



RE-EVALUATING THE SELECTED SHORT STORIES OF NARAYAN (A DALIT WRITER IN MALAYALAM): A CASE STUDY OF MINOR LIERTATURE

ANJU ANTONY

Pondicherry Central University, Kanjhikuzhiyil house, Kanichar, Kelakam, Kannur
Kerala



ANJU ANTONY

ABSTRACT

Cultural Translation examines the wider dimensions of cultural, political and ideological contexts of a text and historical and unconventional practices associated with it. This paper, focusing on Cultural Translation as a counter discourse in the postcolonial context gives a room for discussing Dalit short stories, particularly problematizing their identity as a construct and their assertion of the self through writing in the cultural context of Kerala. Cultural Translation is only relatively possible, not in its complete sense when it deals with the marginalized cultures like Dalit. This paper tells how far translation can mediate two cultures only relatively by analyzing the unique style and themes of selected short stories like "Taxes for Heads and Breasts", "Thenvarikka", "Footprints of the Predator", "Birth of Prophet", and "A Cry in the Wilderness" written by Narayan a famous Dalit writer in Kerala. This paper explores the possibility of reading the short story as part of Minor Literature. It also examines how far the source texts are faithfully translated and addressed the issue of translating the Dalit culture.

Key Words: short story, minor literature, post colonialism, cultural translation, marginalization, adivasi.

Article Info:

Article Received:22/10/2013

Revised on:10/11/2013

Accepted for Publication:12/11/2013

INTRODUCTION

The genre short story, as a brief fictional prose narrative, gains momentum in the nineteenth century in Western literature. The shortness of the short story is the positive character as Elizabeth Bowen suggests (qtd.Sherrif 8). Instead of treating it as a condensed form of a novel, short story has been opened out for multiple experiences with its form

and artful methods of omission, compression, implication, ambiguity, plot less- ness and the like. Unlike biography it is much more fictional and imaginative, and the brevity (though it is decided by the writer) determines the nature of short story. This paper focuses on the analysis of selected short stories of Narayan, in this perspective, and it problematizes the 'Cultural Translation' and the practical difficulties in translation.

It is evident that the short story has root from the oral culture and the tradition of tales which contain life and experience. Orality is the rudimentary element which connects the tales and the short stories though the orally -transmitted stories like tales have differences from the written scripts of short story. Tales vary in accordance with the culture and context unlike short stories. The latter is limited to the spatio -temporal dimension of the written script while the former has wider chances to differ.

In the postcolonial period, as a newly emerged genre, short story makes many discourses. It may be mainly because of its suitability to represent the liminal or problematized identities. The different and traumatic experiences in the colonial time and its ruptures are spoken out through its short story especially focusing on the themes like self, identity and nation. It may be the aftermath of a wide discourse about the colonial period or it may not be a deliberate attempt. But the themes and their significance with the time/age strengthen the bedrock of the short story. It is quite visible in almost all colonies and post colonies. But it does not mean that short story is the only suitable or amenable genre to the postcolonial context; but ought to say that its influence cannot be negligible.

The question comes much later whether short story can be considered as part of 'Minor Literature' when the very idea is originated from Gilles Deleuze and FelixGuattari in their study entitled "Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature" (1975). They define the minor literature as the "writing which a minority constructs within a major language" (Hunter 139). Minor Literature occurs in language which is de-territorialized or displaced (it may through colonization) and it is this displacement which fits the language for strange and minor uses. Kafka's writings abuse the discursive structure of major language by their own creative ends. It is not regionalism they promoted through the political term Minor Literature. According to Deleuze and Guattari:

To make use of the polylingualism of one's own language to make minor or intensive use of it, to oppose the oppressed quality of this language to its oppressive quality, to find the points of non -culture or under

development, linguistic third world zones which a language can escape an animal enters into things, an assemblage comes into play. How many styles or genres or literary movements, even very small ones, have only one single dream: to assume a major function in language, to offer themselves as a sort of state language, an official language. Create the opposite dream: know how to create a becoming minor. (qtd.Hunter 139)

The Minor Literature is highly political and subversive, collective in nature. It is debatable whether short story can be part of Minor Literature, but it can be an instrument of it if the writers want to express in that way. In Dalit Writing, the subversive and political nature of 'Minor Literature' is more visible. "A minor Literature is skeptical, yet produces an active solidarity among the members of the collective group. The evolutionary potential of a Minor Literature is written from the margins, de-territorializing the fragile community from the border from whence "it is possible to express another possible community and to forge the means for another consciousness and another consciousness and another sensibility" (<http://www.umass.edu/complit/achne/janadele.htm>).

Reading Narayan as first Tribal writer in Malayalam

Narayan is the first Adivasi (tribal) writer in Malayalam. He published his first novel Kocherethi which won the Kerala Sahitya Academy award in 1999. He has written many short stories and they are translated to many Indian languages and in English. His stories represent the real alternative to subaltern literature. He explains what he experienced in his life through his short stories which can be considered as the milestone in Dalit Literature in Kerala. His works engender the embitterment towards the injustice and marginalization in the society. It seems that each story of him opens a new window to a world and it may because of his consciousness to face the different worlds as an Adivasi-writer when he narrates Adivasi and the Dalit since there is a wide lacuna between the people in the margins and the 'civilized people'.

When an Adivasi starts writing about the 'self' and the identity politics, it disturbs him since he is positioned (always and already by the civilized group). As an aftermath of the uncertainty provided by this positioning, the identity of him/her seems to be split into fragments. For the mainstream society, these fragments are enough to 'celebrate' the Adivasi culture in their elite literature by snatching away their gods and rituals and making them remain in the margin as the other. The other is accepted in the literature of the elite, which is coloured by the romanticized notions about Adivasi, but not to their domain. Narayan's literary transactions within the literary world seem go beyond the "cries in the wilderness" (as the collection of his short stories entitled), at least it should be heard in the cultural context of Kerala as different and distinct voice.

It is to be noticed that no Dalit Writing as a genre or movement has appeared in Malayalam though the identity politics and issues regarding Adivasi and land have ample room for discussions. Since Narayan is the first Adivasi writer in Malayalam, he seems paying attention more to trace out and mentions the 'ambiguous' nature of an Adivasi than proclaiming the identity and space through the short stories. The feeling of the other, dire poverty they have and their lackadaisical attitude towards life, the treatment of them by the civilized society, influence of religion, caste systems and its problems and the mere helplessness of them being part of the multicultural society and its unrelenting progress and transitions at the same time unaware of their selves and identity and the power politics are the major concerns and themes of Narayan. He seems to pen perspicaciously, finding out the fur and fiber from the surroundings of his own culture, even while describing their ensnaring identity crisis. It may not be a leap in the history of Dalit literature, but it is a step towards transition.

In this paper the problems of translating a culture in short stories are analyzed, especially a marginalized culture, and it should not be lost its flair under the hegemony of the language of majority. Four stories are selected for the study. They are, "Thenvarikka", ("Thenvarikka" in Malayalam), "Birth of a Prophet" ("pravachakantepiravi"), "Taxes for Heads and

Breasts" ("ThalakkumMulakkumKaram"), and "Footprints of a Predator" ("kaloachakal").

Briefing the selected short stories

1. THENVARIKKA (THENVARIKKA):

In this story, Narayan seems to narrate about the relation between Nature and Adivasi and how the trespassing modern culture affects them. The generation gap between Ayyappan (the father) and Surendran (the son) which is intricate, at the same time necessary, is portrayed in this story. The generation gap may be the reason that the son prefers rubber trees rather than thenvarikka (a kind of jack fruit tree) that offers God's plenty of jackfruits. But he does not aware how the tree protects the surroundings, withstanding the soil, keeping the pond water filled, so he decides to sell the tree neglecting the advice of his father. But in the rainy season, there is no hope for him because the tree is no more there to protect him and his family. This story is translated by K.M. Sherrif.

BIRTH OF A PROPHET (PRAVACHAKANTE PIRAVI):

This story depicts the influence of Christian religion among Adivasis and it analyzes the reasons for conversion. 'They' are coming with the word of God and money to save them and to eradicate poverty. How the Adivasis are conditioned by their words, how their mindset is changed, and how they tackle the problems of Adivasi to converse them at the apt time which they cannot resist are there in this story. Chandran's son's disease is treated freely by them and they provide food and dresses which make them attractive to their words and deeds, and the whole people in that area are converted and after many years, a new pastor from their own community is appointed by the old pastor, he is none other than the son of Chandran, who was completely cured and trusted his life to God, and the whole group says 'Amen' for the decision of the old pastor and welcomes him. This story deals with the ruse ways of conversion. This story is translated by M. Jothiraj.

TAXES FOR HEADS AND BREASTS (THALAKKUM MULAKKUM KARAM):

Once in Kerala, it was abided by law that when an Adivasi girl reaches her puberty and her breasts are sprouted, she has to pay 2 chakram* as tax and when a boy is able to work, he has to pay 1

chakram as tax. Later Thiruvathamkur Raja annulled this rule.

This story depicts how one of the Adivasi groups called the Arayan resist the rule even sacrificing their lives. The suffering and agony in their community is also portrayed in this story. Valiyaveittira, the janmi, with the support of police orders the Arayans to pay tax for breasts and heads in their community. They cannot pay the taxes since their pepper and cardamom were looted by the Janmai himself. But when the Arayans go for asking about it, they are severely beaten, somebody is killed. Then Thahasildar (an officer who is appointed by Raja) comes to probe about it, meanwhile Kadutha, an Arayan comes with the head of his son instead of tax, and his daughter strikes her breasts before him and asks him to take them as tax. And Thahasildar finds Ittira and the policemen guilty, and punishes them. After some years the law was annulled by the Royal Proclamation.

This story is translated by M.Dasan

- 1Chakram=one and three-fourths of a British East India Company rupee

FOOTPRINTS OF THE PREDATOR (KALOCHAKAL):

It gives a dreadful picture of an Adivasi who is victimized by the settlers and the police and how he has to be part of them for exploiting nature and natural resources. The helplessness of an Adivasi, the unworthy life he has to live under the speculation of poachers is depicted in this story.

Kannan, the protagonist, happens to be the member among the ganja sellers, and somebody cheats him and is arrested by the police. Since the police and the Boss have connections, they plan to kill him so that he is released after boozing and having ganja (which are provided by the police). Somebody takes him to the jeep and they are planning to kill him. When he understands their plan, he escapes from there. But when he reaches his place he is informed that the Boss wants to see him. It is the first time he is going to see him, he was Kannan's classmate. But he does not show any concern. He comes to know that if somebody comes to squealer's list, he will be killed. He is called to the Boss' room and the door closed behind him, where he hears the footprints of the predator.

It is translated by K. M. Sherriff.

Problems of Cultural Translation regarding the representation of Tribal culture

These stories translated by different scholars in translation are selected because of the diversity of themes and they seem to represent the rudimentary problems of Adivasi. Though Narayan has written many stories other than these, the selection is limited to the stories dealing with the life and problems of an Adivasi. It problematizes the representations of Adivasi/Dalit in Source Text by a Dalit writer himself and how far the translations render the purpose of the text in the Target Text.

The major concerns of translation before the emergence of Cultural Translation and related theories were 'equivalence' and 'faithfulness'. But when translation is recognized as a site for various interpretations, 'reading' (under erasure) and rewriting cultures become problematic. The source text is deviated when it is translated to many languages according to the cultural comprehension of particular communities and these short stories do not have exception. The purpose of these short stories, the cultural comprehension and the communication with the target audience seem to get priority in above translations while the cultural untranslatability makes the Target Text slight different from Source Text. But as Hatim and Munday suggest the translatability or untranslatability is a relative notion and it is possible to express meaning across languages, depend on the factors like the purpose of the text, the receptors and the communication with them.

Andre Lefevere points out that any text in its passage from one culture may be subjected to a kind of 'refraction' by the predominant and/or poetics of the target culture and these are the factors which filter the language (from unwanted). The refraction is not favorable always when it comes to translate the marginalized cultures. When a text in marginalized cultures is translated to any hegemonic language, the concerns are not only to the unsymmetrical relationship between the languages which provides ample loopholes for misrepresentations but also the readability of the text. How far a translated text can be truthful to the Source Text, maintaining its cultural, political and social context within, at the same time balancing the readability is a great challenge before the

translator.(That is the reason sometimes translators are labeled as ‘traitors’). These translations seem to focus more on the readers than its word by word translation. Rather than imitating a text literally, the sense by sense translation used in these translations, apparently avoids certain expressions/ sentences/ passages. It also makes some selections too.

In the story “Thenvarikka”, there is no footnote or any subtitle regarding “thenvarikka” and what it is exactly. Even in the Glossary it is not mentioned. The translator uses the transliteration of the Malayalam title as such. It is evident in the story that ‘thenvarikka’ is jackfruit. Since there are several types of jackfruits it should have been mentioned specifically. “Thenvarikka” is considered as the queen of all the varieties of jackfruit and it is usually plenty in number in tree, but the fruits inside are very less in number. It is sweeter and pulpy than any other variety. It is golden yellow in colour providing delectable fragrance even for miles and very sweet in taste. If the readers are not aware of these qualities, the significance of the tree as the title may be lost.

The translator’s use of idioms, different from the source text is an example of the ‘refraction’ as Lefevere mentioned (8). It seems more readable, but the understanding of the meaning is slight different.

Source Text: “സ്വാർത്ഥരായ മനുഷ്യർ

അതിനും സമർത്ഥരായി പെടും.

ഒക്കെ പറയുകയല്ലെങ്കിൽ.” (19)

(It can be literally translated as: “the selfish men never allow being so. They will pick them up”.)

Target Text: “But man who accepted defeat only temporarily would be waiting below to pick them up”. (35)

This rather apparently simple language is translated skillfully, but the over translation of a Source Text unnecessarily adds burden to the writer himself especially if he deliberately makes his language as simple as he can, as a part of resistance. There are examples like that in this story where the transactions of the translator are more ‘visible’. The addition method used by the translator seems to make a tendency for over translation so that the

invisibility of the translator is being under erasure here.

Eg: SourceText: “വീടിനും പരിസരത്തും

തണലും കാറ്റും നൽകി രക്ഷകനായി പടർന്ന്

നില്ക്കുന്നത് തന്നെ വരിക.”(17)

(It can be translated as “the savior of the house and the surroundings providing ample supply of wind and shades”.)

Target Text: “A great grandfather who looked down benevolently at his home”. (33)

Here the affection and caring nature of the ‘grandfather’ is mentioned in the Target Text while the Source Text speaks about the ‘saviour’. The image of grandfather given by the translator seems adequate while reading the Target Text, but it seems the attempt of over writing/translating a text.

The minute details which have cultural significance cannot be translated properly. The description about the usages and benefits of jackfruits is not that much accurate, sometimes it misses some specific mentioning about jackfruit. For example, the sac of the pulp of jackfruit also uses to make ‘mezukkupiratti’ (19) and it is mentioned in the Source Text, but the Target Text speaks only about the seed of jack fruit. When every nuance of jackfruit is described, it seems it should have also been mentioned. Not many know and use the sac of the pulp. The using of these things apparently describes the economic status and the plight of the people. The food habits are closely link with culture and its specificities. And there is another example which cannot be translated properly, that is,

Source Text: “എങ്ങുമൊരു

കാട്കുതാള്പലോലമില്ലാത്ത കാലം” (19)

It is translated generally stating that “there was nothing to be plucked or cut, no edible leaves or roots of any kind” (35). Here ‘kaatuthal’ in Source Text means a particular kind of leaves which is not edible usually, but if the hunger and scarcity of food is at the peak, people uses it. It sometimes makes allergy too. But it is an idiom in Malayalam to mention that nothing left to eat, “engumorukaattuthalpolumillathakaalam” (19). The technique adopted by the translator here is modulation. The modulation method is said as the

touchstone method of a good translator. Even in the climax it can be seen:

Source Text: “ഇവിടം വിട്കു

എങ്ങെടോട്കെട്കിലും പഠോയ്ക്കുകുടൈ?”

“എങ്ങെടോട്കാണ് അച്ഛരാ?” (22)

(“can’t you go anywhere else son? “But where, father?”)

Target Text: “Go; go away to where mother earth will take you into her lap. Go away. Surendran stared at the darkening sky. “Where shall I go father?” (37)

The modulation is rather dramatic at the same time impressive. The climax of the Target Text is thus more dramatic than the Source Text which seems adequately mentioning the faded state of Surendran. While keeping the interest to provide good readability, it has to be analyzed whether the Source Text is over translated.

In addition to modulation there are additions and deletion methods are used in the translation of the story. Certain paragraphs are completely deleted from this story which seems make them more dramatic. But it does not change the basic structure of the story too.

In the story “Footprints of the Predator” there are certain deletions and omissions of sentences and paragraphs when it is translated. When the protagonist describes the room in which he has seen the damp dresses, he mentions about the broken chair and some staled oil. The description of the police station seems to create fear and suspicion simultaneously focusing on the deplorable conditions of jails. So the apparently ‘defamiliarization technique’ used by the writer was not properly translated and the description is missing there in the translation.

Source Text: “പഠോളിഞ്ഞ് ഒരു കസരേയില് പഴയ കുറച്ഛണ്ണ്” (106)

It can be translated as “There is some staled oil in a broken chair”. But it is not there in the Target Text.

The conversation between the settlers and Kannan’s father and Chithappan is there in the Source Text but it is not translated in the Target Text. The translation of profane words is the Gordian knot for the translators since the usage of

words varies according to cultures. In Source Text, the settlers are bullying the helpless Adivasis for snatching their land without offering them money. When the Adivasis resist their attempt, the settlers start bullying them. The forbidding voice of them frightens the real owners of the land, and the ones who resist them are allegedly killed by the settlers. It is important to know the readers that the way the Adivasis are treated and how they are marginalized, how far language plays an effective tool to suppress them. But it is absent there in the Target Text.

“ഒന്നു പഠോടാ കാട്കുമാക്കാനെ...ഇതു മലയും

കാടുമഠാക്കെ നിന്നറ തന്തടേ വകയല്ല്.

തരുന്തതും മടേച്ഛു സ്ഥലം വിടാന്

നഠാക്ക്.” (109)

It can be translated as “you scoundrels! What you think of? These hills and forests belong to your father? Go with what you get.”

But these sentences are completely omitted from the Target Text. When the invasion of settlers and their colonial attitude is described in the story it is important to analyze the language of the colonizers. The disdainful and threatening voice they used for frightening them seems to be more political and it sharply distinct the Adivasi as the other. The omission of such important and political sentences happens to alter the meaning of the text too.

The power play of poverty and hunger is inseparable from the deplorable plight of an Adivasi life. They do anything for to cease their hunger and Kannan, the protagonist happens to sell the ganja for the settlers for the same reason. He seems to justify himself telling about the politics of hunger. In the story Kannan says,

“വിശപ്പിന്നറ മമത തീര്റയഠോടു മാര്മല്ല്ലേ?”(110)

It may be translated as: “the only concern of hunger is for food, right?”

It is absent in the Target Text. The ignorance of Adivasi culture and how they are struggled for the survival makes the translator sometimes to omit certain sentences/paragraphs which are closely associated with their life. The above sentence indirectly indicates why they are victimized in the society. The misrepresentations of

an Adivasi include the omission and their marginalization. There is a tendency for the translated text which is published in the hegemonic and elite culture, unconsciously or consciously may marginalize the marginalized again. When the Source Text criticizes the ethics of the officers and their corruption and their deliberate attempt to efface Adivasis without considering him as a human being, it should be translated, because the understanding of the 'other culture/elite culture' by an Adivasi is as imperative as the elite's comprehension about them. The paragraph omitted in the same story indicates the same issue.

Source Text: “വനപാലകരെയും പൊലീസിനെയും ആരും വിശ്വസിക്കില്ല.തൊണ്ടി മുതലോ തളിവോ കാണിച്ഛൂക്കൊടുക്കുന്നവനെ പറ്റിയാകും. അങ്ങനെ കസേ തളിയികാൻ കൊള്ള മുതലില് നല്പ ഷയർ. അതൊക്കെ ഉദ്യോഗസ്ഥ സംസ്കാരം. പണിയും വരുമനുഭവമില്ലാതവനു വിശ്വപിന്നെ സംസ്കാരം.” (110)

It may be translated as:“Nobody trusts forest guards and police. They make somebody the victim who shows the evidence or about Ganja plantations. They will get the lion’s share to be so. It is the ethics of officers. For the people who earn little has the ethics of hunger.”

A translator is faithful only when (s)he translates a Source Text with its all significance. If the omission and deletion of sentences affects the content and ideas of Source Text, it cannot be considered as a good translation. When a marginalized culture is translated to any other elite language, it is important to have awareness and understanding of the culture.

The very title of the story is slightly different from the Source Text. In Source Text, the title is “kaalochakal”. It means the voice of footprints which frightens the listener. In the Source Text, it is not mentioned that whose footprints are there, only by reading the story it is evident that Kannan is afraid of the predator, the Boss. But in

Target Text, the title is modified as “Footprints of the Predator” where the ‘suspense’ is missing.

The story “Birth of a Prophet” starts with the picture of the limping boy who comes back from the school. The image of ‘slate’ which he uses as his umbrella is mentioned in the Source Language. But the image of slate is not there in the Target Text. The picturesque image of the schoolboy gives the impression of his poor back ground in the very first reading itself. The first sentence in Target Text is, “The boy came home in the heavy rain, limping on his left foot.” (53)

In the Source Text, the first line is, “ഇടു കാല് കൊണ്ട് പതുക്കെ പതുക്കെ തൊണ്ടി തൊണ്ടി സ്ലേറ്റ് തലയില് വച്ച് മഴ നനഞ്ഞു വരുന്ന മകനോട് പിതാവിന്റെ ചോദ്യമുണ്ടായി”(92)

It could have been translated as, “The boy came home in the heavy rain, limping on his left foot, with a vain attempt to resist the rain covering his slate over his head”.

The Target Text provides the rhythm of his walking and image is pellucid. He comes very slowly, drenching in rain. The effect of his action is emphasized by the repetition of the words in the Source Text. The translation seems so plain and vague in the very beginning itself. The meaning of the original text can be maintained in the translated text only when the images are translated properly. The readability of the Target Text is important so that the literal translation does not work effectively. Again the ‘original meaning’ is under erasure now.

There is a hinting about the repression of sexuality by the church in the story. The preachers speak about the sins where they mention sex also as a forbidden fruit. It is dubious in the story that whether they preach not to indulge in sex, but Chandranmannan analyses their speech in that way and he speaks to himself about it. But that passage is also omitted in the Target Text.

Source Text: എല്ലാ പുരുഷന്മാരും സ്ത്രീകളോട് കൂടി പാപം ചെയ്തവരാണ്. ആ പാപം ചെയ്യാൻ എന്തൊരു ആഗ്രഹമാണ്!

പാപം ചെയ്തിട്ട് ശർപളം വാങ്ങുന്നവരും കൊടുക്കുന്നവരും. (93)

It may be translated as: "All men commit sin along with the women and they wish to do it again. They commit the sin and give and get the wages of it."

It questions the teaching about sex and sexuality by the church. Even the teachings and preachers are there, they want to commit the same 'sin'. It is very much part of human nature. But the church creates a guilty consciousness in the minds of the people in the matter of sex. The operations of power structures which refine the nature with so called constructed notion called culture are intricate, it changes the human psyche, and this story seems to point out how religion plays its ruse ways to dominate people and the unchallengeable laws and norms of the church automatically deeply enrooted with the society and thus it becomes a practice. The concept of sex and its representation in the Source Text should have been translated.

The challenge and difficulty of the translator comes when the dialect spoken by a particular community is translated. As Narayan has already pointed out, he uses Malayalam as his second language; his mother tongue does not have a written script. But in the story "ThlakkumMulakkumKaram" he uses certain words used by the Arayan community which are absent in Malayalam language itself. The dialects they speak in a particular rhythm and tone are difficult to translate and the 'orality' of their language seems to break the conventions of writing. This is a lacuna in translation, since orality is an unresolved puzzle even now in the realm of cultural translation. The word "ആക്രി" (aakri) means 'I don't know' in Malayalam language. It can be asked in the question and the answer can be the same. The tone determines the meaning.

Source Text: എന്തെന്തിനാക്രി? (62) (Why do they call us?)

ആക്രി (62) (don't know)

But in the Target Text the translator does not give importance to the words they used, it is translated as

Target Text: "what are we going down for?"

"Ask me another" (13)

The context determines the meaning and the more focus of this translation seems to turn to be the readability of the translated text.

Relative Translatability of the minor Literature representing Minor Culture

Any culture, which is a mixture of language, religion and the multiple aspects of society, is to be translated with all its significance according to the favorers of cultural translation. These short stories are the attempt to represent the Dalit Culture in Kerala. The above discussed issues in translation reiterate that culture can be translated only relatively. No culture can be represented in all its significance. Though the postmodern dictum, "all representations are misrepresentations", is often serving as a convenient excuse, sometimes the translations turn to be the site of misrepresentations. As K. M Sherrif points out, "this is a sober realization that ought to caution the translator of an author like Narayan who operates from the margins of an already marginalized culture into a hegemonic language like English". (11)

When an Adivasi himself speaks about the experiences of his community, it is necessary that it has to be translated properly. He is addressing a larger context where his voice seems to be strange, but the translations are faithful, they will speak for themselves. The ignorance of the Adivasi culture and their practices, deliberate indifference to the other culture like Adivasis and the power play in the field of translation itself may be the reasons for misrepresentations. But in the post-colonial context, when the marginalized group realizes their potentiality to speak aloud, through writing, maintaining all socio-political and cultural aspects, cultural translation provides a good platform to be marked and propagate a counter discourse. These selected short stories seem to address the multi-faceted problems of an Adivasi and their positioning in the society, the intrusion of settlers, influence of the religion and the like. Unlike Kafka who deliberately uses minor language as a resistance, Narayan uses the bitter experiences of an Adivasi with simple language. In that sense it represents a minor culture.

The effectiveness of Cultural Translation is again problematic while analyzing these selected

stories. The minute and delicate details are missing in the translation. When a Tribal Literature is translated to English the cultural significance and the readability are equally important. The utterances, anxieties, and the untold fears in the Source Text cannot be effectively translated unless the familiarity with these Cultures is enough to explain what it is. The knowledge of the translators and his/her surroundings also become a crucial factor in Cultural Translation.

WORKS CITED

- Narayan. *Cries in the Wilderness*. Trans. and Ed. K. M. Sherrif. Thrissur: Kerala Sahitya Academy, 2009. Print.
- *Nissahayante Nilavili* . Ed. K. M. Sherrif. Thiruvanthapuram: Chintha Publishers, 2008. Print.
- Basenett S. and A. Lefevere. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 6-14. Print
- Bertens, Hans. *Literary Theory the Basics*. Routledge, London, 2001. 5-11. Print.
- Braziel, Gana Evans. Notes on "What is Minor Literature?" Google Search. Web.
<http://www.umass.edu/complit/achne/janadele.htm>).
- Hunter, Andrian. *The Cambridge Introduction to the Short Story in English*. New York: Cambridge, 2007. 138-141. Print.
- Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing Translation Studies Theories and Applications*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001. Print.
- Sherrif K.M. *Kunjupathumma's Tryst with Destiny*. Calicut: Red Star, 2005. 24-28. Print.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility, a History of Translation*. London: Routledge, 2008. 12- 17. Print.
- Mizani, Samira. *Cultural Translation*. Web. 12 December 2009. translationaldirectory.com.
- Pettersson, Bo . "The Postcolonial Turn in Literary Translation Studies: Theoretical Frameworks Reviewed". My Online Classroom. Web. 27 May 2009.