



CROSSROADS

A Journal of English Studies

ISSUE 5

2/2014

An electronic journal published
by The University of Bialystok



ISSUE 5

2/2014



An electronic journal published by The University of Białystok



Publisher:

The University of Białystok
The Faculty of Philology
Department of English
ul. Liniarskiego 3
15-420 Białystok, Poland
tel. 0048 85 7457516
✉ crossroads@uwb.edu.pl
🌐 www.crossroads.uwb.edu.pl

e-ISSN 2300-6250

The electronic version of *Crossroads. A Journal of English Studies* is its primary (referential) version.

Editor-in-chief:

Agata Rozumko

Editorial Board:

Zdzisław Głębocki, Jerzy Kamionowski,
Daniel Karczewski, Ewa Lewicka-Mroczyk,
Nadzieja Monachowicz, Grzegorz Moroz,
Kirk Palmer, Jacek Partyka, Dorota Potocka,
Dorota Szymaniuk, Anna Tomczak

Editorial Assistants:

Weronika Łaszkiwicz, Ewa Tołoczko

Language editors:

Kirk Palmer, Peter Foulds

Advisory Board:

Pirjo Ahokas (University of Turku), Lucyna Aleksandrowicz-Pędich (SWPS: University of Social Sciences and Humanities), Xinren Chen (Nanjing University), Marianna Chodorowska-Pilch (University of Southern California), Zinaida Charytończyk (University of Białystok/Minsk State Linguistic University), Gasparyan Gayane (Yerevan State Linguistic University "Bryusov"), Marek Gołębiowski (University of Warsaw), Anne-Line Graedler (Hedmark University College), Cristiano Furiassi (Università degli Studi di Torino), Jarosław Krajka (Maria Curie-Skłodowska University/University of Social Sciences and Humanities), Marcin Krygier (Adam Mickiewicz University), A. Robert Lee (Nihon University), Elżbieta Mańczak-Wohlfeld (Jagiellonian University), Zbigniew Maszewski (University of Łódź), Michael W. Thomas (The Open University, UK), Sanae Tokizane (Chiba University), Peter Unseth (Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics, Dallas)

CONTENTS

4 ARTICLES

4 Dorota Guzowska

A Conflict of Wills. The Seventeenth-Century Diarist Isaac Archer and His Father

16 Binayak Roy

Mapping the Transnation: Amitav Ghosh's *The Shadow Lines*

32 Peter Unseth

A Created Proverb in a Novel Becomes Broadly Used in Society: "Easily in but not easily ut', as the lobster said in his lobster pot."

36 WORK IN PROGRESS

36 Anita Mackiewicz

Translation Strategies across Time: a Comparison of Two Polish Renderings of *Anne of Green Gables* by Lucy Maud Montgomery

50 Magdalena Szewczuk

Equivalence and Translation Strategies in the Polish Rendering of *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* by Ken Kesey

64 A NOTE ON CONTRIBUTORS

Dorota Guzowska

The University of Białystok

A Conflict of Wills. The Seventeenth-Century Diarist Isaac Archer and His Father

Abstract. Isaac Archer (1641-1700) was a godly man, an Anglican minister, a good father to his nine children and the son of a possessive father. The order in which his life roles are listed here is not random. For a considerable part of his life he kept a diary in which he recorded the many struggles with his sinful nature and presented himself as a man whose priority was to submit to the will of God. His humbleness was frequently and most painfully tested in the context of his parenthood, but it was the challenges that he faced in the relationship with his own father that seemed to have had the greatest impact on his spiritual as well as daily life. This article is a portrait of this very turbulent relationship between a seventeenth-century adult son and his strong-willed father.

Keywords: Isaac Archer, diary, relationship, conflict.

Parents and their adult children

Family life, both in the present day and in the past, has been governed by certain norms regulating parent/child relationships. Recent studies clearly show that the model of formal, unaffectionate contacts between parents and their offspring in early modern England, described by Lawrence Stone in the 1970s (Stone 1977), cannot be universally applied to all English families, and that there was, in fact, much space in family life for love, affection, care and commitment (Pollock 1983; Ozment 1983; Macfarlane 1987, Houlbrooke 1990; Woods 2006; Fletcher 2010). This new interpretation of historical evidence does not, however, invalidate completely the traditional view of early modern parenting. Affectionate and caring or not, parents were seen as agents of God's will, and their roles as nurturers, disciplinarians, providers and educators had a divine mandate. The children, in return, were obliged to honour and obey their parents because obedience to them was obedience to God (O'Day 1994: 46-49). Parents' role was to prepare their children to live in the world, while children's duty was to follow the prescriptions and demands of their parents (Ben-Amos 2000: 292). But how long was this supposed to last? How long were parents obliged to be involved in the lives of their children, and to what extent were adult sons and daughters supposed to meet their parents' expectations? What was the nature of parental/filial love in the period beyond

adolescence and early youth? Theoretical traditions such as attachment theory, family solidarity theory, exchange theory, bioevolutionary approaches, social integration theory, and psychoanalytic theory, used in studies on contemporary family life, emphasize the importance of the parent/child relationship over the course of life. Children's financial independence or physical distance are seen as less important than a distinctive history, a set of experiences, carried by family members and connecting them throughout their lives (Umberson 1992: 664-665).

Studies on the issue of parent/child relationships in early modern Britain, some of which are referred to in this article, tend to focus on the period between infancy and the moment children left home for service, apprenticeship or marriage. In studying relationships between adult children and their elderly parents, earlier historians focused on the questions of inheritance and the care of the elderly, and even when the psychological aspects of these relationships were addressed, it was usually done in the broader context of both parties' material well-being (Thomas 1976; Wall 1987). Elizabeth Foyster notes that historians tend to see marriage as "the point of no return when the break from parental control was completed" (Foyster 2001: 314). In contrast to the prevailing view of "loose" and "shallow" relationships between parents and their adult children, Foyster showed that the bond, although changed in nature, was not entirely severed, and her claim is that sources provide enough evidence of the significant presence of parents in the married lives of their offspring. She wrote, "It is clear that the nature of the parent/child relationship was one that was constantly changing. Marriage was just one point in the life cycle which could mark a shift in parent/child relations, but this did not signal the end of shared experience" (Foyster 2001: 317). Foyster emphasized the involvement of parents in initial marriage negotiations, in the financial affairs of a new couple, in the upbringing of grandchildren, as well as in resolving marital crises.

Regardless of their children's age, parents also remained emotionally committed, and usually found it very distressing when their children's marriages or careers failed. A number of early modern ego-documents: diaries, autobiographies, letters written by parents representing various sections of society, are a testimony of their concern for their children's well-being, even when said children were independent adults. However, commitment, or sometimes even more active involvement in the lives of grown-up children, did not mean that all parents expected the same degree of obedience as they had when their daughters and sons were children and adolescents. Some sources, in fact, show parents quite helpless in the face of problems caused by their adult children's refusal to follow parental advice. Although they saw and bemoaned their offspring's misguided decisions, rarely were these viewed as sheer instances of insubordination, but rather as painful reminders of their own failure to prepare the children for adulthood (cf. Henry Newcome's diary and autobiography, Ralph Josselin's diary). The question arises as to what feelings and emotions were experienced by adult children spreading their wings and, in their attempts to live on their own, sometimes rejecting their parents' will. Another question is what impact the child's struggle for independence had upon the parents themselves and upon the relationship with their adult offspring.

The diary and its author

An answer to this question will be sought in a diary written by Isaac Archer (1641-1700), a father of nine children and himself the son of a very possessive father. What is offered in this article is a picture of a parent–adult child relationship from the perspective of the latter, with special emphasis on the emotional side of it. The diary covers the whole of Archer's life, from 1641 to 1700, but the first entries were not written until 1659 (Archer 1994: 44). Archer's diary is one of many similar seventeenth-century texts created by individuals who committed to paper their religiously motivated need to search and examine their souls. The second half of the 17th century in England was a time of rapid growth in the popularity of autobiographical writing, with spiritual diaries and autobiographies being the most popular forms, especially among members of dissenting groups (Delany 1969: 27-106; Ebner 1971; Glaser 2001: 46-49). As can be concluded from Isaac Archer's own text, his non-conformist father kept such a spiritual diary, and his prompting became an important factor in his son's decision to write an account of his religious experiences (Archer 1994: 43-44, 124-125). Isaac Archer's diary falls into the category of Anglican spiritual life-writing, but it is also a record of his doubts concerning the practices of the Church of England; doubts which were consistently fed by his father.

The editor of Archer's diary suggests that the manuscript on which the publication was based, the only surviving manuscript copy of the diary, is in fact a later version of earlier drafts (Archer 1994: 6-7). One characteristic structural feature of Isaac Archer's diary is that the author was in the habit of delaying writing about important events in his life until he was ready to reflect upon these events and upon his immediate responses to them and, as a result, evaluate those responses. Noting this feature is very important from the point of view of this study because this method of writing entails some degree of reworking, reinterpreting, and self-censorship. Choosing between what should be revealed and what should stay concealed is, of course, typical of any autobiographical writing, and Archer's creation of a specific image of himself in the diary is natural (Glaser 2001: 16-17). His wish to do so is even more understandable in the light of the fact that he wrote with readers in mind. The vision of his diary being read by someone else came to him as a disturbing realization soon after his father's death, when he found some very intimate details of William Archer's life among his personal papers. This "could have made [Isaac] wary of committing everything to paper" (Archer 1994: 9). On the other hand, the awareness that he was writing 'for the world' made him fashion his life stories according to norms and patterns this 'world' accepted. An important task of today's reader of Isaac Archer's text is to find out what hid behind self-creation and convention. Archer's story appears to be a good illustrative example supporting the thesis that although convention made adult children appreciate their parents' involvement in their lives, in reality it could have been a source of conflict and frustration.

The following biography of Isaac Archer is based on the information he left in his diary. The graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge was born in the county of Suffolk, where he spent his whole adult life as a minister. His father, William Archer, was a non-conformist lecturer at Halstead and Colchester, a man with a difficult, volatile character, whose high expectations were

the source of Isaac's frustration. Their relationship, however, was very strong, probably because Isaac's mother died when he was only 8, so his father became the sole provider of parental care. Soon after, two of Isaac's siblings also died. Writing about this traumatic experience in his diary, Isaac Archer remembered his grief-stricken, melancholic father, who found it extremely difficult to comfort himself after the loss. It is possible that it was William's prolonged mourning and detachment from the two surviving children (Isaac and his sister Mary) that was responsible for the combination of yearning and rebelliousness that characterized Isaac's attitude to his parent. Four years after Isaac lost his mother William Archer boarded him at Halstead school, and then sent him to London to learn the trade of linen drapery. In the meantime, however, Isaac underwent a radical religious conversion and decided to become a minister. Although his father initially opposed the idea on the grounds of Isaac's heavy speech impediment and the fear that a university education would in fact divert his son away from godly life, in 1656 Isaac was eventually admitted to Trinity College, Cambridge.

Since 1660 he had been constantly admonished in letters from his father not to succumb to the charms of post-Restoration Anglicanism, but he found it increasingly difficult to follow this advice, as conformity held out the prospect of financial independence. One of Isaac's major concerns throughout his school, apprenticeship and university years was lack of money. Although he was his father's only surviving son, and William's financial situation was fairly secure, he was never sufficiently supported. He did not seem to fully understand his father's reasons for refusing him material provision, but it must have been a painful experience because many years later when he wrote about his childhood, one of the most vivid memories was that "when I went to schoole my father kept mee bare of clothes, and as for money I had none as the rest had" (Archer 1994: 49). It is perhaps due to this humiliating experience that Isaac was so determined in his adult life not to owe anything material to his father, and this determination informed most of his crucial decisions.

In 1662, Isaac was ordained an Anglican priest against his father's wish. Three years later, persuaded by his father to abandon the Church of England, he unofficially resigned from ministry in his parishes of Wicken and Chippenham. However, the prospect of becoming financially dependent on his father again was a decisive factor in his return to ministry after a three-month break, although he never stopped having serious reservations about the post-Restoration church settlement (mostly because of his disillusion with its clerics, some of whom were his fellow students in Cambridge – Archer 1994: 65, 67, 74). His father's immediate reaction was not recorded in the diary, but Isaac's choice must have been a blow to him since he decided to punish his son by disinheriting him in his will. Their relationship became even more stormy after Isaac's marriage, concluded without William Archer's full consent. He was willing to approve of the bride, Anne Peachy, as long as his son could secure a safe living. Isaac's hasty marriage took his father by surprise. He was dissatisfied with the dowry offered by Anne's father, suspected her family of using the marriage as an opportunity to seize his estate, and was generally disappointed that his son did not invite him to attend his marriage ceremony. Although most misunderstandings were subsequently cleared up, it did not suffice to have William Archer change his will.

This uneasy relationship inevitably shaped Isaac's own experience of fatherhood, which was not for him unalloyed bliss and joy. During the fifteen years of his marriage to Anne he buried at least eight children. On the day of his death in 1700, only one child, his daughter Anne (born in 1670), was still alive. Isaac Archer's diary is thus a record not only of his relationship with his father, but also of an experience of fatherhood that was fraught with conflicting emotions, from delight and joy, through pride, to helplessness and grief. His religious persuasion made him see the hand of God in all this and interpret all the misfortunes he experienced as a father as divine retribution for his own filial sins.

Isaac Archer and his father: conformity and marriage as bones of contention

In the diary, the stories about arguments over Isaac's decision to conform with the Church of England and then to marry against the father's will are told in words that reveal deep frustration and are the expression of Isaac's dilemmas. On the one hand, writing about his "good father", "dear father", a father who was "more eminent than I may modestly say" (Archer 1994: 44), he maintained the father's image he, as a cleric, felt bound to uphold. On the other hand, fragments of the diary relating to William Archer are abundant in emotionally loaded words and phrases, such as "displeased", "ashamed", "unnatural carriage", "worse", "snared", "fight against", "lost", "troublesome", "arbitrary", "threatenings" [sic], "provoke", "misunderstand", "sorry", "angry", "forcing", "refuse", "distance", "undutiful", "hardening my heart", "disobedience", "reproof", "sin", "devil", "afraid", "could not trust", "enraged", "passion", "called me names", "his impatient and choleric temper", "breach", "disappoint", and "enemy" (Archer 1994: 69, 72, 80-82, 86). It seems that although Isaac tried to maintain the appearance of respectfulness towards his father by writing, for example, "[...] now I doe thinke he naturally cares for mee, and then did all for my good" (Archer 1994: 82), or "my way towards my father was not good" (Archer 1994: 83), he could not help using diary-writing as a means of giving vent to his negative feelings.

At the same time, the religious motivation of Archer's writing is clear, and the diary formally serves the double purpose of being an introspective self-analysis and a testimony to God's merciful love for a man who sinned so much against his own father. In this vein, descriptions of the worst moments in father/son relations are there to show how far Isaac Archer had changed from his impertinent disobedience to deference. Nevertheless, the diary still reveals much of his impatience caused by his father's behaviour: "Because my father kept me bare in money, although now I thinke 'twas large allowance, but I wanted discretion to lay it out, I talked broadly and unbecomingly of him, neither minding what, or to whom I spoke" (Archer 1994: 79). Probably the most candid expression of Isaac's irritation was a fragment of his diary where he wrote that he could not continue living with his father because "his deep melancholy would kill mee" (Archer 1994: 114). Elsewhere, commenting on how his father changed his mind and forgave him marrying without his consent, Isaac seemed relieved but still could not help marvelling: "I know not how, my heart was inclined to love, and obey him" (Archer 1994: 117).

Fatherly affection was definitely not a thing that Isaac took for granted, and his diary reveals the pain he felt in realizing that sometimes it was offered only when deserved. Only when given a good reason would his father express warmth and liking. The very prospects of not meeting the father's expectations or of earning his displeasure made Isaac very anxious in contacts with his parent. In 1659, after two years spent in Cambridge and a number of letters in which he informed his father about his spiritual struggles, Isaac visited his family home. This is how he remembered meeting his father: "I was bashfull, and very fearfull least my father should find mee worse in discourse then [sic] in writing; I was almost ashamed to owne or speake of those things I had found in my heart before; and therefore, though I longed for more soule-counsell, omitted speaking to him" (Archer 1994: 58). Constant displeasure at his son's decisions was perceived by Isaac as a means of forcing him into absolute submission, even after he left home and embarked on arranging life on his own. At the same time, though, he appreciated that his father sometimes refrained from openly commanding him what to do and instead "for love's sake did intreat mee not to break his heart" (Archer 1994: 72).

Although Isaac was not always disposed or willing to comply, he, paradoxically, sought his father's love and approval and delighted in all the rare moments when either was shown to him. The following words reveal that the father's friendly attitude often came as something of a surprise to his son: "[he] expressed now more than ordinary love in his letters" (Archer 1994: 99), "My wife and I went to see my father, and found extraordinary kind usage, beyond my expectation" (Archer 1994: 118). It is clear that even though he wanted his father to recognize him as an independent individual, he yearned for his understanding and support, and despaired when they were not granted: "[...] he wrote mee a chiding letter which grieved mee. I confessed all my disobedience to God and him, desiring solemnly pardon from both" (Archer 1994: 115); "I wrote my father word of my marrying, and intentions to settle; and he was very angry, and threatened to reward mee in deeds; I besought God daily to worke his heart, and open his hand to mee in a way of maintenance; and to dispose my soule to obedience, [...] and my burden was heavy; the Lord speake peace, and make up the breach!" (Archer 1994: 117). In 1668, although he was 27, married, and living his own life, he did not find it unnatural to visit his father, enter his study and confess with tears his disobedience, and promise solemnly "to be so to him no more" (Archer 1994: 118). After all, Isaac wanted to believe that his father was the "one that would naturally care for mee as to body and soule" (Archer 1994: 53).

That unresolved conflict with his father was clearly a source of Isaac's mental suffering. There is a passage in his diary where he confides that it was a reconciliation with his father that helped him restore emotional balance: "I found my selfe much better in mind since my reconciliation with my father; my heart was more towards him then [sic] formerly" (Archer 1994: 119). Much of Archer's diary is a record of his desperate struggle to love and respect his father in spite of their uneasy relationship. The reader cannot help suspecting that whenever Archer praised his father for being critical of his [Isaac's] achievements as a preacher, or for reminding him of his right as a father to be informed about his marriage plans in advance, he was doing so to persuade himself that it had all been done out of selfless fatherly love. When the love-driven motivation of his father's actions

did not seem apparent, Isaac always attempted to dig deeper, always trying to excuse his father, to find some good that came out of William's efforts to direct him, and to find more reasons for humbling himself before God. When he found out that his father had disinherited him, and that he and his wife "are not like to enjoy what my father was so long gathering", he explained it to himself, writing: "I have deserved this from him, who might doe what he would, with his own, and much more from God, whose hand I see in it! I hope I shall mind eternity the more for my disappointments heer! And use this as physic in regard of my soule's health" (Archer 1994: 124). Anger, displeasure, even if felt at heart, were not disclosed openly in writing. However, he found a way to give vent to negative emotions by ascribing them to others, i.e. 'the world', which, as he assured his readers, interpreted his father's decision as revenge: "the uncles were much vexed at it, but can not helpe it, only hope, in the end 'twill worke for good, which God grant for Christ's sake. Amen" (Archer 1994: 124). Sharing responsibility with others seemed a good, tried-and-tested defence mechanism, which Isaac had used before, shifting the blame for filial disobedience concerning religion onto his college friends (Archer 1994: 69). It did not, however, fully alleviate his suffering, and the whole diary bears witness to his deep sense of guilt.

In his diary Isaac Archer allowed his readers to see that despite the various moods and states revealed above, his attitude to his father did in fact change over time. Although words such as "severity" (Archer 1994: 115) and "mistrustful" (Archer 1994: 124), and passages such as "he would have mee [...] be hot or cold" (Archer 1994: 114), suggesting some level of tension in their mutual relationship, appeared in fragments relating to the time when Archer was 26 and more, they were nowhere near as dramatic as the ones he used when writing about the time when he was a young rebel. The passages that follow are significant in this regard: "I had a letter from my father, who charged mee with contradicting my selfe, and told mee that he never knew any one of such a temper and spirit. Now he thought mee in a far worse posture then before, and thought mee snared with self confidence in spiritual things, and that former convictions were wrought of, or fought against; and wished mee to see my selfe lost, that Christ might find mee" [...](Archer 1994: 81); "I dared not venture to be at his arbitrary allowance" (Archer 1994: 81); "I confesse I was sorry he was so angry, but did not feare his forcing mee home, because he was at such a distance from mee" (Archer 1994: 81); "[...] he was so enraged that in his passion he called mee such names as he never did before or since" (Archer 1994: 86); "I pleaded that from that time he left mee to my selfe" (Archer 1994: 86); "I had gotten an habit of writing sawcily to my father [...]. [I] wrote unhandsomely [as] if he had been only my elder" (Archer 1994: 86). The quotations show Issac Archer at his worst, but it is also hard not to get the impression that the two Archer men were birds of a feather.

Later in his life Isaac regretted all the bitter words that he had addressed his father with. What is more, it is evident that he deliberately remembered these difficult moments to humble himself before God. Diary writing was for him a form of examination of the conscience, with occasional invocations escaping his lips (or rather his hand): "The Lord in mercy forgive my unnatural carriage to a good father who mourned over my sinfull behavior! And I desire to make amends for the future. Amen!" (Archer 1994: 80), or "The Lord humble mee for my undutiful carriage towards him!" (Archer 1994: 81).

In order, probably, to emphasize his own sinful nature, parallel to the descriptions of his youthful rebelliousness, Isaac created an idealized version of his father as a strong-minded, consistent, devout Christian. When in Cambridge, Isaac often wrote to his father, seeking advice in moments of despair and self-doubt. He found it more difficult to talk to him face to face about the state of his soul or “being troubled with vaine thoughts in prayer” (Archer 1994: 62), but he would open up his heart in letters to the man whom he believed to be “a most experienced Christian” (Archer 1994: 53). At the beginning of his career Isaac was presented with a book of sermons his father had preached. It helped him get through the most difficult stage before he gained some experience and fluency as a preacher. In the diary he confessed: “[...] my ambition was to imitate my father. [...] In reading his sermons I would admire his goodness, and repent that ever I slighted him, in that manner as I did of late, who was so precious a man, and so excellent a preacher. I made his zeal and fervency in preaching a pattern to my selfe, so that many wondered and were amazed that such things should come from one so young as I was” (Archer 1994: 94). The most touching passage, however, is where Isaac writes how he was overcome by emotion after reading some of his recently deceased father’s papers and discovering that William Archer was, in fact, a real man with weaknesses and infirmities of the spirit Isaac knew so well from his own experience. He writes: “Who would thinke that the same vaine, filthy, lewd thoughts should be in both of us! [...] I could not have thought that ever such things had bin [sic] in his heart, who even before and then was a gracious, sincere Christian; I did not thinke any had bin [sic] so bad that way as my selfe; and thinke so still, for though the same was in him, yet he delighted not in them, but mastered them, which I could, or rather would not, a great while” (Archer 1994: 124-125).

Isaac’s father was definitely not an easy man to live with, but his son was also very well aware that he himself was often the one to be blamed for much of the friction in their relationship. As he writes, “that unhappy breach betwixt my father and mee” was caused and fueled not only by William’s “impatient and choleric temper”, but also by his own pride, rashness and imprudence (Archer 1994: 69). Elsewhere, he chose to describe the situation by making use of religious allusions. He depicted himself as the prodigal son tempted by Satan not to humble himself before the father: “[...] ’twas often in mind to speake to him, and confesse my faulte, but Satan, through strong temptation working upon my proud nature, would not let me” (Archer 1994: 91). Operating within the same discourse, Archer writes about the day he plucked up courage and visited his father after a long break, and in an apologetic mood he made a confession that his “carriage had bin unbecoming a child” (Archer 1994: 91). In that scene the father was no longer presented as a stubborn miser, but as the Biblical father who was “full of compassion, and ready to forgive, and willing to forgett any thing of that nature, yea he was glad that I moved him to it, and shewed his love by giving mee severall things then” (Archer 1994: 91). Castigating himself for an improper attitude towards his father, Archer writes elsewhere in the diary: “[I] thinke I shall love him better as I grow wiser, and now see, and am ashamed to think how foolish and obstinate I was” (Archer 1994: 100). Eventually, he made a resolution that, even if provoked by his father’s actions, he would never again let his “heart rise against him as before” (Archer 1994: 119). His self-criticism gained

momentum in 1670, when shortly after William Archer's death Isaac seems to have made several crucial discoveries while perusing his late parent's personal papers. He realized that his father had been writing extensively about their conflict and, as it transpired, he had often misinterpreted his son's intentions and reasons for disobedience. Although Isaac made it clear that he did not regret his choice of wife ("who is a blessing to mee" – Archer 1994: 125), he wrote that he wished he had had a chance to live his youth again, probably to make up for the sorrow he had caused. He concluded this passage with an exclamation: "The Lord forgive mee for Christ's sake! and doe not reward mee as I deserve, O my God! Amen" (Archer 1994: 125).

In 1669, Isaac Archer became a father himself, and soon after the birth of his daughter he wrote in his diary about the reconciliation with his father. It is never openly stated that it was Isaac's own fatherhood that helped the two men to make peace at last, but some passages in the text indicate that the younger Archer definitely learnt to understand his father better and to see his own conduct as a son in different light. This is discernible in the passage where he tried to reconcile himself to the fact that, although he had prayed for a son, his wife gave birth to a daughter. He mentioned a letter to his father in which he wrote that by denying him a long-awaited son, God "[took] away fear of such a disobedient child as I was to him [his father]". He also added that he saw it as a great sign of mercy that God did not want to "requite mee as I had served him [his father], for I considered girls are not so dangerous" (Archer 1994: 118). He had been full of foreboding about God's plans for him long before he actually became a father himself. Once, acknowledging disobedience to his father's wishes, he expressed his fear that God would "avenge thees things in mee in the same kind" (Archer 1994: 115).

Isaac Archer's father died in August 1670. His death was sudden and unexpected. Isaac was informed about it by a messenger and immediately set out on a journey to his father's house. He confessed openly in the diary: "I did not thinke it would have so grieved me, at the newes; 1st I was taken giddy etc. When I came to my mother I was so feeble I could not hold a glasse without spilling, by a strange kind of surprise" (Archer 1994: 123).

Conclusions

Isaac's relationship with his father was for him a source of conflicting emotions. On the one hand, he felt guilty of disobedience, lack of due respect, and of deliberately distancing himself from his father. He loved and missed him and keenly sought his approval. On the other hand, he felt a strong need to establish and guard some borders beyond which his father's parental authority could no longer be exercised. We learn from the diary that in his decision to conform with the Church of England and then to marry Anne Peachy, he had strong support from his fellow scholars, teachers, and friends (Archer 1994: 68, 69, 74, 78, 81, 115). One Mr Dearsly, a fellow of Trinity College, became almost like a father figure to young Isaac, and once in his diary he even wrote about him: "My father, nor scarce my tutor, for I called Mr Dearsly so..." (Archer 1994: 55). His other friends would also come to his aid when he was in need of arguments for disobeying his father on the matter of conformity: "I was told by my friends at the colledge that it was not dis-

obedience in such things which a parent could not reach, viz. religious worship” (Archer 1994: 69). It is possible that although his real father’s opinions mattered to Isaac, the fact that he had these alternative sources of social integration and support, i.e. other people who could fulfil fatherly or brotherly roles, helped him overcome doubts about whether or not he should act against William’s wishes (cf. Umberson 1992: 665). In this sense, he was similar to many other young people who defended their religious choices, made to the displeasure of their parents, by “invoking a higher obligation” (Cavallo 2014: 22). Isaac Archer could thus be seen as a typical child of the Protestant Reformation with its very doctrine of “the priesthood of all believers, [...] attacking the paternalistic authority of the priesthood and undermining the heads of Catholic households”, so feared by the said Catholics and so appealing “to young people seeking independence and spiritual liberation” (Brigden 1982: 38).

Early modern English writers on conduct presented marriage as “a gateway to manhood” and a means of making a man “complete”. Marriage “both conferred status within the context of the household and elevated a man’s position in the wider community” (Shepard 2006: 74-75). In this sense, marriage marked the transition from the world of parent-dependent youth to the world of independent adulthood. A marital relationship provided a man with a position of power and control over subordinate members of his household, and thus could have been perceived by young men not only as a means of securing their manhood in the eyes of the world (Foyster 1999: 4), but also as a means of freeing themselves of the relationships with their parents in which they felt constricted. The fact that after several years of successful marriage Isaac still felt pangs of conscience for entering into it against his father’s will indicates the existence of an unresolved conflict between his sense of filial duty and the need to control his own life. As William Archer did not make it easier for his son by disinheriting him, Isaac’s frustrations, as committed to paper, appear entirely explicable. Although, formally, young people in early modern England could marry regardless of what their parents and friends advised, and parental consent to marry was not legally necessary for men over the age of 14 and women over 12 (Macfarlane 1987: 128), the case of Isaac Archer proves that “in the important matter of laying a sound economic foundation to the marriage, it was clearly wise to obtain the goodwill and support of those who might help with connections, advice and gifts” (Macfarlane 1987: 147).

Ralph Houlbrooke points out that sometimes parents’ “protective solicitude made it harder for [the] children to spread their wings” (Houlbrooke 1988: 171), and emphasizes that pious clergymen were most guilty of attempting to control their adult children and, being led by their sense of religious duty, they made heavy emotional demands on their formally independent offspring (Houlbrooke 1990: 180-181). Fathers were constantly reminded that there was a higher bond between them and their children than that of blood. It was the bond of faith and of shared subjection to “a divine plan in both their domestic and religious life” (Ozment 1983: 153). Fathers were thus obliged never to cease guiding their children so that they lived in accordance with God’s law. William Archer was such a father: all the more so because of his six children Isaac was his eldest and only surviving son. Although the “primogeniture that tended to reinforce the bond between

fathers and their eldest sons” among the gentry did not play such an important role among clergymen (Houlbrooke 1990: 180-181), William Archer’s relationship with his male heir, and his deep involvement in his son’s affairs revealed some typical characteristics of close but often strained relationships between fathers and the heirs to their estates. William’s refusal to help his son financially as long as he worked as a conformist minister, and his repeated attempts to lure Isaac away from his vocation by the prospect of allowing him money and goods the moment he gave up his ministry and returned home may have been a means used by a godly, non-conformist father to save his son’s soul (which Isaac many years later acknowledged in his diary). However, they may also have been a less noble means used by a manipulative father who was well aware of the power he had over his son and potential heir. Isaac’s vehement opposition to his father’s attempts to arrange his life must be therefore viewed as a spiritual struggle and the tragedy of a young man who sought to articulate his manhood through rebelling against his parent, but was well aware that in the long run his insubordination would not prove, literally, cost-effective.

Although early-modern fathers were advised to suppress the need to spontaneously show warmer feelings towards their children, at critical moments they were often unable to fully control their emotions, traces of which can be found in their writing (Fletcher 2010: 37-38, 61, 129). As a father, Isaac Archer seemed to have been very affectionate and caring to his children when they were small, and loving and supportive to his only surviving daughter in her married life. It cannot be ruled out that his attitude would have been different had any of his sons lived to adulthood, and it is not impossible that he would have established the same emotionally-charged communication strategies that had made the relationship with his own father so difficult. However, judging by his patient conduct towards his somewhat wayward son-in-law, it is somewhat likely that he would have made a less despotic father to his adult sons. Interestingly, although his father’s domineering manner evoked negative feelings and occasional outbursts of open rebellion, the very principle of filial subordination was never questioned in the diary. On the contrary, it seems that the aim behind writing about this particular aspect of Isaac’s life was to warn the potential readers of his diary by showing that his acts of disobedience were never committed without scruples and, in the long term, they proved harmful spiritually and, in a more mundane sense, cost him material security.

References

- Archer, Isaac. 1994. *The Diary of Isaac Archer, 1641-1700*. ed. by M. Storey, *Two East Anglian Diaries, 1641-1729. Isaac Archer and William Coe*. Suffolk Records Society, vol. XXXVI, 43-200.
- Ben-Amos Krausman, Ilana. 2000. “Reciprocal bonding: parents and their offspring in early modern England”, *Journal of Family History*, vol. 25, no. 3, July, 291-312.
- Brigden, Susan. 1982. “Youth and the English Reformation”, *Past and Present* 95 (May), 37-67.
- Cavallo, Sandra. 2014. “Family Relationships” In: Sandra Cavallo and Silvia Evangelisti (eds.), *A Cultural History of Childhood and Family in the Early Modern Age*. London-New Delhi-New York-Sydney: Bloomsbury, 15-32.

- Delany, Paul. 1969. *British Autobiography in the Seventeenth Century*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ebner, Dean. 1971. *Autobiography in Seventeenth-Century England. Theology and the Self*. The Hague-Paris: Nounton.
- Fletcher, Anthony. 2010. *Growing Up in England. The Experience of Childhood, 1600-1914*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Foyster, Elizabeth. 1999. *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage*. Harlow: Routledge.
- Foyster, Elizabeth. 2001. "Parenting was for life, not just for childhood: The role of parents in the married lives of their children in early modern England", *History* 86, 313-327.
- Glaser, Brigitte. 2001. *The Creation of the self in Autobiographical Forms of writing in Seventeenth-Century England. Subjectivity and Self-Fashioning in Memoirs, diaries, and Letters*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Houlbrooke, Ralph (ed.). 1988. *English Family Life, 1576-1716. An Anthology from Diaries*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Houlbrooke, Ralph. 1990. *The English Family 1450-1700*. London-New York: Longman.
- Macfarlane, Alan. 1987. *Marriage and Love in England. Modes of Reproduction 1300-1840*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- O'Day, Rosemary. 1994. *The Family and Family Relationships, 1500-1900: England, France and the United States*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ozment, Steven. 1983. *When Fathers Ruled: Family Life in Reformation Europe*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Pollock, Linda. 1983. *Forgotten Children: Parent-Child Relations from 1500 to 1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shepard, Alexandra. 2006. *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stone, Lawrence. 1977. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Keith, Thomas. 1976. "Age and Authority in Early Modern England", *Proceedings of the British Academy* 62, 205-248.
- Umberson, Debra. 1992. "Relationships between Adult Children and Their Parents: Psychological Consequences for Both Generations", *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54 (August 1992), 664-674.
- Wall, Richard. 1987. "Leaving Home and the Process of Household Formation in Pre-Industrial England", *Continuity & Change* 2:1, 77-101.
- Woods, Robert. 2006. *Children Remembered. Responses to Untimely Death in the Past*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Binayak Roy

K.G.T. Mahavidyalaya, Bagdogra

Mapping the Transnation: Amitav Ghosh's *The Shadow Lines*

Abstract. Central to Ghosh's oeuvre is the idea that the nation is a fiction whose boundaries are continuously being reimagined and redrawn. Nationalism creates binary divisions, and projects a kind of "false" history which would buttress its own interest. The ideology of modernity and its various avatars, like Western geographical and ideological expansionism, modernist knowledge production strategies, and racism, create a Manichaeian dialectic between the self and its other. Ghosh's engagement with the frequency of boundary-crossings within and outside India, challenges the essentialist definitions of nations and societies. Ghosh's endorsement of the syncretism and humanism that downplay cultural differences explains his antipathy towards nationalism and its divisive epistemology. Despite his celebration of cultural pluralism, an acute sense of the sameness of man across "looking glass borders" and temporal divides underlies his work. Questioning the authoritarian and coercive actions of the postcolonial nation state, Ghosh pines for the Nehruvian utopia of a secularist, democratic national unity which assimilates Indian diversity in a syncretic whole. Based on an ethically conceived solidarity, this feeling of communitarianism would provide an ideal alternative to religious and ethnic chauvinism and "Majoritarianism", as well as political dispersal and the religious/ethnic violence rampant in contemporary Hindu nationalism. Ghosh distrusts the nationalist political and official discourse of a faceless and dehumanizing statist machinery detached from the actual lives of people. In *The Shadow Lines*, Ghosh thematizes the migrations of people(s), the importance of connections between the past and the present, the changing status of nation-states, the fluid nature of boundaries, intercultural communication beyond nationalism, the spread of Western modes of production, and encounters between different cultures – all of which are the fallout of globalization.

Keywords: cosmopolitanism, the transnation, space, alterity, selfhood.

"After all, in the thousands of years of Indian history, there never was such a creature as a united India. Nobody ever managed to rule the whole place, not the Mughals, not the British. And then, that midnight, the thing that had never existed was suddenly 'free'. But what on earth was it? On what common ground (if any) did it, does it, stand?" — Salman Rushdie, *Imaginary Homelands*.

"We live in a world of imagined communities. We are also policed through a world of fixed state borders. Accustomed as we are to the fluidity of our own imaginations, we are also, increasingly, being accustomed to negotiating borders, and using the one to serve the other." — Abena Busia, *ALA Bulletin*.

“Writing has nothing to do with signifying. It has to do with surveying, mapping, even realms that are yet to come.” — Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*.

[I]

The idea of the autonomous nation-state enclosed within non-permeable borders has generated universalist notions of ethnic homogeneity, linguistic uniformity, moral absolutism, and cultural consonance, as the markers of nationhood. When this totalizing norm was filtered through Enlightenment ideals, it powerfully inflected Eurocentric ideas of the self, and simultaneously constructed the non-European Other. The nation is an “unprecedented” institution, contends Sudipta Kaviraj, which attempts to replace premodern communities, marked by “fuzzy” boundaries and intense emotional ties with an “enumerated” and modern national community. The latter is territorially specific, has clear boundaries and must “enumerate” what belongs to it. Hence, “the endless counting of citizens, territories, resources, majorities, minorities, institutions, activities, import, export, incomes, projects, births, deaths, diseases” (Kaviraj 1992: 30-31). Benedict Anderson defines the nation as “an imagined political community — and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign” (1983: 15). It is imagined by its people and ideologues, imaginings fraught with incongruities. One of these is that nation-states, although historically “new” entities, “always loom out of an immemorial past” (1983: 19) as the same entity of a united people sharing the same heritage. Modern India needs to be judged from this perspective. The Indian nation is “not an object of discovery but of invention” (Kaviraj 1992: 1).

Colonialism in India created a rupture out of which the nation emerged as an entirely new historical institution. Colonial borders were drawn up without any knowledge of the peoples or cultures whose lives they affected. Not only did this sometimes result in people with little historical connection being thrown together, it also often resulted in communities being torn apart, internally divided on the basis of administrative fiat. Pertinent here is Arundhati Roy’s (2002) observation that “India, as a modern nation state, was marked out with precise geographical boundaries by a British Act of Parliament in 1899. Our country, as we know it, was forged on the anvil of the British Empire for the entirely unsentimental reasons of commerce and administration” (Roy 2002: 28). This leads her to question the very Indianness of India: “But even as she was born, she began her struggle against her creators. So is India Indian? It’s a tough question. Let’s just say that we’re an ancient people learning to live in a recent nation” (Roy 2002: 28). Be that as it may, the borders of a nation become all-important concepts which it protects for its own salvation. Herein lies the difference between modern nations and older empires. Twentieth-century state sovereignty is recognized by a “legally demarcated territory. But in the older imaginings, where states were defined by centres, borders were porous and indistinct and sovereignties faded imperceptibly into one another” (Anderson 1983: 26).

Cosmopolitanism or multiculturalism militates against narrow, rigid nationalism and supremacism. As Renato Rosaldo argues, “[i]n contrast with the classic view, which posits culture as

a self-contained whole made up of coherent patterns, culture can arguably be conceived as a more porous array of intersections where distinct processes cross from within and beyond its borders” (1992: 20). At the theoretical level, this constitutes the notion of “hybridity” as a synonym for diversity or multiculturalism. From the poststructuralist perspective which foregrounds the “constructedness” of culture, culture is a thing learnt, created, and staged. If this be true, then culture is profoundly susceptible to be aped, copied, or appropriated, in a fashion that disrupts the claim that it is the specific property or the unique expression of a single community.

So “hybridity” is not simply a term for the mixing of once separate and self-contained cultural traditions. It also gives credence to the view that culture is an arena of struggle, where self is played off against the “other”. Hence for R. Radhakrishnan, hybridity is “transgressive in more than one direction, de-territorializing [...]. With hybridity, anything is possible for the simple reason that hybridity is about making meaning without the repression of a pre-existing normativity or teleology: in the exhilarating a-nomie between ‘having been deterritorialized’ and ‘awaiting to be reterritorialized’ there is all manner of unprecedented ‘becoming’” (cited in Smith 2004: 252). The discovery that culture can actually flow between national boundaries undermines the modern narrative of nation. “Curiously”, argues Ashcroft, “this cultural dispersal and heterogeneity has been regarded as more damaging to the narrative of nation than the obvious fact that capital continues to ignore national borders” (2008: 3). The transformation of the global at the level of the local, and the diasporic circulation of local cultures throughout the globe, has subverted the homogeneity of the modern nation state as a repository of culture. With the emergence of the nation as an open cultural site, a transnational site, the global imaginary is characterized by heterogeneity, hybridity, fluidity and movement.

The transnation is much more than “the international” or “the transnational”, which is more appropriately conceived as a relation between states. Transnation is neither simply universal, nor simply between or across nations, but is the “embodiment of transformation: the *interpolation* of the state as the focus of power, the *erasure* of simple binaries of power, the *appropriation* of the discourses of power, and the circulation of the struggle between global and local” (Ashcroft 2008: 4). Primarily, it is the fluid, migrating outside of the state that initiates within the nation. “The transnation”, asserts Ashcroft, is an “‘in-between’ space, which contains no one definitive people, nation or even community, but is everywhere” (2008: 5). For the eminent Singaporean scholar Rajeev Patke (2002) it is only apt that histories, stories, bodies, and values exist in a space of in-betweenness because it liberates historical objects from the trappings of nostalgia. What this “in-betweenness” indicates is that transnation does not refer to ontology. It is not an object in political space but a mode of talking about subjects in their ordinary lives: “The really difficult thing for human subjects to comprehend, given their entrapment within the discourses of history, nation, race and ethnicity, is that *all* subjectivity is *difference in its differing*. It is this that is normal, not the fixity of cultural or national identity, the conviction of one true, shared, essential being” (Ashcroft 2008: 8). This “in-betweenness” signals a liberation which is deeply entrenched in transnational subjectivity, liberation from matters of absence and loss, alienation and not-at-homeness. For Bhabha, “the

time of liberation is a time of cultural uncertainty, and most crucially, of signifiatory and representational undecideability” (1994: 35). This representational undecideability subverts a stable system of reference, be it a tradition or a community. This, believes Fanon, is “the zone of occult instability where the people dwell” (1963: 182-3) and is “a veritable theatre of metamorphoses and permutations” (1963: 56) where all “I’s or claims of self have been transcended. This liberation of the human subject from his entrapment within the discourses of history, nation, race and ethnicity culminates in a “world *without identity*” (Deleuze 1994: 56) where the division between finite and infinite is dissolved. Hence this “zone of occult instability”, this “theatre of metamorphoses”, this world beyond the closure of identity, is the space of the transnation.

As novelist, Ghosh prioritizes space over time as the structuring principle in narrative. In “The March of the Novel through History”, he applauds the novel’s ability to eloquently communicate a sense of place and also to interweave the entire spatial continuum from local to global:

The novel as a form has been vigorously international from the start; [...] And yet, the paradox of the novel as a form is that it is founded upon a myth of parochiality, in the exact sense of a parish — a place named and charted, a definite location. [...] Location is thus intrinsic to a novel [...]. (*The Imam and the Indian*, 294)

Reflecting on “the rhetoric of location” (*The Imam and the Indian*, 303), Ghosh stresses that he is not thinking merely of place or the physical aspects of the setting. Asserting that the links between India and her diaspora are “lived within the imagination” (*The Imam and the Indian*, 247), he examines the modes in which “the spaces of India travel with the migrant” to create what Rushdie calls the imaginary homeland:

That is the trouble with an infinitely reproducible space: since it does not refer to actual spaces it cannot be left behind. [...] Eventually the place and the realities that accompany it vanish from memory and [...] [t]he place, India, becomes in fact an empty space, mapped purely by words. (*The Imam and the Indian*, 248-249)

These “words”, which signify memories and inherited values, are the “metaphors of space” that constitute “the symbolic spatial structure of India” for the migrant (*The Imam and the Indian*, 248). Ghosh calls this kind of alternative mapping, in terms of sites of lived experience and memory and not of material location, “the cultural representation of space” (*The Imam and the Indian*, 250). In Ghosh’s fictional realms, local or global, seen or unseen space is perceived and imagined in the narrator’s memory as a fundamental facet of individual, national, familial, and communal metamorphoses. In Ghosh’s fiction, space is not merely remembered as an imaginative construct but is represented as a domain of political and cultural encounters, encounters which actually shape the connection of different characters with territory and location. Hence, space is represented as a dynamic arrangement between people, places, cultures and societies. James Clifford argues that “space is never ontologically given. It is discursively mapped and corporeally practiced” (1997: 54). According to Clifford, space is composed through movement, produced through use, at the same time an agency and result of action or practice. The construction of space in Ghosh’s *The Shadow*

Lines does not simply manifest territorial struggles but serves to show the interplay between local and global influences, national and transnational reconfigurations and above all the search for community and alliances that cut across boundaries of cultural and ethnic identity.

[II]

Each of Ghosh's novels is concerned with migration and displacement which becomes a "mode of being in the world" (Carter 1992: 101). The task that primarily concerns Ghosh then is "not how to arrive, but how to move, how to identify convergent and divergent movements; and the challenge would be how to locate such events, how to give them a social and historical value" (Carter 1992: 101). The narrator's Hindu family in *The Shadow Lines* fled from their home in Dhaka to Calcutta during the Partition of India in 1947. During the Second World War they befriend an English family, the Prices, and the series of cultural crossings that the members of the two families are involved in are seamlessly interwoven in the narrative, as are the three major locations in which their lives are lived: Dhaka, Calcutta and London. Far from being moored in a single location, the narrator occupies a discursive space that transcends spatial, political and even temporal boundaries, thereby interrogating essentialist notions of self, community and the nation.

Defining cosmopolitanism as "a stance toward diversity itself," "an orientation, a willingness to engage with the Other", Hannerz (1990: 239) describes cosmopolitans as those who are willing "to become involved with the Other" and are concerned with "achieving competence in cultures which are initially alien" (1990: 240). He further conceptualizes cosmopolitanism both as "an intellectual and aesthetic stance of openness toward divergent cultural experiences," as well as a matter of "competence" of "both a generalized and a more specialized kind" (Hannerz 1990: 239). This competence might be "a state of readiness, a personal ability to make one's way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting and reflecting" (Hannerz 1990: 239).

The narrator's archaeologist uncle Tridib, his alter-ego, endowed with an imagination *par excellence*, instills in the narrator an obsession with reconstructing lives very different from his own. Tridib teaches the narrator to use his imagination with so much precision that the locations envisioned in the mind "were infinitely more detailed, more precise than anything I would ever see" (*SL*, 29). Tridib initiates in him a longing to imagine familiar and unfamiliar places in memory and imagination. In short, it is Tridib's gift of imagination that kindles in the narrator a desire to travel around the globe. Both have a penchant to study maps to develop and discover their distinct sense of travelling to places without any kind of mental and physical border or barrier. Cultural space can be configured and the unknown can be experienced "concretely" (*SL*, 29) in the imagination. After all, "a place does not merely exist, [...] it has to be invented in one's imagination" (*SL*, 21).

Tridib points out places on the Bartholomew's Atlas and also tells him stories about them: "Tridib had given me worlds to travel in and he had given me eyes to see them with" (*SL*, 20). This gives wings to the narrator's cartographic imagination which leads to the dissolution of spatial boundaries. He once said to the narrator that one could never know anything except through

desire “that carried one beyond the limits of one’s mind to other times and other places, and even, if one was lucky, to a place where there was no border between oneself and one’s image in the mirror” (SL, 29). The range of Tridib’s intellectual interests is matched by his fluid personality. To his *adda* acquaintances, he is anyone from a slum-dweller to an aristocrat. What the narrator likes best in Tridib is his detachment, his “difference” from others. For him, Tridib’s stories are a gateway to the world. Thus through generosity the world of the self widens to welcome the dimension of the other; the self’s homeland has become a haven for the other, “subjectivity” is presented “as welcoming the Other, as hospitality” (Levinas 1969: 27). Under Tridib’s tutelage, the narrator recognizes the contemporaneity of the past, and the lines that demarcate imagination and reality, the self and the other, are blurred.

Although Ghosh represents the world as socially constructed and creates discursive realities to examine the movements of power, he endeavours to find a way of escaping the realm of discourse controlled by the hegemonic Western mode of knowledge production and its ways of narrating the world. One possibility for circumventing this powerful and deeply rooted way of knowing is to constitute transcendent, ethical realities that cannot be accessed through a specific language and discourse. Therefore, in meeting the other, we should try to remain open and responsive to it, rather than immediately attempting to define it from our own starting points. Alterity, meaning the unknowable and unreachable nature of the other, cannot be attained, but it can, and must, be approached.

In Levinas’s view, this ethical approaching of the other’s alterity is our responsibility. The means by which this can be achieved include the use of a kind of imaginative empathy and reciprocity in the encounter with the other. Radhakrishnan has examined these concerns as they appear in relation to the concepts of imagination and space in Ghosh. These same concerns are relevant in the context of all Ghosh’s novels, and his writing in general. Space in Ghosh’s narratives is manifested as a many-faceted problematic that brings together time, place (imaginary and real dimensions), location (whether geographical or discursive) and identity (both personal and national/ communal/collective). Tridib, the inspired lover, seems to have chosen to live the story of Tristan, a story that cannot be plotted on any map. The story defies any spatial and temporal specificities:

It happened everywhere [...] It was an old story, the best story in Europe, Snipe said, told when Europe was a better place, a place without borders and countries – it was a German story in what we call Germany, Nordic in the north, French in France, Welsh in Wales, Corn in Cornwall ... (SL, 186)

Tristan’s is a very sad story about a man “without a country, who fell in love with a woman-across-the-seas” (SL, 186). The romance of Tridib-Tristan finds its consummate object in May. In his fourth letter to May, Tridib gives an elaborate, pornographic account of the sexual love of two strangers in a bombed-out theatre in war-time London. He rams home the point that that is how he desires to meet May, “as a stranger in a ruin”: “as the completest of strangers – strangers across the seas – all the more strangers because they knew each other completely” (SL, 144). What is more he wants to meet her in a place “without a past, without history, free, really free, two people

coming together with the utter freedom of strangers” (SL, 144). Like Tristan who is a man without a country, Tridib’s imagination enables him to think beyond the boundaries of cultures and nations, time and space. Hence, his craving for an ahistorical meeting place. He longs for a transcendental state outside ordinary human experience, beyond the realm of distinctions where opposites cancel each other out. Tridib’s passion becomes an analogue of ecstasy whose power dissolves the world, so that “the others’ cease to be present; and there are no longer either neighbours or duties, or binding ties, or earth or sky; one is alone with all that one loves. ‘We have lost the world and the world us’” (Rougemont 1962: 146). Such is the nature of this ecstasy.

In Radhakrishnan’s view, these basic insights involving the use of a certain kind of ethical imagination in the envisioning of interhuman and interdiscursive relationships amount to a newness in and of the imagination: “If only the world could be imagined that way! – new and emergent perceptions of nearness and distance; long denied and repressed affirmations of solidarities and fellow-heartedness in transgression of dominant relationships and axes of power; new and emergent identifications and recognitions in profound alienation from canonical-dominant mystifications and fixations of identity” (Radhakrishnan 2003: viii). Ghosh’s narrator compels the reader to imagine space above the narrow confines of a singular culture, nation, territory and community. Inhabiting a world of human, geographical and political barriers, the narrator and Tridib have a vision: to construct a free space (in a world without binaries) which is supposed to be above all temporal or spatial constraints. This contentious space is a transcultural space—a space of cultural and ethnic transactions where characters seek to overthrow artificial frontiers to come to terms with the reality of cultural and political transformations. Moreover, transcultural spaces also refer to cross-cultural practices of imagining or remembering space and place in the novel. While going down memory lane, the narrator tries to inhabit a transcultural space like Tridib to achieve freedom and liberty in its entirety since freedom is central to every character’s story in the novel. It is indeed ironic that Tridib, who desires absolute freedom, who like an artist creates his own world in order to be free of others’ inventions, who transcends arbitrary borders and distinctions and hatreds in search of a truer sense of commonality, finds himself entangled in communal riots. May once abused Tridib as an incompetent person: “All you’re good for is words. Can’t you ever do anything?” (SL, 173). The same Tridib, urged by May, heroically steps out of the car in Dhaka to rescue the nonagenarian and is slaughtered by a frenzied mob puffed up by militant nationalism and communalism.

The cosmopolitan Tridib is a modern nomad who transcends with ease different geographical spaces. If Tridib is the narrator’s mentor, however, Ila is the narrator’s antithesis. Like Tridib, Ila is the child of a diplomat, a world traveller. But she is the obverse of an imaginative traveler; her consciousness is the product of a “worldwide string of departure lounges” (SL, 21). She might have travelled all across the globe, but she is so insular that “although she had lived in many places, she had never travelled at all” (SL, 21). The places went past her in an “illusory whirl of movement” (SL, 23). On the contrary, the narrator passionately believes that “a place does not merely exist, that it has to be invented in one’s imagination” (SL, 21). In stark contrast to Hannerz’s concept of

the cosmopolitan, Ila is a perfect example of Bauman's (1997) tourists who "perform the feat of not belonging to the place they might be visiting; theirs is the miracle of being in and out of place at the same time" and the "point of tourist life is to be on the move, not to arrive" (Bauman 1997: 89). Since the tourists "embark on their travels by choice," their decision to leave home to explore foreign parts is "all the easier to make for the comforting feeling that one can always return, if need be" (Bauman 1997: 91). Ila's presentism blunts her vision and cramps her to make any intercultural negotiations. What she remembers are excitements triggered by the "shifting landscapes of her childhood" (SL, 20). This explains the lack of concreteness of her imagination. For Ila "the current was the real: it was as though she lived in a present which was like an airlock in a canal, shut away from the tidewaters of the past and the future by steel floodgates" (SL, 30). Ila has no sense of identity and continuity with the past. The temporal perspective in her life has become so foreshortened that she lives in a perpetual present, not the experiential, qualitative co-presence of all the elements constituting the past recaptured by memory. Her peripatetic lifestyle has enlarged her mastery over physical space but has also confined her "increasingly to the *mental* and *emotional space* of the momentary present devoid of continuity and significant relations with past and future" (Meyerhoff 1955: 111). Hence, Ila's dimension of mental "space" has contracted to the fragmentary moment of the present.

While Ila aspires to be a free spirit with scant regard for territorial and cultural frontiers, Thamma is an advocate of exclusivist nationalism. Thamma was a college student when terrorist outfits like "Anushilan Samiti" and "Jugantar" recruited youngsters as their cadres. She tells the child narrator the incident of how one of her classmates was arrested by the police. A shy, quiet, bearded boy, the young patriot seemed an unlikely terrorist but he showed great resolve. His impassive face and "clear, direct and challenging" gaze was fixed on the policeman. Inspired by the patriotism of Bagha Jatin and Khudiram Bose, Thamma wanted to do something for the terrorists. She mused that "if only she had known, if only she had been working with him, she would have warned him somehow, she would have saved him, she would have gone to Khulna with him too, and stood at his side, with a pistol in her hands, waiting for the English magistrate" (SL, 39). Wholly committed to the nationalist ideal of independent India, Thamma would have done anything to be free from colonial oppression.

Born in Dhaka, Thamma migrated to Mandalay because of her husband's profession. After her husband's death, she joined a school in Calcutta as a teacher. This provided her with a stability in her rootless existence. While in Moulmein and Mandalay she lived in "a succession of railway colonies" (SL, 124) and her life became uneventful. To her "nothing else in that enchanted pagodaland had seemed real enough to remember (SL, 124) apart from hospitals, railway stations and Bengali Societies. Interestingly, in this she resembles her opposite, Ila, whose peripatetic lifestyle forbids her to attach herself to any place. The bloodshed of the Partition severs Thamma's connection with her ancestral home in Dhaka. However, a chance meeting with one of her kin makes her know that her nonagenarian Jethamoshai still lives in their house at Jindabahar Lane in Dhaka. What is more, she is horrified to learn that their whole house has been occupied by Muslim refu-

gees from India. Throughout her life Thamma never displayed much family feeling. In fact, “she was extremely wary of her relatives; to her they represented an imprisoning wall of suspicion and obligations” (SL, 129). However, consanguinity propels her to dismantle this “imaginary barrier” (SL, 129) and she decides to travel to Dhaka to bring her Jethamoshai back to Calcutta.

Thamma’s journey to Dhaka, her birthplace, initiates her education in the artificiality of the nationalist construct. Her neat and orderly mind seems to be in a quandary when she tries to solve the puzzle “how her place of birth had come to be so messily at odds with her nationality” (SL, 152). Thamma has a hard time coming to terms with the technicalities of passports and visas and the politics of international borders. For her, traveling to Dhaka was different in the pre-Partition era when she could “come home to Dhaka” (SL, 152) whenever she wanted. The fact that her journey to Dhaka is not only physical but also epistemological when the young narrator teases Thamma out of her thoughts: “How could you have ‘come’ home to Dhaka? You don’t know the difference between coming and going” (SL, 152)! Years later the mature narrator realizes that his grandmother’s journey not only destabilizes her fixed conceptions of “home” but also exposes the faults of a language system:

Every language assumes a centrality, a fixed and settled point to go away from and come back to, and what my grandmother was looking for was a word for a journey which was not a coming or a going at all; a journey that was a search for precisely that fixed point which permits the proper use of verbs of movement” (SL,152).

Thamma’s conceptions of home as a place of stability and coherence thus shattered, she receives a further setback when her son exposes the limits of her exclusionary nationalism. Her naïve belief in the existence of borders corresponds with Anderson’s conceptualization of the nation as “*limited*” with “finite, if elastic boundaries, beyond which lie other nations” (1983: 16). When she expresses her curiosity to see the border between India and East Pakistan from the plane, her son humorously asks her whether she thought that the “border was a long black line with green on one side and scarlet on the other, like it was in a school atlas” (SL,151). When she learns that neither trenches nor soldiers with guns pointing at each other separate the two countries but there are only green fields with no distinct demarcation zones, she discovers the limits of her brand of nationalism:

But if there aren’t any trenches or anything, how are people to know? I mean, where’s the difference then? And if there’s no difference both sides will be the same; it’ll be just like it used to be before, when we used to catch a train in Dhaka and get off in Calcutta the next day without anybody stopping us. What was it all for then – partition and all the killing and everything – if there isn’t something in between? (SL, 151)

The modern political border, as her son explains to her, doesn’t exist on the frontier but in the airport. One crosses it when he fills in the disembarkation cards and the forms demanding one’s nationality, etc. This aspect of international boundaries determines the limits of a sovereign authority. Thoroughly unaware about contemporary international travel regulations, Thamma, the

old guard nationalist who once dreamt of a new nation, “believed in the reality of nations and borders” beyond which “existed another reality” (SL, 219). The only relationship that existed “between those separate realities was war or friendship” (SL, 219). The partitioning of the Bose family house in Dhaka is itself an allegory for Thamma’s self/other conceptualization. Whatever exists beyond the other side of the partitioning wall is an inverted image of theirs which is the epitome of normalcy. The upside-down world seems to be a safe place to escape to when problems surface on their own side. The unseen, unknown other part of the house is a source of immense interest for Thamma and Mayadebi and the “strange thing was that as we grew older even I almost came to believe in our story” (SL, 126). This self-other dialectic permeates Thamma’s conceptions of nation and nationalism. By imagining the community of the nation, Thamma is certainly not, in Ila’s words a “fascist”, but as Tridib sums it up “only a modern middle-class woman” (SL, 78).

The patterned orderliness and stability that Thamma seeks is dismantled when she lands in Dhaka airport. The first question she is prompted to ask, confounded by her present surroundings, is “Where’s Dhaka? I can’t see Dhaka” (SL, 193). Thamma’s Dhaka is confined in the localized surroundings of her ancestral home in Jindabahar Lane which had “long since vanished in the past” (SL, 193). This past/present disjuncture leads to her confusion. Her quest for the idyllic, pre-Partitioned Dhaka of her childhood is projected as a nostalgic return home. Throughout her life Thamma has contemptuously dismissed nostalgia as a “weakness, a waste of time, that it is everyone’s duty to forger the past and look ahead and get on with building the future” (SL, 208). Compelled by circumstances, she now realizes the gravity of her predicament that she has “no home but in memory” (SL, 194). Thamma’s Indian citizenship now confronts her with her strong loyalties and affiliations to the solidarity of her ancestral home. Her alienation from her homeland is pointed out to her by Tridib’s teasing remark: “But you *are* a foreigner now, you’re as foreign here as May – much more than May, for look at her, she doesn’t even need a visa to come here” (SL, 195). Nevertheless, Thamma perceives her visit to Jindabahar Lane as her “homecoming”. Dressed in a white sari with a red border she is “going home as a widow for the first time” (SL, 205). After meeting Jethamoshai she emotionally declares that they have “come home at last” (SL, 212). The contradiction between Thamma’s going and coming, home and abroad, local and national identities, surfaces in her resolution to bring her Jethamoshai to “where he belonged, to her invented country” (SL, 137). Thamma’s glorification of the myth of the nation is punctured by her senile Jethamoshai’s stubborn refusal to migrate:

I don’t believe in this India-Shindia. It’s all very well, you’re going away now, but suppose when you get there they decide to draw another line somewhere? What will you do then? Where will you move to? No one will have you anywhere. As for me, I was born here, and I’ll die here. (SL, 215)

Thamma’s “home” turns unhomely when the car in which she was returning along with Jethamoshai in a rickshaw is attacked by some frenzied rioters. Tridib rushes out to save the old man but both of them are brutally killed along with the rickshaw-puller Khalil. Thamma’s ancestral birthplace is also the city of the fanatic rioters which now is transformed into the split space of

home/not-home. Tridib's violent death instills in her a hatred for "them". Hence, when war breaks out with Pakistan in 1965, she donates her gold chain, her late husband's reminiscence, to the war fund: "For your sake; for your freedom. We have to kill them before they kill us; we have to wipe them out" (SL, 237). She takes solace from the fact that it's not a street ambush but an organized war "with tanks and guns and bombs" (SL, 237). Throughout the novel Thamma remains an exponent of territorial nationalism and also learning its hard lessons.

Temporal simultaneity is complemented by identical spatial realities across the "looking-glass border" (SL, 233). London and Berlin, just before World War II are mirror images of each other with the same "exhilaration in the air" (SL, 66). Travelling between the two capitals Alan Tre-sawsen, May's uncle and Tridib's hero, felt that he was "stepping through a looking-glass" (SL, 66). Calcutta and Dhaka serve as mirror images of each other during the riots in 1964. The communal frenzy of "Hindu Calcutta" and "Muslim Dhaka" resembles "the war between oneself and one's image in the mirror" (SL, 204). The adult narrator, after making a series of connections listening to others' perceptions and experiences, realizes that he and Tridib were in the same predicament in two different cities: "I, in Calcutta, had only to look into the mirror to be in Dhaka; a moment when each city was the inverted image of the other" (SL, 233). The narrator who as a child believed in the reality of nations and space, "that distance separates, that it is a corporeal substance...that across the border there existed another reality" (SL, 219), has at the end of the narrative these ideas shattered. The borders between nations in his Bartholomew's Atlas turn into glass, the compartmentalized world turns composite. As he tries to "learn the meaning of distance", he perceives "that within the tidy ordering of Euclidean space, Chiang Mai in Thailand was much nearer Calcutta than Delhi is; that Chengdu in China is nearer than Srinagar is" (SL, 232). The narrator thus interrogates the principles of temporal and spatial division. As he acknowledges, he has created his own secret map of the world, "a map of which only I knew the keys and co-ordinates, but which was not for that reason any more imaginary than the code of a safe is to a banker" (SL, 194). This map of the world is one response to Radhakrishnan's call for postmodern spaces that are imagined "in excess of and in advance of [...] actual history in the name of experiences that are real but lacking in legitimacy" (Radhakrishnan 2003: 61). The representation of London in the novel consists of several levels: the past is represented through an amalgamation of official history and personal imagination, and the present through maps and eye-sight. Radhakrishnan continues: "each of these [...] realities must imagine its own discursive-epistemic space as a form of openness to one another's persuasion" (2003: 61). What has to be avoided is the situation where one version speaks for all, or where all the versions are "islands unto themselves" (Radhakrishnan 2003: 61).

The narrator's belief in the absoluteness of cartographic divisions thus shattered, he learns that the separatist logic of frontiers cannot enforce cultural difference. Ironically, what establishes the identical nature of realities on both sides of the border between India and Pakistan is mutually self-destructive violence. The sacred relic known as the Mui-i-Mubarak disappears in Srinagar and riots break out in Calcutta and Dhaka. The administrators who drew the boundaries between India and Pakistan believed in the "enchantment of lines, hoping perhaps that once they

had erected their borders upon the map, the two bits of land would sail away from each other like the shifting tectonic plates of the prehistoric Gondwanaland” (SL, 233). The narrator discerns a profound “yet-undiscovered irony” in the political separation:

the simple fact that there had never been a moment in the four-thousand-year-old history of that map, when the places we know as Dhaka and Calcutta were more closely bound to each other than after they had drawn their lives – so closely that I, in Calcutta, had only to look into the mirror to be in Dhaka; a moment when each city was the inverted image of the other, locked into an irreversible symmetry by the line that was to set us free – our looking-glass border. (SL, 233)

Paradoxically, the communal riot indicates the deep emotional involvement of the Hindus and the Muslims alike.

Sudhir Kakar, in his influential book *The Colours of Violence: Cultural Identities, Religion and Conflict* (1996), distinguishes between pre-colonial “religious” conflicts and post-colonial “communal” violence in the Indian sub-continent. While religion is “a matter of personal faith and reverence for a particular set of icons, rituals, and dogmas”, asserts Kakar, communalism entails one’s “exclusive attachment to his or her community combined with an active hostility against other communities which share its geographical and political space” (1996: 13). The overarching identities as “Muslim” and “Hindu” were highly charged by the divisiveness of the Partition of 1947, “the most momentous event in the shaping of Hindu-Muslim relations in independent India” (Kakar 1996: 37). The bitter animosity between these two communities is an off-shoot of the British imperialist policy of divide and rule by playing off one against the other. The presentation of the post-Partition riots in Calcutta expatiates Kakar’s observations. The young narrator’s school-bus is more than half-empty as the majority of the students are confined at home because trouble is apprehended in Calcutta. Rumour spreads that “they” have poisoned Calcutta’s water supply. This incident echoes the rumours in war-time London that German aeroplanes were dropping toffee-tins “to demoralize the population by getting at the children” (SL, 184). In the narrator’s account the children “huddled together” (SL, 189) in the bus immediately comprehend that the vague identification “they” refers to the Muslims. The “us” and “them” binarism is crystallized when their own friend Montu is perceived as an “other” because he is a Muslim. When the adult narrator recalls the incident he reflects on the extent to which children had internalized this self/other split:

I remember we did not ask him any questions – not who ‘they’ were, nor why ‘they’ had poisoned their own water. We did not need to ask any questions; we knew the answers the moment he had said it: it was a reality that existed only in the saying, so when you heard it said, it did not matter whether you believed it or not – it only mattered that it had been said at all. (SL, 199-200)

The riots transform the city. The frightening sound of voices alternate with random moments of silence to produce “the authentic sound of chaos” (SL, 201). When the children return home their well-known streets seem completely unfamiliar. Even the positioning of a rickshaw at a street-cor-

ner expresses a threat: “had it been put there to keep Muslims in or Hindus out? At that moment we could read the disarrangement of our universe in the perfectly ordinary angle of an abandoned rickshaw” (SL, 203). The contention that riots are exceptional to South Asia is repeated in Ghosh’s *In An Antique Land*. Not to speak of communal tensions, micronationalist factions subvert the myth of the homogeneity of the Indian nation-state. Robi reflects on how terrorist and separatist outfits in Assam, the north-east, Punjab, Sri Lanka, Tripura utter the rhetoric of freedom to fragment the nation: “And then I think to myself, why don’t they draw thousands of little lines through the whole subcontinent and give every place a new name? What would it change? It’s a mirage; the whole thing is a mirage. How can anyone divide a memory? (SL, 247). Territorial space can be demarcated by lines but the collective unconscious remains indivisible.

However, the separatist strategies of the politics of national boundaries epitomized by the Partition fail to suppress syncretic possibilities. The ecumenical Hazratbal shrine is revered by Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs and Buddhists alike that challenges the “Christian sense of the necessity of quarantine between doctrines”. The synthesizing quality of the shrine is stressed when the theft of the relic brings about “a spontaneous show of collective grief”. Maulana Masoodi. “an authentic hero, forgotten and unsung today as any purveyor of sanity” (SL, 225-226), unites the various Kashmiri communities in their demonstrations. When the relic is recovered, Kashmiris erupt in joy. However, this exemplary secular tolerance and cultural syncretism is marred by a violent riot in distant Khulna. But “As always, there were innumerable cases of Muslims in East Pakistan giving shelter to Hindus, often at the cost of their own lives, and equally in India, of Hindus sheltering Muslims” (SL, 229-230). Unfortunately, no Martyrs Memorials were erected for these unsung ordinary people. Just as the partition of the Bose family in Dhanmundi fail to prevent relatives from being involved with each other, so also the arbitrary division of the country fails to slice one community apart from the other. Amitav Ghosh experienced a similar situation after riots broke out in Delhi in November, 1984 after the assassination of Indira Gandhi. What he remembers is not only “the horror of violence” but also “the affirmation of humanity...the risks that perfectly ordinary people are willing to take for one another” (*The Imam and the Indian*, 61). Such people demonstrate “the indivisible sanity that binds people to each other independently of their governments” (SL, 230). Eventually, *The Shadow Lines* “became a book not about any one event but about the meaning of such events and their effects on the individuals who live through them” (*The Imam and the Indian*, 60). Jethamoshai, the lone, left-behind member of his family, is looked after by a Muslim rickshaw-puller Khalil. His children look up to the old man as their grandfather. Theirs is a family based not on kinship but on love and solidarity, the very basis of community formation. Ghosh’s stance on inter-community solidarity and his assertion of humanity exposes the parochialism of nationalism. The dangerous potential for violence and aggression in the creation of exclusivist collective identities is cogently explained by Regina Schwartz: “Imaginary identity as an act of distinguishing and separating from others, of boundary making and line drawing, is the most fundamental act of violence we commit” (2000: 187). Celebrating “the complex web of relationships between people that cut across nations and generations”, *The Shadow Lines* thus becomes, believes Robert

Dixon, “a fictional critique of classical anthropology’s model of discrete cultures and the associated ideology of nationalism”(2003: 20).

In Ghosh, the male protagonists are rationalists/idealists. Conversely, the female protagonists are pragmatists/humanists. They are more successful than their male counterparts because they are more in touch with life’s reality. May occupies a distinctive position in Ghosh’s gallery of women characters which include Zindi in *The Circle of Reason*, Dolly in *The Glass Palace*, Nilima in *The Hungry Tide*. As an integrated being, May is a champion of humanity. She tirelessly collects funds in London streets for providing housing to the earthquake victims in Central America. In Raibajar, she dismisses the narrator’s grandfather’s huge imported wooden table as “utterly useless”, as a “worthless bit of England” (SL, 49). She indignantly remarks that the amount of money squandered on the table would have provided shelter for a lot of people. She displays courage and compassion in killing the dying dog in Calcutta in order to spare it from more pain. But the defining moment in May’s humanism comes in the narrow Jindabahar Lane when the hostile rioters set upon the old man and his rickshaw-puller. While Thamma, the old man’s blood relation, wants her driver to drive away, the determined May jumps out of the car to defend them: “Your grandmother screamed at me. She said I didn’t know what I was doing, and I’ll get everyone killed. I didn’t listen; I was a heroine” (SL, 250). But in the fiasco, Tridib is killed. For seventeen years after the incident May holds herself responsible for Tridib’s death. She never felt insecure in the mob because “they wouldn’t have touched me, an English memsahib” (SL, 251) but not Tridib. She finally realizes that Tridib “gave himself up; it was a sacrifice” (SL, 251-252). If her self asserted itself in Dhaka – “I was a heroine” (SL, 250) – after the incident she becomes selfless. She is committed to her altruistic mission, a commitment which even intrudes into the private spaces of her domestic life as she sleeps on the floor: “After all, this is how most people in the world sleep. I merely thought I’d throw in my lot with the majority” (SL, 158). While Tridib’s death hardens Thamma’s rigid binarism of “us” and “them”, May’s attitude towards life becomes transnational as she tries to fuse the Self/Other dialectic. Her rhetoric of communitarianism is based on an “understanding of subjectivity, one that values mutual dependency, reliance, appreciation, and trust between the Self and the Other” (Lin, 11). This indeed is a “paradigmatic reconsideration of the status of the Other in our understanding of who we are – our self, identity, and individuality” (Lin, 1). The self’s being “with” the other is an integral part of the ethical relationship with the other. This ‘witness’, conceptualizes Margaret Chatterjee, “covers up the essential difference that there is between people, although we are endowed with the capacity of bridging that distance by embarking on the project of being ‘towards’ the other” (1963: 220). This fusion reaches its zenith in May’s sexual union with the narrator. May and the narrator meet as free citizens transcending the divisions of colonizer/colonized, white/non-white, self/other. Through his union with May, which melts all boundaries, the narrator is granted “the glimpse of...a final redemptive mystery” (SL, 252), the mystery of the depths of human experience.

Literary narrative provides a new perspective of looking at the historical past, often questioning the credibility of the historical representation. By way of questioning what Hayden White calls

history's tropic prefiguration, the prominence given to key historical figures, the erasure of subaltern individuals or communities, literature foregrounds the role of narrative in constructing one's understanding of the world and meaning and truth. A postcolonial writer, in his/her critical re-interpretation of the historical archive, creates a hybrid text that combines historical evidences and imaginative reconstructions, historical as well as invented characters. With this interplay, history is stripped of its objective quality. That literary texts have been widely recognized as essential materials for historical study is evident in Spivak's endorsement of Foucault's suggestion that "to make visible the unseen can also mean a change of level, addressing oneself to a layer of material which hitherto had no pertinence for history and which had not been recognized as having any moral, aesthetic or historical value" (Spivak 1995: 27-28). Evidently what Ghosh tries to reconcile are the "analytical" histories utilizing the rational categories of modern historical thought and the "affective" histories which account for the plural ways of being-in-the-world. After all, as E.L. Doctorow observes, the modes of historical and fictional narratives mediate "the world for the purpose of introducing meaning" (cited in Hutcheon 1988: 112).

References

- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Ashcroft, Bill. 2002 [1989]. *The Empire Writes Back*. London and New York: Routledge.
- 2008. "Globalization, the Transnation and Utopia" In: Krishna Sen and Sudeshna Chakravarti (eds.) *Narrating the (Trans)Nation: The Dialectics of Culture and Identity*. Kolkata: Dasgupta & Co., 1-24.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1997. *Postmodernism and Its Discontents*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Carter, Paul. 1992. *Living in a New Country: History, Travelling and Language*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Chatterjee, Margaret. 1963. *Our Knowledge of Other Selves*. New Delhi: Asia Publishing House.
- Clifford, James. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Daiya, Kavita. 2003. "'No Home But in Memory': Migrant Bodies and Belongings, Globalization and Nationalism in Amitav Ghosh's Novels" In: Brinda Bose (ed.) *Amitav Ghosh: Critical Essays*. Delhi: Pencraft International, 36-55.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. 1994. *What is Philosophy?* Trans. H. Tomlinson and G. Burchell. New York: Columbia UP.
- Dixon, Robert. 2003. "'Travelling in the West': The Writing of Amitav Ghosh" In: Tabish Khair (ed.) *Amitav Ghosh: A Critical Companion*. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 9-35.
- Fanon, Frantz. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.

- Ghosh, Amitav. 1995 [1988]. *The Shadow Lines*. Rpt. New Delhi: OUP.
- 2000. “The Shadow Script”, Interview. New Delhi: *First City*, Sept. 2000.
- 2002. *The Imam and the Indian: Prose Pieces*. New Delhi: Ravi Dayal Publisher.
- Hannerz, Ulf. 1990. “Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture”, *Theory, Culture and Society* 7 (1990), 237-52.
- Hutcheon, Linda. 1988. *A Poetics of Postmodernism*. London: Routledge.
- Kakar, Sudhir. 1996. *The Colours of Violence: Cultural Identities, Religion and Conflict*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kaviraj, Sudipta. 1992. “The Imaginary Institution of India.” *Subaltern Studies VII: Writings on South Asian History and Society*. Ed. Partha Chatterjee and Gyanendra Pandey. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1-39.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. 1969. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne Up.
- Lin, Lidan. 1998. *The Rhetoric of Posthumanism in Four Twentieth Century International Novels*. Diss., University of North Texas, Ann Arbor: UMI.
- Meyerhoff, Hans. 1955. *Time in Literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nandy, Ashis. 1983. *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Patke, Rajeev. 2002. “To Frame a City: the Singaporean Poet in the Postmodern City” In: W. Lim (ed.) *Postmodern Singapore*. Singapore: Select Books, 106-117.
- Radhakrishnan, R. 2003. *Theory in an Uneven World*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rosaldo, Renato. 1992. *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Rougemont, Denis de. 1962. *Passion and Society*. Trans. Montgomery Belgion. London: Faber and Faber.
- Roy, Arundhati. 2002. *The Algebra of Infinite Justice*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- Schwartz, Regina. Cited in Manfred Steger 2000, *Gandhi’s Dilemma: Nonviolent Principles and Nationalist Power*. New York: St. Martins Press.
- Smith, Andrew. 2004. “Migrancy, hybridity, and postcolonial literary studies.” *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*. Ed. Neil Lazarus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 241-261.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1995. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” In: *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. Ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, Helen Tiffin. Routledge: London and New York, 24-28.

Peter Unseth

Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics, Dallas

A created proverb in a novel becomes broadly used in society: “Easily in but not easily out’, as the lobster said in his lobster pot.”

Abstract. C.S. Lewis created several proverbs in his novel *The Horse and His Boy*. One of these has now become broadly used in English-speaking society. This article cites evidence that this new proverb is now being used in novels, poetry, short stories, blogs, and in giving advice. Wolfgang Mieder has noted that there are very few published studies about proverbs created in the last century, so this article fills this gap regarding this proverb. The focus of this article is on the growing use of this proverb, not on proverbs generally.

Keywords: proverbs, C. S. Lewis, proverb creation, *Chronicles of Narnia*, wellerisms.

Proverbs are an ancient way of expressing significant advice, lessons, or observations in a memorable, often colorful way. They are recorded from ancient Sumer, Egypt, Israel, China, India, Greece, and most modern cultures. Because a proverb is a familiar fixed form, a proverb such as “Don’t judge a book by its cover” is quickly recognized and understood as not being about books, but about evaluating something else in the immediate conversational context.

There is a record of an ancient king of Assyria advising his son not to do “as in the ancient proverb, ‘The bitch by her acting too hastily brought forth the blind’” (Moran 1978: 17, 18). In this ancient proverb the son recognized that his father was not thinking about him giving birth to any blind offspring, but was rather that his father was warning him against acting hastily.

But even this proverb, the world’s oldest known proverb (Alster 1979: 5), was first coined by somebody, a person now unknown. After it was first created, others thought the proverb memorable and useful and added it to their speech. In this way, proverbs coined by one person can become the shared riches of an entire community of speakers. This proverb spread not only within the language community, but was later borrowed into other languages, and then passed on again and again so that it has spread as widely as English (Apperson 1929: 289) and Alaaba of Ethiopia (Schneider-Blum 2009: 95).

All proverbs were new creations at some point, even if created long ago by Solomon or Confucius. Many sayings may be considered clever, but only a small number spread among the speakers of a language and become known and used as proverbs across the language community. It is unusual when scholars are able to document the specific origin of a proverb and then document its spread, though Doyle, Mieder, Shapiro (2012) have made a significant contribution by doing this for a number of proverbs first coined in the 20th century.

In his 1954 novel *The Horse and His Boy* (one volume of the *Chronicles of Narnia*), C. S. Lewis (1898-1963) inserts about a dozen proverbs that he created specifically for this book (Unseth 2011 and Melnyk 2013). For these proverbs, we know the exact year they were introduced to the English-speakers: 1954. One of these proverbs has now become used in the broader English speaking world: “‘Easily in but not easily out’, as the lobster said in his lobster pot.” In their study of new English proverbs created in the 20th century, Doyle, Mieder, Shapiro (2012) did not detect this one. Mieder noted that proverb scholars “have studied not even two dozen individual modern Anglo-American proverbs in detail” (2009: 243), so a study such as this, even on just one little-documented proverb, is useful. The other proverbs from this novel were not found with any frequency; they have not become established in the English speaking world. The question of why this proverb has become more established than the others in the book is beyond the scope of this study.

Other authors have created proverbs in fiction, also. Probably the best known examples currently in English fiction are the wealth of created proverbs found in the film *Forrest Gump*, (Winick 1998: 83ff), for which more credit is due to screenplay writer Eric Roth than the novel’s author Winston Groom (Winick 2013). Invented proverbs from *Forrest Gump*, such as “Life is like a box of chocolates, you never know what you’re gonna get” and “Stupid is as stupid does” are now well established in English-speaking culture, the latter being noted by Doyle, Mieder, Shapiro (2012:143). A sign of how established these two proverbs have become is that they are each quoted or twisted on at least a dozen different T-shirt designs for sale on the Web. As another sign of their establishment in pop-culture, these two proverbs are included with several common English proverbs by Bruce Springsteen in his song “My best was never good enough.”

Proverb scholars have also paid much attention to J.R.R. Tolkien’s (1892-1973) creation of many proverbs (Clinton 2014), both in *The Hobbit* (Trokhimenko 2003) and in *The Lord of the Rings* (Boswell 1969, Stanton 1996). Of these, at least two of Tolkien’s created proverbs have gained some currency in English usage: “Not all who wander are lost” and “All that is gold does not glitter” (a twisted form of a proverb based on an existing English one known from Shakespeare). As a sign of their currency in the English-speaking world, these proverbs, too, are for sale on T-shirts and bumper stickers, though neither was included in the collection of Doyle, Mieder, Shapiro (2012).

A few of the other authors who have created proverbs in English fiction include Herman Melville (1819-1891) in his novel about the imaginary island *Mardi* (Hayes 1999: 30), R. D. Blackmore (1825-1900) in his British rural novels (Kirwin 1973), a proverb by Arthur Conan Doyle (1859-1930) in the mouth of Sherlock Holmes (Waterhouse 1990), E. M. Forster (1879-1970) in *A Passage to India* (de Caro 1986 and Gish 1972), Graham Greene (1904-1991) in *The Power and the Glory* (de

Caro 1989), and Samuel Beckett (1906-1989) in *Molloy* (Sherzer 1976). However, none of the proverbs created by the authors just listed have come to be used in broader society.

Artists creating new proverbs are not found only in English novels. To mention only a few, there are newly coined proverbs in the Russian movie *Aleksandr Nevsky* (McKenna 2009: 227), in the Polish poems and essays of Stanisław Jerzy Lec (Frackiewicz 1990), in the Portuguese fiction of Mia Couto (Coutinho 2008), and in Ignatius Mabasa's novel *Mapenzi* (Fools) written in the developing mix of Shona and English in Zimbabwe (Veit-Wild 2009: 696).

The proverb that is the topic of this article is found in the novel *The Horse and His Boy*, spoken by an advisor to the king and queen of Narnia who have become virtual prisoners while visiting a neighboring kingdom. The advisor sums up their predicament saying, "Easily in but not easily out', as the lobster said in his lobster pot" (Lewis 1954: 63).

This type of proverb structure is known as a "wellerism", a saying containing a quotation, a speaker, and an unusual setting (Mieder and Kingsbury 1994: x). Proverbs expressed as wellerisms are an ancient form. *From ancient Sumer we find the wellerism*, "The fox, having urinated into the sea, said: 'The depths of the sea are my urine!'" (<http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/cgi-bin/etcsl.cgi?text=t.6.1.02#>). This structure, even this same urine motif, was found in 20th century America: "Every little bit helps,' said the ant as he peed into the ocean" and "Every little bit helps,' said the old lady as she pissed into the sea" (Mieder and Kingsbury 1994: 76,77). A wellerism with a talking lobster is not entirely original, "I'm turned soger,' as the lobster said when he popped his head out of the boiler" found in "The Boarding house: or, Five hours at Brighton" by Samuel Beazley (1786-1851) (Kitton 1886: 450). Note that this is indeed a wellerism, but it is not a proverb.

A variety of recent writers have quoted Lewis' proverb, "Easily in but not easily out', as the lobster said in his lobster pot." The search for quotations of this proverb was done via the Web, following the example of Doyle, Mieder, and Shapiro (2012). Searches were first done using the exact shape of the original Narnian proverb, then additional searches were done with key words to find instances where authors had quoted the proverb inexactly.

I have found over a dozen examples of this proverb in a variety of genres: novels, poetry, short stories, blogs, and in giving advice about problems. Though all these authors have captured the essence of the proverb, many did not quote it in the exact form that Lewis wrote it. This strongly suggests that these authors had heard the proverb somewhere, not read it in Lewis' novel. Some examples of later writers using this new proverb follow.

Not surprisingly, writers cited it in contexts where a proverb was appropriate. For example, on an advice website, a Catholic priest replied to a questioner about getting a tattoo: "Unless your friend is absolutely sure, I'd advise he wait. Easier in than out, said the lobster in the pot" (<http://forums.catholic.com/showthread.php?t=54013>).

A blogger writing about the complications of emigrating to New Zealand used the proverb to express his frustrated views, "Easily in, but not easily out, as the lobster said in the lobster pot.

For all the hassle of immigration paperwork, getting into NZ was the easy part” (<http://www.expatexposed.com/forum/viewtopic.php?t=1079>).

Concerning American military involvement in Iraq, two different people on the web quoted this proverb. One used it to criticize Bush, overtly acknowledging Lewis as the source, “This is one reason why we counseled against Iraq in the first place. ‘Easily in, but not easily out, as the lobster said in the lobster pot,’ to quote CS Lewis” (http://majikthise.typepad.com/majikthise_/2006/12/false_hope_and_.html).

Another writer used the proverb in criticizing Obama’s policy as naïve, “Iraq is kind of like a lobster pot. Easily in, but not easily out” (<https://answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20081102130033AA84Hrt>).

In Cynthia Harrod-Eagles’ (2011) novel *The Restless Sea*, two characters discuss marriage, one confiding, “Marriage itself is lovely... But there’s no denying it’s a big step. Easily in by not easily out, as the lobster said of the lobster pot.” The same author also used this same proverb in her novel *The Homecoming*.

An author posting a story on the Web wrote, “Srya watched the horses. She cleared her throat, silencing [sic] them. ‘Easily in, but not easily out, said the lobster in the lobster pot,’ she said. ‘If you choose to fight, they will search you out’” (<http://board.youngrider.com/Topic979750-18-7.aspx#bm979968>).

On a website where people bantered with silly questions, one writer wrote,

“Why does fuzz collect in the belly button?

Easily in, but not easily out, As the lobster said in the lobster pot.”

(<http://cosmoquest.org/forum/archive/index.php/t-14367-p-2.html>)

Writing on a role-playing website, one writer explained (for those who already knew the basic rules of a seemingly complex game), “In the license college, anyone is free to enter (contribute content), but no one can leave (take licensed material and transfer it to another license college). *Easily in, not easily out, says the Lobster in the lobster pot*” (*italics in original*). (http://wiki.planetmath.org/cgi-bin/wiki.pl/totalizing_projects)

Discussing the grim movie *Shawshank Redemption*, one person wrote, “That movie was perfect. Evil things, cages. We’re building one for ourselves with this thing. ‘Easily in but not easily out, said the lobster in the lobster pot.’” (<http://politics.gather.com/viewArticle.action?articleId=281474981449018>)

In the short story “Convergence of Interest”, by an author identified as Britpacker, two people in a conversation use the proverb, each citing half of it:

“‘Easily in but not easily out, huh?’ he asked, deliberately bland.

‘As the lobster cried in the pot,’ Malcolm agreed.”

(<http://archiveofourown.org/works/531038>)

A poet identified as Golden Hare wrote a poem titled “Kiss” that includes the proverb as follows:

easily in, but not easily out
the lobster said in the lobster pot.

(<http://undertheaether.wordpress.com/2011/03/>)

On a site discussing software problems, one writer described his frustrating experiences by using the proverb, “It saved the file automatically also as a .mht file, which Internet Explorer could open and I could read it, but couldn’t act upon the message. This reminds me of the proverb, ‘Easily in, but not easily out said the lobster in the lobster pot.’” (http://www.gwmicro.com/Support/Email_Lists/Archives/GW-Info/index.php?message_id=140704&media=print)

Writing about a piece of computer equipment, one person noted that it has “a halt button but it’s recessed and kind of sticky. Easily in but not easily out, as the lobster said”. (<http://comp.os.vms.narkive.com/AGmBRD28/auto-reboot-fails-on-ds10>)

In all, I have found over a dozen documented citations of this colorful proverb. Since Lewis was a bold Christian and *The Horse and His Boy* is a Christian allegory, it would not be surprising if the use of this proverb was limited to people like the two users on the Web who identified themselves as clergymen, and people like myself. However the users on the Web also include those of different bent, showing that the proverb is being diffused across a variety of boundaries into broader society, clear evidence of a proverb becoming established in the general population. It can therefore be concluded that “‘Easily in but not easily out’, as the lobster said in his lobster pot” has gained currency as an English proverb.

References

- Alster, Bendt. 1979. “An Akkadian and a Greek proverb: A comparative study”, *Die Welt des Orients* 10, 1-5.
- Apperson, G.L. 1929. *The Wordsworth dictionary of proverbs*. Ware, United Kingdom: Wordsworth.
- Boswell, George. 1969. “Proverbs and phraseology in Tolkien’s *Lord of the rings* complex”, *The University of Mississippi Studies in English* 10, 59-65.
- Clinton, Esther. 2014. “Proverbial play: J. R. R. Tolkien’s use of proverbs in *The Hobbit* and *The Lord of the Rings*”, *Proverbium* 31, 133-166.
- Coutinho, Maria João. 2008. “The heart is a beach: proverbs and ‘improverbs’” In: Mia Couto’s stories. In: Rui J. B. Soares and Outi Lauhakangas (eds.), *Proceedings of the First Interdisciplinary Colloquium on Proverbs*. Tavira, Portugal: Tipografia Tavirense, 484-489.
- De Caro, Frank. 1986. “A mystery is a muddle”: gnomic expressions in *A Passage to India*”, *Midwestern Journal of Language and Folklore* 12, 15-23.
- De Caro, Frank. 1989. “Proverbs in Graham Greene’s *The Power and the Glory*: framing thematic concerns in a modern novel”, *Proverbium* 6, 1-7.
- Doyle, Charles Clay, Wolfgang Mieder, and Fred R. Shapiro. 2012. *Dictionary of Modern Proverbs*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Frackiewicz, Iwona. 1990. "Sprichwortliche Aphorismen von Stanislaw Jerzy Lec", *Proverbium* 7, 77-88.
- Gish, Robert. 1972. "Forster as Fabulist: Proverbs and Parables in *A Passage to India*", *English Literature in Transition (1880-1920)* 15(4), 245-256.
- Hayes, Kevin. 1999. *Melville's Folk Roots*. Kent: Kent State University.
- Kirwin, William. 1973. "Blackmore – creator of proverbs", *Lore and Language* 1(8), 26-28.
- Kitton, Frederic George. 1886. *Dickensiana: a bibliography of the literature relating to Charles Dickens and his writings*. G. Redway.
- Lewis, C. S. 1954. *The Horse and His Boy*. (The Chronicles of Narnia.) New York: Collier.
- McKenna, Kevin J. 2009. "Proverbs in Sergei Einstein's *Aleksandr Nevsky*", *Proverbium* 29, 217-236.
- Melnyk, A. B. 2013. Особливості відтворення прислів'їв та приказок у перекладі текстів дитячої літератури (на матеріалі роману К.С. Льюїса „Кінь та його хлопчик” і його українськомовних версій). [Specific Aspects of Reproducing Proverbs in the Translations of Children's Literature (Based upon the Novel „*The Horse and His Boy*” by C. S. Lewis and its Ukrainian Versions)]. *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу: наукове видання*, 506-514. Kiev: Kiev University. (http://philology.knu.ua/files/library/movni_i_konceptualni/46-2/61.pdf) (July 12, 2014)
- Mieder, Wolfgang. 2009. "New proverbs run deep': Prolegomena to a dictionary of modern Anglo-American proverbs", *Proverbium* 26, 237-274.
- Mieder, Wolfgang and Stewart Kingsbury. 1994. *A Dictionary of Wellerisms*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moran, William. 1978. "An Assyriological gloss on the new Archilochus fragment", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 82, 17-19.
- Schneider-Blum, Gertrud. 2009. *Máakuti t'awá shuultáa: Proverbs finish the problems: Sayings of the Alaaba (Ethiopia)*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Sherzer, Dina. 1976. "Saying is inventing: gnomic expressions in *Molloy*" In: Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (ed.), *Speech Play: Research and Resources for Studying Linguistic Creativity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 163-171.
- Stanton, Michael. 1996. "Advice is a dangerous gift", *Proverbium* 13, 331-345.
- Trokhimenko, Olga. 2003. "If you sit on the door-step long enough, you will think of something': The function of proverbs in J.R.R. Tolkien's *Hobbit*", *Proverbium* 20, 367-377.
- Unseth, Peter. 2011. "A culture 'full of choice apothegms and useful maxims': Invented proverbs in C.S. Lewis' *The Horse and His Boy*", *Proverbium* 28, 323-338.
- Veit-Wild, Flora. 2009. "'Zimbolicious' – The creative potential of linguistic innovation: The case of Shona-English in Zimbabwe", *Journal of Southern African Studies* 35(3), 683-697.
- Winick, Stephen. 1998. *The Proverb Process: Intertextuality and Proverbial Innovation in Popular Culture*. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Winick, Stephen. 2013. "Proverb is as proverb does: *Forrest Gump*, the catchphrase, and the proverb", *Proverbium* 30, 377-428.

WORK IN PROGRESS

“Work in progress” is a forum for students and university graduates who wish to present the results of their research.

Anita Mackiewicz

The University of Białystok

Translation strategies across time: a comparison of two Polish renderings of *Anne of Green Gables* by Lucy Maud Montgomery

Abstract. The aim of this article is to compare two Polish renderings of *Anne of Green Gables* by Lucy Maud Montgomery: the oldest one by Rozalia Bersteinowa (1911/1912), and one of the most recent ones, by Paweł Beręsewicz (2013). This article attempts to both identify the specific strategies and techniques employed by the two translators and to illustrate how approaches to translation have changed over the years.

Keywords: translation, English, Polish, adaptation, foreignisation, *Anne of Green Gables*, Lucy Maud Montgomery, Rozalia Bersteinowa, Paweł Beręsewicz.

Attitudes towards translation and translation strategies change with time. By looking at two Polish renderings of *Anne of Green Gables* – the oldest one (Bersteinowa 1911/1912) and one of the most recent ones (Beręsewicz 2013) – this article attempts to both identify the specific strategies and techniques employed by the two translators and to illustrate how approaches to translation have changed over the years.

The novel, its author and translators

Anne of Green Gables is a heart-warming story of a ginger-haired heroine known all over the world to both youngsters and adults. After its publication in 1908 in Canada, the book quickly became

a worldwide bestseller, translated into 20 languages and sold in 50 million copies (IS1). It was frequently adapted for movies, TV series, and musicals. The number of its renderings speaks for the popularity of the novel: only in Poland at least 12 different translators have made an attempt to convey the emotions, humour and universal values of the book to the Polish readers.

Lucy Maud Montgomery (1874-1942), who created the famous character, was born in Prince Edward Island and decided that it was the perfect setting for her first novel. She was raised by her grandparents and for a short time worked as a teacher. She was married to Reverend Ewan MacDonald and had two children. Montgomery wrote eight books about Anne: *Anne of Green Gables* (1908), *Anne of Avonlea* (1909), *Anne of the Island* (1915), *Anne of Windy Poplars* (1936), *Anne's House of Dreams* (1917), *Anne of Ingleside* (1939), *Rainbow Valley* (1919), *Rilla of Ingleside* (1920), for which she was awarded many times. Thanks to the success of her works, Prince Edward Island gained popularity as a destination for people who look for Anne-related attractions (IS2).

Among the Polish translators of the book are Rozalia Bersteinowa and Paweł Beręsewicz: the authors of the first and one of the last Polish translations of the novel, respectively. Bersteinowa's rendering comes from 1911 or 1912, and not much else is known about her. Paweł Beręsewicz is a contemporary translator who graduated from Warsaw University where he studied English philology. In addition to being a translator, lexicographer and a part-time teacher, he also writes short stories and novels for children. He cooperates with such editing houses as *Skrzat* and *Literatura*. Among his books are: *Co tam u Ciumków?*, *Czy wojna jest dla dziewczyn?*, *Jak zakochałem Kaśkę Kwiatek*, *Kiedy chodziłem z Julką Maj*, *Tajemnica człowieka z blizną*, *Warszawa. Spacer z Ciumkami*, *Wielka wyprawa Ciumków*, *Wszystkie lajki Marczuka*. Beręsewicz's books have been honoured and awarded. He has received the Kornel Makuszyński Literary Award (twice), the Warsaw Literary Award, the 3rd prize in the II Astrid Lindgren Award, a Nomination in the Book of the Year Competition: Polish Section IBBY (four times). His translations include not only *Anne of Green Gables* by Lucy Maud Montgomery, but also *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* by Mark Twain, *The Secret Garden* by Frances Hodgson Burnett and *The Changeover* by Margaret Mahy (IS3). The sections which follow will focus on selected aspects of the two Polish renderings of the book, comparing the strategies employed by the two translators.

Adaptation vs. foreignisation: proper names and cultural reality in translation

The two translations of the book vary significantly, beginning with the titles of most chapters to individual words and phrases. They are about 100 years distant in time, which is enough for both the language, cultural reality and translation strategies to have changed. The most influential factor, however, which makes the two renderings so distant is the choice of two completely different translation strategies: adaptation and foreignisation.

Adaptation is understood as a translation method whose goal is to replace certain elements characteristic of one society and its culture with elements known by another society and its culture (Delisle, Lee-Jahnke, Cormier 2006: 22). This strategy facilitates understanding a target lan-

guage text thanks to the elimination of foreignness, i.e. elements which do not occur in the readers' native culture. Rozalia Bersteinowa's version of *Anne of Green Gables* is the perfect example of this method. The translator makes the reality presented in the novel more similar to that of Poland, adjusting it to the realities familiar to her and her readers.

Foreignisation, in contrast, focuses on preserving the individuality of a given culture (Skibińska 2000: 162), familiarizing readers with countries they are not acquainted with (Lewicki 2000: 193). It brings in strangeness, saving as many elements of a foreign language and culture as possible. *Anne of Green Gables* in Beręsewicz's translation is an example of the application of this specific technique – the translator made his rendering characteristic by its faithfulness to the original.

A comparison of the two renderings of the novel demonstrates how the application of each of the strategies affects the translated text. First of all, let us take a look at the translator's attitude towards proper names. Both translators decided to transfer the names of the main characters of the novel, but they did it for different reasons. Bersteinowa, who lived in a century when education was not so advanced, was cognizant of the fact that a great number of her readers did not know the English language and Canadian culture. This may have been one of the reasons why she tried to adjust the book to Polish culture; a young girl named *Ania* is easier to identify with than a girl with the foreign name *Anne* (especially when you are not really sure how to pronounce it). Beręsewicz, on the other hand, is known for his disapproval of translating names. He is of the opinion that in the era of television and the Internet people are sufficiently acquainted with the foreign culture to make it possible for a translator not to do so. However, despite this conviction, he did translate the names of the main characters of the novel. His decision was most probably motivated by the fact that *Anne of Green Gables* is a very popular novel, and has already anchored in the minds and hearts of Polish society. Leaving the names of the main characters as they are in the original version was likely to make many readers skeptical towards this idea. Therefore, he met his readers half way and in certain fragments saved both versions of the names, i.e. English *Anne* and Polish *Ania*. The renderings of the following fragment illustrate the strategies employed by the two translators:

Lucy Maud Montgomery:

- Yes, this is Anne Shirley, said Marilla.
- Spelled with an E, gasped Anne (...) (p.108)

Bersteinowa uses 2 diminutive forms of the character's name – *Ania* and *Andzia* – suggesting that Anne hated the latter:

- Tak, to Ania Shirley – potwierdziła Maryla
- Ania, nie Andzia – szepnęła dziewczynka (...) (p.95)

Beręsewicz uses both the Polish and the English version of her name, Anne's comment referring to the spelling of the English version:

– *Tak, to jest Ania. Anne Shirley – przytaknęła Maryla.*

– *Przez „e” na końcu – wykrztusiła Ania (...) (p. 106)*

As for the remaining names, *Marilla* and *Matthew* are translated as *Maryla* and *Mateusz* respectively. Beręsewicz explains that he found the name *Matthew* very difficult to inflect and fit into Polish syntax, and decided that its Polish equivalent would be more convenient to use. To be consistent with the treatment of the names of the main characters, he translated them all. As far as the names of the other characters are concerned, Bersteinowa uses their Polish equivalents while Beręsewicz leaves them in the original. Thus, in Bersteinowa's version *Rachel Lynde* becomes *Małgorzata Linde*, *Charlie* is *Karolek*, *Jane* becomes *Janka*, *Josie* is *Józia* and *Josephine* – *Józefina*.

Anne of Green Gables is fraught with real and fictional names of places. *Green Gables* is translated as *Zielone Wzgórze* in both versions. The rest of the names, however, differ in the two translations. Beręsewicz is consistent in his strategy and leaves most of the place names in the original form. If he decides to translate certain names, usually the longer ones, his translation is as faithful to the original as possible. Bersteinowa, on the contrary, tries to eliminate the foreignness to a complete minimum and translates every place name in the novel, very often adding something from herself and making the translation distant from its original form and meaning (especially in the case of the names invented by Anne herself). Thus, *Lynde's Hollow* is called *dolina Linde'ów* in Bersteinowa's version and *Lyndowa Dolinka* in Beręsewicz's. Barry's house – *Orchard Slope* in the earliest translation is *Sosnowe Wzgórze* and *Sadowy Stok* (which is a calque of *Orchard Slope*) in the latest one. *White Sands* has been translated literally by Bersteinowa as *Białe Piaski*, while Beręsewicz retains its original form.

In the novel there are also names coined by Anne. There is a scene where she is delighted by the geranium and decides to name it *Bonny*. Beręsewicz transfers the original name into the Polish version but Bersteinowa translates it as *Jutrzenka* ('dawn' or 'a morning star'). Then, there is a place used by girls as a playhouse, which they call *Idlewild*. Bersteinowa calls it *Zacisze Słowika* ('nightingale's refuge'), while Beręsewicz uses a name which is closer to the original – *Leśna Samotnia* ('a refuge in the forest'). Another example of Beręsewicz's accuracy in translation is *Willowmere*: he translates it as *Wierzbowe Oczko* (lit. 'a willow's eye'), while Bersteinowa uses an entirely different name – *Jasnooka* ('bright-eyed'). Both translators render *Snow Queen* as *Królowa Śniegu* and *Lake of Shining Waters* as *Jeziro Lśniących Wód*, thus using direct Polish equivalents of the two names.

Moreover, the novel contains names of various associations. Here the differences in translation are caused not so much by the choice of specific strategies, but rather by the temporal distance that separates the two renderings. In effect, the *Sewing Circle* is called *Szwalnia dla Dziewcząt* by Bersteinowa. The noun *szwalnia*, common in her times, is now mostly associated with sewing industry rather than an activity of individuals. That is why Beręsewicz decides to name it *kółko krawieckie*, which is both a literal translation of the English name and a current Polish equivalent of the expression. Another example is *Church Aid Society*. In Bersteinowa's version it appears under the name *Parafialny Związek Pomocy*, while Beręsewicz translates it as *Kościelne Towar-*

zystwo Dobroczynne. In this case, Bersteinowa is closer to the original; Beręsewicz uses a word (*dobroczynność*) which is a Polish counterpart of *charity*.

The application of two different strategies is particularly visible in fragments concerning cultural reality, such religion, education and food. As for religion, it is worth mentioning that Protestantism forbids taking the Lord's name in vain and people from Avonlea obey this law and never use it directly. They, for example, say *Thanks be to goodness for that*. Beręsewicz respects that and in his rendering it becomes *I niech będzie chwała*. Bersteinowa's translates it as *Dzięk Ci, Boże* ('Thank God'), which is a very common phrase in Polish, but it ignores the importance of this unwritten law in Avonlean community. Likewise, *Merciful goodness!* is translated as *Łaska i zmiłowanie* by Beręsewicz and *Na litość Boską!* ('For God's sake') by Bersteinowa.

Names related to school and education also show how an adoption of a specific method can affect translation. Starting with the name of the teachers' school and ending with a graduation outfit, the two renderings are completely different. Lucy Maud Montgomery refers to the school for teachers as *Queen's*. So does Beręsewicz in his rendering. Bersteinowa, on the other hand, uses the noun *akademia* ('academy'). What's more, the traditional English graduating outfit is described by the author as *a gown and mortar board*. Beręsewicz translates *gown* as *toga* and *mortal board* as *kwadratowa czapka* – he knows that Polish readers are already familiar with this custom, not only thanks to television, but also because many Polish universities have adopted it. Bersteinowa omits the fragment entirely and does not mention it at all.

Every country and almost every region has its characteristic food. Lucy Maud Montgomery also weaves many delicacies into the plot. Table 1 below presents how the two translators dealt with their names.

Table 1. Names of foods in the original and the two translations		
<i>Lucy Maud Montgomery</i>	<i>Rozalia Bersteinowa</i>	<i>Paweł Beręsewicz</i>
fruit cake	placek z owocami	keks
pound cake	ciastka z kremem	biszkopt
doughnuts	orzechy w cukrze	pączki
preserves	konfitury	konfitury
pie	pieróg	zapiekanek
chocolate sweeties	pastylki czekoladowe	czekoladowe cukierki
peppermints	pastylki miętowe	miętówki

Beręsewicz's translation is not only up-to-date, but also more precise and accurate. Pound cake is a traditional cake made from a pound of four different ingredients. It has no cream in it, so his *biszkopt* is a closer equivalent than Bersteinowa's *ciastka z kremem* ('cream cakes'). As for *doughnuts*, Bersteinowa seems to have been misled by the *nut* part, which is why she translated the word as *orzechy w cukrze* ('nuts in sugar').

In Avonlean society, many orphans were working and helping at farms. They were usually treated as inferior to other people, as illustrated in the following fragment:

'Well, you'd better go and give that cake to the pigs,' said Marilla. 'It isn't fit for any human to eat, not even Jerry Boute.' (p. 22)

Beręsewicz translates this fragment faithfully:

– No dobrze, idź teraz i zanieś to ciasto świniom – powiedziała Maryla. – Dla ludzi się nie nadaje. Nawet dla Jerry'ego Buote'a. (p. 212)

In Bersteinowa's rendering, however, the entire fragment is omitted. It is possible that she considered it too direct, too radical to be included in a book for children.

Another interesting aspect of the two translations is the treatment of units of measure. When Anne says that she is *an inch taller than Diana*, Bersteinowa translates it as *trościczkę wyższa*, which means *a bit taller*. Beręsewicz, in contrast, uses the Polish equivalent of *inch* – *cal*.

Style and vocabulary

As already mentioned, the two translations are about 100 years distant in time, which is why the style and the vocabulary used by the two translators are often remarkably different. The easiest way to notice the difference between the two renderings is to take a quick look at translation of the chapters' titles. Only 6 out of 38 titles are translated in the same way; the remaining ones are different. Table 2 below summarises the differences.

<i>Lucy Maud Montgomery</i>	<i>Rozalia Bersteinowa</i>	<i>Paweł Beręsewicz</i>
Mrs Rachel Linde is Surprised	Zdumienie pani Małgorzaty Linde	Pani Rachel Linde jest zdziwiona
Matthew Cuthbert is Surprised	Zdumienie Mateusza	Mateusz Cuthbert jest zdziwiony
Marilla Cuthbert is Surprised	Zdumienie Maryli Cuthbert	Maryla Cuthbert jest zdziwiona
Morning at Green Gables	Poranek na Zielonym Wzgórzu	Poranek w Zielonym Wzgórzu
Anne's History	Historia Ani	Historia Ani
Marilla Makes Up Her Mind	Co postanowiła Maryla	Maryla podejmuje decyzję
Anne Says Her Prayers	Modlitwa Ani	Ania odmawia pacierz
Anne's Bringing-Up Is Begun	Zaczyna się wychowanie Ani	Wychowanie Ani rozpoczęte
Mrs Rachel Lynde is Properly Horrified	Oburzenie pani Linde	Pani Rachel Lynde jest wprost przerażona
Anne's Apology	Wyznanie winy	Przeprosiny Ani
Anne's Impressions of Sunday-School	Wrażenia Ani w szkole niedzielnej	Ania idzie do szkółki niedzielnej

Table 2. Titles of chapters in the two translations

<i>Lucy Maud Montgomery</i>	<i>Rozalia Bersteinowa</i>	<i>Paweł Beręsewicz</i>
A Solemn Vow and Promise	Uroczysta przysięga i obietnica	Uroczysta przysięga i obietnica
The Delights of Anticipation	Rozkosze oczekiwania	Rozkosze czekania
Anne's Confession	Przyznanie się do winy	Wyznanie Ani
A Tempest in the School Teapot	Burza w szkolnej szklance wody	Burza w szkolnej szklance wody
Diana is Invited to Tea with Tragic Result	Tragiczne skutki podwieczorku	Podwieczorek ze skutkiem tragicznym
A New Interest in Life	Nowy cel w życiu	Życie odzyskuje blask
Anne to the Rescue	Ania w roli zbawcy	Ania przybywa na ratunek
A Concert a Catastrophe and a Confession	Koncert, katastrofa i wyznanie	Koncert, katastrofa i wyznanie
A Good Imagination Gone Wrong	Bezdroża wyobraźni	Zgubne skutki wyobraźni
A New Departure in Flavorings	Nowe zastosowanie kropli walerianowych	Przełom w dziedzinie dodatków smakowych
Anne Is Invited Out to Tea	Odwiedziny Ani u pastorstwa	Ania idzie z wizytą
Anne Comes to Grief in an Affair of Honor	Ofiara Ani dla sprawy honorowej	Sprawa honoru
Miss Stacy and Her Pupils Get Up a Concert	Wychowankowie panny Stacy urządzają koncert	Panna Stacy i jej uczniowie organizują koncert
Matthew Insists on Puffed Sleeves	Mateusz rzecznikiem bufiastych rękawów	Mateusz a sprawa bufiastych rękawów
The Story Club Is Formed	Klub powieściowy	Klub literacki
Vanity and Vexation of Spirit	Próżność ukarana	Próżność i cierpienia duszy
An Unfortunate Lily Maid	Niefortunne przedstawienie	Nieszczęsna Pani Nenufarów
An Epoch in Anne's Life	Epoka w życiu Ani	Epoka w życiu Ani
The Queens Class Is Organized	Utworzenie kompletu seminarzystów	Zajęcia dla kandydatów do Queen's
Where the Brook and River Meet	Zwierzzenia	Na progu dorosłego życia
The Pass List Is Out	Ogłoszenie listy przyjętych	Lista przyjętych
The Hotel Concert	Koncert w hotelu	Koncert w hotelu
A Queen's Girl	Seminarzystka	Uczennica Queen's
The Winter at Queen's	Zima w seminarium	Zima w Akademii
The Glory and the Dream	Sława i marzenie	Sen i chwała
The Reaper Whose Name Is Death	Żniwiarz, którego imię jest śmierć	Żniwiarz imieniem Śmierć
The Bend in the Road	Zakręt na drodze	Na zakręcie

In Beręsewicz's version the titles are very close to the original. He makes almost no changes in the structure of the titles, while Bersteinowa changes most of those which have the structure of sentences into noun phrases. For example, *Anne Is Invited Out to Tea* becomes *Odwiedziny Ani u pastorstwa* ('Anne's visit at the pastor and his wife's'). She keeps the sense of the original, shortens the title if possible and often adds something from herself, revealing more about the content of a given chapter than the original. For example, in the case of *Anne Is Invited Out to Tea*, the reader already learns from the title that Anne is going to visit the pastor and his wife. Another difference is the translation of the titular *Green Gables*. In particular, *Morning at Green Gables* is translated by Bersteinowa as *Poranek na Zielonym Wzgórzu*. The preposition *at* used in the original suggests a place. Bersteinowa's use of *na* suggest that house is on the top of the hill. Beręsewicz translates the title as *Poranek w Zielonym Wzgórzu*, which implies being inside the house.

There are many words and expressions in Bersteinowa's version which have become outmoded. Table 3 below presents some of them.

Table 3. Selected vocabulary items in the two translations		
<i>Lucy Maud Montgomery</i>	<i>Rozalia Bersteinowa</i>	<i>Paweł Beręsewicz</i>
supper	wieczera	kolacja
buggy	kabriolet	bryczka
sorrel	klacz	kasztanka
your place	posiadłość	farma
ottoman	ottoman	kanapa
skin	pleć	cera
curtains	portier	zasłonki
tapestry	makaty	gobeliny
turnip	brukiew	rzepa
east gable	facjatka	piętro/poddasze
picture	rycina	obrazek
fever	febra	szkarlatyna
grippe	influcja	grypa

As it is to be expected, Beręsewicz's vocabulary is more modern than Bersteinowa's. The translation of the following fragment is a good example:

I'm awfully glad you've come to live at Green Gables. It will be jolly to have somebody to play with. (p. 110)

Bersteinowa's rendering is:

Cieszę się ogromnie, że będziesz mieszkała na Zielonym Wzgórzu. Przyjemnie będzie mieć towarzyszkę zabaw.
(p. 96)

Beręsewicz replaces "ogromnie" with a more modern-sounding "strasznie", and "towarzyszka zabaw" ('a companion') with "będę miała się z kim bawić" ('I will have somebody to play with'):

Strasznie się cieszę, że zamieszkałaś w Zielonym Wzgórzu. Wreszcie będę miała się z kim bawić. (p. 108)

In Bersteinowa's version *I'm sorry I was late* becomes *Żałuję, że się spóźniłem*, which contains the rather archaic form *żem*, while Beręsewicz translates it as *Przepraszam za spóźnienie* ('I'm sorry for being late'). Likewise, *looking after twins* is referred to as *piastować bliźnięta* in the oldest version and as *opiekować się bliźniętami* in the more recent one, where the archaic verb *piastować* is replaced with its more modern equivalent *opiekować się*. When Anne says *I'm glad* or *I wonder*, Bersteinowa translates it as *Jestem temu bardzo rada* and *Ciekawam*, and Beręsewicz as *Bardzo się cieszę* and *Ciekawe, czy*.

Beręsewicz also uses colloquialisms, e.g. he renders *troubles* as *kompletny bigos* (roughly: 'complete mess') while Bersteinowa uses the neutral term *kłopot*.

Nothing affects the style more than the vocabulary used. Bersteinowa's selection of words makes her style romantic and feminine, as illustrated by her translation of the fragment when Anne is imagining her room:

Lucy Maud Montgomery: *The floor is covered with a white velvet carpet with pink roses all over it and there are pink silk curtains at the windows.* (p.78)

Rozalia Bersteinowa: *Podłoga pokryta jest dywanem z białego aksamitu, osypanym różowymi różami. U okien wiszą różowe jedwabne portiery.* (p. 69-70)

Paweł Beręsewicz: *Na podłodze jest biały aksamitny dywan w różyczki, a w oknach różowe jedwabne zasłony.* (p.77)

Bersteinowa uses the literary adjective *różowy* where Beręsewicz uses the neutral term *różowy* (*pink*). The noun *portiery* is also a more literary choice than the ordinary noun *zasłony* used by Beręsewicz to translate *curtains*.

Bersteinowa's style is also rich in diminutive forms and maudlin expressions. For example, when Anne discovers *a lane*, Bersteinowa translates the word as *maleńka ścieżyna* ('a tiny path'), where both the adjective and the noun are in diminutive forms. Beręsewicz translates it as *dróżka* ('a little path'), a noun which also conveys the meaning of smallness, but is less literary and archaic than *ścieżyna*. Marilla said once about Anne: *She's a real bright little thing*. In Bersteinowa's version it is more emphatic: *To taki jasny promyczek, takie miłe stworzenie* ('She is such a bright ray, such a nice thing'). Beręsewicz uses an idiom *żywe srebro* ('quicksilver') to describe her personality: *To żywe srebro, nie dziewczyna.* (lit. 'She is quicksilver, not a girl').

Anne of Green Gables contains many humorous elements. Unfortunately, the romantic womanish style represented by Bersteinowa does not always reflect this quality. In the translation of the

sentence: *Mrs. Rachel swept out and away—if a fat woman who always waddled COULD be said to sweep away—and Marilla with a very solemn face betook herself to the east gable* (p. 85) she omits the humorous comment, and, instead of that, writes that Mrs. Rachel moved slowly and with dignity: *I pani Małgorzata z wielką godnością i szacunkiem do swej okrągłej figury podniosła się i powoli ruszyła w drogę, Maryla zaś, przybrawszy bardzo surowy wyraz twarzy, udała się do pokoiku na facjatce* (p. 75-76).

Paweł Beręsewicz compares her walking style to that of a duck, thus retaining the humorous element: *To powiedziawszy, pani Rachel wymaszerowała z kuchni – jeżeli kaczy chód grubej kobiety można nazwać marszem – a Maryla, z bardzo zasepioną miną, udała się do pokoiku na poddaszu.* (p. 84)

The author's sense of humour is also visible in the way she plays with words and their meanings. Wordplay is generally difficult to translate, but Beręsewicz manages to do it retaining the sense of the original and its humour. The following fragment illustrates it quite well:

'Will you swear to be my best friend forever and ever?' demanded Anne eagerly.

Diana looked shocked.

'Why it's dreadfully wicked to swear,' she said rebuckingly.

'Oh no, not my kind of swearing. There are two kinds, you know.'

'I never heard of but one kind,' said Diana doubtfully.

'There really is another. Oh, it isn't wicked at all. It just means vowing and promising solemnly.' (p.110)

Here, Montgomery uses the word *swear*, which Bersteinowa translates as *przysięga* ('vow') and *obietnica* ('promise'):

Czy przysięgniesz, że będziesz moją przyjaciółką na wieczne czasy? – spytała prędko Ania.

Diana spojrzała przerażona.

Ależ to bardzo brzydko przysięgać – rzekła z wyrzutem.

Cóż znowu! Nie jest brzydko przysięgać, tak jak ja myślę. Są dwa rodzaje przysięgi.

Ja słyszałam tylko o jednym – rzekła Diana z powątpiewaniem.

A właśnie, że jest i drugi. Wcale nie brzydki! Jest to po prostu uroczysta obietnica. (p.96-98)

It is not clear from the Polish version why one should be preferred over the other and why Diana is full of doubts. Beręsewicz finds a word in Polish which is ambiguous and justifies Diana's indignation. The word he uses, *ślub*, may mean *a vow*, *solemn promise* and *a marriage*:

A co byś powiedziała, gdybyśmy złożyły śluby wieczystej przyjaźni, co? – ochoczo zaproponowała Ania.

Diana wyglądała na wstrząśniętą.

Po co? – powiedziała z wyrzutem. – Przecież jesteśmy za małe na śluby.

Nie, to nie o takie śluby chodzi – tłumaczyła Ania. – Są ich dwa rodzaje.

Ja słyszałam tylko o jednym.

Naprawdę jest jeszcze drugi. I wiek nie ma znaczenia. Po prostu chodzi o przysięgę i uroczystą obietnicę. (p. 108)

Bersteinowa's style is more romantic, fraught with maudlin expressions. Beręsewicz has adjusted the novel's language to the contemporary reader. In many ways, he is also closer in style to Lucy Maud Montgomery. In his rendering, the main character is described in an ironic and humorous way, as in the original. Bersteinowa made Anne more romantic and delicate, losing some of the humour and wit of the original version.

What is also worth mentioning is the translators' treatment of quotations from literary works, which are frequent in the novel. Bersteinowa tends to omit the quotations or translates them as if they were part of the novel. Beręsewicz is very faithful to the original in this case. He respects all the references made by the author, often making footnotes to clarify the context for the reader. His footnotes make many fragments more understandable, simultaneously educating the reader in an indirect way. If Bersteinowa decides to make a footnote, it usually concerns very simple, basic facts, like clarifying who Caesar was. For example, in Bersteinowa's version references to Hamlet are completely ignored, as in the following fragment: *I heard him to say 'sweets to the sweet'*. Bersteinowa translates it as: *wyraźnie słyszałam jak wyrzekł: 'Piękno dla piękna!'* ('beauty to beauty'). Beręsewicz uses a quote from a Polish translation of *Hamlet* by Barańczak and makes a footnote explaining the source of the quotation: (...) *i słyszałam, jak powiedział: 'niech wonne kwiaty otoczą ten kwiat.'*

He also identifies an allusion to Shakespeare's comedy *As You Like It* in the following sentence: *There was a tang in the very air that inspired the hearts of small maidens tripping, unlike snails, swiftly and willingly to school (...)*, as well as an allusion to William Wordsworth's poem in the title of Chapter 36 *The Glory and the Dream* and to Henry W. Longfellow's poem in the title of Chapter 37 *The Reaper Whose Name is Death*. He provides quotations from established Polish translations of these fragments.

Bersteinowa ignores references to folk songs as well. Anne mentions the song *My Home on the Hill* which Beręsewicz renders literally as *Mój domek na wzgórzu*. Bersteinowa, however, does not mention it at all.

Conclusions

The two translations discussed in the present study are significantly different mostly because of the temporal distance which separates them. They differ in style and the vocabulary used, but most importantly, they make use of different translation strategies – adaptation (Bersteinowa) and foreignisation (Beręsewicz).

Rozalia Bersteinowa attempts to make the reality presented in the novel similar to the Polish reality of her time: she uses Polish equivalents of English proper names; she translates names of different types of food and even some customs. What is more, parts of the text are often omitted in her rendering, especially Montgomery's quotations from literary works. Also, the language she uses has become a little archaic – many words and expressions have become outmoded. Paweł Beręsewicz represents an entirely different approach – one which is consistent with the current translation standards. He leaves most of the characters' names in the original, and attempts to

preserve the cultural reality and humour of the book. He does not omit any fragments of the original text. The language he uses is modern, but he stays faithful to the original in the meanings he expresses.

An analysis of the two translations illustrates how the art of translation has changes over the years. Omissions of large fragments of the original text are no longer acceptable and foreignisation is now preferred over domestication.

References

- Delisle, J., H. Lee-Jahnke, M.C. Cormier (eds.). 2006. *Terminologia Tłumaczenia*. Poznań, Wyd. Naukowe UAM.
- Lewicki, R. 2000. "Między adaptacją a egzotyzacją" In: M. Ogonowska (ed.). *Przekładając Nieprzekładalne*, Gdańsk, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 191-200.
- Montgomery, L.M. 1908. *Anne of Green Gables* at <http://www.planetebook.com/ebooks/Anne-of-Green-Gables.pdf> (April-June 2014)
- Montgomery, L.M. 1956. *Ania z Zielonego Wzgórza*, Warszawa, Wyd. Nasza Księgarnia.
- Montgomery, L.M. 2013. *Ania z Zielonego Wzgórza*, Kraków, Wyd. Skrzat.
- Skibińska, E. 2000. "Nazwy własne we francuskim przekładzie 'Prawieku i innych czasów' Olgi Tokarczuk" In: M. Ogonowska (ed.). *Przekładając Nieprzekładalne*, Gdańsk, Wyd. Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego, 157-169.

Internet sources:

- IS1: <http://childliterature.net/childlit/realistic/anne.html> (May 2013)
- IS1: <http://childrensbooks.about.com/od/authorsillustrato/a/Anne-Of-Green-Gables-Books-Author-Prince-Edward-Island.htm> (May 2013)
- IS3: <http://www.pawelberesewicz.neostrada.pl> (May 2013)

Magdalena Szewczuk

The University of Białystok

Equivalence and translation strategies in the Polish rendering of *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* by Ken Kesey

Abstract. The aim of this study is to compare the original text of *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* by Ken Kesey with its Polish translation by Tomasz Mirkowicz, and to analyse the strategies and techniques employed by the translator. It examines the way the translator dealt with the language variety of the original, its register, proper names, the use of capital letters, and text formatting. It argues that the modifications he introduced have made the Polish version of the novel more expressive.

Keywords: *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, Ken Kesey, translation, Polish, Tomasz Mirkowicz

Introduction

This paper offers a contrastive analysis of the novel *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* by Ken Kesey and its Polish translation by Tomasz Mirkowicz with the aim to analyse the differences between them, and to estimate the extent to which the translator's intervention has changed the text and influenced its reception among Polish readers.

Taking into consideration that there are a number of approaches to translation and numerous techniques that can be applied in the process of rendering a work into a foreign language, the human factor is of great importance. The translator chooses a specific strategy and shapes the text because of his/her own decisions. He is responsible for taking apart all the pieces of a novel and putting them together again. Such a task is not an easy one, and because of the structural differences between languages and their specific traits, sometimes it is almost impossible to render a phrase in a manner that would preserve both the meaning and the form of the original. *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* is a complex story, rich in symbols and metaphors, which are potentially easy to be lost in translation. Venuti (1995) uses the term *invisibility* to describe the phenom-

enon of the illusion of the translated text – for those, who read it in target language it feels to be natural, and they do not think of it as a rendering:

A translated text, whether prose or poetry, fiction or nonfiction, is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers, and readers when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text—the appearance, in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the “original.”

The below comparison of *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* with its Polish translation focuses on the decisions and choices made by its Polish translator, Tomasz Mirkowicz, and their influence upon the final product.

One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest – the plot, style and background

The story takes place in a mental hospital. It is narrated by Chief Bromden, an Indian who is thought to be deaf and dumb – a pose he adapts as a result of his illness. He is a schizophrenic who believes in the existence of a machine-like conspiracy which he refers to as “Combine”. He pretends to be unable to hear and talk in order to deceive it. When a new patient appears and causes a real revolution in the ward, Bromden's perception changes along with the manner in which he reports the subsequent events.

The language of the novel demonstrates the author's language skills, as well as his flexibility in writing: comical scenes interweave with drama, reality is mixed with the chimerical and deranged images of what is inside Bromden's head, but it is noticeable as one reads on that the story is becoming more realistic: “Readers initially see the ward through the Chief's psychotic haze. His fantastic visions show his paranoia and how oppressive the asylum really is. Then as McMurphy brings him back to sanity, the picture gradually clears, the fantastic visions becoming realistic” (Macky 2010: 2). Randle McMurphy pushes all the events forward; he is the power that introduces changes affecting the asylum and the patients. Starting with such simple things as laughter and playfulness, he shows the other patients a new dimension of life. His frisky and bold behaviour amuses his inmates, but it infuriates the nurses, which is the book's most important motif. However, his rebellion proves to resemble a poker game, which patients play in the ward: though it seems to be fun, it also involves a great risk and the chances of winning are questionable. As he discovers that disobeying the rules might result in the coercion of staying in the asylum for a long time and grave punishments, he becomes meek and quiet. The situation settles down, but not for long – the rebel organizes a fishing trip, which considerably raises the spirits of his fellow patients and gives them hope. Soon, another scheme is planned – McMurphy decides that he will arrange one last gathering after which he attempts to escape. The plan is not successful. On the contrary, the circumstances lead to a suicidal death of one of the patients, Randle's uncontrolled outburst of anger and an injury of the head nurse. Those events cannot go unnoticed. The situation in the

ward changes again, but this time for the worse. McMurphy disappears, being said to be held in different part of hospital, some of the patients leave the asylum, as if they were running away. The atmosphere is tense, filled with anxiety but, nevertheless, Bromden keeps his vision clear and understands the happenings. All the dreadful events only sharpen his senses and bring back the energy he lacked. Finally, he decides on an ultimate step: he wants to run away, just as McMurphy told him he could.

The novel's storyline and its style have attracted numerous critics and literature connoisseurs to this masterpiece. Zubizarreta praises the author's writing style, emphasizing the exceptionality of the picture Kesey has painted with his imagination. He describes the narration's perspective as hallucinatory and hyperbolic and the author's decision to adopt a lunatic's viewpoint as "dramatically effective, entertaining, comic and inspiring" (Zubizarreta 1994: 63-65).

The plot of *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* is related to Ken Kesey's personal experiences. From a very young age was taught by his father how to wrestle, box, fish and hunt, and he cultivated these passions not only during his adolescence but also in his adulthood. He attended Springfield public schools and later enrolled in the University of Oregon at Eugene where he practised wrestling and football. In the 1960s, his life changed its course after Kesey moved to the bohemian quarters of Stanford, where he met other writers and was introduced to Freudian psychology. At that time, he volunteered to participate in drug experiments at the veterans' hospital in Menlo Park, California. Earning twenty dollars per session, Kesey was taking mind-expanding drugs that included Ditrane, IT-290 and LSD, and soon, he became a night attendant of the psychiatric ward at the same hospital. This is where he completed his novel *Zoo* and began writing *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*. Along with some friends, a group later known as Merry Pranksters, Kesey continued his drug experiments and kept on leading his bohemian lifestyle, which meant not only narcotic journeys of a free-spirited and liberated mind, but sometimes resulted in bar fights and being arrested (Reilly and Cole 2010: 1-9).

As Maroufi accurately observes, "Ken Kesey created a bridge between the 1950's Beat generation and the 1960's hippie movement" (1997:1), as he combined spiritual transcendence and affirmation of freedom with the social ills that were destroying America after the Second World War. He was inspired by Jack Kerouac's prose and influenced by the hippie culture movement, which found its reflection in the novel. By incorporating his own memories of spending time with his father in the bosom of nature into the figure of Bromden, and individualism, nonconformity and the praise for the physical strength into the persona of McMurphy, Kesey created two different, yet harmonious characters, who represent the values proclaimed by the author (Maroufi 1997:1).

The translator

It should be noted that the translation of this novel was one of the first such serious tasks in Mirkowicz's career. Later, he also translated Orwell's *1984*, Harry Mathews's *Conversions*, Richard Condon's *Prizzi's Honor* and Kosiński's novels *The Painted Bird*, *Passion Play* and *Blind Date* (Kutnik 2003). Mirkowicz proved to be an observant reader and a careful translator. He commented on

some allusions and nuances, which the novel is imbued with. For example, he was aware of the author's allusions to the New Testament: McMurphy as a savior, Candy as Marie Magdalene or the cross-shaped table as an instrument of crucifixion (Mirkowicz 1990:293).

Venuti (1995: 273) discusses the notion of *simpatico*, which signifies “possessing an underlying sympathy”, which is likely to occur if the translator and the author live in similar times and conditions, if the translator finds the author likeable and is able to relate to him/her experiences to some extent. Venuti claims that the perfect situation would be for the translator to follow the author's career and over time develop affinity towards him, sharing the author's ideas, tastes and opinions. *Simpatico* contributes to the perception of a rendering as invisible. It is difficult to establish whether Mirkowicz felt any special affinity with Kesey while translating the novel, but the fact is that he met Ken Kesey and became friends with him (Kutnik 2003). They were born and grew up in entirely different cultures: the author – in the United States during the hippie times of the flower power, and the translator – in communist Poland, the martial law being introduced when he was translating *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*. Mirkowicz was born in 1953 (Kutnik 2003) while Kesey only 18 years earlier. Mirkowicz supported the democratic opposition in Poland and may have identified some similarities between the Combine and the socialistic system he disapproved of.

Proper names in the Polish translation of the novel

Proper names, especially the names of the main characters are usually very important in literary works. Sometimes they can be left untranslated, but when they are meaningful or have direct equivalents in the target language, the translator has to decide how to render them most appropriately. In the case of *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, one of the potentially problematic names is *Big Nurse*. The immediate Polish counterpart of the word *big* is *duży*, but it only refers to size, while *big* also means “important, because of being powerful, or having a lot of influence or a serious effect” (IS1). Thus, Tomasz Mirkowicz quite accurately decided to call this character *Wielka Oddziałowa* (‘The Great Ward Nurse’) where both parts of the name seem to gain more importance and power. However, there is also a fragment in which McMurphy mocks the nurse, by calling her *Rat-shed* (Kesey 1976:79) instead of using her last name, i.e. Ratched. The intended pun is an evident case of showing disrespect, but it is done in a rather subtle way, and could be excused as a tongue slip. Here, the translator could not rely on any method of literal translation since word-for-word translation would give a rather awkward effect of calling the nurse *Szczurza szopa* (lit. ‘rat's shed’) which would not only sound unnatural, but it would be simply indecipherable for a Polish reader. A well-chosen option was finding an equivalent according to the rules of the communicative translation method, which led to the invention of *Sratched* which not only preserved a similarity to the original name of the character, but also the humorous sneer. By adding a single letter, the translator invented a name which in Polish has a rather unpleasant connotation of defecating.

A different approach was used in the translation of Chief Bromden's nickname. In the original he was called *Chief Broom* by black orderlies because he often had to sweep the floors with

a broom. The translator could not find any equivalents which would produce the same effect, so he chose to translate the word literally, deciding that in this case the meaning was much more important than the phonetic qualities of the moniker. Although *Szczota Bromden* does not contain a similar alliteration as *Broom Bromden*, this loss does not affect the story and is acceptable.

In addition to the main characters' names, there are names in the book which refer to groups of patients, such as *Acutes*, *Chronics*, *Walkers*, *Wheelers* and *Vegatables*. Even a new person who is admitted into the hospital is called *Admission*, also written with a capital letter. The names are translated as: *Okresowi*, *Chroniccy*, *Chodzący*, *Wózkarze*, *Ludzie-rośliny*, each starting with a capital letter except for *nowy pacjent* (lit. 'a new patient'). Perhaps the translator decided that the last one was not sufficiently important to keep the name capitalized, especially that, unlike the rest, it does not appear regularly in the book. Not only are the names of the characters written in a peculiar manner. Also, the names of places in which the action takes place are characterized by the use of majuscule at the beginning. These are: *Inside*, *Outside*, *Main Building*, *Nurses' Station*, *Seclusion*, *Shock Shop* and *Disturbed Ward*, none of which remained capitalised in the Polish translation. They were replaced with their Polish equivalents *wewnątrz*, *na zewnątrz*, *budynek główny*, *dyżurka*, *izolatka*, and in the case of the last two, the translator decided not only to remove the majuscule but even to make the words sound more informal, creating *wstrząsówka* and *oddział dla furiatów* ('a ward for madmen').

Other examples of such treatment include: *Indwelling Curiosity Cutout* (*wyłącznik ciekawości*), *Unaccompanied Leave* (*samodzielne wyjście*), *Potential Assaultive* (*potencjalnie groźny dla otoczenia*) or *Group Discussion* (*dyskusja*). When Big Nurse reads aloud McMurphy's folder, she mentions "a series of arrests for Drunkenness, Assault and Battery, Disturbing the Peace, repeated gambling and one arrest – for Rape" (Kesey 1976: 39, the original version). In the Polish version, those nouns were written in lowercase: "litania bójek ulicznych, awantur w lokalach oraz aresztów za pijaństwo, pobicia, zakłócanie porządku i najliczniej – za szulerstwo. Raz aresztowany... za nierząd" (Kesey 1990: 44, Polish translation).

Then, again, the *Combine*, which is a name of an imaginary institution which seems to be the axis of Bromden's hallucinatory world, is translated as *Kombinat*. What should be noted is the narrator's unique point of view – Chief Bromden is a schizophrenic, who sees his environment in a way that is impervious to others. The use of capital letters is not accidental – the majuscule gives importance to the elements that the asylum patient finds significant. In the very restricted space of the asylum, Bromden has created his own world – *Outside*, *Inside*, *Seclusion*. These are not simply references to certain places. Rather, they look like geographical names of a considerable significance, inhabited by different nations of *Acutes*, *Chronics* and *Wheelers*. In Chief's small world, a new patient is a great change, group discussions are important events but not as important as the possibility of an unaccompanied leave. Dropping the capital letters in those names impoverishes the author's intentions and reduces the power of the image he tried to present.

Sounds and phonetics

Polish and English are languages belonging to different language groups – English is Germanic and Polish – Slavic. In the Polish language there are some consonants which do not exist in English, and vice versa, which is why achieving the same phonetic effect in the two languages is often difficult. As one of the characters in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, Billy Bibbit, stutters, Tomasz Mirkowicz had to analyse his utterances and decide which syllables should be repeated to sound natural in the rendering. First of all, the words in English do not necessarily start with the same sound as their Polish counterparts, and secondly – trying to transfer the stuttering at the same word would not always be successful because of the differences in word order between the two languages. The translator chose the sounds carefully, trying to emphasize the same words as in the original. For example:

“His **n-name** is Bromden. Chief Bromden. Everybody calls him Chief **Buh-Broom**, though, because the aides have him sweeping a **l-large** part of the time. There's not m-much else he can do, I guess. He's deaf. If I was **d-d-deaf**, I would kill myself” (1976:24)

“**N-nazywa** się Bromden. Wódz Bromden. Ale wszyscy przezywają go Wodzem **Sz-szczotą**, bo sanitariusze wciąż zaganiają go do **s-s-sprzątania**. Chyba niewiele poza tym umiałby robić. Jest głuchy. Gdybym ja był **g-g-głuchy**, tobym się zabił” (1990:25)

This comparison shows that Mirkowicz indeed tried to spread the stuttering evenly and put it on the same elements of a sentence (*d-d-deaf / g-g-głuchy*), on the same sound (*n-name / n-nazywa*) or at least at in similar place in the sentence (*l-large / s-s-sprzątania*). Though Mirkowicz managed to overcome the phonetic difficulties with Billy's stuttering, shorter utterances caused another problem. There is a patient whose brain surgery did not go well and, in result, he is unable to function or speak normally. Provoked by an aide, he gathers all his strength to say anything back: “he's working his jaw so hard to say something. When he finally does get to where he can say his few words it's a low, choking noise to make your skin crawl – *Fffffffuck da wife! Fffffffuck da wife!* and passes out on the spot from the effort” (Kesey 1976:19, original version). Although this fragment is not vital for the storyline and does not convey any symbolic meaning, it shows the difference between the two languages and the difficulty to produce the same effect in Polish. The repeated letter “f” resembles a hissing sound or exhaling with a great difficulty, while “p” in Polish *Ppppppierdolę żonę!* is nothing like a whisper that it was meant to imitate.

Another example concerning the phonetic differences is the fragment in which McMurphy is lying on the table in *Shock Shop* when aides put a rubber hose into his mouth. He is singing a song from a commercial of Wildroot Cream Oil: “mage with thoothing lan-o-lin” (made with soothing lanoline) which accurately imitates the way of speaking with one's mouth full. Tomasz Mirkowicz has rendered these words as “w zgład jej wchodzi czyzda lanolina” and using voiced consonants in place of voiceless ones (*zgład* instead of *skład*, *czyzda* instead of *czysta*), he tried to create an effect produced by a speaker who clenches his teeth on an object.

Randle Patrick McMurhpy is a very musical man; his amusing songs appear throughout the whole novel. When rendering these, the translator decided to use an oblique method (cf. Vinay and Darbelnet 2000) instead of a direct strategy, in order to preserve the rhythm and rhyme:

“Your horses are hungry, that’s what she did say.
Come sit down beside me an’ feed them some hay.
My horses ain’t hungry, they won’t eat your hay-ay-aeeee.
So fare-thee-well darlin’, I’m gone on my way.”
(1976:75)

“Twe konie są głodne, tak mi powiedziała.
Usiadłbyś tu przy mnie, siana bym im dała!
Konie nie tkną siana, które byś im da-łaaaa!
Muszę jechać dalej, żegnaj moja mała.” (1990:87)

Although the translation is not literal, and is made up of longer words (which are characteristic of Polish), it successfully transmits the meaning and each verse has the same number of syllables (11 syllables in original and 12 in the rendering). A much more problematic task was probably the translation of a nursery rhyme from which the title is derived:

“Ting. Tingle, tingle, tremble toes,
she’s a good fisherman,
catches hens, puts ‘em inna pens...
wire blier, limber lock,
three geese inna flock...
one flew east, one flew west,
one flew over the cuckoo’s nest...
O-U-T spells out... goose swoops down
and plucks you out”. (1976:224)

“Ene due like fake,
ona dobrym jest rybakiem,
łapie kurczaki i wsadza do paki...
kosz klosz, kłódkę kładzie
trzy gąsiorki w stadzie...
jeden poleciał tam, drugi śmignął siam,
trzeci wzbil się nad kukułcze gniazdo...
gę gę gę... potem sfrunął, wlaź do...
i wyciągnął cię.” (1990:252)

The translator chose to adapt an actual nursing rhyme used by children in Poland, instead of translating the words *tingle, tingle, tremble toes*. The result is very good: it sounds more natural and is easier to pronounce than any literal translation of these words could be. Moreover, that verse rhymes with the next one (*fake – rybakiem*) which did not need to be drastically changed. Then again, the third verse concerning catching hens was rendered quite literally; the translator decided to preserve the meaning rather than come up with an adaptation strategy that could be used to make this verse as short as it is in original and sound more rhythmic. The next part sounds very natural – the meaning here was not as important as the sounding, and here Mirkowicz created a verse which is quite nonsensical (as is the original) but it fits the rhythm and the nature of nursery rhymes – putting words together on the basis of their phonetic qualities, rather than a logical connection between them. Since one of the verses is at the same time the title of the novel, Mirkowicz decided to retain *the cuckoo’s nest* even though it turned out to be difficult to find a rhyme to *kukułcze gniazdo* in Polish, and the whole noun phrase is too long for the verse.

The Polish rendering of the title does not maintain the original structure, but it stays close to the original. The translator used the noun phrase *lot nad kukułczym gniazdem* (lit. ‘a flight over the cuckoo’s nest’). This change is not radical and the reader can easily notice the connection between the title and rhyme included in the novel.

Language variety

The characters which appear in the novel use different varieties of English. Their idiolects differ considerably, e.g. there is a schizophrenic who makes grammatical mistakes, and they also use different social and regional varieties: there is a recidivist who often uses swear words and black aides whose language bears traces of African American Vernacular English. All of them are contrasted with one of the patients who speaks immaculate English and uses elaborate vocabulary. The sections which follow outline some of the strategies adopted by the translator while rendering the peculiarities of the different characters' speech.

Bromden

Bromden is not just a character but also a narrator. For most of the novel his manner of talking does not distract readers from the main plot, especially that there is a lot of action to be followed and focused on. Nevertheless, several nuances can be noticed after a closer inspection. Chief's speech is quite often made of short sentences which sometimes contain grammatical mistakes and informal expressions. Even though he is a schizophrenic, most of the narration is very clear and unambiguous. The fragment below illustrates the characteristics of the language he uses.

"This morning I plain don't remember. They got enough of those pills down me so I don't know a thing till I hear the ward door open. That ward door opening means it's at least eight o'clock, means there's been maybe an hour and a half I was out cold in that Seclusion Room when the technicians could of come in and installed anything the Big Nurse ordered and I wouldn't have the slightest notion what." (1976:13)

"Ale dzisiejszego ranka nie pamiętam. Tak mnie nafaszerowali różnymi świństwami uchodzącymi tu za lekarstwa, że pierwsze, co do mnie dociera, to odgłos otwierających się drzwi. Drzwi wejściowe otwierają się najwcześniej o ósmej, więc co najmniej półtorej godziny przeleżałem bez czucia w izolatce – w tym czasie technicy mogli mi wmontować na polecenie Wielkiej Oddziałowej mnóstwo lichy wie jakich urządzeń." (1990:12)

Bromden uses simple colloquial English, which the translator rendered into simple colloquial Polish, though not all the informal properties of the original text could be rendered directly. For example, Bromden says "I plain don't remember" instead of "I plainly don't remember", which is characteristic of informal American speech. This specific quality has no direct counterpart in Polish. To make the text colloquial, the translator added the mild swear word *lichy wie* in a place where there are no swear words in the original; instead of providing a direct equivalent of the word *pills*, he used the expression "świństwa uchodzące tu za lekarstwa" ('the awful stuff they call medications here').

Another example is "I been silent so long now it's gonna roar out of me like floodwaters and you think the guy telling this is ranting and raving my *God*". In the translation this fragment reads: "Milczałem tak długo, że wypłynie to ze mnie z hukiem wezbranej wody, a wy pewnie pomyślicie, że facet, który to opowiada bredzi, cholera, i majaczy". Again, it is clear that the translator decided not to look for Polish equivalents of the nonstandard form *I been* and colloquial *gonna*, but he

chose to add the swear word *cholera* in the place of *God* to make it more characteristic of a simple man's speech. In other cases, Bromden adds the determiner *a* before a plural noun, or sometimes – uses *don't* instead of *doesn't*. The grammar of the Polish version is invariably standard. The colloquial and nonstandard character of Bromden's speech is only visible on the level of vocabulary.

McMurphy

McMurphy's style of speaking quite often includes vulgar words and informal expressions. His tone is unceremonious; he is never formal in his speech. Again, as in the case of Bromden's language, the translator decided to add slangy words and exclamations, to make up for the loss of other qualities of his nonstandard way of speaking. In the example below, the differences mentioned earlier can be noted:

“They showered me this morning at the courthouse and last night at the jail. And I *swear* I believe they'd of washed my ears for me on the taxi ride if they **coulda** find the **vacilities**. **Hoo**, boy, seems like everytime they ship me someplace I **gotta** get scrubbed down before, after and during the operation. I'm **gettin'** so the sound of water makes me start gathering up my belongings. And *get* back away from me with that thermometer, Sam, and give me a minute to look my new home over.” (1976:14)

“Musiałem brać prysznic dziś rano w sądzie i wczoraj wieczorem w **kiciu**. A w taksówce, **kiedyśmy** tu jechali, wymyliby mi uszy, gdyby tylko mieli czym. **Rany**, ilekroć mnie gdzieś wysyłają, muszę się szorować przed, po i w trakcie podróży. Tak mi to już **weszło w krew**, że gdy tylko słyżę plusk wody, od razu zaczynam pakować manatki. Uciekaj z tym termometrem **kochasiu**, daj mi się rozejrzeć po nowej **chałupie**” (1990:14)

The translator changed the register of selected words and even replaced the name of the black aid (*Sam*) with a pet name (*kochasiu*, roughly: ‘darling’). He also added the idiomatic expression *wieść w krew* to make this utterance sound more natural. Throughout the novel, many colloquial expressions and swear words appear, many of which are difficult to translate. Mirkowicz used their Polish counterparts in strategic places – he did not try to translate each expression as literally as possible, but he selectively enclosed informal expressions where they sounded natural for the Polish reader. Sometimes his Polish expressions are stronger than their English counterparts, sometimes they are weaker, e.g. *farts* is rendered as *skurwysyny* (a stronger word), and the expression *are you guys bullshitting me?* as *czy to ma być żart?* (a softer equivalent, lit. ‘is this a joke?’).

The translator's choices result from his use of the transposition strategy (cf. Vinay and Darbelnet 2000). Instead of translating the character's words directly, the translator focused on conveying McMurphy's personality, which is more important than the literal rendering of his words.

Black aides

Another variety of the English language in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* is the one used by black men. Since the novel was written in the 1960s, the contrast between black and white people's speech was still very clear. Smitherman (1994), recollecting her college years, calls attention to several characteristics that distinguished her language from that of her peers. For example: postvocalic R deletion and problems with “th” which in initial position sounded like “d” and at the end

of the words like “f”, or the tendency to end all syllables with a vowel sound. She says that those deviations are the result of mixing African language patterns with English ones, the mixture that developed during the years of enslavement.

Black English is a phenomenon unfamiliar to Polish readers, therefore Mirkowicz decided not to emphasize the black orderlies’ variety of English. The way they spoke was natural for them and American readers were acquainted with that manner of speaking. Any endeavour to present the fashion they spoke in to readers in communist Poland (the translation was first published in 1981) would probably be fruitless or could misshape the vernacular unknown to Poles. Thus, Tomasz Mirkowicz only rendered the meaning and did not focus on adapting the form. As shown in the fragment below, the peculiarities of their speech are entirely lost in the translation.

“What you s’pose it’d be like if <i>evahbody</i> was to brush their teeth whenever they took a notion to brush?” (1976:77)	„Jakby to wyglądało, gdyby k a ż d y mył zęby, kiedy mu przyjdzie ochota!” (1990:89)
“My <i>gaw</i> , don’t you <i>see</i> ?” (1976:77)	„Rety, nic pan...” (1990:89)
„Tha’s right gennulmen, tha’s the way” (1976:19)	„Słusznie panowie, grunt to porządek!” (1990:19)
„Ahhh, Geo’ge, you jes’ don’t have no idea” (1976:214)	„Ach, George, ty nic nie wiesz” (1990:239)

Harding

In contrast to the previously mentioned characters, Harding is a person whose language is sophisticated and who tends to use long sentences and formal vocabulary, including French and Latin expressions. At some point, he even corrects his wife, explaining to her the difference between *anything* and *nothing* and comments on her use of the double negative (in the rendering he corrects her pronunciation of the word *imaginowałaś*). In this case, the translator played with the form of the utterances, which was also the case in the original.

The example below speaks for itself:

“Have you ever tried to keep up a noble and angry front in the face of such consolation? So you see, my friend, it is somewhat as you stated: man has but *one* truly effective weapon against the juggernaut of modern matriarchy, but it certainly is not laughter” (1976:60)

“Czy po takiej pociesze umiałbyś długo zachować w sercu gniew i marsa na czole? A więc sam widzisz, przyjacielu, masz poniekąd rację: przeciwko molochowi współczesnego matriarchatu mężczyzna rzeczywiście posiada j e d n ą broń naprawdę skuteczną, ale bynajmniej nie jest nią śmiech.” (1990:69)

Words such as *bynajmniej* (‘by no means’) and *poniekąd* (‘partly/up to a point’) are rarely used in speech, especially that of informal character. In fact, *bynajmniej* is often used incorrectly by uneducated speakers of Polish: it is confused with *przynajmniej* (‘at least’), so a correct use of the word is an indication of educated speech habits. There is also an idiomatic expression *mieć marsa na czole* which is an elaborate way of naming an angry face. Moreover, the sentences spoken by

Harding are long and complex. The example provided above demonstrates that Mirkowicz managed to render Harding's ways of speaking accurately.

It appears that the translator used different approaches to render the characteristics of the speech of each of the main characters. He used literal translation, modulation and adaptation, according to the needs of the text.

Changes in register

Hatim and Munday (2004) claim that preserving the register in translation is a myth. They emphasize that "the form is different in each language" and this is the reason why register cannot always be fully transferred. Newmark (1988) suggests that it is essential for the translator to identify idiosyncratic properties of texts written by different authors. He also enumerates various functions that can be applied in the text, influencing its register. These are: informative (distinguished by non-class, non-idiolectal, formal and technical language), vocative (which is meant to be addressed to the reader by using "you", "du", "Sie", "vous" forms and imperatives to enliven relationship between author and reader), aesthetic (focused on onomatopoeias, metaphors, rhyme, metre, intonation and stress) phatic (used to maintain friendly contact with reader; inclusion of standard phrases and spoken language) and metalingual (indicates language ability to criticize and explain its own features) (Newmark 1988: 39-44).

In the case of *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, the main function which influenced the register is the aesthetic one. Mirkowicz has a tendency to overtranslate vulgar words into stronger (e.g. the above mentioned *farts* translated as *skurwysyny*) and at the same time, he quite often employs formal expressions and makes some utterances less colloquial. For example, in a conversation between the two main characters, when Bromden tells McMurphy about his parents, the latter responds: "And when a town woman marries an Indian that's marryin' somebody beneath her, ain't it? Yeah, I think I see". His language is colloquial (it includes "ain't", "yeah", - in' ending), but in the Polish translation, he says: "Jeśli biała kobieta wychodzi za Indianina to popełnia mezalians, tak?" Not only the grammatical elements of his non-standard speech are omitted in the Polish version, but also the term *mezalians* ('mésalliance') appears, which is unlikely to be used by a gambler who has spent his all life working physically and drinking alcohol. This sentence sounds at least awkward when compared with the original.

Another example can be found in the utterance spoken by McMurphy, where "at your balls, buddy, at your everlovin' balls" is replaced with "jąder, koleś, waszych cennych jąder!" – where a colloquial name of men's parts is interchanged with a more technical term which can be found in medical books. And when Cheswick says "You bet", Mirkowicz translated this short expression into much longer "to bezsporny fakt!" ('that's an undisputable fact'), even though a shorter and more natural exclamation like *no chyba!* could be used to translate it into Polish.

Although such alternations of register are not frequent, their use does not always seem justifiable. They do not change the text significantly, but their presence suggests that the translator tried to "improve" the original text.

Expressiveness and text formatting

In the Polish rendering, more than 50 additional exclamation marks occur. They do not introduce anything strikingly new or change the sense of the utterances. However, their addition makes the translated text more dynamic and expressive than the original. The original version illustrates a world within an asylum, plunged in a sleepy, monotonous atmosphere of hospital routine. The patients are portrayed as tired and indifferent, which is consistent with Bromden's illusions, dreams, fears and the dense fog which he believes to appear in the hospital, making the time go slower or faster. The Polish rendering loses a little of the psychotic haze which Kesey depicted in his novel.

According to Delisle (1988), a translator is an author deprived of the responsibility for the substance, but responsible for the form, which means that translation in the first place demands the ability to recognize the type of a text, interpret it and put into an appropriate form. Pisarska and Tomaszewicz (1996: 90-91) stress that the process of re-expression involves "what author meant to say", "what translator understood it" and how the translator "transferred this concept" into a new form of language. This may explain the punctuation changes made by Mirkowicz. The translator may have perceived the novel differently: as more expressive and less drowsy.

In the quotations from *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* provided in the previous subchapters, some words are written in italics – they were accentuated in this manner in the original. In the Polish rendering this distinction disappeared almost completely. In many cases, a word which was italicized in the original is left unmarked in the translation, and sometimes – instead of italics, letter-spacing is used to emphasize a part of a sentence, and there is no clear pattern showing why in some words the distinction has been retained while in others it has not. It seems likely that the sentences whose syntax in a natural way already stressed the elements which were italicized in the original have been left unmarked.

Italics/letter-spacing	"They didn't mind so much when I was a dumb logger, and got into a hassle; that's <i>excusable</i> , they say, that's a hard-working feller, blowing off steam, they say." (1976:22)	„Kiedy wdawałem się w bójki będąc prostym drwalem, przymykali oczy I mówili, że to z r o z u m i a ł e; gość który tak ciężko tyra ma prawo się wyszumieć.” (1990:23)
Italics/no change	"Bibbit! You tell Mr McMurphy I'm so crazy I voted for Eisenhower <i>twice!</i> " (1976:22)	„Bibbit, powiedzcie panu McMurphy'emu, że w swoim szaleństwie głosowałem na Eisenhowera dwukrotnie!” (1990:22)

Here, the first stressed element occurs in the middle of the utterance and changing the font makes it more visible. In the second example, the word which is emphasized is at the end of the sentence, which already makes it visible.

In the novel, there is also a half-page fragment in which Bromden's reminiscences about his father are mixed with his own thoughts about the present day. In the original, his memories are written in italics, in order to be distinguished from the present events described by the narrator. In

the Polish rendering, there is no difference in font, so in consequence, the text seems to be much more chaotic and unclear.

When the narrator talks about the Therapeutic Community, he reports the doctor's words. He does not use reported speech or the passive voice – structures which are difficult to translate literally into Polish. In fact, the narrative is very simple: “Any little gripe, any grievance, anything you want changed, **he says**, should be brought up before the group and discussed instead of letting it fester inside of you. Also you should feel at ease in your surroundings to the extent you can freely discuss emotional problems in front of patients and staff. Talk, **he says**, discuss, confess”. The narrator uses the phrase “**he says**” to indicate that those words are not his. Without them, the fragment would look as if it was just a part of Bromden's train of thought. The Polish version, in contrast, presents this fragment as an independent statement. The utterance starts with a dash, which is usually used to introduce a dialogue, rather than a reported statement:

“ – Nie tłamście w sobie – przekonuje lekarz – żadnych pretensji, bolączek, zgłaszajcie mi, jeśli chcecie coś zmienić, zawsze można wszystko przedyskutować w grupie.”

When written in this way, the text is more expressive. Some of the differences concerning the font and the graphic form of the text may have been caused by the editor's – not the translator's – choice, but it seems unlikely that the editor introduced all the exclamation marks. The modifications outlined above have made the Polish version of the novel a little more expressive, lacking the sleepy, even lethargic atmosphere of the original.

Conclusions

Translation is transparent for the reader who only enjoys the rendered text without getting acquainted with the original, and the Polish version of *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest* is an excellent work. Only a comparison with the source text enables us to notice the subtle differences between the two versions. Mirkowicz smoothed some of the edges, and sharpened the others: he omitted some grammatical mistakes and the characteristics of Black English, but he added some swear words and exclamation marks, which deprived the book of its lethargic atmosphere, giving it a more expressive tone instead. However, even though the form has changed, and many words or phrases have been replaced with their remote synonyms, the translated version reads naturally. The translator put every effort to render short songs and nursery rhyme into Polish without losing their rhythm and rhyme, which is definitely not an easy task to accomplish. Even the stuttering, which is a distinctive feature of one of the characters, has been rendered in a way which makes a similar impression as its original version.

References

- Delisle Jean. 1988. *An Interpretive Approach*. Ottawa: Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.
- Hatim Basil and Munday Jeremy. 2004. *Translation. An Advanced Resource Book*. London: Routledge. 26, 78.

- Kesey, Ken. 1976. *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*. London: Picador
- Kesey, Ken. 1990. *Lot nad kukułczym gniazdem*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy
- Kutnik, Jerzy. 2003. *Tomasz Mirkowicz (1953-2003)*, *Akcent* nr 1-2, 92-92.
- Macky, Peter. 2010. "One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest". In: Mazenno, Lawrence (ed.). *Masterplots 4th edition*. Hackensack: Salem Press, 2.
- Maroufi, Chogollah. 1997. "Ken Kesey", *Identities & Issues in Literature*, September 1997, 1.
- Mirkowicz, Tomasz. 1990. "Afterword". In: Kesey, Ken. *Lot nad kukułczym gniazdem*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 290-295.
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall International. 39-44, 45-49.
- Pisarska Alicja and Teresa Tomaszewicz. 1996. *Współczesne tendencje przekładoznawcze*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 90-91.
- Reilly, Edward and Cole, David. 2010. "Ken Kesey", in: C. Rollyson (ed.) *Critical Survey Of Long Fiction*, 4th edn. Pasadena: Salem Press, 1-9.
- Smitherman, Geneva. 1994. *Black Talk: Words and Phrases from the Hood to the Amen Corner*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Vinay, Jean Paul and Jean Darbelnet. 2000 [1958]. "A methodology for translation". In: Venuti Lawrence (ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 84-93.
- Zubizaretta, John. 1994. "The Disparity of Point of View in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*", *Literature/Film Quarterly* vol. 22, No. 1, 62-69.
- ISI: http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/big_2 (15.03.2014)

A NOTE ON CONTRIBUTORS

Dorota Guzowska is a lecturer at the University of Białystok. Her research interests are in autobiographical writing, identity formation and family life in seventeenth-century England. E-mail address: *guzowska@uwb.edu.pl*

Anita Mackiewicz is a postgraduate student of English Philology at the University of Białystok. Her academic interests are in the area of literary translation, especially the translation of culture-specific items. E-mail address: *anitaamackiewicz@wp.pl*

Binayak Roy teaches English at K.G.T. Mahavidyalaya, Bagdogra, West Bengal, India. His research interests are postcolonial literature, Indian English novel and the cinema of Satyajit Ray. E-mail address: *binayak_roy@hotmail.com*

Magdalena Szewczuk is a postgraduate student of English Philology at the University of Białystok. Her research interests include literary translation, as well as cross-linguistic and cross-cultural studies in the area of food and food-related stereotypes. E-mail address: *magdalena_szewczuk@yahoo.com*

Peter Unseth is a professor at the Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics in Dallas. He is interested in all facets of proverbs, particularly proverbs from Ethiopia. His research interests also include the invention and choice of different scripts. E-mail address: *pete_unseth@gial.edu*

