seen here. The prevailing ideology of the society (Indian and Muslim society) is reflected here and the translator, being Indian herself, has carried forward it into English keeping the flavour and impact intact, though the foreign readers might not be able to make full sense of this event due to religious and cultural contexts. In the above excerpt the name of the neighbour’s wife has been misrepresented as in the original the name mentioned is ‘Sakarbai’ while in translation it becomes ‘Khusoomchachi’. It is clearly a case of negligence on the part of the translator.

Passage 3.

At some other point one incident is depicted in the novel where the innocent act of sharing lunch box between friends – Fateema, a Muslim girl and her close friend Chandan who is Jain by caste – has been criticised by the teacher of her school.

ફાતિમા અને ચંદન બપોરની રિસેસમાં નાશ્તો કરતાં હતાં. જાનીસર ત્યાંથી પસાર થયા. ઊભા રહ્યા હશે થોડી વાર. તે દરમિયાન ફાતિમાએ ચંદનના ડબ્બામાં હાથ નાખી લાડુ ભાંગ્યો ને બટકું પોતાના મોઢામાં મૂક્યું. ચંદને તેના વધારેલા મમરાનો ફાકડો ભર્યો.

“એય છોકરીઓ! આ શું કરો છો?” બેઉ જણી ગભરાઈને ઊભી થઈ ગઈ. “ચંદન, તારી માએ કાંઈ શીખવ્યું નથી? આમ એક-એકનાં એઠાં ખાવ છો તે?”

ચંદન ધ્રુજવા મંડી.

“ને તું, ફાતિમા! આના ડબ્બામાં હાથ નાખે છે?”

ફાતિમા કંઈ બોલવા ગઈ. ચંદને પાછળથી ચૂંટી ખણી.

“ચંદન, જાત-કજાત તો જુઓ! આ ફાતિમા તો - જાવ, હવેથી આવું ન કરતાં.’ (18-19)

In English translation it reads

Fateema and Chandan were busy eating snacks during break time. Jani sir walked past. He must have paused and watched for a while. Obliviously, Fateema put her hand in Chandan’s lunch box, took a piece of laddu and ate it. Chandan took some puffed rice from Fateema’s box.

“You girls there! What do you think you are doing?” Frightened, the girls stood up.

“Chandan, hasn’t your mother taught you anything? You shouldn’t be eating each other’s jootha food like this.”

Chandan quailed.

“And as for you, Fateema! You are putting a hand in her box?”

Fateema was about to respond, but Chandan pinched her surreptitiously.

“Chandan, check caste and culture first before you...This Fateema is...never mind. Just be careful from now on.” (17)

The above mentioned extract points out to the caste system in India which is familiar to an Indian reader but to a foreign reader who belongs to a different culture, where the concept of upper and lower caste does not exist, it is difficult to make sense of this incident.

In the translation, the word જાત-કજાત 'jaat-kjaat' has been translated as 'caste and culture'. The translation makes a different reading, not due to lack of equivalence or linguistic or textual constraints, but it is translator's deliberate attempt to rewrite the social hierarchy in India in a different way, replacing the expression by just mentioning caste, skipping the word કજાત 'kjaat' altogether, while transforming it into a different language system which is completely unaware of such hierarchical social set up. The words 'jaat-kjaat' which sounds quite strong in the SL but the same expression, when rewritten, seems subtle, less impactful in its English translation as the target culture does not have the concept of caste system. From this example, it is apparent that, "...rewritings are inspired by ideological motivations, or produced under ideological constraints" (Lefevere "Translation" 7). In the attempt to serve various ideological constraints, the translator inevitably leaves his or her marks in the translation. Through such manipulation of the original, the translator may be able to project a certain image of the original work and its writer.

Passage 4.

One summer afternoon, Fateema's Ba asked for her help in fetching water from the village well. While returning home, they spotted Vijaya, Jani Sir's daughter-in-law who was carrying a pot of water on her head. She was pregnant and due to the heat and the weight of the pot she was quite exhausted. On Ba's command Fateema extended a helping hand to Vijaya by carrying the pot to her house but as soon as the house approached, Vijaya took back the pot from Fateema and shooed her off saying that her mother-in-law would mind the touch of a Muslim girl to their water.

ડેલીના બારણે પહોંચ્યાં કે વિજયાએ ફતિમાના હાથમાંથી બેડું લઇ લીધું. હળવેકથી કહ્યું, “જા, જતી રે. મારી સાસુ જોશે તો વળી અભડાવી મેલ્યું, એવો દેકારો કરશે. જા. (20)

The English translation reads:

“Once they reached the entrance of the large house, Vijaya took the pot from Fateema.”

“You'd better go. My mother-in-law will say the water is polluted if she sees you carrying it.” Vijaya tried to make light of the matter. Fateema turned away so this is what you get for helping somebody on a scorching day. Polluted? What does that even mean?” (18)

The above incident is an example of the system of untouchability, upper and lower caste social system prevailing in India. The water of a Brahmin family gets polluted if touched by a lower caste or a Muslim. The upper caste people do not mind taking help of a lower caste but they do mind their touch to their water, food or body. Fateema herself is too young and innocent to understand such concepts and feels insulted. Also the excerpt has a sentence in translation – “Vijaya tried to make light the matter.” In the original there is no such reference except the word **ହଲଦେକଥା** ‘*Hadvekthi*’ meaning in a lower voice which may implement that Vijaya doesn’t want her mother-in-law to hear her out. The rewriting brings forward the Indian social system – caste system and untouchability – but how would a foreign reader make sense out of it who has no idea of such a system where even a touch by a lower caste can pollute the water of a high caste? Even the word **ଅଭଦ୍ଧ** ‘*Abhdavu*’ and its English translation ‘Polluted’ have different connotations. The original word **ଅଭଦ୍ଧ** ‘*Abhdavu*’ is quite strong and is used as an insult of a lower class person and is more powerful in its impact while the English word ‘Polluted’ does not create the desired impact. The difference between Indian and Western ideology will make the rewriting confusing for a foreign reader. The Western society does believe in upper and lower categories but their parameters for the same are different based on skin colour and race. In India the parameters change which are mostly based on the intricate caste system which has been practiced since the beginning of the Indian civilization. Thus the rewriting does not create the strong impact as the original.

Passage 5.

The following incident which takes place at Chandan’s house while Fateema goes there to take her along to school. It is important from a variety of aspects reflecting upon a number of semantic and ideological factors and it would be interesting to note how the translator has dealt with it.

Every morning Fateema would go to Chandan’s house from where they both go to school together. Chandan was reluctant to go to school that day and Motiba (Chandan’s grandmother) was trying to convince her giving Fateema’s example. Chandan’s house is quite big and Fateema always felt curious to go inside and have a look at it but Motiba would not allow her in due to her caste. Even she does not appreciate of a poor and lower caste girl

like Fateema getting education and many a times her comments reflect it. On that particular day when Fateema visited the house, she was heard saying –

“આમ વેલી સવારે ભણવા જાશ એના કરતાં તારી બાને મદદ કરાવતી હો તો?”

“લે, પાંઉ તો લઈ આવી. સાયરાને પાઠ વંચાવ્યો.” ફાતિમા પટ દઈને જવાબ આપતી.

“તમે લોકો ભણીને શું કરવાનાં? તારો બાપ તો પરણાવી દેશે કોઈ ઘોડાગાડીવાળા સાથે.”

“ના હોં! બાપુ તો મને દશમું પાસ કરીશ પછી નોકરી કરવા દેવાના છે.”આવું સ્પષ્ટ વાક્ય ફાતિમાએ એવી રીતે કહ્યું કે મોટીબા જરા ભોંઠાંતો પડ્યાં. “આ છોકરી તો જો!” એવોય વિચાર આવ્યો. અને જ્યારે પછી અંગ્રેજી શીખવવાનું ચાલુ થયું અને આ બાજુ ચંદનના “ધમપછાડા !”

...

“શું માંડયું છે આ ?” અંતે મોટીબાએ બરાડો પાડ્યો, “મેટ્રિક નહિ થાય તો કોણ મુરતિયો હાથ ઝાલશે?”

અંદર શાંતિ. ફરી મોટીબા, આ વખતે સમજાવટની સ્વરે બોલ્યાં :

“આખા ગામની છોડિયું જાય છે. જો, આ ફાતિમા જાય છે કે નહિ ?”

પોતાનું નામ સાંભળી ફાતિમા ઊભી થઈ. ડરતી-ડરતી અંદર ડોકિયું કરતાં બોલી, “ચંદન, ચાલ, મોડું થાય છે.” “જો, ચંદલી, આ જો, કપડાંય નથી પુરાં પહેરવાનાં, પણ જાય છે કે નહિ સ્કુલે?” મોટીબા બોલ્યાં.

ફાતિમા અંદરથી સિકુડાઈ ગઈ. આની પહેલાં કોઈએ તેની ગરીબી આમ આંગળી ચીંધીં નહોતી બતાવી.

ત્યાં ચંદન રડમસ અવાજે બોલી, “તો શું થયું? એને તો અંગ્રેજી આવડે છે.”

“આ ફાતિમાને અંગ્રેજી આવડે છે?” મોટી બા નવાઈ પામતાં બોલ્યાં.

“હા, બે દા’ડામાં તો લખતાં શીખી ગઈ. મને નથી આવડતું.” ચંદને હાર કબુલી. મોટીબા જરા મૂંગા થઈ ગયાં.

ચંદનની મમ્મી પુષ્પાબહેન ફાતિમાને જોઈ રહ્યાં. આવડી આ મારી છોકરી કરતાં હોશિયાર? મોટીબા ખાટેથી ઊતર્યાં.

“આને અંગ્રેજી આવડે છે? અલી ફાતિમા, તને કોણ ભણાવે છે?”

“કોઈ નહિ.”

“તો તું આકુડી-આકુડી શીખી ગઈ?” બોલતાં મોટીબાને અચાનક એક વિચાર આવ્યો.

“તો તું રોજ વે’લી આવતી જા જરા. આ છોડીનેય શીખવ જરા.”

...

ચંદન અંતે સ્કુલે જવા તૈયાર થઈ.

...

મોટી બા પાછાં ખાટે ગોઠવાતાં બોલ્યાં :

“જો કાલથી છોડી વે’લી આવે કે એને ચંદનને ભણાવવાનું ભેળવી દેજે. ને હા, પછી આ મમરાની બે લાડુડી હાથમાં પકડાવી દેવાની – છોકરી રાજી-રાજી થઈ જાશે.”

“આંચ ઓટલે બેસાડી દેવાનાં. ને જો, પાછી ટુશન બુશન એવું નઈ કે’વાનું. ભેળાંભેળાં લેસન કરો, એમ કે’વાનું.” મોટી બાએ સમજાવ્યું. (22-23-24-25)

In English translation it reads:

“Look at you, all ready to go study, shouldn’t you be helping your mother?”

Pat came Fateema's reply : "Don't you know that I got the bread this morning? I also helped Saira with her studies."

"What will people like you do with education, hanh? Your father will get you married one of these days to a hawker."

"Not at all. Baapu will let me complete my tenth grade and then take up a job." Fateema spoke with confidence.

Motiba was taken aback. 'What a handful this girl is!' she thought.

Once the school started English classes, Chandan started to throw tantrums and refused to go.

...

"What's going on here?" Motiba bellowed. "Who will marry you, silly girl, if you don't do your metric?"

Silence.

Placated, Motiba continued, "See all girls in the village have been going to school, right? Look, Fateema is also going, isn't she?"

Fateema stood up. Hesitantly, she peered inside the said to Chandan, "Let's go Chandan, it's getting late."

"Chandali, see? Fateema doesn't even have proper clothes, yet she wants to go school," Motiba's voice floated out.

Fateema suddenly felt small. Her poverty had never been pointed out like this before.

"So what? At least she knows English," came Chandan's petulant retort.

"What? Fateema knows English" Motiba was stunned.

"She learnt in two days. I have not," said Chandan despondently.

Motiba was speechless. Chandan's mother Pushpaben, could not take her eyes off Fateema. This idiot of a girl was smarter than her daughter?

Motiba descended from her cot.

"This one knows English? Alee Fateema, who teaches you?"

“Nobody.”

“You mean you learnt it on your own?” A thought struck Motiba as she spoke, “So why don’t you come here early every day? Maybe this girl will also learn something.”

...

Chandan finally agreed to go to school and left with Fateema.

...

“Now look the moment she arrives in the morning, make Chandan sit with her and learn. And listen, give away two mamra laddus to her. That’ll be enough to make the girl happy. Just do it as soon as she comes. And don’t you mention tooshan-booshan. Just say, ‘study together.’ That’s it.” (20-21-22)

In the above excerpt, Motiba tauntingly tells Fateema to give up studies as she believes that a poor Muslim girl has no need of education. In the original Gujarati version, Motiba’s disapproval comes out clearly when she says that Fateema should help her mother in mending the household chores instead of attending school. While in translation Motiba’s comments seem like suggestion instead of condemnation. Even the word ઘોડગાડીવાલા *‘Ghodagadiwala’* becomes ‘hawker’ in translation. The reason could be many Muslim men used to ride horse carts to earn their livelihood in older times. But with the change in time horse carts disappeared and the Muslim men found other means of earning. As the translation is meant for modern readers of Twenty First century, the word is rewritten as ‘hawker’ meaning a poor labourer. The poetics of modern time has affected the translation.

A Muslim girl from poor family taking up a job after completion of studies is quite unthinkable in those days and when Fateema said this with so much confidence and surety, Motiba was taken a back as she misunderstood Fateema’s confidence as her audacity. For a conventional woman like Motiba Fateema’s words could only create awe and surprise. Even the use of the word *‘hankh’* in the translation, which is a archetypal Indian way of expressing one’s condemnation, is additional to the original as the original uses no such word but to increase the impact of Motiba’s comment which is quite blunt, the translator has taken some liberty at semantic level and this addition is a clear sign of the constraint of Universe of Discourse through which the translator tries to naturalize the language for the TL readers by retaining the Indian flavour. In his book *Translation/History/Culture: A Source book* Lefevere throws light on the impact of the constraint of Universe of Discourse on translation

process in the following words, “Translators have to strike a balance between the Universe of Discourse (i.e. the whole complex of concepts, ideologies, persons, and objects belonging to a particular culture) as acceptable to the author of the original, and that other Universe of Discourse which is acceptable and familiar to the translator and his or her audience” (35).

Once Navprabhat school started teaching English, Chandan developed detest for the school as she found the subject difficult. She started avoiding school as a result. Motiba tried to convince her to go to school stating poor Fateema’s excitement for studies. Fateema’s reaction when Motiba brusquely pointed out her poverty creates different impact in the original and the translation. In the original the writer has made use of a typical Gujarati expression of અંદરથી સિકુડાઇ ગઇ ‘*andar thi sikudai gai*’ which indicates how Fateema felt humiliated. The translation uses the expression ‘Fateema suddenly felt small’ which although is an apt equivalent still the artistic and typical expression of the original seems to lose its impact. In the translation it became base. Later from Chandan Motiba found out that Fateema, a poor Muslim girl was comfortable with English while her own grand daughter belonging to a higher caste could not cope with it and she couldn’t believe her ears. Even Pushpaben, Chandan’s mother, felt awed to hear about it and she reflects her thoughts in this matter. The original and the translation differ here as in the original the words આવડી આ ‘*aavdi aa*’ were replaced by ‘This idiot of a girl’. The original expression clearly hints at the caste consciousness where such expressions are used to point out someone’s lower caste or status while the translation only indicates the mental ability of Fateema by calling her ‘an idiot’. The ideology of the translator has interfered once again and two simple words were carried forward in a completely different reference. Later we could see that the same Motiba who was discouraging Fateema to continue her studies a little while ago tried to convince her to teach English to Chandan.

Motiba was simply trying to take advantage of Fateema’s poverty by insisting her to teach Chandan but she was not willing to pay anything in return except some sweet as she thought that Fateema would be any easy prey and it was a clever deal. The social belief that a girl must be educated so that she could find a good match in marriage also gets reflected here. In those days completing 10th grade was more than enough for a girl from cultured background to find a good match so Motiba refers to this fact to convince Chandan to go to school. Even today many castes do not prefer to impart higher education to girls and this reality is reflected here. Once again the various castes prevailing in India along with the

different norms and traditions of each caste is hinted upon which can be difficult for the foreign target readers to take in due to the different poetics of the culture. Even the use of certain words like आकुडी-आकुडी 'afudi-afudi', वाटे-वाटे 'vaade-vaade', बेराबेरा 'bherabhera', टोक-टोक 'tok-tok', टुशन बुशन 'tooshan-booshan' etc. are typical expressions of Kathiawadi language hinting at a classic characteristic of Indian languages which is the repetition of words but while transferring to English, they lose their musicality and become plane. The constraint of Universe of Discourse has played its part where the harmonious expressions of the original were replaced by quite base words in most cases except the word टुशन बुशन 'tooshan-booshan' which has retained its position in translation.

Passage 6.

One day Fateema was reading the history of Mahmud Ghazni's attacks on India between 1000 and 1025 AD in the library when her thoughts – as a Muslim woman and a student of History – in such matters are revealed to the readers as following.

ફાતિમા ઇતિહાસ વાંચી રહી છે.

મહમ્મદ ગઝનીનું સોમનાથ પર આક્રમણ – મંદિરના નાશનું પ્રકરણ હતું.

ઇતિહાસ તો સફેક પાનાં પર કાળા અક્ષરોથી લખાયેલી ભુતકાળની બીના હતી. ડેડ એન્ડ. બહાર

વરસતી ધુપમાં કંટાળાથી વાંચવાનો વિષય હતો, અન્ય માટે, પણ ફાતિમા તેના મનમાં તે કાળ જીવિત કરી રહી હતી.

પ્રચંડ સેના લઇને પવંતો વચ્ચેથી પારકા મુલક પર આક્રમણ કરનાર – સત્તર વાર આક્રમણ કરનાર – મહમ્મદ કોણ હતો?

ફાતિમા વિચારતી હતી સેનાની વ્યવસ્થા કરનાર, રણમાંથી તેમને છેક સોમનાથ સુધી લઇ જનાર તે એક જબરજસ્ત સેનાપતિ જરૂર હતો. પણ...તેણે સંદર્ભપુસ્તક ખોલ્યું, વાંચ્યું. ડૉ. બી. સી. સ્મિથ કહે છે,

“જ્યાં સુધી ભારતને લાગે-વળગે છે, ત્યાં સુધી મહમ્મદ ગઝની એક લુંટેરો હતો, જેણે ભારતની અપાર સંપત્તિ લુંટી.”

કેવી દુર્દશા થઇ હશે મારા આ દેશની, જ્યારે એક પછી એક આક્રમણકારો ધન લૂંટવા આવતા હશે...!

બેસહારા હજારો-લાખો લોકોની કતલ કરતા હશે... સ્ત્રી-બાળકોને ગુલામ બનાવી ઘસડી જતા હશે!

પ્રો. હબીબે સાચું લખ્યું છે, “ગઝનીનાં આક્રમણોથી ભારતનાં મંદિરોને જે હાનિ પહોંચી છે, તેને કોઇ પણ સાચો ઇતિહાસકાર છુપાવવાનો પ્રયત્ન નહિ કરે. પોતાના ધર્મને યોગ્ય રીતે જાણનાર કોઇ પણ મુસલમાન કહેશે, ઇસ્લામધર્મ લૂંટમાર ઔર હત્યાકાંડની આજ્ઞા નથી આપતો – શરિયતના કોઇ કાનુન આ આક્રમણને ન્યાયસંગત નથી કહેતા. દરેક ધર્મમાં પૂજાસ્થાનોને ફૂરતાની સાથે નષ્ટ કરવાનું નિંદનીય જ ગણાયું છે.”

અલગ-અલગ ઇતિહાસકારો તેને અલગ-અલગ રીતે મૂલવે છે.

હું એક સ્ત્રી, એક હથિયાર વિનાની નાગરિક... ધારો કે કોઇ પણ રાજા – વિચાર પછી તેનો ધર્મનો હોય કે અધર્મનો – આજ મોટી સેના લઇ ચડી આવ્યો, મને, બાને કે બીજી ઘણી સ્ત્રીઓને લૂંટના માલ તરીકે પકડી જાય તો... જેમ પેલી સ્ત્રીઓ પકડાઇ હશે, જેમ તેમને બચાવવા અસંખ્ય પુરુષોએ મોત વહોયું હશે – તો...

- એ નરી હેવાનિયત સામે કોઇએ અવાજ ન ઊઠાવ્યો? એના દેશમાં પણ થોડા અલગ વિચારોવાળા નાગરિકો નહિ હોય – કોઇ ધર્મગુરુ, કોઇ દયાળુ, જેણે તે વિજેતા રાજાને આવા ધિક્કારભરેલા કામ માટે નસિયત આપી હોય? જેણે પોતે ગુલામોની સાથે ઘસડાતી જતી હતી !

ફાતિમાને બહાર વરસતી લૂ જાણે તેના શરીરને અંદર વરસતી હોય તેવી દઝાડતી વેદના થઇ આવી.

જરા વાર પુસ્તક બંધ કર્યું. પછી થયું, ઇતિહાસ તો બની ગયેલો બનાવ છે. પણ તેના પરથી ઘડો ન લઇએ, તો જરૂર તેનું પુનરાવર્તન થાય.

આવાં આક્રમણો તો ભારત પર થયેલાં છે. ત્યારે તો મુસ્લિમ સત્તા જ હતી, તો આક્રમણકારીઓ પણ મુસ્લિમ હતા. તૈમુરે તુગલક સામ્રાજ્યના સુબેદારોની કતલ કરી હતી. શું નામ? હા... મુબારકખાં!!..

આમાં મજહબ ક્યાં રહ્યો? મુર્તિપૂજા અને મંદિરોનો નાશ, લાખો નિર્દોશ પ્રજાનોની કતલ કે
ધનસંપત્તિ લૂંટવાના મનસુબા ?

અરે, એ લોકો તો આ મારા દેશના હતા ! આપણા જ હતા !

સાચું તો એ હતું કે આ સમય મધ્યયુગીન માનસનો હતો. હિંસા અને યુદ્ધ તે માનસની પેદાશ હતાં.
માત્ર અહીં જ નહિ, સર્વત્ર પારકી ભૂમિ પર આક્રમણ કરવું, નિર્દોશ નાગરિકોની કતલ કરી ભૂમિ પર
કબજો જમાવવો તે તો ઘણા યુરોપિયન દેશોએ પણ કરેલું છે.

તે જમાનો હતો જ્યારે આવાં યુદ્ધોને વાજબી જ નહિ પણ જરૂરી ગણાતાં હતાં. પણ આજે?... કે
આદમી સુધર્યો જ નથી.

ફાતિમાએ પુસ્તક બંધ કર્યું. જે વિચારો તેના મનમાં ઊભરાતા હતા, તે જો જાહેરમાં બોલવા જાય તો
કદાચ “ફાતિમાને નામે ફતવો નીકળે.” તેને જરા હસવું આવ્યું. (116-117-118)

Its English translation reads:

Fateema was lost in the accounts of Mahmud Ghazni’s raids on the Somnath temple. A dead and boring subject for most students. History came alive for Fateema. Accompanied by a colossal army, as he cut through the mountains, traversed a desert to invade a temple in an unknown land. Mahmud must have been an indubitably impressive warrior. But who was he?

Fateema opened a reference book by a British historian who summed up Mahmud Ghazni as an ‘invader’ in the Indian context. *What must my country have gone through, when one after another, plunderers came and looted, killed thousands of helpless people, took away women and children as slaves?*

Fateema’s history of medieval India had several and contradictory views on Mahmud Ghazni. Was he interested in gold, or political sovereignty, or the dissemination of Islam? Did he harbour hatred towards idolatry – hence Somnath – or was he on a path of personal ambition? History has diverse narratives on this episode. What was clear though, Fateema rued, was that if she, as a dispossessed woman, were to be taken away along with Ba and others and their families were killed while trying to rescue them, it would be unforgivable. Was there no protest against this violence in Ghazni’s own society? Was he supported, incited or

discouraged by his fellow Muslims? Fateema was agitated, scorched by the heat of the summer that had made its way into the library.

She put away the books. It should be possible to interpret history without making it into a bone of contention. Invasions of this nature have always happened in India. Occasionally both the rulers as well as the invaders were Muslims. Tamerlane had slaughtered ministers of Tuglaq dynasty, for instance. What was his name? Oh yes, Mubarak Khan. The fact was that violence and war were products of medieval mind. This was as true of South Asia as of European nations. To wage a war and kill people was considered not just normal but also necessary. *Are we any different today?* Fateema asked herself if she would be able to express what she had been thinking. *Fateemake naam par fatwa*, she thought with amusement. (99-100-101)

This excerpt indicates not only Fateema's interest in History but also her ability to analyse it through objective perspectives. As she tries to read the opinions of various historians on the episode of Ghazni's attack on India and his looting, she gets profoundly involved into it. She could also come to a realization that Ghazni was a great leader and unquestionably a remarkable fighter but his policies were against non-Islamic religions and society. She also considers the possibility of the availability of a religious leader or some citizen who could have stopped Ghazni from getting involved in such evil actions. She could recall a few examples from Mughal History in India of the same nature. She tries to take in the world view of that period where not just in India but in many other Asian and European countries the same inhuman mentality had prevailed demanding war and bloodshed. Even today the traces of this mentality are to be found and Fateema is awed at the thought that haven't we learned anything from history? She also felt amused at the thought that if she could express her thoughts openly a 'Fatwa' might be on its way against her. Here she indirectly tries to mock at this tradition which does not allow an individual a right to think and express him/herself.

In the above example a lot of editing and redrafting has been done by the translator. A number of sentences as well as a few paragraphs were skipped although the main point was made clear. Along with this editing, a few sentences have been added by the translator to make clear a point related to Ghazni and his intentions behind his raids. A paragraph where Prof. Habib tries to explain his views on Ghazni has been skipped altogether. In this paragraph he intends to explain the real meaning of religion which never supports looting and

killing along with criticizing the raids done by Ghazni and the amount of destruction India's holy places have suffered as a result, putting some serious accusations on Ghazni for his inhuman intentions. The omission might be a result of translator's efforts to make light the matter related to accusing a Muslim ruler and his destructive motifs in case of many holy places of India to avoid any controversy in modern circumstances where people are becoming more impatient and rigid in the matter of religious beliefs. The original writer of the novel Ila Mehta expresses her views about the present situation in the matter of our religious beliefs in the following words, "I feel that people have become more fanatic these days adding into the religious troubles. In earlier times, we were not aware of religious diversities so much due to the lack of unity against the foreign attacks and information but today the awareness has been developed due to the exposure of the world only adding up to our fanatic views and discriminations" (my tran,; 2020).

Also these particular references of Muslim invasion in India hardly affect any foreign reader so to make this piece more appealing to them, the translator might have edited and cut short the details of violence. These interventions do affect the overall impact of the excerpt which seems to lose its sharp edge in the English rendering. However, the addition made on the part of the translator when she talks of Ghazni's actual intention behind those attacks. Was he interested in wealth, or it was his political or religious agenda? The translator has added her own opinions in form of these queries as if she is trying to analyse and come to a conclusion just like Fateema.

Passage 7.

Fateema once went to meet a builder through her colleague Niruben's reference but being a single woman, Muslim that too, her offer to buy flat was refused indirectly. Later Niruben pointed out this fact to her in the staff-room as following

“ક્રાંતિમાબેન, એવું છે ને કે તમે એકલાં છો, ને... એટલે એમ કે એકલાં બાહમાણસને સોસાયટીમાં બીજા મેમ્બરો...” નીરુબહેન અચકાતાં હતાં.

“ઇટ ઇઝ ઓલરાઇટ, નીરુબહેન, સમ અધર ટાઇમ.” સ્ટાફરૂમમાં આ બધી વાતોની આમ ચોળાચોળ કરવી ઠીક ન હતી. તે જાણતી હતી, સાંભળનારા રજનું ગજ કરે. તેનોય ડર ન હતો. પણ જે નિર્ણય,

તેણે લીધો હતો એકલાં રહેવાનો, સ્વતંત્રતાપૂર્વક જીવવાનો – આમ કોઈની દયાને પાત્ર બને તે એને મંજૂર ન હતું.

એકલાં બાઇમાણસ? એકલાં બાઇમાણસનો ડર? સ્ત્રી એકલી હોય તો તે અબળા કહેવાય. તે લડી શકતી નથી. તેના પર જુલમ થાય તે સહન કરી લે – કરી લેવા પડે. ગુલામ તરીકેય ઘસડી જવાય.

છતાં તે એકલી બાઇમાણસ પાછી સમાજને ભયરૂપ? બીજા મેમ્બરોને ક્યાંક લલચાવે તો? મેમ્બરોની પત્નીઓ સદાય ફફડતી રહે.

સોસાયટીનું કામ પુરુષો અને તેમનાં કુટુંબોને આવી એકલી સ્ત્રીઓ સામે રક્ષણ આપવાનું પણ ખરું ને?

જ્ઞાતિમા ક્રોધ અને લાચારી વચ્ચે પિસાઇ રહી. (125-126)

The English translation reads:

“Fateemaben, the thing is you are a single woman, so other members in the building may not feel comfortable...” She didn’t finish.

“It’s all right, Niruben, some other time.” It didn’t seem right to discuss such details in the faculty room. Fateema was well aware that people listening would make a mountain of molehill. More important, she had consciously taken a decision to stay single and was determined not to be seen as a pitiable object.

Eklabaaimaanas, they say for single women. So that was threatening, was it? A seductress, who lured away the husbands, and frightened the wives? The building must protect its men and wives from the wiles of a single woman, right? Fateema shook with anger and helplessness. (106-107)

The prevailing ideology of society which affects the general poetics can be seen here through these examples. The difficulty of a highly educated and professional woman like Fateema in finding a house in a big city like Vadodara hints at the narrow mindedness of the society towards a single woman. The hesitation of the builder to deal with a woman, Niruben’s hint at her singlehood – all these indicate how even in our modern society people still doubt the character of a single woman who is considered a threat for the social harmony. The neighbours might think that a lonely woman can easily lure men folk and can become a

threat for their wives. Nobody would have questioned the character of a single man in such circumstances but a single woman is always looked down upon as a danger and thus Fateema has to face such humiliating comments.

In the above extract the translator has skilfully handled the constraint of Universe of Discourse where she has kept the original expression used for a single woman along with putting its translation just next to it to clarify the matter. The original expression એકલો બાઈમાણસ '*Eklabaaimaanas*' has been used in italics to retain the impact of the original while giving its English translation next to it as 'they say for single women'. This liberty is taken by the translator at many places throughout the novel which helps to preserve the original flavour of the translated language.

The translator has also taken another liberty by skipping a line which expresses Fateema's views on how a single woman is considered helpless and vulnerable to all kinds of exploitation. This line is helpful in increasing the impact of the other contrasting views put in the next line that although a single woman is considered easy prey still a woman's decision to stay single is seen as a threat to patriarchy and the system of matrimony and therefore seems to threaten societal structure and its harmony. Even the ideological constrain seems to work here as the Indian and Western ideology in this regard is quite opposite. In Indian context a 'single educated and professional woman' is seen in a completely different milieu with two contrasting images (either as feeble and susceptible or a threat to the system) while its Western counterpart is considered under a completely different light. Even the Western image of a woman has its counterpart – as she is considered a powerful, self-sufficient and independent person on one hand while on the other she is constantly scrutinized under the eye of being a beautiful, seductive body – an eye candy (without any intellectual faculty). Jasodhara Bagchi expresses her views quite radically on how the misleading images of women were formed in the following words, "The cultural investment in Indian womanhood, in her voluntary abstinence and purity was made into a national 'myth'...as it denied Indian women all human rational control over their own bodies...The gender construction that it achieved through the dominant myth of Indian womanhood may well be read as the formula for class/caste hegemony of modern India" (3-4).

The lines that were skipped expressed first side of the Indian mentality while the lines kept intact expressed the other side. Although the reader of the translation would not refer to

the original still the loss must be taken into consideration. May be the translator's own ideology in connection to the modern poetics reflects this choice. In modern society the perception regarding women is changing rapidly (although not positively) and instead of a weak and fragile person, women are considered powerful and independent personality but still the age-old notion is so deeply rooted that although women have time and again proved their talent and skills to be an autonomous entities still they are seen under the light of the traditional concepts of either a *devi* or a devil. This controversial Indian mentality got reflected through the original piece but while translated only the present ideology was reflected instead of a whole picture.

Passage 8.

Kareem's religious views are taking a form of fanaticism and the following two examples are the proof of it. One day Fateema brought a few books on Hinduism to Kareem's *kholi* and on seeing them he reacted rather violently.

“આ શું વાંચે છે?”

“આ ? અરે, મારી સ્ટડીબુક્સ છે.”

“આ સ્ટડીબુક્સ ? આ મૂર્તિઓ, ચિત્રો તારા સ્ટડીમાં છે ? ફેંકી દે.”

“કરીમ, સ્ટોપ ઇટ ! આ કંઈ ફેંકવાનું નથી. તું તો એકદમ...”

“હા, હું પાક છું. તું નથી જાણતી કે ઘેર આર નો ગોડ્ઝ બટ વન ગોડ એન્ડ ઘેર આર નો બુક્સ બટ વન બુક.” કરીમે તેને હચમચાવી મૂકી.

“કરીમ, પ્લીઝ, શાંત થા. આટલો રેડિકલ ન બન. બાપુ અને બા સાથે આપણે નમાજ પઢતાં, ઉરસમાં જતાં એ હું ભૂલી નથી. એ મારો મજહબ છે. પણ તું કહે છે તેમ હું મારા દિમાગના દરવાજા બંધ કરી દઉં એ પણ પોસિબલ નથી. પ્લીઝ.” કિતાબોને ફેંકી દેવા માગતાં કરીમને તેણે દૂર ખસેડ્યો.

“શટ અપ ! બહુ જબાન ચલાવે છે ? હવે તો અમે દરેક મુસ્લિમ ફેમિલીમાં જઈ બુરખો પહેરવા સમજાવવાના છીએ. તારે પણ પહેરવો પડશે.”

“કરીમ, બહુત હુઆ. ચલ.” અનવરે કહ્યું. ફાતિમા જરા ડઘાઈ ગઈ હતી. કરીમ હવે શાળાના કમ્પાઉન્ડમાં ગવાતી પ્રાર્થના કે સરસ્વતીવંદનાનો કરીમ રહ્યો નથી તે તો તે સમજી ચૂકી હતી, પણ આટલો ગુસ્સો?

आटलो बडलाव? (145)

The English rendering reads:

“What is this you are reading?”

“Arre, these are my study books.”

“These are your study books? This idolatry – and these pictures? Throw them away.”

“Kareem, stop it. These are not to be thrown away. You have absolutely...”

“Yes, I am religious, and you don’t know that there are no Gods but One and no books but One,” Kareem’s anger shock her.

“Kareem, calm down please. Don’t be such a radical. I have not forgotten the namaaz we did with Baapu and Ba and the Urs we visited. That is my religion. But I will not shut the doors of my consciousness as you want me to do, that’s not possible. Please.” She pushed him away.

“Shut up! Your tongue’s wagging too much these days. We intend to advise every family to make its women wear a burkha. You will also have to wear one.”

“Kareem, enough now. Let’s go,” Anwar said.

Fateema watched her brother in a daze. She had known that this was not the Kareem who recited Saraswati prayers in the school compound, but such anger, such change? (121-122)

After a while both Kareem and Anwar came back home and Kareem offered a packet to Fateema saying that it is their identity that he is offering. On opening the packet she found a burkha inside.

In the above example, Kareem mentions Allah and the holy Koran as ‘there are no Gods but One and no books but One’ and later he compares ‘burkha’ as Fateema’s identity. Kareem’s emphasis on Fateema wearing a ‘burkha’ hints at the ancient mentality of patriarchal society which compelled women to veil for the sake of their easy classification in form of ‘respectable’ and ‘disrespectable’ categories and to control their sexuality.

He also gives an indirect reference to Hinduism and their custom of worshipping idols. In both the above incident visible signs of a change in Kareem's attitude towards his own religion and that of other religions can be noted. He is turning more and more radical in his opinions and narrow minded towards other religions. He could not bear a sight of his own sister, whom he and Anwar intend to involve in their terrorist activities, reading books on Hinduism. The same Kareem had lived in a small village with people of other communities and attended school with children belonging to other faiths which Fateema reflects as 'the Kareem who recited Saraswati prayers in the school compound'. But only recently he seemed to be more aware of the differences between them and he was also trying hard to impose his notions on Fateema. His giving a burkha to her is a clear sign of this.

The indirect reference to Allah and the holy Koran can easily be understood by a reader having some idea of Islam which believes in One God that is Allah and One Book that is the Koran. Hinduism and their idol worshipping have also been hinted upon as 'This idolatry – and these pictures?' in a sarcastic tone as Islam forbid any kind of idol worship and this entire point might be misinterpreted by a reader unfamiliar with the basic norms of these two religious faiths. Even the importance of 'burkha' for Muslim community is again a matter of their religious customs and without any reference into the background of this religion, its reference might miss its entire significance. Also the reference to the daily ritual of most of the schools in India – the recitation of Saraswati prayer by the students of all faiths due to the religious and cultural connection of the Goddess Saraswati as the Goddess of Knowledge might be missed by a Western reader unaware of these aspects of Indian culture. The difference between the Indian and Western culture along with their religious ideology might create a misunderstanding for a Western reader.

In the above episode, Fateema emerges as a mature person as far as her religious outlook is concerned. She clearly mentions to Kareem that she is a religious person but she also respects other religions. She is more open-minded compared to her brother. She could also realize that both Kareem and Anwar somehow are trying to inflict their biased perceptions on her.

The changing ideology of the society where on the one hand, Muslim men are becoming more radical in their views while Muslim women are becoming more liberal minded trying to break the barricades of religion, gender, society to lead a life of respect and free will gets reflected here. In case of Kareem, education has not helped him to expand his

consciousness, rather he has become more and more narrow-minded while for Fateema education helped her develop an analytical skill to judge and understand the things happening around and even to recognize the meaning of her own religion. With the help of education Fateema could develop a global perception which assisted her to fight against fanaticism and religious rigidity. For Fateema education liberated her while for Kareem it was a pretext to continue his terrorist activity. Both the brothers, Kareem and Jamaal could not benefit out of education and fell prey to the stubborn religious views for short term benefits.

Passage 9.

Once Kareem, Anwar and Ammiji took Fateema to listen to a lecture by some moulviji who was to deliver a passionate speech about the meaning of ‘jihad’ and encouraged (in reality, mislead) the young listeners to involve in a battle against other religions to save and spread their own through bloodshed and killing. Later Fateema was asked to address the audience on the same matter. She was in a big dilemma of what to speak as she was against any such fanatic views. Finally she decided to go with her inner voice and say what she truly believed resulting into the following speech :

હિજાબ ઠીકઠાક કરી તે માઇક પાસે ઊભી, “સલામ આલેકુમ’ ‘આલેકુમ સલામ’ કહેવાયા પછી દિલમાં થયું, “ફાતિમા, તારે જે કહેવાનું છે તે જ કહેજે.” યસ, એમ જ કહીશ.

“બચ્ચો, મૌલવીજીએ આપને ઇસ્લામને માટે કહ્યું તેમાં હું વધારે નહિ કહું, પણ હું આપ સહુને ‘જિહાદ’ માટે કહીશ. અનવરજીએ કહ્યું તેમ તમે બચ્ચાં છો, કચ્ચાં છો. પણ આટલી છોટી ઉમ્મથી આપ બધાં આપણા મજહબના સાચા સબક શીખો છો તે અચ્છી વાત છે. બચ્ચો કુરાન ફરમાવે છે કે, ઓ મહમ્મદ, કુરાન સાથે તું ‘જિહાદ’ કર. મતલબ, કુરાન એ તલવાર નથી, બંદૂક પણ નથી. પણ પવિત્ર કુરાન હાથમાં લઇને જિહાદ કરે એનો મતલબ કે શાંતિથી, મજહબ અને ઇમાનની નેકીથી તું તારી દિલની બદદાનત, બદઇરાદાઓ સામે જંગ કર.

બચ્ચો, આપના ઇમાન અને જાન બચાવવા જો જંગ થાય તોપણ તે જંગ દુશ્મનોની સામે જાહેર કરવાને પાક કુરાન ફરમાવે છે. જે લોકો નિર્દોષ છે, બેખબર છે તેમને બોમ્બ ફેંકીને આતંક ફેલાવવો, નિર્દોષોની કતલ કે જાનમાલનું નુકસાન કરવાની કુરાનમાં મનાઇ ફરમાવી છે.”

તે અટકી કે તેને અટકાવી? ફાતિમા પાસેથી માઇક ખસેડી લઇ અનવરે કહ્યું, “શુક્રિયા, ઇતની સિરિયસ શોય આ બચ્યા ન સમજે. સમજાના ભી જરૂરી નથી.” (202)

In English translation it reads:

She adjusted her hijaab and took the microphone. She greeted everybody with “Salaam Alekum” and heard herself saying, *Fateema, you must only say what you want to say.* Of course.

“Children, I can’t add much more to what Moulviji has already told you about Islam. But I will talk to you about jihad. As Anwarji mentioned, you are young and innocent. It’s a good thing though that you are getting to learn the real essence of our religion so early on.

Children, the Koran says, ‘Oh Muhammad, you do a jihad with Koran.’ This does not mean that the Koran is a sword or a gun. What it means is that, holding the sacred Koran in your hand and the lessons of peace and honesty in mind, you wage a war against evil.

“Children, should you need to fight to preserve your self-respect and your body, the Koran asks you to announce that to even your enemies. To kill innocent and cause harm to life and property is prohibited by the Koran.”

Fateema paused, or was she made to? Taking the microphone away from her, Anwar said, “Thank you. These kids are too young for such weighty arguments. They don’t need to understand this.” (166-167)

Fateema was talking in the same line as moulviji but the difference between her speech and that of moulviji is that moulviji was manipulating the religious concepts to spread violence while Fateema was using references from the Koran to convey the actual meaning of ‘jihad’ that is to spread peace and harmony in the world. Fateema’s dilemma before the speech and her decision to stick to her moral showed a mature outlook.

In the translation of Fateema’s speech a minor change can be noticed. The original speech uses the words like બોમ્બ ફેકીને આતંક ફેલાવવો ‘*bomb fekine aatank felavvo*’ which is missing in the translation. Normally tricks like bomb explosion or suicide bombers are used to spread terror (and there are plenty of examples of it in the world) and even Kareem and Anwar were up to the same trick but the translation omitted these words all together which somehow nullify the impact of the speech. Fateema was trying to hint at the current situation

where this trick has been often used by terrorist groups to spread violence and to kill innocent ones. Possibly the translator does not want to hurt the feelings of a particular community with such direct reference so she might have opted not to mention these words. The constrain of patronage might have affected the translation where to maintain peace it is advised to avoid any direct or humiliating comments on any religious community. In Lefevre's words, "Patrons circumscribe the translators' ideological space...To make a foreign work of literature acceptable to the receiving culture, translators will often adapt it to the poetics of that receiving culture" ("Translation/History" 7).

Passage 10.

Fateema decided to break her tie with Kareem and his group and focus on her studies but due to her connection with them she was taken in police custody and was interrogated. The police was building pressure on her to confess her crime and the inspector used some abusing words during the interrogation but Fateema faced it boldly and replied confidently. One such incident when inspector Gohil was questioning her is narrated below

“જો, બાઇ, તારા છાત્રાલયની અમે ઝડતી લીધી છે. એમાંથી કશું વાંધાજનક મળ્યું નથી. જો, બાઇ, આ તારા ભલા માટે કહું છું. જે કંઈ છુપાવ્યું હોય તે કહી દે.”

“શું છુપાવ્યું? કંઈ નહિ.”

“ખોટું બોલે છે ? તારાં સગલાંઓ સાથે રે'તી'તી, ભાષણો કરતી'તી ને હવે નાટક કરે છે ?” પોલીસ અફસર તું-તા પર આવી ગયો. હવે કદાચ ગડદા-પાટુ. પણ તે શું કરે ?

“મેં છુપાવ્યું કંઈ નથી. જે જાણતી હતી, તે બધું કહી દીધું જ છે.”

“હરામ...” બોલતાં તે ઇન્સ્પેક્ટર અટકી ગયો. ફાતિમાને પોતાના તરફ તીવ્ર નજરે જોતાં થંભી ગયો. ફાતિમાએ અતિ સ્વસ્થ સુરે કહ્યું :

“મિસ્ટર જોશી, તુ આર અ બ્રાહ્મીન. ટોક લાઇક અ બ્રાહ્મીન. સ્પીક વીથ રિસ્પેક્ટ ટુ અ વૂમન.” જોશી ચમક્યા. યુનિફોર્મે પર પોતાના નામની પિત્તળની પ્લેટ હતી, તે યાદ આવ્યું.

“હેર ડુ યુ કમ ફ્રોમ? ક્યાંનાં છો? ઉત્તરપ્રદેશ? બિહાર? આઝમગઢ?”

“તે બધી માહિતી આપને મારી તપાસમાં મળી જ હશે, સર! હું અહીંની જ છું. પાસેના ગામની. બ્રાહ્મણ-વાણિયાઓની દીકરી સાથે ભણી છું. જાની-સર, ગાયકવાડ-સર, પ્રોફેસર દિલીપ શાહ, પ્રોફેસર દવે મારા ગુરુઓ હતા. – છે.”

“હં...” એક ઊંડો શ્વાસ લઈ જોશી ઢીલા પડ્યા. પાણી મંગાવ્યું. ચા અને બિસ્કીટ મંગાવ્યાં. (225-226)

In English translation it reads:

“Listen woman, we have searched your hostel room. We did not find anything suspicious there. I am telling you for your own good. You be truthful to us about anything you’ve been hiding.”

“Hiding what?”

“Bloody liar! You were staying with your loved ones, giving speeches and all, and now such drama?” The cop had switched over to the familiar ‘you.’ He may descend to blows now, but what could she do?

“I am not hiding anything! Whatever I know I have already told you.”

“Haram...” He stopped himself. Fateema’s eyes bored into him.

She spoke in a steady voice, “Mr. Joshi, you are a Brahmin. Talk like a Brahmin. Speak with respect to a woman.”

Joshi was taken aback. His eyes went to the name-badge on his uniform. “Where are you from? Uttar Pradesh? Bihar? Aazamgarh?”

“You will know all this from my background check, Sir. I am from this place. From a village, nearby. I have studied with the daughters of Brahmins and Baniyas. My gurus were – I mean are – people like Jani Sir, Gaekwad Sir and Professor Dave.”

“Hmm,” Joshi took a deep breath. He looked uncertain and ordered tea and biscuits. (187-188)

The interrogative session of Fateema and inspector Joshi throws light on many aspects typical to the interrogation of criminals or suspects done by the Indian police. First of all, the hard language used by the inspector while questioning Fateema along with some abusive words like હરામખોર '*Haramkhor*' meaning 'Bastard' is so typical of Indian police while interrogative a suspect. Even his shift from તમે '*tame*' to તું '*tu*' in Gujarati version hints at his roused anger. In English we simply use 'you' while in most Indian languages we have multiple pronouns used in accordance to one's relationship with the other. The translator has deftly tried to hint at this language discrepancies through the expression of 'familiar 'you'' still the implication is lost somehow. Even the typical Gujarati words like સગાલુ '*sagla*' used in sarcasm which is translated in English as 'loved ones' fails to convey the actual implication. In Gujarati the word સગાલુ '*sagla*' which refers to 'relatives' is used in sarcasm when you try to taunt someone of suspectful relation with the other. Here the inspector is trying to refer to Fateema's suspected relationship with Kareem and others. Although 'loved ones' is an apt translation still the sharpness of sarcasm in the original is missing in the translation.

Later when the inspector lost his control as Fateema was not ready to confess, he used an abusive word હરામખોર '*Haramkhor*' but he did not complete it realizing that he was talking to a lady. On hearing this, Fateema was stunned and she spoke to him in English and made him aware of his religious background by reminding him that he belongs to a Brahmin caste. First of all, the use of English in such circumstances was unexpected and when Fateema spoke with so much confidence and clarity, the inspector was at loss for words and got baffled. It is so typical in Indian context that English is used to impress someone as it is considered more respectable compared to any other Indian languages. So Fateema's use of the language helped her win the first half of the battle. Later her reference to his caste and expected behaviour with a lady made him realise his mistake. Once again a typical Indian way of speaking where we often give reference of castes and religion and make judgements based on them. Brahmins are considered the highest community in India and they are expected to behave in a respectable manner. Fateema simply reminded the inspector Mr. Joshi of this fact as she guessed his caste from his surname as in India, surnames (often names) are based on one's caste and religion.

Even Fateema later mentioned that she was born and brought up in a small village of Gujarat where she had studied with the children of Brahmin-Vaniya community under the guidance of Brahmin and Vaniya teachers. Once again Fateema was making her point clear that she knows the Indian culture well having spent her childhood amongst the people of mixed faiths and would not get involved in any such scandals. This is another distinctive habit of Indians to on and again refer to one's native place, background and mother tongue. Fateema is simply trying to convince the inspector that she respects other religions along with her own and would never try to harm anyone based on their religious preferences. Her statements had desired impact on the inspector who loosened his grip and relaxed after hearing all this.

The references to caste and expected behaviour based on them or background references is a typical Indian way of speaking and any Indian reader would easily get the point but for a reader who is not familiar with the caste system prevailing in India might be at a loss of meaning. Although the translator has carried forward the exact meanings still the impact of the entire episode might be lost for a foreign reader without any reference to the Indian context as no footnotes are given. The difference between the poetics of Indian and Western societies could create a constraint for the foreign reader while trying to understand the various aspects of the novel which is full of such religious and cultural references.

Passage 11.

When Fateema was called for an interview for the post of a lecturer of History in her own college, she was quite excited yet nervous about it. The committee also seemed to be concerned about the appointment of a Muslim candidate for this post and to clarify their doubts they asked her a number of tricky questions regarding Jinnah, Mughal Era and Hindu-Muslim unity. Fateema's sensibility and belief in secularism along with her reading about other religions came to her aid on this occasion.

“મિસ ફાતિમા, ઇતિહાસના વિદ્યાર્થી તરીકે તમે જિન્નાહને કઈ રીતે જુઓ છો ?”

“પ્રશ્ન પેચીદો છે. ભારતના ભાગલા માટે કોણ જવાબદાર તે સવાલ વારંવાર પુછાયો છે. કદાચ તે અનુસંધાનમાં આપ આ સવાલ પૂછી રહ્યા છો. વેલ, તે વખતે બીજા વિશ્વયુદ્ધની વિસ્ફોટક પરિસ્થિતિ

હતી. બ્રિટિશ શાસનની સામે પચાસ વર્ષથીય વધારે વર્ષોથી પ્રજા સંગ્રામ કરતી આવી હતી. તેમાં હિંદુ અને મુસલમાન બંને પ્રજાની સામસામા ધ્રુવ જેવી માનસિકતા હતી. આ બધાં કારણોસર ભાગલા થયા.”

“જિન્નાહનો એમાં કેવો રોલ હતો ?”

“સર, જિન્નાહ સંપૂર્ણપણે કોમવાદી ન હતા. ઊલટું, ઇ. સ. 1924માં મુસ્લિમ લીગની લાહોરમાં મળેલી બેઠકમાં તેમણે કહ્યું હતું કે ‘સ્વરાજ્ય’ ને હિંદુ-મુસ્લિમ-એકતાનો પર્યાય કહી શકાય.

...પરદેશી શાસન અને તે પણ આટલો લાંબો સમય એટલા માટે ટક્યું, કારણ કે ઇન્ડિયાના લોકોમાં, હિંદુ-મુસલમાનમાં એકતા નથી. અને તેઓ એકબીજા પર પૂરતો વિશ્વાસ કરતા નથી.” ફાતિમા અટકી.

પછી ઉમેર્યું :

“બેદની વાત એ છે કે આ જિન્નાહ આગળ જતાં હિંદુ બહુમતીની ઉદારતા સાથે જીવવા કરતાં જુદા નેશનની માગણી કરે છે. શા માટે જૂદું નેશન - પાકિસ્તાન - તેનાં કારણો તો છેક ઇસ્લામની સ્થાપનાના મૂળ સુધી જઈ શકે.” (261)

In English translation it reads:

“Miss Fateema, as a student of History, what is your perspective of Jinnah?”

“It’s a difficult question. The question about who was responsible for India’s partition has been raised time and again. You are probably asking the question in that context. Well, those were the turbulent times of World War II. Secondly, the colonized Indians had been fighting against the British rule for over fifty years. Included in this struggle were both Hindus and Muslims occupying polarized positions. All this contributed to Partition.”

“What was Jinnah’s role in this?”

“Sir, Jinnah was not sectarian in the complete sense of the term. In fact, he had mentioned in a meeting of the Muslim League held in Lahore in 1924 that ‘Swaraj’ was synonymous with Hindu-Muslim unity. In fact foreign rule was able to last for such a long time in India because the Hindus and Muslims lacked unity and mutual trust.”

Fateema paused, and then continued: “It’s rather unfortunate that in the course of time Jinnah came to demand a separate nation. As to why a different nation – Pakistan – the reasons also go back to the foundations of Islam.” (214)

Being a Muslim candidate, Fateema was expecting questions related to her religion but the first question, which came directly and unexpectedly, shook her. However, she did not lose her cool and answered with confidence. Her views on Jinnah were unbiased and objective. She even connected his demand for a separate country for Muslims with the root of the establishment of Islam. In the reply Fateema gave to the questions regarding Jinnah and his demanding a separate nation there is a minor editing – the translator has skipped a phase mentioned in the original that is – હિંદુ બહુમતીની ઉદારતા સાથે જીવવા કરતાં ‘*Hindu bahumatini udarta sathe jivva karta*’ which means ‘instead of living with the generosity of Hindu majority’. This particular phase signifies the fact about Indian history where since early times Hindus have been in majority and people of other faiths including Muslims are in minority. The original author might want to imply through Fateema’s response that both the majority and minority groups could have lived in harmony after Independence and there was apparently no reason for the demand of a separate nation for Muslims. Even the phase hints at the generous nature of Hindu community which has accepted the arrival and settling down of many foreign rulers and people including Muslims in this country which was formerly called ‘Hindustan’. But the translator might have predicted this phase in different sense and felt it safe to skip it altogether as it might hurt the feelings of certain community. The reason behind it might be that since the colonial period, especially after partition, India has witnessed many incidents of communal violence. Even in modern times such tussles continue and perhaps felt it safe to skip such instigating comment to avoid any kind of trouble. The ideology on the part of the translator and the poetics prevailing in the present society might be responsible for this decision.

The interviewers’ questions to Fateema indicate a narrow mentality of these scholars who ask such provocative questions to Fateema to check whether she can be trusted or no. They would not have asked a Hindu candidate about Gandhi. The mentality of employees, particularly when a Hindu employee is considering a Muslim candidate, is mostly biased and trust factor is normally found missing due to many seen unseen reasons. The roots of such behaviour can be traced back to the partition and Hindu-Muslim riots that followed. Since the incident of the formation of Pakistan and the event of partition, the trust is somehow lost

between the people of both the communities. In routine life it is not reflected but on such occasions it becomes a major issue. In case of Fateema, the interviewers only wanted to be sure of Fateema's views and how much can they trust her with young students. They were also considering the danger or risk of employing a Muslim faculty to teach in their college which might instigate some serious issues in future. The present ideology is reflected through this mind-set influenced by the current poetics.

3.6 Analysis of Translator's methodology

Both the writer and translator are contemporary and they are well-familiar with the current socio-religious situation. The same reason could have led to the selection of this novel by Rita Kothari for the purpose of rewriting in English as it not just reflects the modern poetics, it also mirrors the current feminist ideology which takes into consideration the issues of women from minority groups and brings forth their life situations. Patrons can also play their role while deciding to publish the source text. As R. S. Gupta comments on the reasons behind the selection of the original text for translation in the following words

The person who translates and the text that is to be translated are decided, generally, by publishing houses/commissioning agencies. This decision depends, among other things, on the credentials of the translator and the 'reputation' and 'success' of the source text. The text may be chosen because of its immense popularity in its original form in its native socio-cultural context, or because it represents a new trend, a new experiment in form and technique and possesses the potential to become a classic or else it may be chosen because it represents a literature or a poetics belonging to a part of the world hitherto isolated from the 'mainstream' of world literature. The choice of the source text would also relate, quite naturally, to its market ability in the receptor language and culture. (185- 186)

The central character is a Muslim lady Fateema Lokhandwala and through her the author intends to throw light on the lives of women of Muslim community. The situation, the characters and their choices have some reality traits as we do come across such characters in real life and their struggles are based on the issues faced by many women in their day to day life. The changing mentality of the Post-modern writers towards the selection of theme and portrayal of their characters (women characters in particular) based on real life events hint at

the changing scenario of regional Indian literature. Meena Shirwadkar rightly comments on this matter, “The writers in these languages... came out rapidly from the shadow of historical romance and presented the reality of the life of woman. So, the woman, the family, and the writers' views were all changing, resulting in a variety of realistic images” (24).

However, it is important to take a note of the fact that the image of women emerging out of these fictions is based on contemporary, postcolonial Indian contexts without a blind imitation of First World feminist ideology. The transformations taking place in our society, especially in the matters pertaining women, is reflected through regional fiction as well. The writing could also be a form of resistance on the part of the writer who in words of G. S. Jayashree, “The stories that women write can be read as efforts to gain a space by wresting moral and intellectual leadership in a society where they had systematically been denied agency...Most writers try to recover the self, lost in the labyrinth of tradition and social custom through the medium of writing” (91-92-94).

But the actual reason is not the life and struggles of a Muslim girl but the choices she makes that make her stand with pride in the society. Fateema bears traits of a modern woman who challenges the patriarchal exploiting notions of womanhood reducing them to a sheer existence of dependability and opens up a world of possibilities for women to get out of the dominating walls and take full control of their lives instead of leading surrogate lives. The writer reflects the changing mind-set of people towards women, particularly of the lower communities through the example of Fateema’s parents who, although illiterate themselves, encouraged their children to gain education and to lead a respectable life in society. Fateema and her parents, especially her mother Khatijabi hint at this positive change in the attitude of society towards educating girls in the current times and so the novel must have been chosen for translation.

Along with this, the novel also addresses the burning issue faced not just by India but the world that is ‘Terrorism’ pointing out the possible reasons and politics behind such inhuman mentality while trying to advocate a solution in form of ‘education’. The original author has not taken a rebellious tone while dealing with this delicate subject but even in a subtle way, she has been successful to put forward her views. So we can say that as the novel brilliantly deals with two of the present day ideologies pertaining women and their emancipation (especially in case of marginalized group) and terrorism – the two issues in

lime light in the current social and political fields. These two factors are reasons enough for the selection of this text to be rendered in English.

It is important to note that the translation has a good flow and the translator seems to have done justice to the original to a great extent in the matter of carrying forward the sense and cultural nuances to the target language-culture. The translator has often kept the original Gujarati words intact to maintain the flow and cultural flavour and she has not given a single footnote which can interfere the flow of reading. Although Kothari has done much justice to retain the flavour and tone of the original along with representing the culture of the state that is Gujarat and the religious connotations of Islam still at times the translation seems distant from the reality presented in Gujarati version, especially in the description of the poverty and hardships of the Lokhandwala family, their routine struggle for sustenance, their fighting the social discriminations, the reference to Islamic traditions or the Kathiawadi dialect etc. The translator has done a good attempt, no doubt about it, still the actual picture doesn't emerge out clearly for the target culture readers (specially foreign readers) as they may not have an idea of poverty the way we understand in India. Even Fateema and her struggle on the bases of her religion point out at the Indian mind-set towards religious diversity and discrimination on that bases which is completely missing or sparsely affect the lives of Western readers. The central theme of the novel is Fateema's resistance against the multiple fences of poverty, illiteracy, religious bias, discrimination of gender which are witnessed and experienced daily in India due to multi-cultural background we share with her and her crossing these hurdles one after the other after much hardship through her optimistic view points and courage. The way an Indian understands these factors, a Western reader can never decipher them in the same light resulting into some ambiguity in certain matters typical to Indian society affecting the image of Fateema as it appears to the target readers. Her background, her reality, her choices may not appeal to a foreign reader the way it does to an Indian reader ensuing into the emergence of a different kind of Fateema or other women characters as compared to the original ones.

In the entire novel majority of the characters belong to a small village of Kathiawad district – Fateema, Ba and Baapu, Kareem, Chandan, other villagers and they speak in a Gujarati language so typical to that district. At semantic level, the special tone and accent of Kathiawad or Saurashtra region of Gujarat is lost in the translation. The special pronunciation – using હ 'h' instead of શ 'sh', the typical way of saying things and use of certain expressions

so typical to that culture, use of proverbs as well as the use of mixed language (a combination of Gujarati, Hindi and Urdu), particularly by a few of the Muslim characters like Anwar, Ammiji, Hafeez etc. who are not very comfortable with Gujarati are used by the original author to give a tinge of reality to her narrative and when transferred to English they seem to lose their special impact and implication.

Even though the translation looks quite satisfactory, the special semantic characteristics of the original cannot be reproduced in a language semantically and culturally different. The translation makes these words look more sophisticated while in original they come out of the mouth of characters who belong to rustic background having no idea of modern life and culture. These words have lost their rustic flavour when transferred to English. The references to typical regional or Indian traditions also miss out in translation due to the lack of such traditional values in the target culture. Expressing his views in line with the difficulty a translator faces in such circumstances Udaya Singh says, “Notice that in the matter of style, it is not only that the writers of literary texts often employ distinct dialects in comparison to hundreds of other texts written and published in the standard variety of the language. These writers may also create a peculiar compound textual style by operating with different – styles and dialects within the same text. The result is innovation, in both single words as well as in local word groups or compounds, which becomes very difficult to transfer into any other language” (200).

The writer has also used some proverbs at different places. The translator has used various strategies to deal with the constraint of Universe of Discourse at semantic level. At many points Kothari has used the original expressions (Gujarati as well as Kathiawadi along with some Urdu words) to retain the impact of the cultural nuances and implications while on the other hand she has translated them or kept both the original along with their English translation. Let us have a look at some of the expressions carried as they are in translation –

જમણવાર (39) ‘*Jamanvaar*’ (35) (feast), મોહનથાળ (40) ‘*Mohanthaal*’ (36), લાડુ (40) ‘*laadu*’ (36) ‘ગાંઠીયા’ (40) ‘*gaanthia*’ (36), પાપડવડી (40) ‘*papadvadi*’ (36), ખીચુ (44) ‘*khichu*’ (40), ફરસાણ (44) ‘*farsaan*’ (40) (names of various Indian cuisines), બેંડ-બાજા (37) ‘*band-baja*’ (34) (musical band called on some auspicious occasion), ચનિયા-ચોલી (41) ‘*chania-choli*’ (37) (an Indian attire with petticoat and dupatta) દેરાસર (40) ‘*Derasar*’ (37) (Jain temple), સ્વાલંબન

(54) ‘swaalamban’ (48) (self-reliance), ભુખડીબારસ ‘bhukhdibaras’ (a typical way of pointing at someone who has a habit of over-eating), ખેરાત (95) ‘khairaat’ (83) (charity), આવામ (95) ‘aawaam’ (83) (community), ઘાસપૂસ (85) ‘ghaaspooos’ (74) (a way of showing contempt for vegetarian food) etc. Most of these words require a detailed explanation due to the dearth of equivalence in English so the translator has chosen a smart way of dealing with them by using the original words as they appear in Gujarati.

At two places two proverbs have been used, once with reference to Fateema પાટુ મારીને પાણી કાઢે એવી છે ‘patu marine pani kadhe evi che’ (57) and at other for Jamaal પથરા ફોડી પાણી કાઢે એવો છે ‘pathra fodi paani kadhse’ (121). At both the places it has been carried in English as ‘draw water out of rocks’ (51-103). At another place, once again a proverb comes in – મોંમાં મગ ભરીને ‘moma maag bhari ne’ (68) and it has been translated as ‘People who sit meekly get what they deserve’ (59). In both the cases the translator has focused on the sense of the proverb, which is so deeply rooted in the culture and is quite challenging for any translator, and very skilfully rewrite them to make sense to the TL readers. For translator some of the culture specific words like metaphor, idioms, proverbs pose great challenge and M. B. Dagut remarks in this regard, “Since a metaphor in the SL, is by definition, a new piece of performance, a semantic novelty, it can clearly have no existing ‘equivalence’ in the TL: what is unique can have no counterpart.....any ‘equivalence’ in this case cannot be ‘found’ but will have to be ‘created’” (21).

At one point, the translator has acquired a unique strategy to deal with a typical Indian expression where instead of simply carrying it as it is or trying to translate (in both the cases the chances of mistranslation or ambiguousness are higher), the translator has used both the expressions side by side to retain the original nuance and make sense of it through its English rendering. Once when Fateema insisted Ba to learn how to read and write, Ba thought that Fateema is making fun of her and she used the expression મારી ફિલમ ઉતારે છે? ‘Mari filum utareche’(64)? It is a typical way of saying that ‘Are you making fun of me?’ The word ‘film’ when spoken by Ba in her rustic tone becomes ‘filum’ (‘phillim’ in another chapter) and while translating in English Kothari has made sure to use the expression in that typical fashion as ‘Are you making fillum about me’ (57)? The translator has tried to introduce a new

expression in the target language in line with the original one to deal with Universe of Discourse. Lefevere has discussed a good deal about the various techniques acquired by translators to deal with linguistic and semantic difficulties in his book *Translation/History/Culture* where he has pointed out, “Languages benefit greatly if skillful translators dare to give some foreign figure of speech or style to their nation, as long as it does not deviate too much from that nation’s customs and general way of life. They can also imitate the language of the original, using it as a kind of matrix, and invent or construct new well-formed words to enrich the language they translate into” (51). In this light Kothari can be called a skilful translator as she has dealt with these constraints quite artistically.

Along with these skilful rendering at various places, the translator has created confusion and incidents of mis-translation have occurred. For example, ગણપતિચોથ ‘*Ganpatichoth*’ (150) has been translated as ‘fourth day of Ganesh festival’ (126), શેતરંજી ‘*Shetrangi*’ (153) meaning ‘mat’ as ‘chess’ (129) and પરસોત્તમ મહિના ‘*Parsottam mahina*’ (188) refereeing to an Indian month where Lord Vishnu is worshipped as ‘Parsottam mother’ (155).

3.7 Concluding Remarks

In a closing statement I could say that Ila Arab Mehta has penned a tremendously brilliant work of fiction unlike any other in the history of Gujarati literature in general and women writers in particular by shifting her focal point to the lives and struggles of the woman of minority group – Muslim community along with highlighting many contemporary issues – terrorism, fanaticism and emancipation of women in general and of Muslim community in particular. Her central character becomes a torch bearer for many women who aspire for education and to lead a life of respect thus and her secular approach kindles hope of a secular world where peace and religious harmony prevails. Nevertheless, the image of a woman that emerges does create many speculations in the minds of readers when they give it a reality check. The writer has also followed the old trick of presenting a woman in the garb of idealness, though with a change in traits, circumstances and motif, still Fateema materializes as a Utopian figure which can be aspired for in future but difficult to come across in present time.

Rita Kothari has done a fabulous job as a translator and with the help of her creative ability she has done justice to the original text to a great extent. Although her translation often suffers at linguistic and cultural level, she has managed to deal with them artistically with the conscious use of her awareness of the various constraints responsible for the ambiguity. She has brilliantly applied various translation techniques like carrying forward many original words, using both original and translated expression simultaneously or altering the expressions or phrases to suit the current ideology or poetics for a clear understanding of the readers who belong to a completely different set of language and culture. She has also been quite faithful in her rendering and has taken very little liberty in the matter of omission or addition, unless it is necessary. The flow of language in the translation remains intact making the translation reader friendly. She has also toiled to present the life and struggles of the central character Fateema in line with the original still the image suffers from certain drawbacks, not due to the limitations of the translator but because of the wider factors like culture and social realities. So finally it can be concluded that Kothari's efforts are praise worthy and she has set bench marks in certain areas of translation techniques, particularly in the matter of pragmatics inspiring many contemporary and future translators.

WORKS CITED

- Ahmed, Leila. *Women and Gender in Islam*. Yale University Press, 1992, p. 6.
- Bagchi, Jasodhara. *Indian Women: Myth and Reality*. Sangam Books, 1995, pp. 3- 4.
- Chaudhuri, Sutapa. "Real and Imagined Gujarati Families: Shifting Positionalities of Gender in Contemporary Gujarati Women's Writings." *The Indian Family in Transition : Reading Literary and Cultural Text*, edited by Sanjukta Dasgupta and Malashri Lal. Sage Publications, 2007, p. 180.
- Dagut, M. B. "Can Metaphor be Translated?" *Babel*, vol. 22. Issue 1, January, 1976, p. 21.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.22.1.05dag>
- Ferguson, Mary Anne. *Images of Women in Literature*. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1977, p. 35.
- Gupta, R. S. "Translation : A Sociolinguistic Perspective." *Translation and Multilingualism: Post-Colonial Context*, edited by Shantha Ramakrishna. Pencraft International, 1997, pp. 185-186.
- Jameson, Fredric. *The Prison House of Language*. Princeton U P, 1974, p. 107.
- Jayashree, G. S. "Courage Never to Submit or Yield: Short Stories by Women in India." *Re-defining Feminisms*. Eds. Rajnana Harish and V. Bharathi Harishankar. Rawat Publications, 2008, p. 91-92-94.
- Lal, Malashri. "Writing The Self: Indian Women Writers in English." *Literature and Ideology, Essays in Interpretation*, edited by Veena Singh. Rawat Publications, 1998, p. 109.
- Lefevere, A. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. Routledge, 1992. p. 7.

- , editor. *Translation/History/Culture: A Source book*. Routledge, 1992, p. 7-35-51.
- . 'Mother Courage's Cucumbers: Text, system and refraction in a theory of literature'.
Translation Studies Reader, edited by Lawrence Venuti. Routledge, 2000, p. 236.
- Mehta, Ila. Personal Interview. 2020.
- Mehta, Ila. *Vaad*. Gurjar Granthratna Karyalaya, 2011.
- . *Fence*. Translated by Rita Kothari, Zuban, 2015.
- Rich, Adrienne. "What Does a Woman Need to Know?" *Blood, Bread and Poetry" Selected Prose 1979-1985*. W. W. Norton, 1994, p. 3.
- Roy, Kumkum. "Recent Writings on Gender Relations in Early India." *History and Gender: Some Explorations*, edited by Kirti K. Shah. Rawat Publications, 2005, p. 89.
- Singh, Udaya Narayana. "Language Patterns : Lexicography and Translation." *Translation, Text and Theory – The Paradigm of India*, edited by Rukmini Bhaya Nair. Sage Publications, 2002, p. 200.
- Soroush, Abdolkarim. "A Conversation with Abdolkarim Soroush." *Q-News International* (British Muslim Weekly), 1996, pp. 220-21.
- Shelat, Himanshi. *Gujarati Kathisahityama Narichetna*. R. R..Sheth & Co., 2000, p. 10.
- Shirwadkar, Meena. *Images of Woman in Indo-Anglian Novel*. Sterling, 1979, p. 24.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "The Politics of Translation." *Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti. Routledge, 2000, p. 405.
- Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. Ed. Jenifer Smith. Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 82.