MODALITIES OF TRANSLATION-IDEOLOGY NEXUS

Critical Analysis of V. G. Kiernan's Translation of Iqbal

Dr. Jamil Asghar Jami

IQBAL ACADEMY PAKISTAN

Publisher

Nazir Ahmad
Director
Iqbal Academy Pakistan
Government of Pakistan
National History and Literary Heritage Division
6th Floor, Aiwan-i-Iqbal Complex,
Egerton Road, Lahore.
Tel: 92-42-36314510, 99203573,
Fax: 92-42-36314496
Email: info@iap.gov.pk
Website: www.allamaiqbal.com

ISBN : 978-969-416-547-9

1st Edition	:	2019
Quantity	:	500
Price	:	Rs.500/-
Printed at	:	Mian Alijan Printers, Lahore

Sales Office:116-McLeod Road, Lahore. Ph.37357214

Dedicated to:
To my father whose loving memory
is one of the constants of my life.

Contents

FOREWORD

"Traduttoretraditore" – A translator is a traitor
(Italian Proverb)

Dr Jamil Asghar Jami's substantial and insightful critical study, *Modalities of Translation-Ideology Nexus: A Critical Analysis of V. G. Kiernan's Translation of Iqbal* stands out as a highly welcome contribution to both Iqbal and Translation Studies.

Having reviewed a spate of English translations of the Quran, particularly by the Orientalists, the ilk to which V. G. Kiernan too belongs, I appreciate and endorse all the more Dr Jami's painstakingly massive and perceptive study. For, it presses home the unpalatable truth that ideological presuppositions on the part of a translator amount to wreaking havoc upon the source text and denying readers their right to learn what the text says.

The regrettable history of English translations of the Quran by the Orientalists, from 1649 to our times, has been disfigured by willful distortion of the meaning and message of the Quran. Far from stating what the Quran is and what it tells man, their versions poison the minds of the unsuspecting readers, who do not have access to the Quran in original Arabic, with the following outrageous, bizarre notions that the Quran

- is merely a product of Prophet Muhammad's (peace be upon him) mind,
- is a poor, rather grotesque replica of the Bible drawing heavily, though without any

acknowledgment, upon the Judaeo-Christian religious tradition,

- is bereft of any logical order in its presentation and largely incomprehensible in its contents,
- incites violence and bloodshed against all those outside the fold of Islam, and
- represents, at best, a Christian heresy.

Readers are bound to develop these misperceptions on reading any of these Orientalist translations which are highly popular in the West:

- Alexander Ross, TheAlcoran of Mahomet (1649).
- George Sale,The Koran (1734)
- J. M. Rodwell, The Koran, the Surahs Arranged in Chronological Order with Notes (1861).
- E. H. Palmer, The Quran (1880)
- Richard Bell, The Quran, Translated with a Critical Rearrangement of the Surahs(1937-1939).
- N. J. Dawood, The Koran (1956).
- Alan Jones, The Quran (2007)
- A. J. Droge, The Quran: A New Annotated Translation (2014).

This brief account of the polemical thrust of these translations reinforces the main thesis of Dr Jami in the present book i.e. how an ideology-propelled translation cheats and misdirects readers. The numerous examples, so diligently culled by him from Kiernan's rendering, illustrate how the translator has superimposed his own dogma upon the text. It is not simply an instance of not being true to the source text. As cogently adduced by Dr Jami, Kiernan is guilty on many counts of giving a diametrically opposite ideological twist and thrust to Iqbal's message. As a result, Iqbal's quintessential Islamic ethos and symbolism, to which he was unflinchingly wedded, appear in Kiernan's domesticated terms, which bear no relation to the original. Apart from the Christianization of Iqbal's message, Kiernan has faltered also in the

misrepresentation of the form of Iqbal's poetry. It is indeed gratifying that Dr Jami has stoutly substantiated all the instances of Kiernan's failure to present faithfully Iqbal's contents, owing mainly to his ideological presuppositions and cultural blindness, which borders on xenophobia or the colonial trait of usurpation.

Other translators of Iqbal's poetry have not been successful either in fathoming the depth of his poetic universe which is premised solidly on the Islamic/Quranic *weltanschauung*. Take the Indian translator, Khushwant Singh as illustrative. It must be, nonetheless, clarified at once that unlike Kiernan, he is not tethered to the colonialist agenda. Rather, by dint of his familiarity with Urdu and Persian poetic corpus and his dabbling in Sufism, Singh at times, displays some empathy for Iqbal's egalitarian ideals. Yet in his translation of Iqbal's widely acclaimed "Shikwah" and "Jawab-i Shikwah" he, occasionally, betrays his inability to capture Iqbal's intent, for example, in confounding the characteristic Islamic posture of prostration with "kissing the earth" and "*millat/ummat*" with mere "following", rather than a community.

Divided neatly into 10 chapters, Dr Jami's work delves deep into the intricacies of both the art and craft of translation. His grounding in the translation theory is impressive. More importantly, he has drawn discerningly upon this body of knowledge in his critique on Kiernan's translation, particularly his fault lines.

Dr Jami's book is a pioneering work in assessing a popular translator with reference to his ideological presuppositions and the resultant distortion in his translation of Iqbal. I am sure this study will inspire some bright students of Iqbal to evaluate R. A. Nicholson's, A. J. Arberry's and Annemarie Schimmel's renderings of Iqbal's works.

Dr Jami deserves every credit for this sterling scholarly contribution which will enlighten students of Iqbal studies,

Urdu literature, cultural studies, and translation studies.

Professor Abdur Raheem Kidwai
Professor of English
Director
UGC Human Resource Development Centre
Aligarh Muslim University
Honorary Visiting Fellow/Professor (2006-2016)
School of English
University of Leicester
UK

PREFACE

Let it be said at the outset that this book is primarily for the researchers and academicians who are interested to know the intricate power play and subtle workings of translation and its immense potential to re-create the source text in its own image. Located in the Foucauldian perspective, the book mildly subscribes to the idea that there is no such thing as apolitical scholarship and under the impact of a ubiquitous post-modernity, our knowledge has become disjointed, catastrophic and complicitous with the larger power structures and subversive praxis. Therefore, in our age where all kinds of texts are mired into politics, one daunting challenge for us is to get used to knowledge in such a way that it can interrupt old patterns and hone our sensitivity to differences and strengthen our capacity to tolerate the incommensurables.

Against this backdrop, I have explored the elements of ideology-translation nexus and domestication in V. G. Kiernan's translation of Iqbal into English. Domestication is a translation strategy which plays down, or in extreme cases obliterates, the linguistic and cultural distinctiveness of a source text. At times, it tends to *re-write* the source text in line with the dominant poetics of the target text. I have also examined the nature of this domestication and its effects on the overall scheme of translation.

As regards the theoretical and methodological framework, I have employed Lawrence Venuti's model of *foreignization* and *domestication* which contends that, rather than being a liability, it is one of the greatest assets of a translation

to appear *unfamiliar* and *foreign* since that is the only way to register and negotiate the linguistic and cultural distinctiveness of the source text. Besides, as per this model, I have conceptualized translation in a broader perspective as a site of ideological conflict for power and discursive supremacy constantly animated by multiple cultural and social factors/variables.

We are living in troubled times when the question of intercultural dialogue and negotiation has assumed unprecedented proportions. The world in which we are living, individual nation-states are increasingly embroiled in socioeconomic and information networks. The competing national and linguistic identities are compounding the inter/trans-cultural relations. Of late, the global reach of the sociopolitical institutions and technological gadgets has just added to the value and relevance of translation.

Today, we are confronted with rapid and radical changes all around us and the modern technologies are just precipitating this process of social and cultural transformations. In transnational relations and inter-dependent economic, commercial and strategic affairs, translation is operating at every level (Berman & Wood, 2005). Indeed in a turbulent and increasingly polarized world, the role of translation is so fundamental that IlanStravans rightly said, "Modernity…is not lived through nationality but through translationality (quoted in Sokol, 2002, p. 138). Globalization with all its violent discontents coupled with rampant terrorism and protracted wars, calls for a much more nuanced and intimate understanding of all the cultural others.

In the development of such self-critical understanding, translation plays essentially a crucial, if often unappreciated, role (Berman & Wood, 2005). By negotiating meanings, translation has the potential to create a meditational zone of intercultural conciliation which is of key importance in a global and transnational world. Without such meditational zones, different peoples are likely to remain partitioned in

their own cultural cocoons. Such distancing among different cultures will cause misunderstandings at best and ethnic cleansings at worst. The only antidote to these problems is a deeper and broader understanding of other peoples and nations.

However, translation has the immense potential to do more harm than good if it domesticates the source text by submerging all its cultural and linguistic identities. In our times, this recognition was achieved mostly ably and subtly by Lawrence Venuti (1992, 1995 & 1998). Venuti is right in cautioning the translators that domesticated translations will only create what he varyingly calls "Eurocentrism", "ethnocentrism", "narcissism", "isolationism", etc. Viewing from this perspective, domesticated translations are very likely to be partial, partisan and dismissive of the source text. As a result, the entire business of translation is imprudently reduced to an act of making selections (inclusions as well as exclusions), and the representations of the source text happen to be little more than a sum total of all these selections. It is this partiality of perspective associated with domesticated translations which is, therefore,destined to play a complicitous role in the politics of power, hegemony and discursive control. This, in turn, leads to a perpetuation of the dominant power structures in the society (Tymoczko, 2010).

Lastly, and admittedly, Kiernan's translation of Iqbal is beautiful, moving, mesmerizing and well-esteemed. Assuredly, it has its share of prosaic patches and at times one can feel him plodding through his text. But then, so what? As regards the beauty of translation, we have to remember that there is nothing which does not come at some cost, let alone a thing of beauty which purportedly is a joy forever. And as regards, its prosaic and plodding patches, it has to be understood that every act of translation, in Friedrich Schleiermacher's words, is a *Trial of the Foreign* which inevitably results in the deformation of translation. Let us proceed.

INTRODUCTION

Sir Muhammad Iqbal (1877-1938), a celebrated Muslim philosopher, poet, and political leader, born in Siālkot, India (now Pakistan), has variously been translated into English by different translators of note. Among them, Victor Gordon Kiernan's translation of Iqbal (*Poems from Iqbal,* first published 1955) enjoys a unique and prestigious status. Kiernan (1913 - 2009) was a British writer, Marxist historian, translator and a noted scholar of imperialism.

Since its publication, Kiernan's translation has been received with great acclaim and the translator has rightly been eulogized for his literary merits and aesthetic prowess. However, there has been an acute dearth of criticality which could help evaluate this translation (or, for that matter, any English translation of Iqbal) from the ideology-translation nexus perspective. A large number of allusions, tropes, idioms and metaphors used by Kiernan have led in varying degrees to domesticate the source text in a way where ideological considerations can clearly been seen taking over the linguistic considerations.

While translating Iqbal, Kiernan at times appears to have applied what David Katan has termed as "cultural filter" whose clear aim is to communicate the meanings to the reader from the standpoint of target culture canons and precepts (2004, p. 78). Coincidently, the Urdu language happens to be a subordinate partner in the cultural power relationship with English. Stark power differentials between these two languages are a historical and social fact. In fact, the status and the character of Urdu and English differ so widely that they are entirely two different and distinct languages

unlike Spanish and Portuguese or, for that matter, Italian and French which are sister/cognate languages (Campbell, 2004).

Urdu happens to be one of those languages which have not been very frequently translated into English and within the Anglophonic translation discourses its position is still quite marginal. Since the World War II, the languages most often translated into English were mainly the European ones such as French, Italian, Russian, German, Spanish, etc. (Baker, 1998). The renowned translation scholar André Lefevere justifiably observes that the European and non-European cultural and literary traditions are so different that the translators dealing with these traditions, of necessity, have to engage in a process of far-reaching cultural mapping.

During the course of translating the non-European languages into the European ones, the former have routinely been conceived, constructed and situated within the European cultural categories (Lefevere, 1992). To a considerable extent it is true of Kiernan's translation of Iqbal also as the translator has negotiated the meanings and proposed the equivalents within the categories borrowed from the European (more specifically Anglophone) thought and culture.

Translation—A Translucent Curtain

Translations are often problematic for those who consume them because they have little or no access to the meaning of original texts.If we take translation as a text that stands for another text, then translation, in effect, is meant for those who have little or no access to the meaning in the original text. The practice of translation is intricate and is usually defined with relation to target language culture rather than source language culture. Moreover, in the process of translation, cultural and linguistic norms of the source text are steadily redefined, re-presented and, at times obliterated — in short, domesticated. The issues of power and appropriation come into play very actively as translations are not between

two texts but rather between two cultures and two worldviews.

This cross-cultural negotiation of meaning is also determined by the amount of relative prestige which a source and a target cultures enjoy. Thus, the bilateral relations between the two cultures/languages also have a direct bearing on the practice of translation. Hence translation is not merely between two set of words; rather, it is between two set of *worlds* which, more often than not, are very distinct from each other.

Most of the existing research on Iqbal's translation into English comprises the literary and aesthetic analyses and comparisons. There is, however, an acute scarcity of research on such specific issues as domestication and the Eurocentric appropriation of the source text mostly done by the European translators. These translators, including Kiernan, have in varying degrees adapted the source text to the poetics and politics of the target text in order to make it more acceptable 'at home'. For this reason, these translations continue to enjoy uncritical acceptance in the Anglophone world as well as among the indigenous readership and have not been sufficiently problematized and deconstructed.

Arguably, the fact that Kieran's translation has received such great acclamation and uncritical acceptance is the sign of the general level of insensitivity toward the power politics of translation and its complicity with the dominant discourses. Therefore, here I am interested in deconstructing the translation by employing Lawrence Venuti's model of domestication and foreignization. I have assiduously pointed out minor deviations, lines of tension, imprecisions as well as outright distortions.

Reach and Limit

Although I have dealt intensively with the question of domestication of Iqbal's poetry by Kiernan, there are several

theoretical and methodological issues which delimit the present book in more than one way. All of these issues define the scope of this book and delimit the application of its findings. The following three considerations must be kept in mind as the central delimitations of the present study:

- The study deals with Urdu poems of Iqbal and their translations by Kiernan. More specifically, I have limited myself to those poems/extracts/verses which bear directly on such issues as otherness, appropriation, domestication, power, hegemony, manipulation, etc. Coincidently, these are the poems in which such themes have been foregrounded by Iqbal as:imperialism, liberty, nationalism, Pan-Islamism, resistance, spirituality, culture, identity, theology, etc.That constitutes the actual sample for the present inquiry. Besides this, no attempt has been made to include the Persian poetry of Iqbal for the simple reason that the number of Persian poems translated by Kiernan is too small to enable us to draw viable generalizations (just eight out of a total number of one hundred and eighteen). However, a similar analysis of the English translation of Iqbal's Persian poetry is definitely a distinct topic of study in its own right.
- It must also be made clear at the outset that domestication of a translation does not affect its aesthetic appeal or merit in any real sense. My claim that Kiernan's translation is a domesticated one does not subtract from the aesthetic or literary import of the translation. In fact, the purely aesthetic and literary features of Kiernan's translation remain outside the purview of this book as such. A translation may be incredibly aesthetic, yet domesticated to its core (Venuti, 2013). Similarly, the fact that Kiernan's translation is immensely popular also does not invalidate the central premise of the book since to be popular is not a proof that a translation has done real justice to the source text also.

- The fact that the study deals with a translator who belongs to the Anglophone literary tradition should not lead to the conclusion that all the Anglophone translators of Iqbal produced domesticated translations. In addition, there is a sizable collection of translations done by the Pakistani, Indian and Persian translators also which must be taken in a completely different light and with an entirely different set of epistemological and methodological assumptions (Ghani, 2004). Furthermore, the fact that Kiernan's translation is domesticated does not necessarily imply that he did it on purpose or anything of that sort. Rather, one of the most intriguing features of domestication is that it can imperceptibly permeate translation of which a translator may well remain unaware on account of a 'pious ignorance'.

The Challenge of Translating Iqbal's Poetics

The literary and historico-cultural significance of Iqbal's poetry is immeasurable both quantitatively as well as qualitatively. For a vast majority of Urdu speaking people, Iqbal typifies the inner core of the Muslim identity as he is hailed as the ideological founder of Pakistan and the Poet of the East. Quantitatively he is among the most widely read, debated, circulated and translated of the Urdu poets; and qualitatively, he symbolizes the epitome of literary excellence and lyricism. Within Urdu and Persian literary traditions, he has been consensually given the honorific of *Allama* (Urdu: علامہ) which means "extraordinarily learned".

There have been a large number of people who translated Iqbal into English but immediately we are just concerned with the British translators. The prominent British translators of Iqbal include such prolific and eminent Orientalists as R. A. Nicholson (1868-1945), Arthur John Arberry (1905-1969) and Victor Gordon Kiernan (1913-2009). These much esteemed writers, in fact, belong to the classic tradition of British Orientalist scholarship whose

intellectual authority has largely been revered. Nevertheless, these translators produced such translations which, in one way or another, suffer from the problem of domestication and, at times, outright inaccuracies. The notable Pakistani scholar of Iqbal and the Professor of Islamic Studies at Youngstown State University, Mustansir Mir (1949-) is of the view that most of Iqbal's translations into English "frequently raise the questions of accuracy and quality" (Mir, 2006, p. 151).

Here is a cursory discussion of some of the instances of domestication and inaccuracies found in Nicholson's and Arberry's translations of Iqbal. A mild but academic indictment of these translators can be framed as follows: although their translations are widely acclaimed and they carry great literary import as well, yet for a more intimate and genuine study of their subject they substituted a kind of elaborate discourse which was readily accessible to them in the intellectual archives of their imperial culture. Their universe of discourse was largely formed by such prominent figures as Sir William Muir (1819-1905), Anthony Ashley Bevan (1859-1933) and Charles James Lyall (1845- 1920) who directly followed in the line of descent from people like Sir Edward William Lane (1801-1876) and Giovanni Battista Belzoni (1778-1823). Their scholarly precepts were supplied primarily by such apologists for imperialism as Rudyard Kipling and Baden-Powell who had sung so excitingly of holding "dominion over palm and pine" (see Said, 1978, pp. 224-225).

Moreover, these translators, although extremely well-versed and erudite in the field of their "specialization", lacked the empathy which is the only means to transcend spatial and cultural barriers in order to gain an informed perspective on Iqbal's poetics. They went about their business with strong maxims, abstractions and 'truths' about the Orient based upon the mythology of a mysterious and inscrutable East. This is what Kiernan himself has termed as "Europe's

collective day-dream of the Orient" (Said, 1978, p. 53).

Let us take into account some of the domesticating instances in Nicholson's and Arberry's translations. Nicholson translated Iqbal's book *Asrar-e-Khudi* as *The Secret of the Self* in 1915. This was Iqbal's first introduction to the West. Iqbal gave his critical response to this translation and did not feel wholly satisfied with it and recommended revisions here and there. Some of the corrections recommended by Iqbal were abidingly incorporated while some others were rejected by Nicholson. What is more, on occasion, Nicholson tried to 'improve upon' the recommendations made by Iqbal (Ghani, 2004). For instance, look at the following verse (Lines: 363-364):

خیزد، انگیزد، پرد، تابد، رمد

سوز، افروزد، کُشد، میرد، دمد

> The Self rises, kindles, falls, glows, breathes; Burns, shines, walks and flies. (Nicholson, 1920, p. 19)

The problematic nature of this translation can easily be seen. There is nothing in the source text which could mean "falls", "walks", or "breathes". Nicholson has incorrectly translated the verb "**رمد**"as "breathes". This is a wrong lexical move which is clearly redundant and, therefore, constitutes an instance of unwarranted inclusion. At the same time, we have two interesting examples of unwarranted exclusion also. For examples, two verbs present in the original "**کشد**" (kills), and "**دمد**" (grows), have been left out by the translator (Ghani, 2004). Let us look at another extremely interesting example of domestication (Line 372):

با غلام خویش بر یک خواں نشست

> He sat with his slave at one table (Nicholson, 1920, p. 25).

In this line, Iqbal is talking about the essential

egalitarianism introduced by the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) as he demolished all the distinctions of high and low and never hesitated to sit with his servants or to share his meal with them. Anyone slightly familiar with the Arab dining customs knows all too well that the Arabs up till this day prefer to sit on a mat spread on the ground.

Moreover, within the classical Islamic tradition it is a well-documented fact that the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) never sat atthe table for eating his meals. In fact, sitting on a mat for eating meals is part of the Semitic, Middle-Eastern tradition and the use of dining tables and chairs is a much later phenomenon. Nonetheless, Nicholson's use of the word "table" makes his translation well correspondedto the British cuisine and the dining etiquette of the 20th century. This is a clear example of disregarding the cultural specificities associated with the source text and subjugating it to the dominant canons of the target language culture.

It is because of these inclusions, exclusions and departures from the original text that at times Nicholson's translation also appears domesticating. However, this is not a place to pursue this subject to any greater lengths. Such instances of inclusions and exclusions can be found in the translations of the following lines of *Asrar-e-Khudi*: 17, 26, 33, 57, 60, 66, 95, 96, 102, 113, 125,126, 170, 217, 218, 335, 700 and 885 (Ghani, 2004).

It is also pertinent to conclude that Nicholson's translation, much to Venuti's chagrin, is remarkably *fluent* and *transparent*. Its fluency and transparency is so naturalized that it does not look like a translation and the 'alienating' and 'de-familiarizing' experiment which a translator, in Venuti's words, should ideally enact is totally absent. One clear aim of all the lexical and syntactic choices made by the translator is certainly to smooth out some of the cultural peculiarities of the source text which may dishevel the reading fluency and thereby pose a challenge to readers' easy comprehension.

Having dealt with these specific cases of domestication, now I will discuss one conceptual problem related to Nicholson's misidentification of Iqbal's thought. Nicholson, while translating Iqbal, was driven by a very deformed understanding of the concept of the Self (*خودی*)—the central theme of *The Secrets of the Self*. He miserably failed to understand the poet's notion of the Self and put it in a highly contorted form. Nicholson, presented Iqbal as a religious enthusiast, inspired by the vision of a New Mecca, a world-wide, theocratic, Utopian state in which all Moslems, no longer divided by the barriers of race and country, shall be one…It must be observed that when he speaks of religion he always means Islam. Non-Muslims are simply unbelievers, and (in theory, at any rate) the Jihad is justifiable, provided that it is waged "for God's sake alone". (SeeVahid, 1964, p. 93)

Nicholson's unfounded and highly erroneous view created a great deal of misunderstanding regarding Iqbal in the British intellectual circles. Even a reasonably well-meaning figure like E. M. Forster was deluded into saying, after coming across this view of Nicholson, that "the significance of Iqbal is not that he holds [Nietzsche's doctrine] but that he manages to connect it with the Koran" (quoted in Hassan, 1977, p. 98). Now this is hardly what Iqbal saw himself doing and is profoundly at variance with his philosophical and religious persuasions. Iqbal protested vehemently in his letter dated 24 January 1921 to Nicholson at this mischaracterization of his thought by Forster:

Nor does he rightly understand my idea of the Perfect Man which he confounds with the German thinker's Super-man. I wrote on the Sufi doctrine of the Perfect Man more than twenty years ago, long before I had read or heard anything of Nietzsche...The English reader ought to approach this idea, not through the German thinker, but through an English thinker of great merit – I mean Alexander – whose Gifford Lectures delivered at Glasgow were published last

year. (Iqbal, 1978, pp. 141-42)

The foremost reason for such a grossly flawed understanding of Iqbal's poetic philosophy is an outright domestication of his philosophical thought. Iqbal never saw himself founding a "New Mecca"; rather, he exhorted the Muslims to go back to the same old Makkah. Look at the following line in which he clearly makes this exhortation:

بھٹکے ہوئے آہُو کو پھر سوئے حرم لے چل

[Oh, God!] Once again guide the strayed impala [Muslim Ummah] toward the Haram! (My translation)

Similarly, Iqbal was never an advocate of any theocratic or Utopian state. His political philosophy was thoroughly realistic and in tune with the central premises of Islam. Iqbal never envisaged Islamic state as a theocracy in the Western sense of the word. Here are his words:

The essence of *Tauhid*, as a working idea, is equality, solidarity, and freedom. The state, from the Islamic standpoint, is an endeavour to transform these ideal principles into space-time forces, an aspiration to realize them in a definite human organization. It is in this sense alone that the state in Islam is a theocracy, not in the sense that it is headed by a representative of God on earth who can always screen his despotic will behind his supposed infallibility. The critics of Islam have lost sight of this important consideration. (Iqbal, 2000, p. 67)

Besides, Forster's characterizing of Iqbal's *Mard-e-Momin* (I will translate it as the *Noble Master*) as Nietzsche's power-driven and godless Superman (*Übermensch*) is a clear example of the domestic as well as the domesticated representations of the foreign. Making sense of Iqbal by drawing parallels with Nietzsche is a very superficial understanding of the poet and the one which subjugates the actualities of the source text to the dominant structures of the target culture. In spite of clear protestations from Iqbal, Nicholson's mischaracterization of

his thought is an evidence of the deep-rootedness of domestication in Anglophone translation tradition.

Equally fluent and prosodically more artistic than Nicholson's is Arberry's translation of Muhammad Iqbal. Arberry was one of the most widely respected British Orientalists and a prolific scholar of Islamic studies and mysticism. It is also to his credit that he introduced Rumi to the English speaking world through his selective translations, *Mystical Poems of Rumi* (2009). With reference to his translation of Iqbal, Arberry declared to remain as faithful to the source text as possible and it can be seen too that he achieved considerable success in his goal. Arguably, his is the least domesticated translation of Iqbal when juxtaposed with Nicholson's and Kiernan's.

There are, however, numerous examples of domestication present in his translation. His translation of *Shikwa*and*Jawab-e-Shikwa* ("The Complaint" and "The Answer") published in 1955, is a case in point. Perhaps the most interesting and surprising aspect of all this is that Arberry did not know Urdu as it is evidenced from his *Preface* (Arberry, 1955). In order to overcome this critical shortcoming, he was graciously provided with a literal rendering on which he based his translation. Therefore, this very indirectness of his translation made it at times inevitably prone to domestication. Here are just a few instances:

تیرے دیوانے بھی ہیں منتظرِ ھُو بیٹھے

> Dream, Thy lovers, of Thy coming, and the cry of "He the King". (Arberry, 1995, p. 18)

In this translation, what the translator fails to appreciate is the word "ھُو" which does not here refer to God or Providence. Nor are the "lovers" eagerly announcing the Kingdom of God. Rather, what is being longed for by the lovers is the consoling voice which emanates from God and not from humans. Now look at another distortion:

قیس زحمت کشِ تنہائی صحرا نہ رہے

Qais, if so he pleases, may endure the desert's solitude. (Arberry, 1995, p. 37)

This is a clear case of mistranslation—an obvious distortion of the source text. The original line makes a negative statement about the well-known Arab lover Qais; whereas Arberry's translation is making a positive statement. This shift completely inverts the concept. In fact, Iqbal bemoans the tragic fact that the modern-day Qais (i.e. the Muslims who ardently claim to be God's lover) are no longer ready to endure the solitude of desert for the sake of their Beloved (Allah). But this is precisely which is not shown in the translation at all. Look at yet another example:

آسماں چیر گیا نالۂ بیباک مرا

That the very walls of heaven fell down before its wild lament. (Arberry, 1995, p. 42)

In fact what Iqbal is talking about is the piercing of the sky, whereas the falling down of the walls of heaven is an unwarranted inclusion and altogether alien to the tenor of the source text. We are left with only two possible inferences and both of them are problematic: either it is an outright inclusion just to keep the prosodic balance, or it is an imposition of the Anglo-American canon on the foreign text. In both the cases, the result is the domestication of the source text.

Now, something about the difficulty of translating Iqbal. There are various factors which contribute to this difficulty which are at once linguistic, literary, and cultural. The renowned literary critic and author Mustnsir Mir has elucidated the complexity and diversity which characterizes Iqbal's poetry:

A reader of Iqbal's poetry is struck by its sheer thematic variety. Iqbal was deeply interested in the issues that have exercised the best minds of the human race—the issues of

the meaning of life, change and constancy, freedom and determinism, survival and progress, the relation between the body and the soul, the conflict between reason and emotion, evil and suffering, the position and role of human beings in the universe—and in his poetry he deals with these and other issues. He had also read widely in history, philosophy, literature, mysticism, and politics, and, again, his catholic interests are reflected in his poetry. (2000, p. 13)

Sayyid Abdul Vahid, one of the most prominent Pakistani scholars of Iqbal, also describes the difficulties of translating Iqbal. To Vahid, Iqbal's poetry has an overwhelming sense of inventiveness and the chief reason for this is that Iqbal employs words, expressions and phrases in an utterly unconventional sense. A considerable number of these words and expressions are ingeniously endowed with new meanings by him.

At times, the sense attached to a word by Iqbal happens to be so radically counterintuitive that it baffles even those who are well versed in Urdu. To Vahid, Iqbal is also one of the great phrase-makers of Urdu literature who has been endowed by a rare felicity of expression by which his poetic discourse achieves meanings beyond the ones assigned by the lexicon. These words and expressions function like the "keystone for the entire arch of the poetic inspiration". Vahid illustrates Iqbal's knack of expression:

As the removal of the keystone is sure to cause the downfall of the entire arch, so if we try to substitute something else for the master word or phrase, the whole artistic expression is marred… The use of those words and phrases gives to Iqbal's poetry not only a sense of newness found in very few Urdu and Persian poets, but also the quality of surprise which "characterizes all great poetry. (Vahid, 1964, p. 17)

Iqbal's inventive genius gave new dimensions to such age-old literary allusions as love, time, selfhood, freedom, art, etc. Take just one example — Iqbal's conceptualization of

love. To Iqbal, love is an ecstatic and dynamic passion which awakens what is divine in the humans. Iqbal defies the conformist notions of love which take it in a quietist and passive sense. Instead, Iqbal takes love as "the source of the highest inspiration for true knowledge and effective, righteous action" (De Bary, 1958, p. 754). Love is a spring of vitality which can enable a devout Muslim to achieve such noble goals as spiritual redemption, moral integrity, and individual freedom. It is the alpha and omega of the human existence and has the miraculous power to awaken the hidden talents. This is how Iqbal describes the full immensity of the role played by love in the world:

> The luminous point whose name is the Self
> Is the life-spark beneath our dust.
> By love it is made more lasting,
> More living, more burning, more glowing.
> From love proceeds the radiance of its being
> And the development of its unknown possibilities.
> Its nature gathers fire from love,
> Love instructs it to illumine the world.
> Love fears neither sword nor dagger,
> Love is not born of water and air and earth.
> Love makes peace and war in the world,
> Love is the fountain of life,
> Love is the flashing sword of death.
> The hardest rocks are shivered by Love's glance:
> Love of God at last becomes wholly God.
> (Iqbal, 1915, pp. 28-229)

This kind of conceptual and philosophical uniqueness surrounds all the major themes in Iqbal's poetry. It is this uniquely situated cultural and literary position of Iqbal which proves to be a daunting challenge for all those who set out to translate him. The famous translation scholar Eugene Nida illustrates this problem when he says that for a truly successful translation, it is biculturalism which is more important than bilingualism (Nida, 2002). Another translation scholar Christiane Nord makes the same point when he says

that the cultural chasm between the two given languages has always been a hard nut for translators to crack. It is with this conceptualization in mind that he opines: "...translating means comparing cultures" (Nord, 2001, p. 34). Moreover, it seems to be this biculturalism or the cultural chasm which is largely responsible for a great of deal of domestication of Iqbal by his English translators.

Conclusion

Translations are problematic for those who consume them because they have little or no access to the meaning of original texts.Most of the research on Iqbal's translations largely comprises the literary and aesthetic analyses/comparisons. There is, however, an acute scarcity of research on such specific issues as domestication and the Eurocentric appropriation of the source text. These translators, including Kiernan, have in varying degrees adapted the source text to the poetics and politics of the target text. Kiernan's translation of Iqbal has received much praise but little critical assessment. Coincidently, Urdu happens to be a subordinate partner in the cultural power relationship with English and the European and non-European literary traditions are so different that the translators, of necessity, have to engage in a process of large-scale cultural mapping — Nicholson's and Arberry's translation are two more cases in point. Lastly, Iqbal's poetic discourse poses some unique challenges to translators, given its inventiveness, unconventional semantics, thematic diversity, etc.

IDEOLOGY AND TRANSLATION—THE NEXUS

Kiernan's translation of Iqbal is indeed artistic, beautiful, aesthetic and authoritative. It has its share of admirers, lovers and chanters. The passion and commitment with which he approached Iqbal's poetry is rare and laudable. We are also grateful to him for making a concerted effort to render Iqbal into English and, thereby providing him with greater global readership. But the aesthetics and literary merits of his translation are not my concern. Instead, this study seeks to problematize a traditional and facile understanding of translation and aims at illustrating the immensity of its political and ideological intricacies.

Historically, the idea of translation coupled with the mystique to know *the foreign* has always fascinated the theorists and scholars of language. From this historical perspective, it can be affirmed that, at the broadest level, all human communication is centered upon the very notion of translation. Primarily translation aims at actuating some inter-lingual communicative patterns along with effecting some intercultural dialogic engagements. However, in these intercultural and inter-lingual engagements, the complex notions of politics, manipulation, control and dominance inevitably emerge and complicate the relations between the source text (the original text that is to be translated into another language) and the target text (the finished product of a translated text). Furthermore, the inherently subjective and culture-sensitive character of language adds to the complexity of the power politics so closely associated with translation.

Therefore the ubiquitous risk of miscommunication in translation ranges from the unintentional semantic misidentifications to a systematic and intentional propaganda (Crumbley, 2008). The "mist and veil of words," as the Irish philosopher George Berkeley put it, is still a frequently debated issue in the discipline of translation studies (see Daniel, 2007, p. 145).

However, George Berkeley is not alone in doubting the capability of language tocommunicate. A large number of philosophers and translation theorists harbor a considerable distrust of language and have been questioning its authenticity as a "clear windowpane" which could reveal facts with objectivity and total neutrality (Baker, 2006, p. 98) We have novelists like George Orwell who disputed our linguistic capacity to communicate and, at the same time, we have iconoclasts like Friedrich Nietzsche who terms language utterly incapable of objective description because of its thoroughly metonymic nature (Emden, 2005).

Notwithstanding this distrust expressed by philosophers, semanticists and scholars, translation has been playing an extremely significant role all through human history whenever there has been a conjunction of cultures and/or languages. Nevertheless, it is also true that for a considerable part of history, the act of translation has been viewed as subversive, controversial and perilous — an act of betrayal necessitating suspicion, distrust and even executions:

There is an Italian proverb that says, "Translators are traitors" (*Traddutore, traditore*), and it's true. All translation loses meaning. All translators are traitors to the actual meaning. There is no such thing as a noninterpretive translation. Anyone who says otherwise probably has limited exposure to translation theory and it may not be worth discussing the point with them. (Mounce, 2003, p. 73)

Some of the translation theorists attribute this distrust of translation to the fact that, by and large, the act of

translation amounts to a *rewriting* of the source text. The dominant socio-political institutions play a major role in these acts of rewriting accomplished in the name of translation. This rewriting emerges after an elaborate process. The discourses based upon such themes as racism, gender inequality, minority rights and unipolarismbecome a mouthpiece for entire social institutions. These institutions, by virtue of their power, exercise huge influence and as a result of this influence ideologies emerge. These ideologies in turn shape the visions of *reality* in their own images. Once sufficiently shaped, these visions of reality guide the trajectories of the translation practices (Hatim&Munday, 2004, p. 93).

An act of *rewriting* operates on the politics of inclusions/exclusions as well. Which readers/writers, systems of values and sets of beliefs are to be privileged and which ones are to be deprived? This is a fundamental question and plays a critical role in the politics of inclusions/exclusions. It is also interesting to note that how a large of body of foreign literatures translated into English mostly tend to look *similar*. This can largely be accounted for by appreciating the tendency of the target text to enforce its own constraints on the source text during the process of translation. However, in the context of the power politics of translation, this implies some sort of inclusions/exclusions somewhere—either denying a certain constituency of readers the access to a certain text or forcing them to read it in a particular way. It also implies somewhere "an author committed to oblivion or a translator doomed to be invisible" (Hatim&Munday, 2004, p. 94).

The Anglo-American translation tradition is particularly noted for its tendency to practice these exclusions/inclusions. This is usually done through selectively adopting such apparently apolitical and innocent-sounding strategies as *gisting*, *free translation*, *compensation*, *heavy glossing*, or *ennoblement*. At the same time, the so-called translation *norms* also come into play and effectively transform translation into an

ideological weapon with power to exclude/mute a writer by engaging in such seemingly innocuous techniques as normalization, clarification or rationalization. This is usually done to achieve such edifying goals as 'bringing fluency' and 'preventing boredom'. Eventually, the translators themselves fall prey to the same politics of exclusions by the hard-nosed editors and money-minded publishers.

All this elaborately structured politics of exclusions/ inclusions paves the way to what we have just discussed as the rewriting of the source text. The notable French translation scholar André Lefevere aptly describes the damaging and culturally alienating effects of this practice of rewriting not only on literature but also on society:

Translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and in its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society…But rewriting can also repress innovation, distort and contain, and in an age of ever increasing manipulation of all kinds, the study of the manipulative processes of literature as exemplified by translation can help us towards a greater awareness of the world in which we live. (Lefevere, 1992, p. 67)

Obviously when translation becomes a rewriting, it is bound to depart from the cultural and linguistic specificities of the source texts. All rewritings, regardless of their motives, have firm ideological underpinnings. To Lefevere, ideology is one of the "very concrete factors" which steadily governs the course of translation and eventually helps it turn into a rewriting (1992, p. 2).

The 20th Century Indictment of Translation

In spite of all the previous problematizations of the practice of translation, it is its 20th century indictment by such

scholars as André Lefevere, Antoine Berman, Lawrence Venuti, Philip Lewis, TejaswiniNiranjana and Gayatri Spivak which helped lay bare the real nexus between translation and ideology (Munday, 2013). These scholars and theorists also successfully brought the inner workings of politics of translation to the fore. The deep-rootedness of the discursive and highly institutionalized power operative behind and through translation came in the lime light and powerful pleas were made for a self-critical reflection on the part of the translators. Translation was perceived as a *discursive construct* which essentially deals with two distinct linguistic codes underwritten by two distinct cultural patterns (Munday, 2007). In short, a move was made from the appreciation of translation as text to translation as culture and politics and Mary Snell-Hornby named this trend as the "cultural turn". This was subsequently taken up by other translation theorists as a metaphor for the politico-cultural characterization of translation. The "cultural turn", over time, came to denote a conglomeration of influences emanating from the power of publishing industry, pursuits of ideologies, feminist writing, cultural appropriation and colonialism (Munday, 2001, p. 125). This 'cultural turn', in this way, proved to be a paradigm shift in the conceptualization of translation and some really unprecedented questions were raised such as:

- WHO is the translator?
- For WHOM is he or she translating?
- WHY is this translation being made?
- WHOM does this translation benefit?
- WHOM does this translation harm?

In fact, it was largely due to the raising of such radical questions that the cultural complexity and the politico-ethical role of translation were adequately recognized. Furthermore, the translation theorists and the postcolonial critics also began to appreciate the fact that it is not enough to approach

translation merely from the perspectives of literature and humanities. Instead, such disciplines as media studies, international relations, cultural studies, corpus analysis, feminism and post-colonialism should also be taken into account.

This radically new conceptualization took translation as a site of ideological conflicts marked by struggle for power and supremacy underpinned by a variety of socio-historical and political factors. It was largely for this reason that the translation theorists maintained that meanings are not just carried by texts as such; rather, they are constantly constructed and reconstructed by an intersection of situational, ideological and linguistic variables. It was in this perspective that Hermans saw translation as a patent form of *manipulation* in which the text coming from a dominant culture invariably triumphs (1995). This conceptualization of translation formed an extremely important benchmark in the modern history of translation.

In this new conceptualization of translation, the discipline of cultural studies (in line with the trend set by the 'cultural turn') played a very important role. Arguably, cultural studies have done more than any other discipline to make translation studies a truly multidisciplinary subject and to bring it in tandem with the contemporary debates and issues. Sherry Simon illustrates the importance of cultural studies in the following words:

Cultural studies brings to translation an understanding of the complexities of gender and culture. It allows us to situate linguistic transfer within the multiple 'post' realities of today: poststructuralism, postcolonialism and postmodernism. (Simon, 1996, p. 100)

As the act of translation does not take place in a vacuum, therefore, it is inevitably complicit with the larger questions of power, transformation, authority and marginalization. Moreover, translation has also been playing a foundational

part in the creation, perpetuation and distribution of differential and asymmetrical power relations across cultures and nations. Moreover, as translation invariably involves the socio-cultural imperatives, it appears to be more like a political and narrative scheme which results not only in social convergence but also in social antagonism. In this context, it is not difficult to see how the repercussions of translation go well beyond the syntactic and semantic bounds and create a sociopolitical network in which individuals as well as cultures situate themselves discursively in relations to one another (Meschonnic, 2011).

This broader politics of power, manipulation and control also operates at a micro level, i.e. at the level of equivalence and sentence. It is at this level that we come across such problems as distortions, misidentification of meanings, false friends, inadequate equivalents, lacunae, etc. All this partly results from a translator's inability (or perhaps unwillingness) to communicate the delicate semantics of the source text. One example of this subtle mistranslation is the English equivalent *demand* for the French word *demande*. Here the problem is that the French *demande* simply means a *request*, which is similar to but also very different from a *demand* in English and *demandar* in Spanish. Sometimes, when a word is borrowed from another language, it undergoes a thorough semantic transformation. For example, *angst* means *fear* in a general sense (as well as *anxiety*) in German, but when it was borrowed into English in the context of psychology, its meaning was usually taken as *a neurotic feeling of anxiety and depression*.

We run into the similar difficulties when we translate the Arabic word 'فكر' (*fikr*) into English as 'thought'. The Arabic word *fikr* is not exactly 'thought'. Rather the word 'thought' with its contemporary meaning hardly occurs in the traditional Islamic texts. In fact, what would better correspond to the proper meaning of *fikr* would be

something more like the French word *pensée* as used by Blaise Pascal which could be translated into English as 'meditation' rather than 'thought'. In this sense, the Arabic word *fikr* exactly corresponds to the Persian word '*اندیشه*'(*andíshah*). In the traditional Islamic philosophy, both *fikr* and *andíshah* are associated with meditation and contemplation (see Nasr, 1987, p. 99).

However, with the increasing awareness of the power politics of translation, such issues as gender, identity ethics, hegemony, power, and cultural relativism were brought into sharp focus by the researchers and the students of translation alike (Venuti, 2013). Lefevere's notion of rewriting and Venuti's idea of domestication and foreignization have considerably helped bring the questions of ideology and politics to the fore. As a result, not only the scope but also the definition of translation studies has been broadened. This shift increasingly conceptualizes translation in metalinguistic terms — an intercultural communication embedded in numerous discursive practices and underwritten by politico-ideological considerations. How these metalinguistic terms influence translation can be seen by the following statement of AmitavGhosh, a modern Bengali writer, who bemoans the fate of a South Asian writer:

To make ourselves understood, we had both resorted [...] to the very terms that world leaders and statesmen use at great, global conferences, the universal, irresistible metaphysic of modern meaning. (1993, p. 237)

This statement characteristically describes the power politics which typifies the translation practices in the contemporary global world. What Ghosh means by 'irresistible metaphysic of modern meaning' is a complex combination of geopolitical and economic factors which privileges certain nations and the discourses emanating therefrom. The ascendancy of this 'metaphysic of modern meaning' is more cultural than textual and it is primarily

underpinned by the scientific and economic supremacy. This ascendency affects the entire process of translation right from the selection of the works and their interpretation to their publication and circulation. Aijaz Ahmad, a well-known Marxist literary theorist and political commentator, describes the far-reaching outcome of this ascendency:

By the time a Latin American novel arrives in Delhi, it has been selected, translated, published, reviewed, explicated and allotted a place in the burgeoning archive of 'Third World Literature' through a complex set of metropolitan mediations. That is to say, it arrives here with those processes of circulation and classification already inscribed in its very texture. (1994, p. 45)

This means that the act of translation is situated on a continuum with hosts of factors, each having politics of its own. All translations are embedded not just in language but also in institutions, practices, marketing dynamics and varied cultural and social economic configurations. Therefore, a translation is inevitably interwoven, intertwined and implicated with so many things besides language.

Translation: From Subjugation to Conquest

For millenniums the study of translation just focused on the purely literary and linguistic aspects of the texts and the questions of power and ideology were not accorded due recognition. Too much attention was paid to the aesthetic and stylistic features of language to the virtual exclusion of the issues of politics and power embedded in the practice of translation (Asghar, 2014). The attention of the translation scholars has been appallingly limited to such issues as comparisons, contrasts, thematic analysis and textual criticism. A cursory look at the European tradition of literary translation makes it abundantly clear that it has been more of a norm than an exception with the European translators to subjugate and domesticate the non-European texts while translating them. Lawrence Venuti's book *The Translator's*

Invisibility: A History of Translation (1995) is a landmark study of this phenomenon. In this book, Venuti cogently contends that the European translators routinely sought to adapt the Oriental source texts to the Western norms and canons of translation (Venuti, 2013).

In this magnum opus, Venuti shows how the Oriental texts were usually treated by the European translators as 'raw material' which it was their duty to turn into elegant and edifying target texts. Therefore, it was not uncommon with the European translators to remove all the supposed coarseness and inappropriateness from the Oriental texts and make them acceptable to the 'urbane and cultured' readership at home. The translators felt no qualms in going to great length in 'improving' and 'refining' the source texts. Scholars like Edward Said, Philip Lewis, Venuti and Niranjana consistently censured this condescending attitude of the European translators and dismissed it as mere euphemism and apology for geographical or cultural imperialism (Venuti, 1995).

Venuti is obviously not alone in problematizing and questioning the European translation tradition. Gayatri Spivak has also discussed this ideological aspect of the European translation tradition at length in her works. To her, the 'Third World literature' is not rendered proper justice when it is translated into English. Spivak has addressed this issue in her seminal essay *The Politics of Translation:*

In the act of wholesale translation into English there can be a betrayal of the democratic ideal into the law of the strongest. This happens when all the literature of the Third World gets translated into a sort of with-it translatese, so that the literature by a woman in Palestine begins to resemble, in the feel of its prose, something by a man in Taiwan. (Iqbal, 2000, p. 338)

Lefevere also bears Venuti and Spivak out and maintains that the European and the non-European literary traditions are at such a great variance from one another that a translator

while dealing with these traditions has to engage in a process of *cultural mapping*. It is only through this cultural mapping that a *bi-culturalism* can emerge and which can assist a translator in rendering greater justice to the autonomy and distinctiveness of the source text. To Lefevere, the non-European texts have been usually conceived, constructed and situated in the categories, thought-patterns and genres derived from the European translation tradition (see Bassnett, 2011). However, it remains to the credit of Venuti to bring all these varied concerns together and give them a systematic and disciplinary expression. To Venuti, the European translation traditions have their own well-defined canons of acceptability, notions of correctness and highly institutionalized conventions which inevitably come to bear upon the practice of translation. It is not uncommon for the target text to *domesticate* the source text and to recast it in its own image. In this domestication, the patterns of variations along with the linguistic and cultural distinctiveness of the source text are usually obliterated by the target text. This subjugation, so to speak, of the source text leads to its ultimate conquest:

> Translation is often regarded with suspicion because it inevitably domesticates foreign texts, inscribing them with linguistic and cultural values that are intelligible to specific domestic constituencies. This process of inscription operates at every stage in the production, circulation, and reception of the translation. (Venuti, 1998, p. 209)

The first step to subjugate a source text is to *familiarize* it to the reading constituencies at home. A source text is uprooted from its original historico-cultural setting and is re-planted into an altogether different milieu where the foremost task of the translator is to *familiarize* it to the 'readers at home'. It is certainly in this act of familiarization that a source text goes through a systematic and extensive process of trimming and accretion which results in a huge linguistic and cultural loss. The translator situates *the foreign* outside the

cultural comprehension and the literary imagination of his domestic readers. The utmost care is taken by the translator not to perturb the *urbane sensibilities* of the readers at home, no matter how much linguistic and cultural loss is caused to the particularities of the source text. Such an idea of translation is a strategic schematization of an idealized *inter-national* world in which nations are situated at various geographical points, enclosed by territorial borders and invested with nationalist narratives (Venuti, 2013). All this tends to lead to kind of cultural closures and can have far-reaching repercussions for our global world. To some of the cultural critics, such closures can, at times, possibly result into the ethnocentric states of mind which can be dangerous for our shared and collective existence (Bayart, 1996, pp. 7-9).

What goes hand in hand with this large-scale domestication of the less privileged discourses or what provides it with a rationale to operate is the Eurocentric tendencies in our socio-academic world. From Macaulay's denunciation of the entire Indian and Arabic literature to Fredric Jameson's highly unflattering view of the "Third World Novel", we come across a long line of these Eurocentric tendencies which put the non-European texts at a clear disadvantage in the power politics of translation. Here is Macaulay's utterly sweeping statement, "…a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia" (see Momma, 2013, p. 97). Now look at this totalizing statement by Frederic Jameson, "The third-world novel will not offer the satisfaction of Proust or Joyce" and will only "remind us of outmoded stages of our own first-world cultural development" (see Bahri, 2003, p. 18). These two statements by two leading spokespersons of the European politico-cultural world go, at least, some way illustrating that patronizing attitude which, to Venuti and Spivak, has been a hallmark of the European literary traditions.

This makes one wonder as to whether Hafiz Shriazi,

Baba Farid, Sultan Bahu, Labīd, IbnMiskawayh, Al-Jahiz, Francis Marrash, Rumi, Tulsidas and other scores of such Arab, Indian and Persian writers are as worthless as not to produce the brilliance and grandeur of "a single shelf of a good European library". This also makes one wonder as to what is there in Proust or Joyce which one does not find in TahaHusayn, Tawfiq al-Hakim or in Naguib Mahfouz. Moreover, if the artistic majesty and literary merits of BahaaTaher, Nawal El Saadawi or OrhanPamuk are not known to the European readership, it is largely due to the power politics of translation because of which either such literary giants have not been translated at all into the European languages or they have been translated in a highly domesticated fashion. Therefore, when a non-European writer of exceptional merit and prowess is translated into a European language in a domesticated way, he/she ipso facto loses the lion's share of his/her originality and turns out to be just harping on the commonplace European literary themes and motives.

Although considerable effort has been made even within the European cultural as well as the academic world to combat such stereotypical legacies, people like Venuti, Niranjana and Spivak have shown its vigorous persistence to this day. To these writers, when it comes to translation, the non-European literatures are usually relegated to the genre of 'non-canonical literature'. The supposed 'canonicity' of the European literatures invests them with greater power and influence. These practices and trends have contributed to the asymmetry of the contemporary cultural relations. At the same time, they have been one of the main causes behind the traditional European estimation of the non-European literatures. Obviously the European scholars are aware of only those Oriental works which have been translated into any of the major European languages. What has not been translated into any of the European languages, just does not *exist* for them as such. This is once again what I have

discussed above as the politics of exclusions. Even Frederic Jameson has been indicted of it by AijazAhamad. To Ahmad, Jameson is guilty of a facile overgeneralization and his statement about the "Third World Literature" is insufficiently theorized (1994, pp. 98-110). To mention yet another case in point: even Rumi, was introduced to Europe as late as 1935, when R. A. Nicholson translated him into English. Similarly there are scores of Chinese, Indian, Persian, Arabic, African literary giants waiting to be translated into any major European language.

This legacy has to be critically re-negotiated but this obviously is not an easy task given the sedimented and centuries-old notions such as 'appropriateness', 'transparency', 'correctness' and 'fluency'.These notions are firmly rooted not just in the minds of a large number of translators but also in the publishing industry and the academia. The difficulty of breaking away from them has always been recognized by the translation scholars mentioned above (Saldanha& O'Brien, 2013). Therefore, Venuti calls for more valor and greater courage on the part of the translators and asks them to resist and defy the Eurocentric hegemony and discursive dominance in an ethnodeviant manner. After all, speaking truth to power has been the dream of all the postcolonial theorists ranging from Edward Said to GayatriSpivak (Munday, 2013).

All these theorists and scholars agree that the syntactic specificities and the cultural distinctiveness of the source texts should not be sacrificed for the sake of spurious and stereotypical notions of *urbanity*, *taste* and *accuracy*. All such elitist notions are bourgeoisie constructs formed to perpetuate the Anglo-American discursive dominance in a post-industrial and globalized world. The best way to stand up to the appropriations and rewritings of the source texts is the 'strategy of foreignization'— a technique advocated by Lawrence Venuti. Foreignization can be understood as a radical translation technique which is aimed to *send the reader*

abroad instead of bringing the author home (Boase-Beier, 2011). It does not advance the pseudo claim of substituting the source text in an absolutist and unmediated way. Its avowed aim remains to vigilantly register and communicate all the essential linguistic and cultural characteristics of a source text (Toury, 2012).

Furthermore, foreignization does not seek to barter away the actuality of the source text with the acceptability of the target text. In this way, the technique of foreignization efficiently excludes any possibility of setting up the ideological dominance of the target text over the source text. Instead, it puts the source text at par with the target text and the power imbalance between them is strategically calibrated. In a systematic way, the strategy of foreignization foregrounds the cultural and linguistic peculiarities of the source text by enhancing their visibility and reinforcing their centrality (Asghar, 2014). This calls for a kind of interventionism on the part of the translator which Venuti describes in the following words:

I want to suggest that insofar as foreignizing translation seeks to restrain the ethnocentric violence of translation, it is highly desirable today, a strategic cultural intervention in the current state of world affairs, pitched against the hegemonic English-language nations and the unequal cultural exchanges in which they engage their global others. Foreignizing translation in English can be a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations. (Venuti, 1995, p. 208)

It should also be noted that the technique of foreignization does not seek to overly familiarize the source text to the reader. Rather a quasi-surrealist ambience of mystique is retained in which the reader is set free to develop his/her own understanding in an experimental and incremental way. The suspense and curiosity of *the foreign* is not totally repealed. Nor is any overly patronizing assistance

offered to the reader. The autonomy of the reader is as much respected as the autonomy of the source text. The 'regimes of power'are replaced with democratic textualities. As a result, instead of being a liability, it appears to be one of the most remarkable assets of a translation to look *unfamiliar* and *foreign* (Munday, 2013). Therefore, in its most characteristic form, foreignization prevents the source and non-canonical texts from being standardized, internalized, in short, cannibalized (Asghar, 2014).

However, it is not enough to just foreignize the source text. Along with this a paradigm shift of perspective is required which would allow a re-thinking of the non-European and non-canonical literatures. Moreover, what is commonly called the *World Literature* (sometimes in contradistinction with the so-called *Third World Literature*) is not to be taken as an outcome of the contemporary internationalization but instead as a critical dimension by which various cultures and cultural turmoils can be appreciated in their complexities.

ArjunAppadurai, the Indian-born US ethnologist and writer, has ingeniously introduced some new post-national perspectives which seek to substitute translation with "deterritorialization" i.e. by transferring, blending and shifting the local towards the metropolitan (1996, p. 198). The post-national demographic dynamics such as diaspora, exile and migration are throwing new challenges to the practice of translation. The present day Syrian refugee crisis, galvanized by the tragic death of three-year-old AylanKurdi, a three-year-old Syrian boy whose image made global headlines after he drowned in the Mediterranean Sea while attempting to escape the civil war in Syria, aptly illustrates the immensity of these challenges. As a corollary of this, the idea of a nation as the 'carrier' of culture and the sole source and target of translation is being increasingly questioned. Therefore what needs to be revised is not just the practice of translation but the canons of cultural studies and comparative/world

literature. In this regards, our literary imagination, hybrid identities, syncretistic cultural experiences and composite self-images should all be accorded a due place. Therefore, all acts of translation should be underwritten not only by our collective affiliations but also by what HomiBhabha calls our "shared historical traumas" (see Simon, 1996, 137).

Conclusion

Virtually at the outset of the book, the purpose of this chapter is to bring about a sensitization regarding the role of ideology in translation and the power politics of translation itself. Located in the broader domain of culture (in the Saidian sense of the word), translation in mired in a politics of discourse and knowledge (in the Foucauldian sense of the word). Hence the urgency to re-conceptualizeour ways of going about the business of translation. Thanks to the radical and insightful theorizations of the late 20th century, at present a sizable critical literature is available which can help us appreciate the power politics of translation and take steps to avoid it. People like Venuti, Berman, Lefevere, Niranjana and Spivak stand for an *ethics of difference* in translation (Munday, 2013). The golden principle endorsed by these scholars is crisp and effective: Instead of moving the author to the reader, seek to move the reader to the author. This means that a translator should avoid obliterating the linguistic and cultural distinctiveness of a source text as much as possible. Instead of *rewriting* a source text in the image of a privileged target text, the job of a translator should remain to communicate it *on its own terms* as much as possible. The subsequent chapters should be read with this caveat in mind.

ANGLICIZATION AND CHRISTIANIZATION

Kiernan Anglicizes Iqbal and does it quite often.This Anglicization, however, is complex and can possibly be accounted for by taking into consideration a broad range of linguistic and cultural differences.Kiernan, on numerous occasions, exhibits disregard for the specificities of the source text and instead of registering and communicating these cultural/textual peculiarities, he either elides them or casts them into Anglicized/Christianized moulds.

Certainly, the relation between literature and culture is direct and central. It is culture which, with its expansiveness and magnitude, serves as the paradigmatic context for literature. For instance, a translation of Shakespeare's Sonnet 18, *Shall I compare thee toa summer's day,* into Arabic may not have the same artistic and emotional appeal as in the Arabian Peninsula the very idea of summer is associated with the oppressive heat and blinding sunshine (Munday, 2009).

Similarly, when an Urdu poet bemoans the collapsing of the wall of his house and terms it a huge encroachment upon his estate by the strangers, an Englishman may not appreciate this 'grievous' loss as in the English culture walls are frequently associated with separation and estrangement. Robert Frost famously wrote:

> Something there is that doesn't love a wall,
> That sends the frozen-ground-swell under it,
> And spills the upper boulders in the sun,
> And makes gaps even two can pass abreast.
> (Quoted in Venuti, 1995, p. 179)

On the contrary, in Urdu literature, walls denote such notions as safety, honour, privacy, etc. This is how Sibt-e-Ali Saba, a relatively less known Urdu poet, grieves the crumbling of the wall of his home (Sadiq, 1997, p. 78):

دیوار کیا گری میرے خستہ مکان کی
لوگوں نے میرے صحن میں رستے بنا لیے

As the wall of my debilitated house collapsed!
People made paths through my courtyard. (My translation)

For an English reader, it may be somewhat difficult to appreciate the intensity of the poet's grief over the mere collapsing of a wall. Thus, it is incumbent upon a translator to accord fuller and greater recognition to the culture of the language he or she is dealing with as a source language. It is important to clarify that here I am talking about culture in terms of a *Weltanschauung*— a shared map of the perceived world. This shared map orientates the individuals as well as the societies. There are also certain *core* cultural values which influence a translator's choice during the process of an intercultural translation (Chesterman, 2010).

Take the example of the Russian word *duša*.According to Anna Wierzbicka, this word does not have a corresponding equivalent in the entire "universe of Anglo-Saxon culture" (2011, p. 62). The word recurs in VasilySemyonovich Grossman's novel *Life and Fate* (1980). However, its English equivalent "soul", as proposed by its translators, brings about a contextual incongruity and a cultural strangeness (Wierzbicka, 2011, p. 63).

Some of the translation scholars and theorists have termed this sort of compromised translations as a "distortion" of the original text (Munday, 2000, p. 84).In the course of dealing with the literary works which are culturally at variance with the background of the translator, an inadequate translation of expressions, metaphors and idioms can seriously impair the overall scheme of translation and mar

the comprehension of the text. It does not mean, however, that a proverb or idiom does not have an equivalent in the target language. It may have its equivalents in the target language but, due to their cultural dissimilarity, they do not *translate* it as such. At best they can furnish the reader with a rough idea only.

There are numerous examples in Kiernan's translation which duly attest to the presence of Anglicization in it. This Anglicization constitutes domestication. The examples of this kind of domestication and their in-depth analyses have been given below:

(1)

چھوڑ یورپ کے لیے رقصِ بدن کے خم و پیچ
روح کے رقص میں ہے ضربِ کلیم اللّٰہی!

To Europe leave the dance of serpent limb:
The prophet's power is born of the spirit's dance.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 200)

Comment: Translating the Urdu phrase "رقصِ بدن کے خم و پیچ" as "the dance of serpent limb" is an explicit instance of an attempt at Anglicizing the original text. The serpent, in Christian theology, is perhaps one of the most well-known symbols associated with Satan. In the Bible, the serpent is associated with Satan (Genesis: 3, 1ff.). Sometimes, the serpent is even identified with Satan. St. Paul has suggested that the serpent *was* Satan incarnate (Romans, 16, 20). Substantial evidence of this association can be found in the apocalyptic literature too. In the Jewish pseudepigraphical group of writings — *Apocalypse of Moses* — it is clearly mentioned that the serpent who led Adam and Eve astray was little more than an instrument used by Satan. Thus in the English literary tradition, the windings of the serpents stand for diabolical and satanic designs. Therefore, the mentioning of the serpent's dance here is logically and historically

traceable to the Judeo-Christian apocalyptical traditions which had a profound influence on the English literary tradition (Murdoch, 2009).

Similarly, the English philosopher and essayist Sir Francis Bacon (1561-1626) also demeans the serpent in his essay*Of Truth* in the following words: "For these winding, and crooked courses, are the goings of the serpent; which goeth basely upon the belly, and not upon the feet" (Bacon, 2005, p. 5). In addition, John Milton (160-1674) also held the serpent responsible for the fall of Adam and Eve: "Th' infernal Serpent; he it was, whose guile//Stird up with Envy and Revenge, deceiv'd" (1:35). Albert C. Labriola, Professor of English at Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, brings out the intrinsic diabolical nature of the serpent in the following words:

Disobedience and its consequences, therefore, come to the fore in Raphael's instruction of Adam and Eve, who (especially in Books 6 and 8) are admonished to remain obedient. By examining the sinfulness of Satan in thought and in deed, Milton positions this part of his narrative close to the temptation of Eve. This arrangement enables Milton to highlight how and why Satan, who inhabits a serpent to seduce Eve in Book 9, induces in her the inordinate pride that brought about his own downfall. Satan arouses in Eve a comparable state of mind, which is enacted in her partaking of the forbidden fruit, an act of disobedience. (quoted in Augustyn, 2013, p. 334)

Moreover, it is also worth considering that in the first line, Kiernan includes a reference which clearly bespeaks of Christian theological tradition but in the second line, where Iqbal is mentioning an Islamic historical reference, the translator just elides it. Originally, the Urdu phrase "ضربِ کلیم" implies the "Stroke of Moses (AS)". The Prophet Moses (AS), as per the Semitic/Abrahamic tradition, was blessed by

God with a miraculous Staff (عصا) and the stroking of this Staff (ضربِ کلیمی) is one of the most abiding and recurrent themes in Iqbal's poetic discourse. So ingrained and deeply embedded this notion in Iqbal's poetic and philosophical thought is that he has named one of his books after it — (ضربِ کلیم) — which can be translated as "Moses's Stroke".

Iqbal increasingly looks towards the Prophet Moses as a revolutionary and a revivalist who iconoclastically smashed the pagan and idolatrous ideologies and broke the spirit of the rebellious Pharaohs. His stroke (ضربِ کلیم) holds a promise of liberation and consolation for a suffering and agonizing humankind.All these implications are deeply embedded in the original text but they largely go amiss in the translation as they are either left out or radically Anglicized. Kiernan subsumes these extremely nuanced implicationsunder a nonspecific and generic equivalent: "the prophet's power". It is not clear from this translation that which particular prophet is meant here whereas the original text clearly talks about the Prophet Moses (AS). This way of tackling the source text directly results in the loss of historical specificity of the original.

(2)

اس میں کیا شک ہے کہ محکم ہے یہ ابلیسی نظام
پختہ تر اس سے ہوے خوئے غلامی میں عوام

Firm, beyond doubt, is the sovereignty of Hell
Through it the nations have grown rotten-ripe in slavishness.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 230)

Comment: In this translation, the Anglicization of the source text takes a very radical form. In the source text, the poet has included the phrase "ابلیسی نظام" ("Satan's Dominion") which Kiernan has translated as "the sovereignty of Hell". The

identification of Satan with hell is not uncommon in the Anglo-European literary tradition. In English literature, there have been writers who made this identification. Sometimes this identification is carried to that extent where both of these words begin to look synonymous. Take, for example, the case of Milton who, in *Paradise Lost*, identifies Satan with hell:

> Me miserable! which way shall I fly
> Infinite wrath and infinite despair?
> Which way I fly is hell; myself am hell;
> And in the lowest deep a lower deep,
> Still threat'ning to devour me, opens wide,
> To which the hell I suffer seems a heaven.
> (Paradise Lost IX: 73-78)

This extract has been taken from the Book IX of *Paradise Lost*. This book illustrates the change which occurs in Satan's attitude ever since he raised the flag of revolt against God in Book I. His haughtiness, courage and passion are now things of the past. Satan seems to have learnt his lesson, having paid a larger-than-life price. The hellfire is corroding him so mercilessly that he himself has turned into hell. This is how Satan is identified with hell and this very identification can be seen operating in the translation made by Kiernan.

(3)

خدا نصیب کرے ہند کے اماموں کو
وہ سجدہ جس میں ہے ملّت کی زندگی کا پیام

> —God teach His ministers in India
> A way of worship that shall be to all
> His people an evangel of new life!
> (Kiernan, 1955, p. 224)

Comment: Translating the Urdu word "سجدہ" as "a way of worship" is a departure from the linguistic and contextual specificity of the source text. In the Islamic scheme of rituals, the word "سجدہ" constitutes the core of worship. Once again, it is one of those Urdu words which do not comfortably lend

themselves to translation into English. I have discussed this issue somewhere else in this book and, therefore, here nothing more should be said with reference to it. However, the most glaring example of Anglicization is the use of the equivalent "evangel" for the Urdu word "پیام". Evangel is another word for the Christian Gospel. More precisely, Evangel stands for any one of the first four books of the Christian Bible that tell of the life of Jesus Christ. In ecclesiastical terms, it also stands for a body of teachings in a discipline regarded as basic and central. Doubtless, one of its connotations also implies such meanings as "good news", "tidings", etc., but the main problem remains that the word is primarily associated with the Christian religious order and its employment as an equivalent for "پیام" gives the translation an alien coloration.

(4)

شہیدِ محبت نہ کافر، نہ غازی
محبت کی رسمیں نہ ترکی نہ تازی

The martyrs of Love are Muslim nor Paynim,
The manners of Love are not Arab nor Turk.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 148)

Comment: This translation is fraught with problems which are at once linguistic and cultural. The translator has rendered the Urdu word "کافر" as "Paynim" and the other Urdu word "غازی" as "Muslim". This entails confusion. Let us begin with the first problematic equivalent — Paynim. *Paynim* (Middle English: *painim*) is an archaic word and isgenerally used for a person who is considered to be pagan from Christian perspective. The ecclesiastical tradition termed all those people as Paynims who were non-Christian, especially Muslims. Thus a Muslim is a Paynim as per the Christian theological tradition and also as per the real linguistic

background of this word. So this translationbrings us back to square one as the word "Paynim" itself implies a Muslim. The renowned English critic and poet Thomson Warton (1728-1790), while describing the traditional story of Arthur's death, mentions the word "Paynim" in the similar sense:

> Yet in vain a paynim foe
> Armed with fate the mighty blow;
> For when he fell, the Elfin queen,
> All in secret and unseen,
> O'er the fainting hero threw
> Her mantle of ambrosial blue,
> And bade her spirits bear him far,
> In Merlin's agate-axled car,
> To her green isle's enamelled steep,
> Far in the navel of the deep.
> (Johnson, 1810, p. 110)

As regards the word "غازی" which the translator renders as "Muslim", it must be said that this is not what Iqbal intends to say at all. In Urdu, the word "غازی" is used for a gallant soldier of a Muslim army who survives aholy war in the way of Allah. To Iqbal, those who lay down their lives for the noble cause of Love deserve our deepest regards. They are the undisputed heroes of humankind irrespective of the bonds of religion and creed. Therefore, the martyrs of love are always above and beyond the categories drawn by the institutionalized systems of thought. As with love, so with its martyr! Love is neither pagan nor Muslim, nor Turkic.

(5)

اے مردِ خدا! تجھ کو وہ قوت نہیں حاصل
جا بیٹھ کسی غار میں اللہ کو کر یاد

> But that strength, preacher, we shall not
> Find your hand muster;
> Go, and recite in some cool grot
> Your paternoster.

(Kiernan, 1955, p. 178)

Comment: Look at the translation of the Urdu phrase "اللہ کو کر یاد" as "recite…paternoster". Here the word "paternoster" (Latin: *pater noster* "our father") calls for some discussion as it is this word which is giving the translation an ecclesiastical coloration. It is another name for the Lord's Prayer in the Roman Catholic Church. The Lord's Prayer is by far the most important prayer in Christianity taught by Jesus Christ to his disciples according to the Gospels of Luke (11: 2NRSV) and Mathew (6:9 NRSV). The Prayer consists of seven petitions which seem to be a liturgical expansion of the actual statements of Jesus Christ. After the rite of baptism, the Paternoster is the most significant connection of unity among Christians and it is always recited in the course of ecumenical gatherings.

Here is one specimen of the Paternoster, which has been employed liturgically since the beginning of the Christian tradition:

Our Father who art in heaven,
Hallowed be thy name.
Thy kingdom come,
Thy will be done,
On earth as it is in heaven.
Give us this day our daily bread;
And forgive us our debts,
As we also have forgiven our debtors;
And lead us not into temptation,
But deliver us from evil.
(Wiersbe, 2000, p. 63)

This is how thetranslation seems strongly tinged with an ecclesiastical coloration.

(6)

جانتا ہوں میں یہ اُمت حاملِ قرآں نہیں
ہے وہی سرمایہ داری بندۂ مومن کا دیں

I know its congregation is the Law's
Upholder now no more; the Muslim runs
With all the rest, makes capitalism his creed.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 240)

Comment: This piece of translation is also full of patently Christian terms and references. To begin with, "congregation" hardly measures up to the meaning of "اُمت". The notion of "Congregationalism" is crucial to the understanding of the Christian theological thought. It denotes a system of church government under which each individual congregation or local church enjoys autonomy. The word can be employed either generally, or to refer to a specific historical development having its origin in Puritanism, or to designate a specific denomination within that tradition (Woodhead, 2004).

Secondly and perhaps more problematically, the translator uses the word "Law" for "قرآن". This is yet another deviation from the source text. Considering the Holy Quran as a mere *Law* is to exhibit disregard for the complex nature of the Holy Quran. True, the Holy Quran introduces a large body of laws but then it does not stop there. There are stories of ancient people, details of Islamic rituals, accounts of Divine justice, eschatological descriptions, visual descriptions of the afterlife, etc.

Moreover, if the translator has reduced the Holy Quran to a mere *Law* on the one hand; in the same translation, he has restricted "دین" to a mere *creed* on the other hand. The same indictment can also be made against this piece of translation as well. A creed is just one of the constituents of "دین" and, certainly, not the whole of it. In fact the word "دین" is untranslatable into English. Even the most frequently employed equivalent "religion" does not totally capture the true essence and real breadth of the term — "دین". As used in

the Holy Quran, it refers both to the path along which virtuous Muslims journey in order to obey the divine law and to the ultimate judgment which all humanity must inevitably face without intercessors before Allah (1:4; 2:256; 4:46; 15:35; 22:78).

In the same way, what the poet is maintaining here also necessitates a broader and more inclusive conceptualization of this term. The poet is lamenting the fact that the present-day Muslims, in general, have taken capitalism as their *dīn*. Now what the poet means by this is quite easy to appreciate i.e.Muslims have subscribed to the tenets of capitalism and adhered to its practices in totality. In short, Muslims have taken capitalism not just as a politico-economic doctrine of mere theoretical import but as an all-encompassing way of life — as their *dīn*. Viewed from this perspective, Muslims seem to have made a religion of it and their commitment to it is all consuming and unconditional.

(7)

فقیہِ شہر کی تحقیر! کیا مجال مری
مگر یہ بات کہ میں ڈھونڈتا ہوں دل کی کشاد

> And for the Pharisee—far from this poor worm be disrespect! But how to enfranchise Man, is all the problem I have sounded. (Kiernan, 1955, p. 94)

Comment: This translation is problematic for a two-fold reason and eventually results in the Anglicization of the source text. To begin with, the use of the equivalent "Pharisee" for "فقیہِ شہر" is unmistakably domesticating. By all accounts, it is abundantly clear that the word "Pharisee" (Aramaic: *prīsayyā*; Hebrew: פְּרוּשִׁים) has Judaic connotations. Kiernan takes this word from the Jewish theological traditions and employs it to translate an Islamic jurisprudential designation. A Pharisee stands for a member of the Jewish religious party that flourished in Palestine

during the latter part of the Second Temple Period.

Most probably, the translator has likened "فقیہ شہر" with a Pharisee because of his extreme and obsessive emphasis on the questions of morality and externalities of faith. But that remains an insufficient reason to do that. This is just goading one religious tradition into another with total disregard for the specificities of the original text. What Iqbal is talking about here is the self-righteousness and pretentious hypocrisy of the Muslim jurists who are ceaselessly engaged in theological hair-splitting and insist on a mechanical observation of rituals.

In addition, the translation of the second line is also marked by Anglicization. Here, Kiernan has translated the Urdu phrase "دل کی کشادڈھونڈنا" as "to enfranchise man". To put it briefly, this is an extremely superficial, oversimplified and somewhat far-fetched way of approaching the original text. The original Urdu phrase bespeaks of something profoundly expressive which the translation is communicating only inadequately. Iqbal is talking of a profound quest which could alleviate his inner turbulence and disenthrall his agitated soul. Here Iqbal is directly concerned with his inner discord and spiritual restiveness. The very Urdu word "دل" (*heart*) denotes the inner dimension of that struggle and conflict which the poet is describing here and which is assuredly more than any universal suffrage movement aimed at enfranchising men. The word "enfranchise" also brings to mind and foregrounds the Westminster democratic model whose battle cry is "enfranchisement".

Moreover, the poet'sstrained relations with the "فقیہ شہر" (the arch-jurist) are also because of this reason — Iqbal is preoccupied with his inner disquiet, whereas the arch-jurist is insistent upon the ritualistic observance of religious injunctions. However, all this remains uncommunicated in the translation and the reader is presented with a hasty and

indelicate phrase — "to enfranchise man".

(8)

وہ دنیا کی مٹی، یہ دوزخ کی مٹی
وہ بت خانہ خاکی، یہ خاکستری ہے!

That—earth's soil:this—soil of Hades;
Dust, their temple; ashes, ours.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 158)

Comment: In this instance, the translator has translatedthe Urdu word "دوزخ" as "Hades". This is an interesting instance of Hellenizing the source text. The word "Hades" (Greek: *Aidēs*) belongs tothe Greek mythological tradition where it means,"the god of the underworld". The legend has it that Hades was the son of Cronus and Rhea. When the three brothers divided up the universe after they had deposed their father, Cronus, Hades was awarded the underworld (Peterson & Dunworth, 2004). Homer refers to it in his *Iliad*:

> Sing, goddess, the anger of Peleus' son Achilleus
> and its devastation,
> which put pains thousandfold upon the Achaians,
> hurled in their multitudes
> to the house of Hades strong souls of heroes…
> (Book I, 1-5)

At the same time, the word Hades was used in the Greek Old Testament to translate the Hebrew word "sheol", denoting a dark underground region inhabited by the condemned souls. By extension, the word is also used more generally to denote *hell*. However, its Greco-Christian denotationsare so familiar and embedded that the use of this wordsomewhat Hellenizes Iqbal. The reference to "دوزخ" could have easily been translated in more neutral terms by employing such equivalents as "hell" or "inferno".

(9)

ہوا ہے بندۂ مومن فسونِ افرنگ
اسی سبب سے قلندر کی آنکھ ہے نمناک

One hermit's eyes grew wet with watching how you fell,
Poor Muslim, under England's spell. (Kiernan, 1955, p. 204)

Comment: In this instance, the Urdu word "قلندر"is translated as "hermit". This wordoriginally meant somebody who, in the early Christian period, renounced worldly things and decided to live away from the society in a monkish way. Conventionally, the first Christian hermit was Paul of Thebes, who fled to the desert around 250 AD and took up a wandering life. The eremitic life was marked by austerity and rigor (see Boyett, 2009). Even in the contemporary lexicon, the word has the same sense — a person living in solitude as a religious discipline.

Now this is not the right characterization of a "قلندر" who does spend a life of austerity but does not seek to flee from the society in an escapist way. Especially in Iqbal's poetry the notion of a "قلندر" is very significant and unique. To Iqbal, a "قلندر"is a mystic of great theosophic wisdom but, at the same time, he is also distinguished from the ordinary folk by virtue of his heroic resistance to the demonic forces. Although he lives in the midst of all the sound and fury of life,he does not lose sight of his goal. Nor is he dazzled by the apparent pomp and show of an exhibitionist world which is so prone to avarice and commercialism (Corbin, 1993).

(10)

مگر میں نذر کو اک آبگینہ لا یا ہوں
جو چیز اس میں ہے، جنّت میں نہیں ملتی

But I have brought this chalice here to make my sacrifice;
The thing it holds you will not find in all your Paradise.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 40)

Comment: In the first line, the word "آبگینہ" (*crystal goblet*) is rendered as "chalice" which has a distinctly ecclesiastical ring to it. Chalice, (Latin: *calix*), stands for a sacred vessel used in the Eucharistic rites, in which bread and wine are consecrated and consumed by an ordained minister.

(11)

نگہ پیدا کر اے غافل تجلّی عین فطرت ہے

Rub your eyes, sluggard! Light is Nature's law.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 74)

Comment: Iqbal is exhorting the slumbering Muslims to create/achieve what he calls "نگہ"by issuing this momentous imperative to them: "نگہ پیدا کر". This extremely intricate and consequential command is rendered by the translator in a banal and crude manner — "Rub your eyes!" This is a highly superficial way. Iqbal is not mourning the loss of eyes as such. Obviously the slumbering Muslims do have eyes but in spite of their eyes, they are unable to "see". So "rubbing the eyes" will not work. Arguably, Iqbal is reiterating one of the Quranic themes here which states how some people go blind in spite of having eyes. The Holy Quran makes this point:

Have they not travelled in the land, and have they hearts wherewith to feel and ears wherewith to hear? For indeed it is not the eyes that grow blind, but it is the hearts, which are within the bosoms, that grow blind (22:46).

In the similar sense, Iqbal is mourning the loss of this *inner*perception. Thus, viewed from this perspective, the word "نگہ" does not merely stand for an optical capability of an individual to perceive an object visually. Instead, it implies something decisively more than that.

(12)

یہ ہماری سعیِ پیہم کی کرامت ہے کہ آج
صوفی و مُلّا ملوکیت کے بندے ہیں تمام
کند ہو کر رہ گئی مومن کی تیغِ بے نیام

From our unceasing labour this wonder blooms:
Priesthood and sainthood now are servile props
For alien dominion. (Kiernan, 1955, p. 232)

Comment: In this instance, the equivalent phrase "priesthood and sainthood" for the Urdu expression "صوفی وملّا" constitutes a clear act of Christianization. Ihave already discussed this point at length and shown that there is no concept of sainthood or priesthood per se in the Islamic theological tradition. Sufis are not canonized the way the saints are.Similarly, priests are especially consecrated to the service of a divinity and it is through them that prayers and sacrifices are offered to God.

(13)

یہ راز ہم سے چھپایا ہے میر واعظ نے

Secret our priests have hidden. (Kiernan, 1955, p. 260)

Comment: Here the Urdu phrase "میر واعظ" has been translated as "priest" which is problematic. In fact, the phrase "میر واعظ" is a politico-religious honorific title which is given to the leaders in Kashmir. Instead of being a mere priest, a Mirwaiz will be a politico-religious head of the Kashmiri Muslims. Moreover, when the entire context in which the above line occurs is considered, the choice of "priest" looks all the more awkward. The line has been taken from Iqbal's poem "ملازادہ ضیغم لولابی کشمیری کا بیاض" (*From the Diary of Mullah ZadaZaighamLolabi of Kashmir*) which is a politically oriented poem in which Iqbal

bewails the woe-stricken fate of Kashmir.

(14)

جانتا ہوں میں کہ مشرق کی اندھیری رات میں
بے یدِ بیضا ہے پیرانِ حرم کی آستیں

I know that in this dark night of the East
No shining hand that Moses raised to Pharaoh
Hides under his priests' sleeve.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 240)

Comment: In this piece of translation, the translator renders "پیرانِ حرم" as "his priest". This is an interesting example of "inscribing the foreign with the domestic" (Robinson, 2002, p. 21). Defining "پیرانِ حرم" as "priest" is problematic for several reasons. True, the word "priest" has more generalized connotations, its ecclesiastical connotations are so strong and pronounced that it inevitably Christianizes the source text. In Islam, scholars do not have the same status as their counterparts have in Christianity. Muslim religious scholars (ulema, imams, muftis, sheikhs, etc.) are not institutionalized the way they are in Christianity.

Therefore, the term "priest" which is very often recklessly applied to such Muslim functionaries as *Imam* or *Faqih*, by the Western authors is misleading and alien to Islamic understanding.

Conclusion

With this we come to the end of this chapter. I have demonstrated with ample evidence that Kiernan has considerably Anglicized and Christianized Iqbal's poetic discourse. Numerous references, words and phrases present in the original text have been transformed into more "English" norms.The extensive amount of Anglicization and Christianization which has been pointed out above partially contributes to the rewriting of the source text as per the

Eurocentric cultural and historical terms.Kiernan, on numerous occasions, shows a substantial disregard for the Islamic background of Iqbal's poetry and, instead of registering and communicating the Islamic references and idioms present in the source text, he either elides them or casts them into Anglicized and/or Christianized moulds. Eventually the cumulative outcome of this Anglicization and Christianization is a large-scale and systematic domestication of Iqbal's poetry by the translator.

CLASSIFICATIONAL DISLOCATION

Iqbal's poetic discourse is highly classified and this classification suits the thematic and linguistic variety of his poetry in an accomplished manner. The alteration between the proper and the common nouns and between the generic and the specific references has always been done by the poet to achieve a particularly desirable effect. It serves to communicate as well as develop a pinpointed and nuanced understanding of the subject matter. However, there are numerous instances in Kiernan's translation in which he has dislocated this classification and has replaced one category with the other. This dislocation has certain domesticating effects on the overall textual as well as the semantic scheme of the source text ranging from slight misunderstandings to outright misrepresentations. The following examples illustrate this problem:

(1)

نہ ستیزہ گاہِ جہاں نئی، نہ حریفِ پنجہ فگن نئے
وہی فطرتِ اسد اللّٰہی، وہی مرحبیؔ،وہی عنتریؔ

Not new the antagonists, face to face, hands clenched;
Unchanged of purpose stands the Lion of God,
Unchanged the opposing champions.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 43)

Comment: In this instance, we see the problem of classificational dislocation as the translator selects too broad and blanket equivalents for the original Urdu words and expressions. In the second line of this verse, Iqbal has used three historical references based upon three proper nouns,

but Kiernan just deals with the first of them and omits the last two. The reference to HazratAli (RA), the Lion of God, is retained but the references to Marhab (a Jewish chieftain and one of the major adversaries of Islam), and to Antar (an Arab warrior who perished at the hands of HazratAli (RA) at the Battle of Khyber), are left out. Marhab symbolized the arrogance and formidable hostility which Islam had to encounter in its early days. He landed in the famous Battle of Khyber chanting the following war cries:

> Khyber knows well that I am Marhab
> whose weapon is sharp, a warrior tested.
> Sometimes I thrust with spear;
> Sometimes I strike with sword,
> when lions advance in burning rage.
> (Tabari, 1997, p. 135)

Therefore, Marhab's killing by HazratAli (RA) marks an important milestone in the early history of Islam. In the later Islamic literature, HazratAli (RA)'s conclusive victory over pompous and pretentious Marhab came to emblematize the triumph of Islam against the mighty forces of aggression. Keeping this backdrop in view, an elision of Marhab has resulted in a historical and literary impoverishment of the source text. Similarly, the elision of Antar also entails the same impoverishment.The translator's disregard for the particular historical actualities and allusions of the original text is obvious here.

It seems that Kiernan is more interested in enhancing the acceptability and comprehension of his translation than taking into consideration the discursive and schematic characteristics of the source text. To him, probably, an inclusion of the Arab historical characters would task the mind of the reader or ruffle his or her aesthetic sensibilities. Or probably, he thought that a cluster of the Arab historical characters would make his translation look anachronistically *Middle-Eastern.* Whatever motives in the mind of the translator might be, the result is quite simple — domestication of the source text.

(2)

ہے وہی سازِ کہن مغرب کا جمہوری نظام
جس کے پردوں میں نہیں غیر از نوائے قیصری

In the West the people rule, they say:
And what is this new reign?
The same harp still, the same strings play
The despots' old refrain.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 52)

Comment: In this instance too, the translator has replaced a proper noun with a common one.In the original text, Iqbal is equating the Western brand of democracy with the despotic and tyrannical regimes of Caesars. To Iqbal, the contemporary form of Western democracy has sham pretences with its rabble-rousing and demagogic juggernauts. On the contrary, the translator, instead of translating the proper reference to the Caesarean despotism, merely renders it as "the despots". This is obviously less than what Iqbal meant or it only inadequately expresses the intent of the poet. Iqbal is not talking about the ordinary historical despotisms of some bygone days; rather, he is referring to the Caesarean despotism in concrete terms. The net result of this translation is the loss of the historical specificity of the source text.

(3)

رقابت علم و عرفاں میں غلط بینی ہے منبر کی
کہ وہ حلّاج کی سولی کو سمجھا ہے رقیب اپنا

Where reason and revelation war, faith errs
To think the mystic on his cross its foe.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 74)

Comment: Here too, Iqbal is referring to a specific and immensely significant figure of the Islamic history but the translator has stated it in common and generic terms. In the original text, Iqbal is talking about Mansur al-Hallaj (858-922), a Persianmystic, revolutionary writer and teacher

of Sufism, who was executed for his allegedly heretical views and who subsequently, became a symbol of divine love and ecstasy. While referring to him, Iqbal says that the present-day Muslim intellectuals and divines have set up a false and uncalled-for dichotomy between Reason and Revelation. These intellectuals and divines, driven mainly by their wilful ignorance, are taking Mansur as their rival for naught. However, the translator, just uses the very generic word — "the mystic". This, in itself, is a classificational dislocation because it is a nonspecific reference and can stand for any mystic; not necessarily for Mansur al-Hallaj who is the actual subject in the original text.

(4)

حضر بھی بے دست و پا، الیاس بھی بے دست پا

Your ministers and your prophets are pale shades.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 142)

Comment: Iqbal is mentioning two celebrated figures of Islamic/Semitic history. HazratKhidr (AS) was a revered figure in Islam, a mystic of great wisdom and knowledge; whereas, HazratIlyas (AS) (English: Elijah), was a famous Hebrew prophet who combated the idolatrous and pagan spirit of his time. In different Islamic and pre-Islamic traditions, HazratKhidr (AS) is variously described as a messenger, a prophet and a*wali* (Urdu: "a companion of Allah"). In this line, Satan is belittling these two outstanding Semitic figures by declaring them quite powerless and infantile before his crooked and expedient designs.

However, when looking at Kiernan's translation, we readily recognize its inadequacy and shallowness. Kiernan translates "*حضر*"and "*الیاس*" as "Your ministers and your prophets".Proper historical nouns are being translated into common terms which isdeprecating the much-intended specificity of the source text.

(5)

مجلسِ ملت ہو یا پرویز کا دربار ہو
ہے وہ سلطاں، غیر کی کھیتی پہ ہو جس کی نظر

Whether parliaments of nations meet, or Majesty holds court,
Whoever casts his eye on another's field
Is tyrant born.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 234)

Comment: This is also an instance of classificational dislocation in much the same way as the preceding one. Kiernan translates "پرویز کا دربار" just as "Majesty" — once again a classificational dislocation in which a proper historical reference is being translated in an exceedingly generic and nonspecific way. The proper historical reference enshrined in the source text is flattened out by the translator in a way which seriously affects the discursive heterogeneity of the source text. Khosrow II (590-628) was the ruler of the Persian Empire and the contemporary of the Holy Prophet (PBUH). Iqbal, in this verse, intends to, in fact, illustrate the pernicious effects of exploitative and overbearing forms of governments be they in the garb of democracy or monarchy. Iqbal is mentioning Khosrow II as an embodiment of all the vile and mischief of monarchy.

However, in Islamic history, Khosrow II personifies not only the repressively monarchical rule but also outright haughtiness and implacable hostility towards Islam as he tore the epistle of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) contemptuously and berated the Arab race in loathsome terms. Given this importance and relevance of this specific historical reference, the loss which may result from its omission is not difficult to assess. Thus, here too, it can be clearly seen how the translation is depriving the source text of its historicity.

(6)

بانگِ اسرافیل اُن کو زندہ کر سکتی نہیں
روح سے تھا زندگی میں بھی تہی جن کا جسد

No angel's trumpet-blast
Can bring those back to life
Whose bodies whilst they lived were void of spirit.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 248)

Comment: In Islamic eschatological discourse, HazratIsrafil (AS)is one of the archangels who is divinely appointed to blow the trumpet which will proclaim the Day of Judgment. In the above-mentioned verse, Iqbal makes a clear and direct mentioning of this archangelbut Kiernan has translated "اسرافیل" as a mere "angel". This is how the translation falls short of expressing the specific nature of the source text and casts it in imprecise and approximate terms.

(7)

عارف و عامی تمام بندۂ لات و منات!
خوار ہوا کس قدر آدمِ یزداں صفات

Wisdom and folly
Bow before stocks and stones. How has man, once
Made in God's image, fallen so low?
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 248)

Comment: The poet is referring to two of the pre-Islamic Arabian goddesses which were enshrined in the form of idols in Kabbah. These are evidently Laat (لات) and Manaat (منات). Both of these goddesses are mentioned in Chapter 53 of the Holy Quran. The poet, as a matter of fact, is bemoaning the tragic fact that the present day Muslims are merely serving the goddesses like Laat and Manaat instead of serving the One Supreme God. On the contrary, the translator overgeneralizes this enormously particular and historicalallusion and renders it as "stocks and stones", without even making the first letters of these two equivalents capital.

(8)

یہ بتانِ عصرِ حاضر کہ بنے ہیں مدرسے میں
نہ ادائے کافرانہ! نہ تراشِ آزرانہ!

The school-bred demi-goddesses of this age
Lack the carved grace of the old pagan mould.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 70)

In the second line, the poet is referring to a proper historical reference — "تراشِ آزرانہ"(originally: Āzar's carvings). According to the Holy Quran, Āzar (English: Tareh) was the father of The Prophet Abraham (AS), the revered prophet for all the three Semitic religions. In the Holy Quran, Āzar is portrayed as a highly wicked and arrogant idol-monger (6:74). As per Semitic scriptural traditions, he used to manufacture idols and his attachment to his idols was proverbial. When he saw his idols smashed by his son, he was infuriated and expelled Abraham (AS) from his household.

In this verse, the poet is mentioning the idol-mongering cult of Āzar and bewails the fact that the modern day educated generation is little different from the idols carved by the crooked idol-manufacturers like Āzar. However, these modern-day, school-bred idols do not bear any of the marks of their manufacturer's craft. Nevertheless, the translator leaves out this historical reference of the Semitic tradition and remains content with an extremely generalized rendering of the original text. There is no mention of the name Āzar in the translation anywhere and the entire concept is rendered as "the old pagan mould".

(9)

بجھی عشق کی آگ، اندھیر ہے
مسلماں نہیں، راکھ کا ڈھیر ہے

Quenched is devotion's burring spark,
Islam an ash-heap cold and dark.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 130)

Comment: In this instance, the translator has rendered the original word by employing an equivalent which is although

associated yet not identified with it. The word "مسلماں" ("Muslim")is rendered as "Islam". Now certainly the word "Muslim"is associated with Islam but not identified with it. This kind of classificational dislocation may serve to give a rough and ready idea to the reader about the meaning of the source text but it hardly does justice to its nuanced and subtle nature. It looks all the more problematical when one notices that the translator's resorting to such an equivalent is not so much due to any technical/terminological necessity as to a mere beautification and embellishment of the translation.

There is, however, one more corollary of this kind of translation which is more serious. Using "Islam" as an equivalent for "Muslims" can possibly bring about a veiled insinuation that the plight of the Muslims (mourned by Iqbal here) is perhaps a failing of Islam as such. In entire Islamic discourse in general and in Iqbal's poetry in particular, the distinction between Islam as a religion and the Muslims as followers is crucially maintained. Nowhere in his poetry does Iqbal equate the plight of the Muslims with the 'Fall' of Islam as such. That, certainly, would have been an anathema to his thinking because, to Iqbal, "religion has always elevated individuals, and transformed whole societies" (Iqbal, 1934, p. 76). He made this conviction explicit in his Presidential Address to the All India Muslim League in 1930:

To address this session of the All India Muslim League, you have selected a man who has not despaired of Islam as a living force for freeing the outlook of men from its geographical limitations, who believes that religion is a power of the utmost importance in the life of individuals as well as states, and finally who believes that Islam is itself Destiny and will not suffer a destiny. (quoted in Singh, 1997, p. 88)

In this way, Kiernan's equation of the Muslims with Islam constitutes a classificational dislocation which does not sit well either with the scheme of the source text or the philosophy of the poet.

(10)

خودی تیری مسلماں کیوں نہیں ہے؟

Why is your nature without belief?
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 256)

Comment: Now what is there in the translation is not exactly being communicated in the target text. The poet is lamenting the tragic fact and raising a rhetorical question to his coreligionists and compatriots as to why their Selfhood ("خودی") has not fully surrendered and submitted to the Will of God. Why does the Selfhood not become truly *Muslim*? This remains an unremitting concern of the poet and he is expressing it succinctly. On the contrary, the translator renders it as "Why is your nature without belief?" which is a very vague and blanket way of handling the original text and, therefore, can be faulted on more than one count.

To begin with, it is obvious that *to have belief* is not the same as *to be a Muslim*. In the Islamic theological tradition (which is germane to Iqbal's poetic inspiration), one may have a *belief* yet not be a Muslim in the exact sense of the word—the sense in which Iqbal is using this term. One of the most apparent themes of Iqbal's poetry is the scathing criticism of those who do confess a belief in Islam yet remain utterly void of Islam. Somewhere else, he has made this point in the following words:

خرد نے کہہ بھی دیا لا الٰہ تو کیا حاصل؟
دل و نگاہ مسلماں نہیں تو کچھ بھی نہیں

To what avail is the Mind's confession of the Divine Unity?
If Heart and Vision are not Muslim, all confessions are empty.
(My translation)

The same point is reiterated in the following verse as well:

اگر ہو عشق تو کافر بھی مسلماں
نہ ہو عشق تومسلماں بھی کافر و زندیق

With a passionate love, even a pagan is a Muslim
And without a passionate love, even a Muslim is a pagan faithless. (My translation)

In Iqbal's philosophical paradigm, to be a Muslim what is actually required is an unconditional and total surrender to the Will of Allah; not a mere possession of a *belief* or an abstract confession. Instead, what the poet is really mourning is exactly the opposite: in spite of possessing beliefs, our Selfhood ("خودی") remains unacquainted with Islam — not fully bowed before Allah. Instead, it remains preoccupied with its narcissistic and egotistical self-importance. Thus, the classificational dislocation in this instance of translation is quite subversive to the overall meaning of the verse itself.

Lastly, the word "خودی" has been translated as "nature" which is also incomprehensible and positively misleading. First of all, the notion of "خودی" (Selfhood) which is foundational to Iqbal's entire poetic and philosophical discourse needs to be translated in even more precise and accurate terms. For that purpose, any equivalent employed in its stead should ideally begin with a capital letter. That is one way of foregrounding this thematic centrality.

Second, the equivalent "nature" for "خودی" is less than accurate. *Nature* almost certainly refers to the overall disposition and temperament of one's personality. It may also refer to intrinsic qualities of an individual. At the same time it can also stand for the universal human behaviour. But "خودی" (Selfhood) is entirely distinct from *nature* per se. What is commonly termed as *nature* is a taken-for-granted component of our *Being*. All individuals possess *nature* by nature (pun is

intended). But this is not the case with "خودی" (Selfhood) which can only be realized through a relentless and conscious struggle by humans and can never be taken for granted. Thus, to Iqbal, the possession and the constant maintenance of Selfhood is the measure of our existential success.

(11)

خرید سکتے ہیں دنیا میں عشرتِ پرویز
خدا کی دین ہے سرمایۂ غمِ فرہاد

The fleshpots of the wealthy are for sale about the world;
Who bears love's toils and pangs earns wealth that God's hand has compounded.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 94)

Comment: In this translation, the dislocation takes place because of the unusual explicitation and the elision of two of the proper references present in the source text. A seven-word line (خدا کی دین ہے سرمایۂ غمِ فرہاد) is rendered by a fourteen-word line — "Who bears love's toils and pangs earns wealth that God's hand has compounded". But I do not fault the translator for employing more words. However, what really concerns me is that, in spite of this much padding, the translator does not seem to have succeeded in translating the source text adequately.

In the source text, the poet has used two extremely significant figures who symbolize two poles of the historical spectrum. Khosrow II represents extreme indulgence and unbridled despotic power. On the other hand, Farhad, the celebrated Persian lover who in order to please his mistress Shirin dug through a huge mountain, stands for astounding courage and excessive destitution. He embodies nobility in the face of adversity.

By referring to these two diametrically opposed figures of history, Iqbal is making the point that the rich and the powerful live a life of excessive indulgence and laxity.

However, people like Farhad succeed in achieving the deep heart contentment of which the rich can just dream. This contentment is the sheer grace of God. However, in the translation, there is no mention either of Farhad or Pervez. The translator omits these two crucial references and resorts to a very generalized and impersonal translation.

It is also noteworthy that for the Urdu phrase "عشرتِ پرویز" the translator uses an inordinately far-fetched phrase: "the fleshpots of the wealthy". Therefore, this is how even an extensively padded and verbose translation fails in communicating the source text.

Conclusion

To sum up this chapter, it can be maintained that Kiernan's translation of Iqbal is characterized by various classificational dislocations.Iqbal's poetry has a concrete historical background which serves as a schema to his ideas. This schema is frequently punctuated with images, personalities, doctrines, allusions, terminologies and constructs taken from the world history in general and the Islamic history in particular. However, in the instances discussed above, he can be seen resorting to extremely general, approximate and imprecise equivalents while dealing withthese proper and historically specified references. This kind of classificational dislocation brings in its wake a referential impoverishment and a loss of historicity.It also deprives the source text of its spatial concreteness and temporal situatedness.

DISTORTION AND MISTRANSLATION

The problem of distortion in translation is widespread and to a certain extent inevitable. Even when translation, as a discursive practice, seeks to transcend the national and the cultural barriers to communicate a supposedly universal spirit, some amount of distortion is unavoidable. On occasion, the communicative process initiated by translation is confounded due to various sociocultural and linguistic factors with which the translator has to reckon consistently. Some of these factors are utterly beyond the control of the translator and, consequently, there is little what he or she can do to help the situation. At the same time, there are so many things which a translator can do in order to reduce the likelihood of distortion in translation.

Language, which remains the ultimate and the only tool of translation, has certain constitutive properties which have a direct bearing on the process as well as the product of translation. Schleiermacher showed an exceptional understanding of these constitutive properties and maintained that it was largely due to these properties that all representations (including translation) are appropriative. They are seldom transparent or adequate to their subject and they play a key role in establishing the multiple forms for consciousness in the mind of the reader. These forms of consciousness remain crucial to the entire process of translation right from its inception (see Venuti, 1995).

Therefore, in a certain sense, the instances of distortion discussed herealso have something to do with the well-known phenomenon of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural mappings.

To Roman Jakobson, these mappings are based upon obligatory syntactic and lexical forms —"Languages differ essentially in what they must convey and not in what they may convey" (see Munday, 2001, p. 38). This is one of the most basic conceptualizations which can help us understand the phenomenon of distortion in translation.

In Kiernan's translation of Iqbal, there are numerous examples of the distortion of the original text. These examples range from the mild twists to the outright inversions and inaccuracies. Consider the first of these instances:

(1)

ہے زندہ فقط وحدتِ افکار سے ملّت
وحدت ہو فنا جس سے وہ الہام بھی الحاد

Only identity of thought keeps the Faith thriving—
Doctrine by whose means schism is brought
Is impious striving.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 178)

Comment: This translation is likely to cause a subtle dislocation in the understanding of the reader given the distortion it contains. The translator has rendered the word "ملّت" as "Faith" which is not appropriate for more than one reason. To begin with, this is a considerably imprecise equivalent. The concept of a "ملّت" (a pan-Islamic and sociopolitical community of Muslims) features very prominently in Iqbal's poetry as well as philosophy. Indeed, faith plays a crucial role in the formation and maintenance of a "ملت" (English: "nation"), yet the concept of a "ملت" is not wholly reducible to faith as such.Instead, faith is just one of the factors which have a formative influence on it. Therefore, translating "ملّت" as "Faith" is overemphasizing the part at the cost of the whole.

Secondly, the translation of the Urdu word "الہام" (originally "intuition") as "doctrine" by the translator is also problematic. To be more precise, the word "الہام" implies a form of knowledge or of cognition which is independent of the sensory experience or conscious reasoning. In the great mystic traditions of different religions, it is considered to be one of the miraculous qualities of the human mind. It also refers to a form of truth that surpasses the power of pure reason.

(2)

سینۂ افلاک سے اُٹھتی ہے آہ سوزناک
مردِ حق ہوتا ہے جب مرعوبِ سلطان و امیر

A burning sigh breaks from the Heavens, to see
Their children crouch in awe of tyrant lords.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 258)

Comment: In this instance, the translation of the second line is noticeably distorted. The translator renders the phrase "مردِ حق" in a strangely subjective way — "Their children". This is an extremely imprecise translation and because of its imprecision it unleashes so many legitimate questions such as:

- In the phrase "Their children", what is meant by "their"?
- Are the children being attributed to Heaven"? If yes, why?
- Is the translator employing the phrase — Heaven's children — to translate "مردِ حق"?
- In the first line, the translator has used the verb "see". Who is the subject of this verb i.e. who sees?

Now all these questions deserve reasonable answers but

it is very difficult to work out these answers from within the translation made by Kiernan. These questions illustrate the vagueness and ambiguity which can hamper the understanding of the reader. The phrase "مردِ حق" (as well as its variation "مردِ مومن") is one of the most frequently used phrases in Iqbal's poetry. Iqbal uses this term in a very specified and original way. The phrase refers to an ideal Muslim who is distinguished from the ordinary folk by his superlative courage, unshaken faith and an extreme consciousness of Selfhood.

(3)

وحدت کی حفاظت نہیں بے قوتِ بازو
آتی نہیں کچھ کام یہا ں عقلِ خداداد

And only the strong hand is fit
To guard the creed:
Let no-one trust man's native wit
To serve such need.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 178)

Comment: In this instance, two major problems are likely to affect the communicative value of the translation. First, the translator, in an extremely roundabout way, has translated the word "وحدت" as "the creed". This, however, seems an imprecise equivalent. The word "وحدت" stands for "unity", "solidarity" and "integration". Throughout his poetry, one can see Iqbal exhorting Muslims to work for unity. In this particular verse also Iqbal, in effect, is regretting the splintering and fracturing of the Muslim Ummah along sectarian and nationalist lines and advocates a greater and fuller unity and harmony within their ranks.

(4)

یہی دینِ محکم، یہی فتحِ یاب
کہ دنیا میں توحید ہو بے حجاب!

Here is true victory, here is faith's crown—
One creed and one world, division thrown down!
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 152)

Comment: The poet has used the phrase "دنیا میں توحید" in the source text — a reference which lies at the very heart of Islam. It is translated by Kiernan as "one creed and one world".This appears to be a considerably imprecise way of dealing with the source text and the translationseems deprived of its doctrinal and religious significance. How can "one creed" imply the Unity of Allah (توحید)? Any single creed can be termed as "one creed". To Iqbal, for a Muslim, this doctrine of the Unity of Allah is the source of all power and resoluteness in the world because by submitting to One Supreme God one can rid him/herself as well as the world of all the other subjugations and slaveries.

(5)

آہ وہ مردانِ حق!عر بی شہسوار
حاملِ خلقِ عظیم، صاحبِ صدق و یقیں

Ah, those proud cavaliers, champions Arabia sent forth
Pledged to the splendid Way, knights of the truth and the creed.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 108)

Comment: This also constitutes an example of distortion. In a somewhat farfetched manner, the Urdu phrase "مردانِ حق" becomes "champions". This equivalent deprives the source text of its iconic beauty and communicative and expressive depth. The source text clearly indicates that the poet is not talking about "champions" in any ordinary sense; rather, he is referring to "the Champions of Truth". The word "حق" has two remarkable meanings: "God" and "Truth" with a capital "T". Both of these meanings are crucial to the understanding of the verse mentioned above.

There are two more problems with this translation which, in isolation, may not seriously affect the translation, but cumulatively they become all the more detrimental. The inclusion of such words as "knights" and "cavaliers" in the translation invests the target text with a strangely medieval European coloration. The knights and the cavaliers bring to mind such references as the European feudal order and the power struggle of King Charles I and the support he received by the Cavaliers.In this way, collectively, the references present in the translation create a schematic atmosphere which does not sit well with the overall scheme of the source text.

(6)

نصیبِ خطہ ہو یا رب وہ بندۂ درویش
کہ جس کے فقر میں انداز ہوں کلیمانہ

Grant to this country, oh
God, such a guide as hides under beggar's rags
Prophet's high thoughts!
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 260)

Comment: In this instance, it is the second line whose translation can pose considerable problems for the reader. In the source text, the poet has used an adjective "کلیمانہ" which is a historico-religious reference to the Prophet Moses (AS). However, the translator has over-generalized it while rendering it into English and the phrase "انداز۔۔۔کلیمانہ" becomes "Prophet's high thoughts".

This equivalent phrase is flawed for a two-fold reason: first, it is extremely generalized; second, in spite of slight padding, it is truncated. The Urdu word "انداز" ("manners", "ways") encompasses not only the realm of thoughts but also of actions. But the translator hasmerelymade a mention of the former. It is not only an unwarranted pruning of the source

text but alsoa contradictionof Iqbal's philosophy which censures mere *thoughts* in the absence of corresponding *actions*.

(7)

کیے ہیں فاش رموزِ قلندری میں نے
کہ فکر مدرسہ و خانقاہ ہو آزاد

I have laid bare such mysteries as the hermit learns, that thought,
In cloister or in college, in true freedom may be grounded.
(Kiernan, 1955,p. 94)

Comment: The word "hermit" is a false characterization of the original word "قلندر" as this point has already been explained above. A hermit usually stands for a recluse who adopts a monkish life and tends to pay no heed to the mundane affairs and the existential challenges. A hermitic life is typically marked by self-denial and a somewhat escapist attitude. On the contrary, a "قلندر" is a *heroic believer* whofar from being a monkish figure, accepts and confronts the hard challenges of the practical life.It is remarkable that in Iqbal's poetic discourse, the word "قلندر" has a totally unique and different meaning to it. Far from being an ascetic escapist, a *heroic believer* stands firm in the face of all odds and remains a paragon as much of heroism as of spirituality.

(8)

اسی دریا سے اُٹھتی ہے وہ موجِ تند جولاں بھی
نہنگوں کے نشیمن جس سے ہوتے ہیں تہ و بالا

Her waters that have bred the shark now breed
The storm- wave that will smash its den below!
(Kiernan, 1955,p. 74)

Comment: The translation of the first line "اسی دریا سے اُٹھتی ہے وہ

موجِ تند جولاں بھی" as "Her waters that have bred the shark now breed" is to some extent an over-translation. The inclusion of the word "shark" and its supposed breeding by the waters is a fanciful and subjective extrapolation by the translator. The source text, on the contrary, implies something considerably different: "That tumultuous wave rises from the same waters." This is all what this line implies, but the translator erroneously includes the reference to the shark and attributes its breeding to the waters.

(9)

خودی سے اس طلسمِ رنگ و بُو کو توڑ سکتے ہیں
یہی توحید تھی جس کو نہ تو سمجھا نہ میں سمجھا

By Selfhood only are the spells
Of sense broken,—that power we did not know.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 74)

Comment: This is an obvious instance of mistranslation. In the source text, the poet has employed the word "توحید". This is an Arabic word with such meanings as "Divine Unity", "Oneness of God" or "Grand Unification".A careful reading of the source text suggests that the poet is using this word in close tandem with the notion of the Selfhood (خودی). However, the translator fails to communicate this essential meaning of the source text, and instead he subsumes it under a very sketchy and imprecise phrase: "— that power we did not know." In an extremely disingenuous way, the translator is confusing the notion of the Grand Unification (توحید) with an amorphous and faceless "power".

Iqbal, in fact, is implying in this verse that, at the highest level, the notion of Selfhood becomes indistinguishable from the ideal of a Grand (Divine) Unity (توحید) and the former happens to be a true crystallization of the latter. This

correlation is one of the most abiding themes in Iqbal's thought. To him, at the broadest level, in the absence of a fully awakened and Active Selfhood (خودیٔ بیدار), a mere confession of the Divine Unity is little more than an abstract belief of no real import. Without a dynamic Selfhood operating behind its back, any such confession will degenerate into a ritualistic and theoretical testament. Thus, Iqbal perceives the Selfhood to be the custodian of the Grand Divine Unity. At some other occasion, Iqbal has presented the same concept in the following words:

زندہ قوت تھی جہاں میں یہی توحید کبھی
آج کیا ہے، فقط اک مسئلۂ علم کلام

Animated force once this Tawhid was
And now? A topic of mere rhetoric.(My translation)

However, when one goes through Kiernan's translation, one does not find any inkling of this correlational meaning firmly embedded in the source text. On the contrary, Kiernan's translation is eliminating this very notion as there is nothing which could enable the reader to somehow construct this correlation.

(10)

تیرا جلال و جمال، مردِ خدا کی دلیل
وہ بھی جلیل و جمیل، تو بھی جلیل و جمیل

Outward and inward grace, witness in you for him,
Prove your builder, like you, fair of shape and of soul.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 104)

Comment: This is arguably one of the most glaring examples of mistranslation. Elisions of the essential referencing, highly problematic equivalence and unnecessary curtailment mar the source text semantics. In effect, what the translator has brought about looks more like a rewriting of the source text

than its translation in any real sense. In the source text, the poet has used the phrase "جلال و جمال" which the translator has translated as "Outward and inward grace". This is problematic for several reasons and invites some elaboration here.

The Urdu word "جلال" has such meanings as "Majesty" and "Splendour"; whereas "جمال"can be translated as "Beauty" and "Comeliness of One's Person". The former has the undertones of grandeur and masculinity; whereas the latter implies tenderness and femininity. Neither "جلال" nor "جمال" is necessarily inward or outward. Instead, both of them have inward as well as outward dimensions. Thus when the translator reduces "جلال" to an "inward grace", he is unnecessarily curtailing the source-text semantics. Besides, he is also mistranslating it. The similar problem can be detected with the word "جمال" and its translation as "outward grace".

Next problem pertains to the translation of the phrase "مردِ خدا" which the translator has translated in a highly unimaginative way. For this, the translator has used a bald and plain objective pronoun "him" which seems powerless to communicate the wholesome meaningfulness of the original phrase. The employment of this objective pronoun here is extremely vague and, in effect, trivializing for the following reasons: First, this objective pronoun is not clearly referring (either anaphorically or cataphorically) to any antecedent within the translation i.e. any noun. Second, it is inadequate. The phrase "مردِ خدا" is somewhat synonymous with another oft-quoted phrase in Iqbal's discourse "مردِ مومن" which has already been explained in detail by me.

The phrase "مردِ مومن" frequently punctuates Iqbal's poetic and philosophical discourse and is of foundational

importance for his entire scheme of thought. It is such a rich and meaningful term that a mere employment of an objective pronoun (i.e. "him") cannot render it. Only a Muslim of exceptional calibre blessed with perceptiveness, courage and a highly developed sense of the Self (*Khudi*) can be legitimately called a "مردِ مومن". Such a reference cannot be translated merely as "him".

Furthermore, the translation of the second line is also deeply flawed for several technical reasons. As a matter of fact, the poet, in an extremely inventive and artistic way, draws an ingenious parallel between the Mosque of Cordoba and an *Accomplished Believer* (an equivalent proposed by me to render the Urdu phrase "مردِ خدا"). Therefore, according to the poet, it is with special reference to this comparison that in Beauty (جلال) as well as in Majesty (جمال), the Cordoba Mosque and an Accomplished Believer are totally identified with each other.

Finally, there is an undue historical specificity in Kiernan's translation — a reference to the builder of the Mosque. Kiernan is correlating the Beauty and the Majesty of the Mosque with those of its builders. This is not what the source text implies in any sense. By a clear allusion to an *Accomplished Believer* (مردِ خدا), the source text plainly establishes the generality of the reference. But the translator, in direct violation of this generality, confines the reference to only those believers who built the Mosque.

(11)

مٹ نہیں سکتا کبھی مردِ مسلماں کہ ہے
اس کی اذانوں سے فاش سرِّ کلیمؑ و خلیلؑ

Never can Muslim despair: he, reciting his creed,
Stands before God where once Moses and Abraham stood.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 104)

Comment: Another mistranslation. First, the Urdu phrase "مٹ نہیں سکتا کبھی مردِ مسلماں" has been rendered as "Never can Muslim despair". This is an obvious mistranslation. The poet is maintaining that Muslims can never be wiped out from the world. However, the translator puts it this way that Muslims can never despair. Now clearly this is not what the source text is saying.

Similarly, the entire second line has been translated in an enormously imprecise and deficient way. The line "اس کی اذانوں سے فاشِ سرِّ کلیمؑ و خلیلؑ" has been translated as "…he, reciting his creed / Stands before God where once Moses and Abraham stood". This is incomprehensible and the translation is not easily correlatable to the source text. In accordance with the source text, the translation should have been something like this: "His Call lays bare the mysteries confided to Moses and Abraham" There is nothing in the source text which could possibly imply the act of "standing before God" in any sense.

(12)

وہی بُت فروشی، وہی بُت گری ہے
سینما ہے یا صنعتِ آزری ہے؟

Cinema—or new fetish-fashioning,
Idol-making and mongering still?
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 158)

Comment: The equivalents used by the translator can be schematically presented as follows:

بُت فروشی	fetish-fashion
بُت گری	Idol-making
صنعتِ آزری	[idol]-mongering

These equivalents are repetitious and evidently less than accurate. "Fetish-fashioning", "idol-making" and "idol-mongering" refer to more or less the same phenomenon. This is one of the most apparent features of domestication that it imposes a homogeneity on the source text. There is nothing more remarkable to be said about the first two equivalents; however, the third equivalent calls for some discussion. The phrase "صنعت آزری" is not precisely "[idol]-mongering" as the translator has rendered it. In fact, the phrase "صنعتِ آزری" is also an explicit historical reference to Āzar (English: Tareh, Hebrew:תֶּרַח), the father of the Prophet Abraham (AS) and one of the most notorious idol-makers. This historical reference has been flattened out in translation and the target text does not make any mention of it. There is no direct or indirect clue which could enable the reader of the translation to appreciate the central role of Āzar in the source text.

Lastly, "بُت فروشی" is not just "fetish-fashion"; it is "fetish-auctioning". "Fetish-fashioning" is just "بُت گری" which implies just the making idols; not essentially vending them.

(13)

بھر آئے پُھول کے آنسو پیامِ شبنم سے
کلی کا ننّھا سا دل خون ہو گیا غم سے

And at the dew's report the flower's eye filled
With pain the new bud's tiny heartbeat thrilled.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 24)

Comment: The Urdu expression "دل خون ہونا" means "to experience acute pain" or "to be deeply distressed". The poet has used this expression as "کلی کا ننھا سا دل خون ہو گیا". Its translation should have been something like this: "The petal's tiny heart snapped", "The petal's tiny heart grieved with pain", etc. However, in a very periphrastic way, the translator has

rendered it as "…new bud's tiny heartbeat thrilled", which is implying something totally opposed to that what is delicately embedded in the source text. To be thrilled means *to feel excited* or *to be delighted*; however, the source text is all about grief, mourning and severe heartache.

(14)

طبعِ مشرق کے لیے موزوں یہی افیون تھی
ورنہ قوّالی سے کچھ کم تر نہیں علمِ کلام

…Opium such as theirs
Was medicinable to Asia; had we needed,
The sophist's art lay ready no less potent
Than droning psalm.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 232)

Comment: This piece of translation is also fraught with problems. To begin with, the word "قوالی" has been rendered as "droning psalm" which is antithetical to the spirit of the "قوالی" which is Sufi devotional music marked by tempo and passion. *Qawwali*comes of a rich vocal tradition and largely takes the form of devotional music and chanting characterized by melodic and free-rhythmic versification (Kopka, 2011).

It is evident that the translator has crafted this equivalent in order to cater for the semantic gap in the target text but this is an inadequate crafting for the following reasons: First and foremost, in real sense of the word, "قوالی" is not just a "sacred song" or a "prayer hymn" as the equivalent "psalm" is suggesting here. It is a devotional and passionate narrative in poetic form which is sung with elaborate musical arrangements. *Qawwali* (a loanword frequently used in English) can deal with a number of themes ranging from an epic re-collection of the glorious past to a fervent self-abnegation and love-songs (*ghazals*).

Second, the juxtaposition of the adjective "droning" with it makes this equivalent phrase all the more inappropriate as, in contrast to the loud rush and throb of *qawwali*, it has the undertones ofa "low humming" and "flat buzzing". The vocal and musical scheme of a droning psalm is, in fact, diametrically opposed to that of a *qawwali*.

(15**)**

عجم کے خیالات میں کھو گیا
یہ سالک مقامات میں کھو گیا

Turned sophist roams his inner stage,
Imaginary pilgrimage.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 130)

Comment: Translating the Urdu word "سالک" as "sophist" calls for some discussion. In Sufism, the word "سالک" stands for a wandering Sufi who seeks to achieve Divine Love and who, in this pursuit, passes through various spiritual stations. What Iqbal is lamenting here is the fact that Sufis have mistaken these stations for the actual destination. There may well be an element of sophistry in the current practices and cultic rituals of Sufism but the use of the word "sophists" brings a clearly Hellenistic ring to translation.

Besides, the reference to "عجم" is left totally untranslated. Iqbal is critical of the fact that Muslim mystics are lost in the "Persian abstractions"—"عجم کے خیالات". In an extremely periphrastic way, the translator has rendered it as roaming the "inner stage". This translation is so far-fetched as to be incomprehensible. One can only conjecture as to what relation he or she can construct between the original expression and its translation. Another relational problem arises regarding "imaginary pilgrimage". It is not clear from the translation whether the spiritual pilgrimage of a Sufi is actually imaginary or it is considered to be as such by the Sufi

himself. The clarification of this ambiguity remains a pre-condition for the proper understanding of the source text.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have discussed several examples of distortions and imprecisions from Kiernan's translation of Iqbal. A large number of these distortions and imprecisions are mostly due to a disregard for the specificities, variations, polysemic patterns and sensitivities embedded in the source text. Now and then, the foremost ethical aim of translation (i.e. receiving the foreign as foreign) also gets compromised (Berman, 1992). While dealing with the culture-sensitive terms and references, the translator does not register variations between the two languages. This results in problems for the reader seeking to understand the text on its own terms. Such translations, for the most part, miss the mark "by failing to signal the wider semantic field distinctive of the author's structure of thought, which consists in a web of intricately interconnected synonyms and antonyms" (Lukes, 1973, p. 34).

OMISSION AND EXCLUSION

Within the Anglo-American translation tradition, it is not uncommon to practice extensive exclusions and elisions in order to backgroundor erase "any textual effect, any play of the signifier, which calls attention to the materiality of language, to words, their opacity, their resistance to empathic response and interpretive mastery" (Venuti, 1992, p. 4).Translators,at times, findthe discursive and schematic heterogeneity of the source texts to be more of a liability than an asset. Many of them commonly take it upon themselves to rid the source texts of "irrelevant" and "insignificant" elements.

At times, they set about to create "order" in the "skewed narratives and faulty parameters" (Petrusich, 2015, p. 188) so that the domestic readership could comprehend them with ease and naturalness (Munday, 2009). In order to achieve this goal, these translators routinely makes omissions and additions which, in turn, seriously affected the overall lexical cohesion, syntactic development and,what the renowned New Testament scholar Craig A. Evans calls, "discursive fullness" of the source texts (2004, p. 104).

Kiernan's translation of Iqbal also suffers from this problem of omission and thus entails a syntactic and semantic loss along with a truncated comprehension of the source text. On occasion, the proliferation of significations, tropes, allusions and figures present in the original is curtailed by the translator by resorting to large-scale omissions. Let us discuss some of these examples:

(1)

یہی شیخِ حرم ہے جو چُرا کر بیچ کھاتا ہے

گلیم بُوذرؓو دلقِ اویسؓ و چادرِ زہراؓ!

…the Prophet's heir filches
and sells the blankets of the Prophet's kin.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 74)

Comment: In this verse, there are three proper historic references which have been omitted and instead of them an extremely general and prosaic equivalent phrase has been introduced in the translation. In the source text, thereare three historic references: HazratAbu DharrGhaffari (RA), HazratUwaisQarni (RA) andHazratFatima (RA). With reference to these notable personalities of Islam, Iqbal says that the contemporary Muslim preachers have lost all qualms and they do not shrink from exploiting the names of these noble people. However, in the translation, these three historical personalities are subsumed under an exceedingly generic and somewhat non-factual phrase, "the Prophet's kin".

It is inadequate to rely on one simple and generic phrase—"the Prophet's kin" to refer to these three proper references. The proper references present in the source text are historically specific and context-sensitive. It becomes clear from a cursory glance on the pages of Islamic history that in Islam these figures are known for their proverbial other-worldliness, detachment to the thing mundane and a total austerity—the qualities whose lack Iqbal is mourning in the present day Muslim divines.

Similarly, there is a semantic and factual problem too which seriously mars the overall scheme of translation presented here. Semantically, the word "kin"refers to a group of peoplehaving a common ancestry or more generally to one's relatives. Out of these three personalities, HazratFatima (RA) indeed was the beloved daughter of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), therefore she can be termed his close kin. However, HazratAbu DharrGhaffari (RA) and HazratUwaisQarni (RA) did not share the ancestry, in any

way, with the Prophet (PBUH). The Prophet (PBUH) had no "kinship" with them as such.

(2)

نگاہِ عشق و مستی میں وہی اوّل، وہی آخر
وہی قرآں، وہی فرقاں، وہی یٰسیں، وہی طٰہٰ!

Love's eyes, not slow to kindle, hail him Alpha and Omega, Chapter, and Word, and Book.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 78)

Comment: In this translation too, most of the proper nouns used by the poet have been left out by the translator. The equivalents are not pertinent enough to capture the spirit of the original text. They suffer from various kinds of semantic and referential inadequacies. But because "**طٰہٰ**" and "**یٰسیں**" are *Harūf-e-Muqatta□at* ("The Mysterious Letters"), therefore, we can reasonably accept it as, in accordance with the Muslim exegetical tradition, it is not humanly possible to know the exact meanings of these words. But let us say something about the fourth word: "**فرقاں**" which originally means "The Differentiator/Distinguisher". This word, which occupies a central position in the overall scheme of the verse, has been altogether omitted by the translator. This omission entails a serious semantic loss which the translator does not seek to compensate in the target text in any way.

(3)

بندۂ مزدُور کو جا کر مرا پیغام دے
خضر کا پیغام کیا، ہے یہ پیغام کا نَات

To the workman go, the toiler, and to him this message tell:
Words not mine alone, a message that the world's four corners swell.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 54)

Comment: The poet is mentioning HazratKhidr (AS), a

revered figure in Islam described by the Holy Quran as an upright servant of God (18: 65). The reference to him is crucial to conceptualize the core significance and relevance of this verse. This reference serves as a schema to the source text and invests it with essential historicity. According to the Holy Quran, HazratKhidr (AS) was blessed by Allah with remarkable wisdom and great mystic knowledge (*gnosis*). In the Holy Quran he has also been depicted as the Prophet Moses'spiritual master whoinitiatedthe latter into the divine sciences and esoteric mysteries. The Holy Quran anecdotally describes how he ingeniously justified God's ways to man.

All this essential information goes amiss in the translation as the translator altogether omits his name in the translation and uses a pronoun in its stead. Interestingly and more remarkably, in the entire translation of this poem, nowhere does the translator mention the name of HazratKhidr (AS). Therefore, for a reader it is not easy to connect this pronoun with any antecedent as there is none provided by the translator.

(4)

گرچہ برہم ہے قیامت سے نظامِ ہست و بود
ہیں اسی آشوب سے بے پردہ اسرارِ وجود

Though Resurrection wrench
The fabric of existence
It lays all mysteries bare in its fierce gale.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 248)

Comment: Here is another example of a brief but quite far-reaching omission. In the source text, the poet talks about "اسرارِ وجود" (*the mysteries of existence*) but, in the translation, the translator just mentions "mysteries" and the noun "وجود" ("Existence") is left untranslated. "Existence" and, by the same token, "non-Existence" are two important themes in Iqbal poetic and philosophical thought. His treatment of

these two themes is superbly complex, nuanced and extremely crucial to the overall comprehension of his ideas. He elucidates the question of existence taking into account its essential complexities and its many-sided realities/mysteries.

Therefore, the poet, in this verse, is not just talking about *mysteries* in any ordinary sense of the word. Instead, he is concerned with the mysteries which have fatefully complicated the question ofExistence on this planet and which will ultimately be unravelled on the Day of Judgement.

(5)

تمدن، تصوف، شریعت، کلام
بتانِ عجم کے پجاری تمام

…his art,
Philosophy, law, divinity
Still tainted with idolatry.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 130)

Comment: Here the translator has skipped so much which should have been preserved and, as a result of this wholesale omission, the target text seems semantically at wide variance with the source text. To the poet, whatever Muslims are claiming in the name of culture, mysticism, *Kalam*(Muslim apologetics), and even Shariaare but the offshoots of the Persian idolatrous traditions which are so profoundly antithetical to the spirit of Islam. The poet is of the view that all such doctrines and institutions are the plagiaristic adaptations of the Persian and Mazdakian cults and have no warrant in Islam. Iqbal is primarily interested in the recovery of what he thought to be the pristine form of Islam bereft of all the subsequent accretions.

For this purpose, he avowedly opposes what he found to be the Persian accretions in Islam. To him, Islam remains, first and foremost, a complete and "unadulterated" religion on its own right. All the Greco-Roman and Mazdakian

elements in Islam are an anathema to him. All this becomes apparent when one looks at the original text as the poet categorically mentions the Persian idolatrous and polytheistic cult and its adverse impact on Islam.

However, the lion's part of these references and terminologies is left out by the translator and the second line "بتانِ عجم کے پجاری تمام" is translated as "still tainted with idolatry". It should be remembered that idolatry, as a pagan phenomenon, is as old as polytheism. It ranges from the veneration of false gods to an excessive devotion to the material images. But here the poet is specifically concerned with the Persian idolatrous cult and its contamination of the Islamic doctrines and institutions. All this is omitted in the target text which just mentions idolatry without mentioning any further qualifications. The result of this way of approaching the source text is the loss of a historicity and a specificity.

(6)

بھروسہ کر نہیں سکتے غلاموں کی بصیرت پر
کہ دنیا میں فقط مردانِ حر کی آنکھ ہے بینا!

Trust no slave's eyes, clear sight and liberty
go hand in hand.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 76)

Comment: This translation is a very glaring example of the omission done by the translator. The second line "کہ دنیا میں فقط مردانِ حُر کی آنکھ ہے بینا" which has been translated as "clear sight and liberty go hand in hand", is problematic on account of some serious omissions. This leads to an extremely domesticated translation dislocated from its linguistic and cultural moorings.

The amorphousness and the lack of specificity which characterizes this translation establish the point that the target text is being homogenized by the translator. Moreover, the

extremely nuanced character of the source text is being flattened out by him. The iconicity of the source text is conspicuously absent in the translation. Most of these iconic words/references are omitted and in their stead the translator proposes very generic and non-signifying equivalents. The Urdu word "بصیرت" becomes "eyes" which is obviously an inadequate equivalent. More appropriately, the original word "بصیرت" denotes something exceedingly greater than that which meets the eyes. The word "بصیرت", in fact, stands for a uniquely endowed perceptiveness which enables the ordinary folks to see the esoteric and the ultimate mysteries of our existence.

In this particular instance, the poet is exhorting the Muslims not to trust the "بصیرت" of the slaves. This implies that the slaves are incapable of that *perceptiveness and insight* (بصیرت) which could be really trusted upon by the Muslims in their times of woes.

(7)

الحذر، محکوم کی میّت سے سو بار الحذر
اے سرافیل! اے خدائے کائنات! اے جانِ پاک

Beware the carrion slave,
A hundred times beware,
Angels, and oh You Whom the worlds obey!
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 248)

Comment: In this particular instance of translation, the translator has committed serious omissions while translating the second line. In this line, there are three phrases of equal textual import but only the first two of them are translated and the last one is just left out. To be more precise, only two of the Urdu phrases are translated as shown below:

- "اے سرافیل" as "Angels"
- "اے خدائے پاک" as "oh You Whom the worlds obey!"

The third phrase which is present in the source text—"اے جانِ پاک"—is omitted. Moreover, apart from this exclusion, there is one more problem which should be mentioned here. The compound word "الحذر" has been rendered as "Beware" by the translator which is not wholly correct. In fact, the word "الحذر" is a compressed and formulaic prayer which originally means: "Thy shelter O God!" In the cultural context of the Urdu language, this expression precedes all the fateful proclamations which people make in the more formal discourses. Finally, I will also like to mention it here in passing that the two equivalent phrases proposed by Kiernan are problematic on yet another count i.e. the lossthat specificity which characterizes the source text.

(8)

تاریک ہے افرنگ مشینوں کے دھوئیں سے
یہ وادیٔ ایمن نہیں شانِ تجلی

Dark is the white man's country with the grime
Of engines, no valley that might see
Splendour descending on a burning tree.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 207)

Comment: In this piece of translation, it can be noticed that once again the source text is more iconic as well as symbolic. The poet is talking about "وادیٔ ایمن" (the Valley of Aiman). However, the translator has rendered it merely as "valley". The Valley of Aiman is the place where the Prophet Moses (PBUH) heard God's calling. The reference to this Valley invests the source text with a historicity and grandeur. But when the translator renders it as a mere "valley", there is no way for a reader to appreciate the essential richness and the historical specificity of the reference.

Conclusion

With thiswe come to an end of this chapter and, therefore, it is pertinent to draw together some of the stands of the preceding discussion. Here I have established with the help of numerous examples that in his translation of Iqbal, Kiernan has committed extensive omissions which have eventually resulted in the domestication of the source text. Like other domesticating strategies, the practice of omission has also at times resulted in silencing the "voice" of the source text. It has been shown that a considerable number of proper references, tropes, allusions mentioned by the poet, have been omitted by the translator. These references and tropes have either been translated very generically or omitted altogether. In the absence of these proper source-text references, the translation experiences a cultural and linguistic dislocation. The target text does not remain as communicative and as meaningful as the source text happens to be.

QUALITATIVE IMPOVERISHMENT

The poetic discourse of Iqbal abounds in expressions, references, figures and turns of phrases which have proverbial exquisiteness, artistry and inventiveness. Iqbal is one of those poets who set new benchmarks of excellence and merit in the literary tradition of Urdu. There are various examples in Kiernan's translation of Iqbal where the translator overtly fails to maintain the requisite standards of artistic and qualitative standards. This results in highly prosaic pieces of rendition. In this chapter, I have taken various examples into account which illustrate qualitative impoverishment in Kiernan's translation. To begin with, consider the following instance:

(1)

حقیقت خرافات میں کھو گئی
یہ اُمت روایات میں کھو گئی

Truth buried in rubbish, a ritual maze
Burying the creed…
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 130)

Comment: As it has already been discussed that the word "اُمت" is a very complex term and defies translation into English. At the most fundamental level, the word "Ummah" (a loanword widely used in English) refers tothe pan-Islamic community of the believers. This community is supposed to transcend the long-established tribal and ethnic boundaries in order to achieve a measure of politico-spiritual unity. The Ummahdenotes a non-territorial affiliation and it evokes a

sense of belonging and a shared identity in Muslims which is crystallized and communicated by an association founded on religious grounds.

The translator has rendered this word as "the creed" which is highly problematic. In fact, translating the word "اُمت" as "the creed" does not signify anything substantial;rather, the employment of this equivalent is extremely far-fetched and fanciful. Perhaps the word "creed" has been metonymically used for Islam which, in turn, is expected to stand for the Ummah. But, if that is the case, then it is a considerably tortuous way of articulating the source text. First, the word "creed" cannot even stand for Islam, let alone for a complex and unique concept like the Ummah. The word "creed" (Latin: *credo*) stands for an authoritative summary of the primary articles of faith of the various Christian churches or the bodies of believers. Thus, even using the term "creed" for Islam is an act of cultural and historical appropriation.

Furthermore, while looking at the source text, the reader achieves this realization that Iqbal is not mourning here the loss of any creed as such.It is not even the creed which is lost in the mazes of rituals. Instead, more accurately, it is the Ummah which has gone adrift because of sectarian hair-splitting and an overemphasis on the externalities of the faith.

(2)

بھروسہ کر نہیں سکتے غلاموں کی بصیرت پر
کہ دنیا میں فقط مردانِ حر کی آنکھ ہے بینا!

Trust no slave's eyes, clear sight and liberty
go hand in hand.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 76)

Comment: In this translation, the artistic and aesthetic exquisiteness of the source text suffers because of the superficial and simplistic equivalents. What the poet is

employing here are the finely nuanced phrases which the translator has rendered by resorting to largely one-dimensional equivalents. For the Urdu phrase "غلاموں کی بصیرت" the translator uses the equivalent "slave's eyes" which is a somewhat crude way of dealing with the source text. In fact the word "بصیرت" is similar to another Urdu word which has already been discussed by me — "نگہ". In Urdu, both of these words go beyond the mere optical ability of an individual to visualize an object. Instead, they imply an enlightened and gnostic glance which is capable of a miraculous insight. In this way, the Urdu word "بصیرت" is something like a theosophic illumination which has the potential to lay bare the deeper mysteries of our existence. By using the phrase "slave's eyes", the translator seems to have depreciated the true value of the original phrase.

Almost a similar indictment can be made of another equivalent phrase used by the translator here — "clear sight". In the translation, this phrase stands for the Urdu expression: "بینا آنکھ". Although the word "sight" is more consequential and meaningful when compared with the word "eye"; still it falls short of the required level of communicability. It is in fact "insight" that Iqbal is talking about, and not just "sight".In spite of its somewhat broader semantics, the word "sight" basically remains an external and physical faculty of seeing and visualizing.In Iqbal's scheme of ideas, it is the loss of "insight" (بصیرت) which makes humankind spiritually and esoterically blind. To him, one may be deprived of "insight" in spite of being fully in possession of "sight". The latter, in fact, does not necessitate the former.

Finally, in the same way, rendering the Urdu phrase "مردانِ حُر"as "liberty" is also indictable on much the same grounds. The equivalent "liberty" is too abstract as compared

to the original phrase "مردانِ حُر" ("soldiers of freedom"). The equivalent used by the translator invests the translation with an impersonal tone. However, the source text does not have this *impersonality* and *abstractness* of tone. In fact, Iqbal's poetic discourse is highly *embodied* and *personal* in which things are not expected to happen on their own. Nor are they expected to come into existence from nowhere.Instead a personal and human agency is mostly posited behind all the purposive actions.

(3)

حاضر ہوا میں شیخ مجدّدؒ کی لحد پر

I stood by the Reformer's tomb.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 160)

Comment: The word "Reformer" for "مجدّد" is problematic andabetterequivalent is "Revivalist". In the Islamic religious tradition, there have been numerous "Revivalists" (مجددین) who were largely responsible for the reassertion and restoration (i.e. revival) of the pure and unadulterated Islamic teachings against the syncretistic and unorthodox tendencies of the day.

In this particular verse, likewise, Iqbal is referring to Sheikh Ahmad of Sirhind (1564-1624) who was an Indian mystic and a revered revivalist who is more commonly known asMujaddid-i Alf-i Thaani, (مجدد الف ثانی) — *The Revivalist of the Second Millennium*. It is a reference to the fact that he lived at the beginning of the second millennium of the Muslim calendar. However, the use of the word "Reformer" smacks of the Lutheran idea of a 16th century Protestant Reformation. It is also worth mentioning here that it is very common to translate "مجدد" as "reformer" which is an obvious mistake. For all intents and purposes, a "مجدد" has to be a

"revivalist" — the one who undertakes and accomplishes the *Revival* (تجدید) of the faith. On the contrary, a reformer is just concerned with its reform (اصلاح).

(4)

بیچتا ہے ہاشمی، ناموسِ دینِ مصطفیٰ ﷺ

The lord of Mecca barters the honour of Mecca's faith.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 46)

Comment: This is also an example of shallow translation. To Iqbal, the Muslim scholars, who claim to be the heirs to the Prophet (PBUH), are auctioning away the honour of the Prophet (PBUH)'s faith. But Kiernan has widely generalized this whole notion. The Urdu phrase "ناموسِ دینِ مصطفیٰ ﷺ" is rendered as "the honour of Mecca's faith". This is not what is evident from the source text. Here Iqbal is historically referring to Hussain Bin Ali (1854-1931), commonly known as Sharif of Mecca. He declared himself as the king of Hejaz and initiated the famous Arab Revolt against the Ottoman Caliphate. After the abolition of the Caliphate, he became the self-proclaimed caliph of Muslims.

According to the poet, this was an act of treason and betrayal and Iqbal was deeply pestered by it. In this verse he is referring to Sharif of Mecca and his selling out the honour of the Prophet (PBUH)'s faith (ناموسِ دینِ مصطفیٰ ﷺ) which is rendered by the translator as "Mecca's faith". To Iqbal, Sharif's act amounted to a betrayal of the entire Ummah; not just Mecca. Therefore, the translator has unnecessarily confined Sharif's betrayalto "Mecca's faith".

(5)

خالی ہے کلیموں سے یہ کوہ و کمر ورنہ

No Prophet walks these hills, or we might be…
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 12)

Comment: The word "کلیم" here is a title used for the Prophet Moses (AS) as in the Islamic tradition Moses was given the title "کلیم اللہ"(*The one who speaks to Allah*). In Iqbal's poetry, the Prophet Moses (AS) symbolizes revolutionary zeal and robust courage in the face of the arrogant Pharaohs. To him, only a Moses-like individual can deliver the Muslim Ummah from an all-prevailing darkness and bondage. Just as the Prophet Moses (AS) delivered the Israelites from the slavery of the Pharaohs, similarly an exceptionally gallant and spiritually alive leader is needed to liberate the Ummah at this critical juncture. Therefore, in this verse, Iqbal is alluding to the Prophet Moses (AS) and the entire concept has been developedaround this prophetic reference.

However, in the translation most of this schematic referencing is lost and the translator uses an extremely generalized and somewhat non-impressionistic equivalent — " Prophet" — which falls short of signifying anything specific with reference to the source text semantic specificity. Doubtless, all the prophets sought to overthrow the tyrannous and oppressive regimes of the day with remarkable enthusiasm but with reference to the source text, here, it is Moses who happens to be the direct object of Iqbal's thoughts. Therefore, an omission of this central reference deprives the translation of its essential historicity and thus divests the source text of its richness and communicative potential.

(6)

وہ صنعت نہ تھی، شیوۂ کافری تھا
یہ صنعت نہیں، شیوۂ ساحری ہے

Art, men called that olden voodoo—
Art, they call this mumbo-jumbo.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 158)

Comment: A cursory glance at the source text makes its serious and formal tone abundantly clear. These lines have

been taken from the poem "سینما" (*Cinema*) which is characterized by a serious tone. However, the translator renders it in a somewhat slang and informal manner which compromises the earnestness and the decorum of the original text. In this way, the translator seems to have exhibited a disregard for the formal properties of the source text. Furthermore, this translation also smacks of the Anglicization of the source text.

To begin with, the translator has rendered the compound Urdu phrase "شیوۂ ساحری" as "mumbo-jumbo" which is obviously an informal expression. This original Urdu phrase implies such meanings as "sorcery", "magic" and "bewitchment". According to Iqbal, the modern day cinema industry is also a form of sorcery and a kind of bewitchment for human soul. On the contrary, the word "mumbo-jumbo, apart from being thoroughly informal, is at variance with the source text. It stands for (1) unintelligible or incomprehensible language, (2) language or ritualistic activity intended to confuse, and (3) a complicated or obscure ritual. Now, none of these three meanings is likely to be a reasonable equivalent to translate for the phrase "شیوۂ ساحری".

Moreover, the use of the word "voodoo" for "شیوۂ کافری" also calls for a brief elaboration with reference to qualitative impoverishment. The employment of the equivalent "voodoo" Anglicizes the translation a bit. "Voodoo" implies a religion practiced throughout Caribbean countries, especially Haiti, whichis a combination of Roman Catholicism and some brand of animism.

(7)

اربابِ نظر سے نہیں پوشیدہ کوئی راز

There are shrewd folk who always know what's what…
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 204)

Comment: In this verse, the phrase "اربابِ نظر" has been rendered by the translator as "shrewd folk". Shrewdness implies pragmatism and a tricky intelligence. By extension it also connotes artfulness and craftiness. In the source text, the poet has used the word "نظر", which is an exceedingly complex and multifaceted word to translate into English. It entails a theosophic illumination, an intuitive insight coupled with exceptional perceptiveness. Those who are endowed with this rare insight are hailed as "اربابِ نظر" or "اہلِ نظر" in the Urdu language.

However, the translator has given this couplet a totally pragmatic and utilitarian coloration by selecting the equivalent "shrewd folk". In the same way, the preceding phrase "who always know what's what" is yet another instance of poor translation. In the source text the words used by the poet are far more meaningful and deeper. The way the translator has presented this exceptional ability of the select few (اربابِ نظر), it looks more like a psychometric and quantitative aptitude shorn of all intuitive and transcendental dimensions of knowing. What the source text implies is something like this: "All mysteries are laid bare to the eyes of the discerning folks".

(8)

مرا کنوّل کہ تصدّق ہیں جس پہ اہلِ نظر

My heart, though it found love
In feeling heart its vassal…
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 16)

Comment: In this instance, the poet is using the word "کنوّل" symbolically and it can also mean "heart" as the translator has explicated it in the translation. But the poet is symbolizing this word which has been de-symbolized by the translator.

Moreover, this is an imprecise translation. By "کنول" the poet does not mean his heart; rather this symbol is intended for the poet's beloved who remains the central figure of the poem. The translator, in effect, could not get down to the meaning of the verse and this misunderstanding resulted in a meaninglessly circular translation: "My heart, though it found love/In feeling heart its vassal". It is not clear as to how to correlate the first *heart* with the second one. Did *heart* feel *heart* as its vassal? Does one of the references to heart stand for the beloved of the poet? All these and many more questions are difficult to settle given the deeply flawed scheme of translation.

(9)

نہ ایشیا میں نہ یورپ میں سوزوسازِ حیات
خودی کی موت ہے یہ، اور وہ ضمیر کی موت

Death to man's soul is Europe, death is Asia
To man's will: neither feels the vital current.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 202)

Comment: This is an example of an extremely flattened out translation which has homogenized most of the elements of the source text. The phrase "سوزوسازِ حیات" becomes the mere "vital current" in the translation. However, this equivalent phrase does not capture the passion, the fervour, the iconic beauty and the alliterative gusto which characterize the source text so artistically. Therefore, the equivalent phrase used by the translator is generalized, simplistic and it fails to stand for the original phrase. Eventually, it leads to an impoverishment of the translation.

Qualitatively, there is more impoverishment. The second line in the original verse contains two indictments: "خودی کی موت" ("Death of the Selfhood") and "ضمیر کی موت" ("Death of the Conscience"). The poet relates the former with Asia and the

latter with Europe. However, the translator erroneously relates the former not only with Europe but also with Asia. And as regards the latter i.e. Death of the Conscience, it is altogether skipped.

(10)

آہ ظالم! تو جہاں میں بندۂ محکوم تھا
میں نہ سمجھی تھی کہ ہے کیوں خاک میری سوزناک

Ah, villain! Were you then
A thing at ease with bondage?
I did not guess what itch was in my clay!
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 250)

Comment: The phrase "بندۂ محکوم" is translated as "A thing at ease with bondage". This besides containing a lot of padding is a qualitatively impoverished piece of translation. It seems more like a paraphrasing of the original text. In Iqbal's poetry the phrase "بندہِ محکوم" has been used frequently which can profitably been translated as "an enslaved creature". As regards the translation of the second line, it must be said that it is extremely witless and banal. An exceptionally exquisite line — "میں نہ سمجھی تھی کہ ہے کیوں خاک میری سوزناک" — is rendered as "I did not guess what itch was in my clay". The word "itch" has the implications of "irritation" and "prickling". Connotatively it implies "eager yearning" and "longing". An air of informality and casualness which characterizes this word is easily discernible.

This overtly informal character of this word has been documented by all the notable dictionaries as well. *The Webster College Dictionary*(2010) and *TheMerriam Webster Online* are just two cases in point. Moreover, the original phrase "سوزناک" which implies "an ardent sense of burning" is decisively more than an "itch". The sombre seriousness and the sepulchral atmosphere of the poem are seriously affected by an inclusion

of such an informal equivalent phrase.

(11)

نُورِ خورشید کی محتاج ہے ہستی میری

If I exist, it is only as a pensioner of the sun.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 8)

Comment: Here we can see that the original text is far more *concrete* and more *iconic* than its translation. The word "نُورِ خورشید" (*the light of the sun*) is far more expressive than its replacement with a metonymic notion — "the sun". The sun as a celestial object has many purposes (either perceived or real). It is not only a source of light but also the chief cause of heat and discomfort. However, here Iqbal is specifically concerned with the metaphorical aspect of the sun and what he means is not so much as physical light. Rather, more accurately, what he means is a spiritual and gnostic illumination. Therefore, reducing this complex and highly polysemic phrase (نورِخورشید) to a mere reference to the sun is inadequate and truncating.

(12)

کیا زمانے سے نرالا ہے مسولینی کا جُرم؟
بے محل بگڑا ہے معصومانِ یورپ کا مزاج

What, are crimes like Mussolini's so unheard of in this age?
Why should they put Europe's goodies into such a silly rage?
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 218)

Comment: This is yet another example of rendering a highly serious source text in somewhat informal terms. In this piece of translation, the translator has rendered the Urdu phrase "معصومانِ یورپ" as "Europe's goodies". Once again the phrase used as equivalent is informal. Furthermore, a "goody" does not have the denotations of a "معصوم" which means "faultless",

"immaculate" and "unblemished".

(13)

شریکِ حکم غلاموں کو کر نہیں سکتے
خریدتے ہیں فقط اُن کا جوہرِ ادراک

No slave is given a partnership in England's reign—
She only wants to buy her brain.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 204)

Comment: In this piece of translation, the translator has rendered the Urdu phrase "جوہرِ ادراک" as "brain" which compromises the depth and the splendour of the original. The word "brain" invokes the idea of cerebral smartness and purely mental potential. It has an external and superficial ring to it. In Iqbal's poetic and philosophical discourse, it is very rare for the "brain" to be considered a locus of wisdom or insight. Many a time Iqbal comes down harshly upon the self-important role of the brain (the role played by *abstract reason* — عقل). On the other hand, "جوہرِ ادراک" is an extremely far-reaching and profound phrase which, on account of its amazingly wide reach, far surpasses the meanings conveyed by the word "brain". The phrase "جوہرِ ادراک" betokens a highly sophisticated and developed ability of an individual to make sense of the mysteries of our existence. It is an exceptional talent which illuminates human understanding and extends far beyond the workings of theoretical and abstract reasoning.

However, what really characterizes and distinguishes "جوہرِ ادراک" from the mere talent of the abstract reasoning is the deeper knowledge which is the result of an enlightened and gnostic understanding.The source of this knowledge is the spiritual realm of our existence. Viewing from this perspective, the term "جوہرِ ادراک" implies a gnostic and illuminated discernment which in the very act of seeing

embraces the object of vision. However, all this is not communicated by the equivalent used by the translator—*brain*.

Conclusion

To conclude this chapter, it can be maintained that there are various instances in Kiernan's translation of Iqbal which illustrate the qualitative impoverishment of the target text. The grace, historicity, richness, iconicity and depth present in the source text have not always been successfully rendered by the translator. At times, the translator has resorted to considerably pedestrian equivalents to render some of the highly nuanced, resonant and vivid words/expressions. On certain other occasions, the translator has employed informal as well as slang equivalents. The sum total of all these moves made by the translator leads to the qualitative impoverishment of the translation. Eventually this qualitative impoverishment leads to the domestication of the source text by the translator. Besides, it has also been noted that this qualitative impoverishment also deprives the source text of its essential qualifications.

EXPANSION AND EXPLICITATION

It constitutes one of the great merits of literature, especially poetry, that its clarities and concisions are finely counterbalanced by its ambiguities, implicitness. What is stated implicitly and indirectly by the author can only be explicated and elucidated at the cost of its charm and literary merit. In a certain sense, however, some amount of expansion/explicitation is inherent in every act of translation as every translation involves some degree of semantic clarification and syntactic qualification. Therefore, it is not uncommon for translations to be longer than the originals.

The actual writer may have concealed a thought, used vague tropes, alluded to something in passing or implied something in a roundabout way. However when it comes to translation, a translator may feel compelled to explicate such textual ambiguities and, consequently, eliminate the mystique and the purposeful obscurityenshrined in the source text. Poetry is particularly marked by ambiguity and mystique which serve as one of its most remarkable features. But explicating these ambiguities can pave the way (of course with good intentions) to a far-reaching domestication.

Kiernan, at times, renders explicit what is not intended to be explicit in the original text. It seems to be a move away from the polysemous nature of the source text and a shift towards its re-casting as a monospermous narrative. Certain themes, tropes and references which remain *folded* and *muffled* in the original text are readily unfolded by the translator. At times, this explicitation sounds empty and does not seem to add anything substantial to the signification or the

significance of the source text. This results in what is technically called "overtranslation".

Iqbal's poetic expression proverbially possesses a purposeful brevity which contains a broad range of meanings. When Kiernan unfolds the source text this brevity of expression vis-à-vis a broad range of meaning gets radically upset. The following discussion takes into consideration different instances of this phenomenon of explicitation.

(1)

ہے اس کی طبعیت میں تشیُّع بھی ذرا سا
تفضیلِ علیؓ ہم نے سنی اس کی زبانی

And some taints of the Shias' vile heresy sully
His mind—I have heard him extolling their Ali.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 10)

Comment: Here it can easily be seen that the unwarranted inclusions by the translator result in confusion and entails a semantic dislocation. Iqbal says that as per the opinions of his coreligionists and compatriots, he has an element of "تشیُّع" (Shiitism) in his religious makeup. It is presumably just because he holds HazratAli (RA) in extraordinarily high esteem. In the source text, Iqbal has mentioned a neutral term "تشیع" (Shiitism) which refers to one of the major divisions within Islam.

By no means, Iqbal, in the source text, qualifies this denomination with any deprecating or derogatory terms as such. On the contrary, in the translation, Kiernan has given it an extremely offensive coloration by adding a highly disparaging phrase to it — "vile heresy sully". One wonders as to why the translator deemed it necessary to add this offensive and highly judgmental phrase to a neutral expression. This might have been a subjective and far-fetched extrapolation from the source text, but not a viable

interpretation of it from the perspective of translation.

(2)

پابندیِ احکامِ شریعت میں ہے کیسا ؟
گو شعر میں ہے رشکِ کلیمِ ہمدانی

But how do religion's stern monishments seem
To agree with this man who at verse beats Kalim?
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 69)

Comment: Here the translator seems more inclined towards an unwarranted paraphrase than translation. For the Urdu phrase "احکامِ شریعت" the translator has used the equivalent phrase: "religion's stern monishments". Now this is not what one actually gathers from the source text or, at least, is not what the poet intends to foreground. True, in Islam, the Sharia consists of regulations which a Muslim is expected to observe but, unlike the translator, the poet is not accentuatingthe stern character of Sharia as such.

(3)

مکر دکی چالوں سے بازی لے گیاسرما یہدار
انتہاے سادگی سےکھاگیا مزدور مات

Your sharp paymasters have swept the board, they cheat and know no shame:
You, forever unsuspecting, have forever lost the game.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 54)

Comment: This is yet another example of the extensive overtranslationin which one complete phrase ("…they cheat and know no shame") has been gratuitously added by the translator. In fact, once the translator is done with translating the first line — "مکر کی چالوں سے بازی لے گیا سرمایہ دار" — as "Your sharp paymasters have swept the board", there remains little need for any further explicitation. But he instantly adds an additional phrase. The second problem with this translation is

the referential one. In the second line, the poet is mentioning the Urdu word: "مزدور" (English: "labourer", "workman", or more generally "the proletariat"). However, in the translation, this core reference is conspicuously missing. Instead, the translator replaces it strangely with the pronoun "you"which wrongly seems to be directed at the reader.

(4)

رہے ہیں، اور ہیں فرعون میری گھات میں اب تک
مگر کیا غم کہ میری آستیں میں ہے یدِ بیضا!

…Pharaoh
Plotted and plots against me; but what harm?
Heaven lifts my hand, like Moses', white as snow.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 78)

Comment: In this translation, the translator fails to achieve clarity in spite of considerable padding. Instead, the result is greater confusion and a radical departure from the source text. The problem occurs in this phrase "میری آستیں میں ہے یدِ بیضا" which the translator has rendered wordily as "Heaven lifts my hand, like Moses', white as snow". Originally and more accurately, it should have been "Underneath my sleeve lies a White Hand". It is not clear as to what the translator really means by "Heaven lifts my hand" since nothing like this is present in the source text. The source text just mentions the "The White Hand" (یدِبیضا). True, the Prophet Moses' hand was miraculously rendered white by God in order to cow down his opponents but the poet is not confining this miraculous capability here to Moses alone. To do so would have been utterly to inverse the intentionality of the poet.

Besides, the designation "Pharaoh" has been used plurally by the poet implying all those people and tyrants who behaved with arrogance and depravity once they achieved power. The source text clearly bespeaks that Pharaohs are not

a thing of the past. The present age has its own Pharaohs which are exceedingly more ruthless and powerful than the Egyptian despots of the bygone days. But the translator has rendered it as singular, reducing it to a specific Pharaoh who belongs to just one particular period of time. At the broadest level, the source text talks about the timeless animosity of the Evil towards the Good and this animosity is being typified here by Pharaohs. But the translated version is just about one pharaoh or, at maximum, the ancient Egyptian Pharaohs who flourished between 1550 BCand 1307 BC.

Lastly and in passing, the use of the simile of "snow" takes on to the Book of Exodus (4:6):

And the LORD said furthermore unto him, Put now thine hand into thy bosom. And he put his hand into his bosom: and when he took it out, behold, his hand was leprous as snow (KJB).

(5)

آدم کو بھی دیکھا ہے کسی نے کبھی بیدار؟

Has ever star seen slumber
Desert Man's drowsy head?
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 144)

Comment: In this verse, *The Morning Star* is addressing his comrades — the other smaller stars — and puts an interesting but extremely significant question to them. But in the translation, the translator has made some uncalled-for additions to this question. In the original text, the poet is mentioning the word Adam and avoids using any qualifications/modifications with it. Adam is a generic reference in this context and stands for the entire humankind. The translator, on the other `hand, adds a qualification to this word and makes it a "Desert Man".

One wonders as to how "Man" becomes "Desert Man" in translation? The question raised by the *Morning Star* is not about some "Desert Man" as such but about "Man" in general.

(6)

روحِ سلطانی رہے باقی تو پھر کیا اضطراب
ہے مگر کیا اُس یہودی کی شرارت کا جواب؟

While tyranny's spirit lives on no fear should come
To trouble us! But what answer shall we give
To that accursed creature, that vile Jew.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 234)

Comment: In the original text, the poet is referring to the renowned economic and political philosopher Karl Marx and terms him "Jew" (Urdu: یہودی). However, it can be noticed that during the translation a considerable amount of padding is done by the translator. The single word — "یہودی" (Jew) — is translated in a padded way — "that accursed creature, that vile Jew". In the original text, Iqbal does not explicitly present this condemnation of Karl Marx; rather, just implies it in passing.

(7)

آفتابِ تازہ پیدا بطنِ گیتی سے ہوا

From the womb of this old universe a new red sun is born.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 54)

Comment: In this piece of translation also, the problem of explicitation is very prominent. In the source text, the poet is using the phrase "آفتابِ تازہ" (*the youthful sun*). However, in the translation it becomes "a new red sun". Now the qualifier "red" is the concoction of the translator's own mind having no origin in the source text. One wonders why the translator has included this adjective at all. It is incorrect on purely factual grounds also. The rising sun, which the poet is mentioning here, is never red. On the contrary it is the setting sun which looks red because of the dusky aurora. The award-winning American writer Will F. Jenkinz (1896-1975) says in

his short story — *Easy Home-Coming* — while talking about the main character of the story: "She thrust away the feeling as the taxi rolled out across *the neck of land* beyond most of the houses. The red, dying sun cast long shadows across the road" (Sivasankaran, 1993, p. 109). In this way the translation is an inversion of the original text which is likely to evoke different meanings in the reader's mind.

In the same way, in the original text the poet is using the phrase "بطنِ گیتی" (*the womb of the universe*). But the translator has rendered it as "the womb of this old universe". Once again, the word "old" attributed to the universe is added here by the translator. This is yet another example of the explicitation by the translator. Iqbal may have been attributing oldness to the universe, but he nowhere mentions it.

(8)

غمِ رم نہ کر، سم غم نہ کھا کہ یہی ہے شانِ قلندری

…do not bewail that terror, do not
Swallow the poison of that wailing: take
The road by which the saints came to their crown.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 42)

Comment: In the original text, Iqbal has used the phrase "شانِ قلندری" which is rendered by the translator as "the road by which the saints came to their crown". The two-word original Urdu phrase is rendered by a ten-word equivalent expression. This is irksome because of its extensive redundancy and explicitation. There are, obviously, techniques by which this padding and redundancy could have been dispensed with. One way of rendering this phrase can be using a more precise equivalent such as "ways of the Sufis/Dervishes".

(9)

جنگ و جدل سکھایا واعظ کو بھی خدا نے

Our God too set His preachers to scold and to revile.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 20)

Comment: This is yet another example of an unnecessary qualification and nominal referentiality. In the original text, the poet is just mentioning the word "God" (خدا) but in translation it becomes "Our God". What further complicates the translation is the italicization of the pronoun "Our" by the translator. It is not so easy to say as to why the translator has made this move. Similarly, in the original text, the poet is using the word "preacher" (واعظ). However, the translator has rendered it as "His preacher". The poet is using the word "preacher" (singular) but, in the translation, Kiernan renders it as "preachers" (plural).

(10)

زخمِ گُل کے واسطے تدبیرِ مرہم کب تلک

For the red wounds of the rose your idle ointment will you bring.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 54)

Comment: In the source text, the poet is using the word "ointment" (مرہم). However, the translator renders it as "idle ointment". Moreover, the poet has not used any possessive pronoun with the word "ointment", yet the translator makes it "your idle ointment". The Urdu phrase "زخمِ گُل" (the wound of the flower) is rendered as "the red wounds of the rose". In the source text, there is nothing which could imply that the wounds of the flower are red. The poet does not identify any particular colour for the wound of the flower. Moreover, in passing, let it be mentioned here that more accurately the Urdu word "گُل" does not mean "rose" per se; rather, it means "flower". However, this point has already been discussed in detail.

Lastly, the poet is not asking whether the ointment will be brought; rather, when the ointment will be brought. These are two different statements of inquiry.

(11)

حضور ﷺ دہر میں آسودگی نہیں ملتی

Master! there is no quiet in that land of time and space.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 40)

Comment: What the poet talks about is "دہر" (meaning "world") but the translator has rendered it as "that land of time and space". It is evident from Iqbal's poetic and philosophical discourse that the concept of Time and Space (زمان و مکاں)is one of his choicest themes and the one which frequently features in his literary and philosophical thought. But here the poet is not making any mention of this theme and its inclusion by the translator seems somewhat superfluous.

(12)

کیوں نہیں ہوتی سحر حضرتِ انساں کی رات؟

Or why does no daybreak
Come to dispel mankind's heavy night?
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 252)

Comment: In this verse, Iqbal is mourning the never-ending night which shrouds human existence. This "night" becomes "heavy night". This translation may not much affect the source text, yet, in its own right, it constitutes an instance of explicitation. However, it is not difficult to detect as to why the translator has resorted to this act of explicitation. These are purely the prosodic considerations of rhyme and meter which are dictating the lexical and syntactic choice of the translator here. If so, then the translator is conveniently sacrificing the actuality of the source text to the structural exigencies of the target text.

(13)

پیکرِ نوری کو ہے سجدہ میسر تو کیا
اس کو میسر نہیں سوز و گُدازِ سجُود

What, to Him Who is Light, is it to watch men kneel?
He cannot feel this fire melting our limbs as we pray.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 104)

Comment: In this verse Iqbal is enunciating the inherent superiority of the human mode of worship over the angelic mode of worship as the latter is deprived of the intrinsic "سوزوگداز". The Urdu word "سوز" implies such meanings as "burning" "fire" and "passion"; whereas the Urdu word "گُداز" means "melting", "consumption" and "anguish". Put together, the phrase "سوزوگداز" stands for "a passionate burning and consumption". However, in the above-mentioned instance, the translator proposes a considerably redundant translation — "fire melting our limbs as we pray". But in spite of this redundancy of expression, the true meaning of the source text is seriously compromised. There is no mentioning of the phrase "our limbs as we pray" in the original text and it appears to be yet another extrapolation by the translator.

Lastly, the translation of the first line is problematic. The poet nowhere says that the angles are able to watch men kneel; rather they too are capable of kneeling.

(14)

ہے بد آموزیٔ اقوام و ملل کا م اس کا
اور نہ جنت میں نہ مسجد، نہ کلیسا، نہ کنشت

His business has been to set folk by the ears
And get nations and sects in a tangle:
Up there in the sky is no Mosque and no Church
And no Temple—with whom will he wangle?
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 187)

Comment: The phrase "—with whom will he wrangle?" is utterly an addition by the translator which has no origin in the source text at all. The addition made by the translator is also an instance of extrapolation.

(15)

سونی پڑی ہو ئی ہے مدت سے دل کی بستی

Too long has lain deserted the heart's warm habitation.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 20)

Comment: This is also an example of the unnecessary qualification of the source text. In the original text the poet is using the phrase "دل کی بستی" ("the vale of heart"). However, the translator adds the adjective "warm" and makes it "the heart's warm habitation".

Conclusion

To sum up, it can be maintained that there are numerous examples of explicitation in Kiernan's translation.The inclusions made by the translator have an accumulative effect of explicitation which, in turn, leads to the domestication of the source text. Here and there, the translator interposes qualifiers, modifiers, determiners, nouns, pronouns, etc. Poetry is often deliberately left oblique and cast in an implied mould. The discovery of these implied elements constitutes the real merit as well as the actual challenge of poetry. Therefore, when a translator renders these implied and purposefully ambiguous elements explicit, the true merit and the real worth of the source text inevitably suffer. Moreover, these additions appear even more problematic when one takes into account the obvious fact that a considerable number of the additions made by the translators are contradictory to what is being implied in the source text.

MISREPRESENTATION OF THE FORM

This kind of domestication is also detectable in Kiernan's translation of Iqbal. The prosodic domestication in Kiernan's translation bears mainly upon the structure of the source text and two of the most recognizable sites of this kind of domestication are syntax and punctuation. In this kind of domestication, the translator re-casts/re-shuffles the syntax and the formal properties of the source text in such a radical way that the structural scheme of the source text is drastically disturbed. This re-structuring/re-shuffling directly impacts upon the semantics of the source text and the translation either miscommunicates the source text or does not communicate it at all. In this way, although this kind of domestication pertains to the form, its implications are, by no means, confined to the form.

There is no other genre of literature in the construction of which the form plays as important a role as it does in the construction of poetry. Therefore, while rendering poetry, a translator's scope of tempering with the form is always very limited. Such literary giants as Roman Jakobson (1896-1982) and Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975) dwelt extensively upon the significance of the form in poetry. By and large the translator exhibits a great regard for the formal/structural properties of the source text but, at times, he obviously fails to do so which has been pointed out in the following discussion.

(1)

میرے خاک وخوں سے تو نے یہ جہاں کیا ہے پیدا

صلۂ شہید کیا ہے؟ تب و تابِ جاودانہ!

Out of my flesh and blood you made this earth;
Its quenchless fever the martyr's crown of gold.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 70)

Comment: While going through this piece of translation, one clearly perceives that a considerable restructuring of the source text is taking place. In the source text there is a question followed by an answer in the second line. The use of questions (either actual or rhetorical) is a famous prosodic/formal technique employed by the poets. Iqbal's poetry is also exquisitely marked by this characteristic. Here are a few examples of this phenomenon:

میں کہاں ہوں تو کہاں ہے؟
یہ مکاں کہ لامکاں ہے؟

Where am I, where are you?
It is some space or non-space? (My translation)

کیا نہ بیچوگے جو مل جائیں صنم پتھر کے؟

Will you not auction them,
if the stone statues you are given? (My translation)

The same technique can be found in English poetry also. Shelley famously wrote:

O Wind! If Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?

Shakespeare wrote in *Julius Caesar*:

O mighty Caesar! dost thou lie so low?
Are all thy conquests, glories, triumphs, spoils,
Shrunk to this little measure?

From these examples the significance and relevance of questions in literature is not difficult to establish. In fact, the use of such questions gives the text a forward thrust, a textual dynamism and a fluency of narrativity. It also invests the text with dialogic and dialectic properties and, as a result, adds to its expressiveness and artistry. However, in Kiernan's translation it can be seen that the question present in the

source text has been excluded and a plain phrase takes its place. This leads to a discursive homogeneity which the practice of domestication quite often seeks to impose on the source text.

(2)

کیا زمانے سے نرالا ہے مسولینی کا جُرم؟
بے محل بگڑا ہے معصومانِ یورپ کا مزاج

What, are crimes like Mussolini's so unheard of in this age?
Why should they put Europe's goodies into such a silly rage?
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 218)

Comment: In this instance, the elimination of the interrogative mode which is present in the source text is affecting the scheme of translation adopted by the translator. This verse has been taken from Iqbal's famous poem *Mussolini: To his Eastern and Western Rivals*. This poem is an address of the Italian dictator Benito Mussolini to his European adversaries and critics. The whole poem has been cast in a verbal and rhetorical mould and the use of the questions in it is foundational to its artistic crafting.

In the beginning of the poem, Mussolini raises a question and then supplies an answer. Subsequently, he just further elaborates the questions instead of answering them. This raising of questions and then answering them is one of the techniques used by the poet which contributes to the dialogic and the dialectical effect of the poem. But the translator tampers with the structural properties of the poem and turns even the answer into yet another question. Therefore, the second line is an answer to the first line but in translation this has also been turned into another question.

(3)

بھروسہ کر نہیں سکتے غلاموں کی بصیرت پر
کہ دنیا میں فقط مردانِ حر کی آنکھ ہے بینا!

Trust no slave's eyes, clear sight and liberty
Go hand in hand.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 76)

Comment: In this piece of translation, Kiernan is changing the modalities of the source text. The line "بھروسہ کر نہیں سکتے غلاموں کی بصیرت پر" has been translated as "Trust no slave's eyes…" This is an act of changing the syntactic mode in which the source text has been cast. It is clear from the source text that its first line has been written in the simple, active and affirmative mode. However, the translator has made it an imperative.

The use of the simple and affirmative mode invests the source text with a timelessness and generality which is largely impaired when cast in an imperative mode. An imperative mode, in fact, is giving the text a make-believe aura and strips it of its essential factuality. In the translation of some of the other verses too this change of modality by the translator continues unabated. The following translation is also an instance of the same phenomenon.

(4)

قصد کس محفل کا ہے؟ آتا ہے کس محفل سے تو؟
زرد رُو شاید ہوا رنجِ رہِ منزل سے تو؟

To what far gathering are you bound, from what far gathering come?
Your face is balanced, as if from journeying long and wearisome.
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 14)

Comment: Here, the entire source text is in the interrogative scheme which is just partially retained in the translation. In the source text, both the lines are in the interrogative mode but the translator just maintains that interrogative mode in the first line; whereas, in the second line this mode has been discarded. In the source text, the interrogative mode of the second line can easily be seen in which the poet is inquiring

about the reason for the pale countenance of the moon — "زرد رُو شاید ہوا رنجِ رہِ منزل سے تو؟". This is rendered in a positive mode by the translator — "Your face is balanced, as if from journeying long and wearisome".

In the source text, the poet is just raising two questions. The line which should also have been a question as per the source text becomes a statement of affirmation. This is how the translator seems to have reshuffled the formal properties of the source text and, as a result,the relations of subordination/coordination and broader stylistic and syntactic features go through major transformations.

(5)

الحذر، محکوم کی میّت سے سو بار الحذر
اے سرافیل! اے خدائے کائنات! اے جانِ پاک

Beware the carrion slave,
A hundred times beware,
Angels, and oh You Whom the worlds obey!
(Kiernan, 1955, p. 248)

Comment: The alliterative repetition embedded in the source text is of special significance in Iqbal's poetry, or in any poetry for that matter. It is partly due to an artistic alliterative repetition that the poetic texts acquire a reiterative and rhythmic character. In the above verse, the poet has employed exceptionally elegant repetition which is altogether absent in the translation.In the first line, the interjectional compound word "الحذر" is repeated and, as a result, reinforces the intensity of the expression. In the same way, the Urdu interjection "اے" is repeated alliteratively three times in the second line. This entire repetition scheme is flattened out in the translation and a prosaic homogeneity takes over.

Conclusion

To conclude this chapter, it can be maintained that there

are various instances of structural domestication in Kiernan's translation. The crucial and direct relation between the form and the content which is one of the hallmarks of poetry is seriously impaired by this kind of domestication. It is fruitful here to recall Roman Jakobson who famously asserted that poetry by definition is untranslatable because in poetry the form itself contributes to the meaning (see Hatim& Mason, 1997). The underlying networks of significations which are built into the structure of the source text are largely disrupted. The logical outcome of all this is an extensive reshuffling of the structural and formal relations found in the source text which, in turn, leads to an inversion of the meanings. The discursive and narrative patterns found in the source text are also dislocated and the translation acquires new paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations not precisely found in the source text.

CONCLUSION

This study was set out to explore the elements of domestication in V. G. Kiernan's translation of Muhammad Iqbal's poetry. I have carefully investigated the nature, impact, extent, and background of various kinds of domestication by taking into consideration a significantly broad range of examples. The practice of translation involves transformations, and these transformations are worthy of attention. The possibility and necessity of translation is one of the most apparent features of the universal human communication. This possibility and necessity is built into our cognitive and social make-up and is also prefigured into our inter-cultural consciousness.

Findings

Within the parameters of this book, the following findings are presented:

1. Kiernan's translation of Iqbal has been found to be considerably domesticated. By far, the most apparent indictment of Kiernan's translation of Iqbal is its growing Anglicization and Christianization of the source text. I have demonstrated thatat times Kiernan exhibits massive disregard for the cultural and linguistic features of the source text and instead of registering and communicating them, he either elides them or casts them into Anglicized and Christianized moulds and thought patterns. This serves to show how the translator has overwritten the linguistic and cultural specificity and uniqueness of Iqbal's poetry with Anglophone experiences and representations.At

times, the Anglicization done by the translator completely squanders the artistic and aesthetic merits of the original text. Some of the words are so differently used in Urdu that an attempt by Kiernan to translate them results in superficiality and simplification, and it is at such moments that the translation sounds prosaic.

2. I have also illustrated numerous instances of classificational dislocation in Kiernan's translation. Iqbal's poetic discourse is highly classified and this classification suits the thematic and linguistic variety of his poetry in an accomplished manner. The alteration between the proper and the common nouns and between the generic and the specific references has always been done by the poet to achieve a particularly desirable effect. However, at many occasions, Kieran classificationally dislocates these references. Therefore, this dislocation has domesticating effects on the overall textual as well as the semantic scheme of the source text ranging from minor misunderstandings to serious misrepresentations.

3. Kiernan has sometimes overly expanded his translation. This is largely due to "empty explicitation", and "overtranslation". I have discussed that in Kiernan's case this undue expansion seems to be a move away from the polysemous nature of the source text and a drift towards its re-casting as a monospermous narrative. Certain themes, tropes and references which remain *folded* and *muffled* in the original are readily unfolded and unmuffled by the translator. I have also demonstrated how this expansion sounds empty and how it remains unable to add anything substantial to the signification or the significance of the source text.

4. Kiernan's translation of Iqbal considerably suffers

from the problem of omissions and discursive abridgements. This results in a substantial syntactic and semantic loss along with a truncated comprehension of the source text. I have presented numerous examples which illustrate extensive omissions of the source-text significations, tropes, references and figures. Such omissions lead to a "silencing of the voice" of the source text and bring about discontinuities and lacunae in the general comprehension of the reader. It is pertinent to mention here that Iqbal's poetic discourse is replete with the mention of prophets, saints, revolutionaries, philosophers, thinkers, artists, poets, generals, leaders, dictators, commander, angels etc. These references animate his poetry and add to its richness and artistry. This broad range of proper historical references gives his poetry a schematic grandeur and a discursive exuberance which is one of the most distinctive features of his poetry. Therefore, viewing from this perspective, any translation technique or approach which seeks to leave out these concrete and specific references or to subsume them under the generic and umbrella equivalents is likely to negatively impact upon the literary appeal and artistic significance of the source text.

5. There are numerous instances of qualitative impoverishment in Kiernan's translation in which the translator remains visibly unable to maintain the standards of artistic value and craftsmanship. Iqbal's poetry is distinguished by exquisite lyricism, epigrammatic expressions, dramatic intensity, bold neologisms, illustrative examples, and sublime and varied imageries. It is here where Kiernan's translation is at its most vulnerable and the target text results in some highly prosaic and pedestrian pieces of translation. On certain occasions, the translator has

opted for informal, even slang equivalents to render some of the most serious and sombre portions of the source text.

6. There are several examples of distortions in Kiernan's translation which range from mild twists to outright inaccuracies. We have seen how these distortions undermine the overall literary and artistic makeup of the source text and, to a considerable extent, mischaracterize the intents and motives of the poet. Alarge number of these distortions are mostly due to an increased disregard for the specificities embedded in the source text. At times, the translator seems to have created new textual and semantic patterns with altogether different cultural and discursive underpinnings.

7. I have also brought out various instances of mistranslation in Kiernan's translation of Iqbal. This appears to be one of the most serious problems with Kiernan's translation. There are occasions when the translator fails to understand the linguistic content of the source text and makes some matter-of-fact mistakes. These instances of mistranslation have a serious cumulative effect on the overall structural and semantic scheme of the translation.

8. I have also discussed instances of the misrepresentation of the form. This though bears mainly upon the syntax,it also disrupts the underlying networks of signification embedded in the source text. The structural relations found in the source text are re-shuffled which leads to the radical modifications in the semantics of the original text. I have contended that poetry is more form-sensitive than any other genre of literature and any attempt to take liberties with its form, directly affects its content. It is profitable here to recall Roman Jakobson who contended that poetry by definition is untranslatable

because in poetry the form itself contributes to the production of the textual meaning (see Hatim& Mason, 1997). It is also largely because of this domestication that the translation acquires new paradigmatic and syntagmatic associations not precisely present in the source text.

9. At times, Kiernan's translation of Iqbal seems underwritten by the larger questions of power and ideology which are not always apparent to a casual reader. The complacency and smugness which, on occasion, is evidenced by the translator while translating Iqbal is symptomatic of the Anglo-American relations with the cultural others. It is this complacency which the translation theorists like Venuti has described *as imperialistic abroad and xenophobic at home.*

10. Lastly, for an average monolingual reader, this translation is likely to be "correct" and adequate to the source text. In all probability, he or she is likely to remain unaware of the domestication which operates delicately in the textual and discursive praxis of translation. It becomes all the more difficult for a reader to detect this domestication when the translation sounds 'good', 'fluent' and 'natural'.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are proposed:

1. The foremost problem with reference to the subject of translation as such has been the narrowness of the definition with which the theorists and the translators tend to conceptualize it. This attitude shows the restrictiveness and insufficiency with which the subject of translation is usually approached. Today what we need is a transcultural and humanistic perspective on translation. Thus the only way to

produce a functionally adequate and culturally viable translation of Iqbal is to conceive translation as an intercultural communication in which the source text and target text should be accorded equal prestige.

2. The problem of domesticating Iqbal in translation cannot be resolved by merely readjusting the theoretical principles of translation as such. Instead, a radical shift in the overall attitude towards translation is needed.

3. It is illusory to think that a translator of Iqbal can be freed from such domesticating trends and attitudes overnight merely by becoming *aware* of them. Instead, he or she has to neutralize his or her unconscious from a two-millennia-old literary tradition. The systems of domestication, which have burdened the practices of most of the European translators of Iqbal, have been *internalized* by these translators over centuries and, therefore, a neutralization of the unconscious is paramount.

4. The foreignness, integrity and complexity of the source text should be registered and communicated by the translator to the maximum possible extent. In other words, Iqbal's translations should be as much source-text-oriented as possible. Therefore, instead of moving the poet to the reader, the translators of Iqbal should aim at moving the reader to the poet. Thus a translator should read the source text according to a *different map of the world* and a different set of perception filters.

5. The English translators of Iqbal should disengage themselves from the romantic and elitist notions of the translation theory. They should consider themselves as ethical agents of social change and not function as the power brokers of the Anglo-American literary hegemony. In this regard, their efforts should

intersect with other broader socio-cultural models of mutual engagements. Hence, the translators should see themselves more as the cultural mediators than merely as linguistic interpreters.

6. It has been demonstrated that most of the English translators of Iqbal (from Nicholson to Kiernan) have endeavoured to produce *transparent* translations which usually look indistinguishable from the source text. Such *transparent* translations of Iqbal obviously facilitate the reader yet they come with a price — they obliterate the cultural uniqueness and the linguistic complexity of the source text. This diminishes the possibility of meaningful engagement with the foreign culture and, eventually, leads to what has been termed as *cultural isolationism*. Therefore, it is recommended that the translators should not seek to obliterate the cultural uniqueness and the linguistic complexity of the source text for the sake of any spurious *transparency*.

7. It is also necessary to note that the merely linguistic and grammatical theories of translation are not sufficient to appreciate the problem of the domestication of Iqbal. The linguistic and grammatical theories tend to underrate, disregard, or even oppose the adequate conceptualization of translation as a discursive and strategic practice. Therefore, it is essential for the translators to go beyond the mere linguistic and grammatical theorizations in order to develop a fuller and more nuanced understanding of the practice and role of translation. This should also lead to a broadening of the theoretical base of translation by incorporating the socio-cultural and the historico-political considerations.

8. It is also noteworthy that Iqbal comes of a literary tradition which is at wide variance with the European

literary canons and epistemological assumption. The Urdu-Persian literary tradition is clearly distinct from the European literary systems of thought. An English reader while reading Iqbal does not have the benefit of that cultural closeness which he or she definitively has while reading Samuel Beckett or Bertolt Brecht. Therefore, it is recommended that an English translation of Iqbal should be thoroughly annotated and all the cultural and historical references should be elaborated in order to help the reader develop a more informed comprehension of the poet.

9. While translating Iqbal, the translators should try as much as possible not to leave any discontinuities or lacunae between the target text and the source text. That means, instead of omitting parts of the source text for the purpose of bringing *order* and *discursive homogeneity* in translation, the translators should communicate its entire 'voice'.

10. It is also proposed that the English translators of Iqbal should challenge the dominant interpretations and the highly *constructed* image of Iqbal in the European world. Such an effort will bring a change in the dominant conceptual paradigm which, at present, defines Iqbal in the European consciousness. In the West, it is not uncommon to take Iqbal as a zealous Islamicist who pines for the supposed golden age of Islam and preaches a highly exclusive and nationalist gospel. This image is fundamentally flawed and the English translators of Iqbal can play a key role in its deconstruction/correction.

11. The English translators of Iqbal should strive to reproduce Iqbal's style and phraseology as much as possible. Admittedly, this is an extremely difficult task and, in a certain sense, not wholly possible. However, the translators should try honestly and as hard as they possibly can. In order to achieve a measure of success

in this challenging task, the translators must develop an in-depth understanding not only of Iqbal's poetry and culture but also of the norms and canons of the Persian-Urdu literary tradition. It has been viewed that during the translation the target text transcends the sociocultural barriers and brings to the readers a new world, a new space, a new idiom and a new history. At this moment instead of *rewriting* this new world, new space, new idiom and new history, the translator has to retain their peculiarities and distinct identity to the maximum.

12. Lefevere has spoken of an "aesthetic imperialism" which prevents the translators from registering and communicating the foreignness of the source text while translating them (1977, p. 34). As a result, a translator in order to *aestheticize* his or her translation eliminates the foreignness of the source text. Kiernan has also served this aesthetic imperialism to a considerable extent in order to *ennoble* his translation. Therefore, it is recommended that, instead of serving this aesthetic imperialism, the translators should problematize it by strategically foreignizing their translations of Iqbal.

13. It is also recommended that the English translators of Iqbal should re-conceptualize translation not as a linguistic transference of message from one language to the other but as a site of resistance, transformation and identity formation. Venuti has aptly suggested that translators should enact resistance against the ethnocentric regimes of power and the Anglocentric cultural narcissism in order to defy the domesticating trends and influences. The same holds for the English translators of Iqbal also.

14. As a result of a long and laborious historico-cultural process, the practice of translation has shaped a *canon* for the European translators. I also recommend a

methodological revision of this *canon* in the discipline of translation studies. The translators should challenge the *regimes of power* which are represented by the literary elitism and the Eurocentric cultural ascendency. One way of achieving this goal is to problematize the dominant and elitist principles of translation which are currently defining the practice of translation in the West.

15. Traditionally, the translation scholars have been taking bilingualism as the most essential competency to go about the business of translation. However, with the advent of the *cultural turn*, a new competency has emerged which is called *biculturalism*. Therefore, it is recommended that translators of Iqbal should also be bicultural to a certain extent, besides being bilingual. This biculturalism is essential to develop what has been termed by the translation scholars as an "intercultural sensitivity" (Snell-Hornby, 2001, p. 45).

16. Some people see this rising tide of domestication in translation as relatively benign. However, to a large number of translation theorists, anthropologists, and cultural historians this is remarkably alarming. Countries like France are actively resisting domestication with the help of such government-sponsored institutions as Académiefrançaise. However, in most of the countries of the world, the level of awareness regarding the problem of domestication in translation is appallingly low. True, there is always a degree of subjectivity and reformulation in translation but this by no means implies that a translator has got a licence to inscribe the foreign with the domestic and to dismiss coarsely the indigenous properties and features of the source text. Within the broader literary discourse, domesticated translations result in a cultural

marginality of the source text and just go on to perpetuate the global ascendancy of Anglo-American culture. These considerations should be critically borne in mind while going about the presently 'innocuous' business of translation.

17. Lastly, a word of caution must be said about the practice of foreignization. Foreignization must be practiced with great circumspection and prowess or else the quality and standard of translation is likely to suffer seriously. Although some of the supporters of foreignization have dismissed this threat, I for my part, however, consider it real. Foreignization and the beauty of translation should not be mutually exclusive and to foreignize a translation should not necessarily mean to deliberately tarnish its aesthetics or to cast it in a totally prosaic mould. Nor does a foreignized translation should mean an ungrammatical or unintelligible translationese.

The Way Forward

As the present study is drawing near to its end, it is pertinent to make a few concluding comments. In the contemporary world when the literary translations are growing in importance, there should be a revision of the canons and principles adopted by the Anglo-American translators for a fuller and more empathic understanding of the non-European cultures/literatures. Today the international book market (a pseudonym for the Anglo-American publishing industry) is flooded with tens of thousands of such domesticated translations of the writers hailing from the former colonies of the European nations. Small wonder, an astonishingly large number of the Anglo-American readers are consuming these translations regularly and constructing the image of the non-European literatures/cultures which is considerably at variance with the reality. Viewing from this perspective, it can be maintained

that non-domesticated translations can go a long way in revitalizing our intercultural communication and our dialogic encounter with the cultural others. It is only by embracing this outlook that we can live up to the dictates of our shared humanity and avoid dismissing the inter-cultural differences and effacing the linguistic identities of those who are economically and socially less privileged.

This is the ideal to which the translation scholars and the translators of Iqbal (and even translators in general) should aspire. The task is not easy given the legacy of the elitist prejudices, discursive practices and hegemonic notions of power politics dating back to the antiquity. But, now, when the world is standing at the threshold of the third millennium, translation should be seen in a new light.In this arduous task, if the translation scholars achieve even a fraction of this enlightenment and succeed in disengaging themselves from the power politics of translation our lives and efforts will be worthwhile. With this the present book comes to an end, but our task has just begun.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad, A. (1994). In theory: classes, nations, literatures. New York: Verso.
2. Appadurai, A. (1996). Modernity at large: Cultural dimension of globalization. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.
3. Arberry, A. J. (1953).The Mysteries of Selflessness. Lahore: Iqbal Academy.
4. Arberry, A. J. (1995).Complaint and Answer of Iqbal. Lahore: S. M. Ashraf.
5. Arnold, M. (1960).On the classical tradition.ed. R.H.Super, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
6. Asghar, J. (2014). An analytical study of domestication of V. G. Kiernan's translation of Muhammad Iqbal's poetry into English (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad.
7. Asghar, J. (2015). The Power Politics of Translation: A Study of Translation-Ideology Nexus. NUML Journal of Critical Inquiry.National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad.13(2), 32-49.
8. Augustyn, A. (2013). Authors of the medieval and Renaissance era. New York: Britannica Educational Publishing.
9. Bahri, D. (2003). Native intelligence: Aesthetics, politics, and postcolonial literature. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

10. Baker, M. (1998).The Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies. London & New York: Routledge.

11. Baker, M. (2006).Translation, power and conflict. New York: Routledge.

12. Bassnett, S. (2011).Reflections on translation. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

13. Bayart, J. F. (1996). The illusion of cultural identity. London: C. Hurst & Co. Ltd.

14. Berman, A. (1992). The experience of the foreign: Culture and translation in Romantic Germany. Translated by S. Heyvaert.Albany: State University of New York Press.

15. Bermann, S. & Wood, M. (2005).Nation, language, and the ethics of translation, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

16. Boase-Beier, J. (2011). A critical introduction to translation studies. New York: Continuum.

17. Boyett, J. (2009). Pocket guide to sainthood. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

18. Campbell, L. (2004). Historical linguistics: An Introduction. MIT Press.

19. Chesterman, A. (2010). Memes of translation. New York: John Benjamin Publishing.

20. Corbin, H. (1993). History of Islamic philosophy. New York: Kegan Paul International.

21. Crumbley, A. (2008).The politics of translation: authorship and authority in the writings of Alfred the great. (Unpublished graduate dissertation). University of North Texas, Denton.

22. Daniel, S. H. (2007). Reexamining Berkeley's philosophy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

23. Emden, C. J. (2005). Nietzsche on language,

consciousness, and the body. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.

24. Evans, C. A. (2004). Of scribes and sages, Vol 2: Early Jewish interpretation and transmission of Scripture (Vol. 51). A&C Black.
25. Even-Zohar, I. (1978/2004).'The position of translated literature within the literary poly-system', in L. Venuti (ed.) (2004), pp. 199 –204.
26. Even-Zohar, I. (1990).Polysystem Studies. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute of Poetics and Semiotics, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, special issue of Poetics Today, 11, 1.
27. Francis, B. (2005). The essays. Stilwell, KS: Digireads Publishing.
28. Ghani, M. A. (2004). The English translations of Iqbal's poetry: A critical and evaluative study. Lahore: Bazm-e-Iqbal.
29. Ghosh, A. (1993). In an antique land. London: Granta Books.
30. Grossman, V. (1980).Life and fate. London: Vintage Classics.
31. Gunton, C. F. (1997). The Cambridge companion to Christian doctrine.Cambridge University Press.
32. Hall, S. &Dugay, P. (2002).Questions of cultural identity. London: Sage Publications.
33. Hassan, W. S. (2011). Immigrant narratives: Orientalism and cultural translation in Arab American. New York: Oxford University Press.
34. Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997).The translator as communicator. London and New York: Routledge.
35. Hatim, B. (1997). Communication across cultures: translation theory andcontrastive text linguistics. Exeter:

Exeter University Press.

36. Hatim, B., Munday, J. (2004). Translation: an advanced resource book. London: Routledge.
37. Hermans, T. (1995).The manipulation of literature studies in literary translation. London: Croom Helm.
38. Iqbal, M (1990). Kulliyat-e-Iqbal. Lahore. Iqbal Academy.
39. Iqbal, M. (1915).Secrets of the self. Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf.
40. Iqbal, M. (2000). The Reconstruction of religious thought in Islam. Iqbal Academy: Lahore.
41. Jameson, F. (1998).The cultural turn: selected writings on the postmodern, 1983-1998. London: Verso.
42. Johnson, S. (1810). The works of the English poets. London: Whittingham Press.
43. Katan, D. (1999/2004).Translating cultures: An introduction for translators, interpreters and mediators, Manchester: St. Jerome.
44. Kiernan, V. G. (1955). Poems from Iqbal. London: John Murray.
45. Kopka, D. (2011). Middle East. Dayton, OH: Lorenz Educational Press.
46. Lefevere, A. (1992). Translation, rewriting and the manipulation of literary fame. London and New York: Routledge.
47. Lewis, P. E. (1985). "The Measure of Translation Effects". J. F. Graham, ed. Difference in translation. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press. 3-62.
48. Lukes, S. (1973). Emile Durkheim: His life and work: A historical and critical study. New York: Harper and Row.
49. Meschonnic, H. (2011). Ethics and politics of translating. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

50. Mir, M. (2006).Iqbal. Lahore: Iqbal Academy Pakistan.

51. Mounce, W. D. (2003).Greek to the rest of us. Grand Rapids, MN: Zondervan.

52. Munday, J. (2001). Introducing translation studies.Theories and applications. London and New York: Routledge.

53. Munday, J. (2007). Translation as intervention. New York: Routledge.

54. Munday, J. (2009). The Routledge companion to translation studies. New York: Routledge.

55. Munday, J. (2013). Style and ideology in translation. New York: Routledge.

56. Murdoch, B. O. (2009). The apocryphal Adam and Eve in medieval Europe: Vernacular translations and adaptations of the Vita AdaeetEvae. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

57. Nairn, T. (2009).Faces of nationalism: Janus revisited. New York: Verso

58. Nasr, S. H. (1987). Traditional Islam in the modern world. London: Kegan Paul International Ltd.

59. Nicholson, R. A. (1920). The secrets of the self. Lahore: S. M. Ashraf.

60. Nida, E. A. & de Waard, J. (1986).From one language to another:Functional equivalence in Bible translating. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

61. Nida, E. A. (1964). Toward a science of translating with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating. Leiden: Brill.

62. Nida, E. A. (2002). Contexts in translating. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

63. Niranjana, T. (1992).Sitting translation: History,

poststructuralism and the colonial text. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

64. Nord, C. (2001). Translating as a purposeful activity – functional approaches explained. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

65. Peterson, A. T. &Dunworth, D. J. (2004).Mythology in our midst. Westport: Greenwood Press.

66. Petrusich, A. (2015). Do not sell at any price: The wild, obsessive hunt for the world's rarest 78rpm records. Simon and Schuster.

67. Robinson, D. (2002). Western translation theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishers.

68. Sadiq, M. (1997).History of Urdu literature. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

69. Said, E. W. (1978).Orientalism. New York: Vintage Books.

70. Saldanha, G., O'Brien, S. (2013). Research methodologies in translation studies. New York: Routledge.

71. Sale, G. (2006). The Koran.Fairford: Echo Library.

72. Sawyer, J. F. A. & Simpson, J. M. A. (2001).Concise encyclopedia of language and religion. Oxford: Elsevier.

73. Simon, S. (1996). Gender in translation – cultural identity and the politics of transmission. London: Routledge.

74. Singh, I. (1997). The ardent pilgrim: An introduction to the life and work of Mohammed Iqbal.(2nd edn.) Delhi: Oxford University Press.

75. Sivasankaran, T. (1993).Choice short stories. Chennai: Allied Publisher Pvt. Ltd.

76. Sokol, N. (2002). "Translation and its Discontents: A Conversation with IlanStavans," The Literary Review 45

(3): 554.

77. Spivak, G. C. (2000). Politics of translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), The translation studies readers. (pp. 397 - 412). London: Routledge.

78. Steiner, G. (1975, 3rd edition 1998).After Babel: Aspects of language and translation. London, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

79. Tabari, M. J. (1997). The history of al-Tabari: The victory of Islam. Albany: State University of New York.

80. Tinkler-Villani, V. (2005).Babylon or new Jerusalem? Perceptions of the city in literature. New York: Editions Rodopai.

81. Toury, G. (1978/2004).'The nature and role of norms in literary translation ', in L. Venuti (ed.) (2004), pp. 205 – 18.

82. Toury, G. (1980).In Search of a theory of translation. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute.

83. Toury, G. (1985).'A rationale for descriptive translation studies', in T. Hermans (ed.) (1985a), pp. 16 –41.

84. Toury, G. (1991). 'What are descriptive studies in translation likely to yield apart from isolated descriptions?', in K. van Leuven-Zwart and T. Naaijkens (eds), pp. 179–92.

85. Toury, G. (1995).Descriptive translation studies – and beyond. Amsterdam & Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

86. Toury, G. (2004). 'Probabilistic explanations in Translation Studies: welcome as they are, would they qualify as universals? ', in A. Mauranen and P. Kujamäki (eds), pp. 15–32.

87. Toury, G. (2012).Descriptive translation studies—and beyond. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

88. Tymoczko, M. (2010).Translation, resistance, activism.

Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press

89. Vahid, S. A. (1959). Iqbal: His art and thought. London: Murray.

90. Vahid, S. A. (1964). Thoughts and reflections of Iqbal. Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf.

91. Venuti, L. (1995). The translator's invisibility. New York: Routledge.

92. Venuti, L. (1995/2008). The translator's invisibility. London/New York: Routledge.

93. Venuti, L. (1998a). The scandals of translation: Towards an ethics of difference. London and New York: Routledge.

94. Venuti, L. (1998b). 'The American tradition', in M. Baker (ed.) (1998a), pp. 305–15.

95. Venuti, L. (2000). The translation studies reader. New York: Routledge.

96. Venuti, L. (2009). "Translation, Intertextuality, Interpretation," Romance Studies, Vol. 27, No. 3, 2009, 157-173

97. Venuti, L. (2013). Translation changes everything. New York: Routledge.

98. Venuti, L. (ed.) (1992). Rethinking translation: Discourse, subjectivity, ideology. London and New York: Routledge.

99. Wiersbe, W. W. (2000). Classic sermons on the Lord's Prayer. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications.

100. Wierzbicka, A. (2011). English meaning and culture. New York: Oxford University Press.

101. Woodhead, L. (2004). An introduction to Christianity. New York. Cambridge University Press.