HECTEROSEXISM IN TRANSLATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF NGŨGI WA THIONG'O'S *CAITANI MUTHARABAINI (DEVIL ON THE CROSS)* AND *MATIGARI MA NJIRŨŨNGI (MATIGARI)*

WANGŨI WA GORO

AWARDED BY

MIDDLESEX UNIVERSITY

THE THESIS IS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

'This candidate is known as Elizabeth Wangũi Mbuguah Goro'

July 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is dedicated to the late Professor G.H. McWilliam who was my lecturer of Italian during my undergraduate years at Leicester University and translator of major works including Bocaccio's *Decameron*. He made me aware of the potential of translation as something dynamic and powerful.

I am grateful to Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o for his pioneering work in literature and in Gĩkũyũ. In addition to this, he has been open to discussions on the development of the Gĩkũyũ language, literature, culture and knowledge, and some of the challenges for translation over the period I have been involved in his work in general, and in conducting this research in particular. I owe my translation of Ngũgĩ's work to Henry Chakava who had faith in my translation competence and was the first to take the risk of publishing my translation. I am also grateful to Veronique Tadjo for allowing me further insights in translation through the translation of her book *À Vol D'oiseau* through which I was able to clarify some of my ideas on translation theory and practice during this research period.

In relation to this research, I am particularly indebted to Dr. Ranjana Ash who first invited me to discuss the translation of Ngũgĩ's work at the ACLAILS Silver Jubilee conference at the University of Kent in 1989. I am also indebted to the late Dr. Cook who invited me to speak on the importance of translation and tradition and the future at the *Commonwealth of Letters Conference* in Yale in 1991. These two papers form the backbone to this thesis.

I would like to acknowledge the support that I have received from the University, colleagues, friends and family. I was fortunate enough to obtain research and travel bursaries through the University, which have supported me and I am grateful that Translation Studies was accorded significant recognition to warrant this support. I am therefore indebted to the Dean, Professor Gabriel Parker and the staff at the Centre of translation studies and indeed the school for this accommodation. This includes Dr. Peter Bush, Dr. Steven Barbour, Dr. Alberto Mira and Dr. Emily Saline who supported me at the inception of the research. I owe my profound appreciation to my supervisors, Professor Malkmjær and Dr. Alberto Mira who have supported and encouraged me through the bulk of the research and Professor Mulhern, the head of Research at the School. I found stimulus though the teaching colleagues, fellow researchers and students who kept the debates lively and from whom I learned so much. The public seminars in translation from leading theorist and practitioners have left a lasting impression on me and have given me enormous insights into a wide range of issues. The encounters with some of the contemporary thinkers who are shaping thought and practice brought not only inspiration but also opened invaluable terrain which would have been unavailable through research as some of the ideas have only publicly evolved through such fora and were unpublished until more recently. This is partly due to the stage that translation studies have been undergoing as a relatively new academic discipline. Their generosity with their ideas and time has been welcome and I have also been very fortunate to be a member of vibrant translation studies, literary, cultural and translation communities. I therefore owe my gratitude to other institutions which have received me or supported me and individuals within them who have made a difference. This includes: Professor

ABSTRACT

This thesis proposes an investigation of ethical issues within what I have termed 'hectorosexist' frameworks, which it asserts to be a prevalent global discourse in contemporary theory and practice in translation particularly in the English-speaking world.

The research aims to investigate the theoretical and practical implications of issues around the subject locations of writers and translators as readers and writers in historical contexts. The thesis asserts that the wider context of culture, economics, politics and societal development impact on the translation process in general.

The study seeks to ascertain how much is lost or gained through the subject location of translators and that of culture through texts and readers (Bhabha, 1994). This is done through a comparative study, analysis and re-translations of selected sections of Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's, *Matigari Ma Njirũũngi* (1987) translated as *Matigari* (1989) and *Caitani Mũtharabaini* (1980), translated as *Devil on the cross* (1980).

The thesis will conclude with a synthesis of the comparative studies and the impact of any shifts on the culture and subjects. It will ascertain whether translation can enable the relocation or re(dis)covery of 'hidden', 'lost', 'forgotten' or 'new' 'cultures' in narratives including such shifts, and indeed the 'migration' of the 'subjects' of writers, readers, and translators (Boyce-Davies, 1994).

CONTENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER ONE

THE CONTEXT AND BACKROUND OF THE STUDY OF THE TRANSLATIONS OF *MATIGARI MA NJIRŪŪNGI* AND *CAITANI MŪTHARABAINI* IN RELATION TO HECTOROSEXISM

I. INTRODUCTION

This thesis proposes an investigation of ethical issues within what I have termed 'hectorosexist' frameworks, which it asserts to be a prevalent global discourse, in contemporary theory and practice in translation particularly in the English-speaking world.

The research aims to investigate the theoretical and practical implications of issues around the subject locations of writers and translators as readers and writers in historical contexts. The thesis asserts that the wider context of culture, economics, politics and societal development impact on the translation process in general.

The study seeks to test the theories of loss or gain through this subject location of translators/texts/readers (Bhabha, 1994). This is carried out through a comparative study, analysis and re-translations of selected sections of Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's, *Matigari Ma Njirũũngi* (1987) (*Matigari*) (1989) and *Caitani Mũtharabaini* (1980), (*Devil on the cross*) (1980), reflecting hectorosexist concerns. The conceptual framework 'hectorosexism' is one which I coined and which I define below in this introduction.

The thesis concludes with a synthesis of the comparative studies and the impact of any shifts on the target texts. It will ascertain whether translation can enable the relocation

or re(dis)covery of 'hidden', 'lost', 'forgotten' or 'new' 'cultures' in narratives including such shifts and indeed the 'migration' of the 'subjects' (Boyce Davies: 1994) i.e., writers, readers and translators.

The research comprises five chapters including this introductory chapter. In this first chapter, I outline the background, rationale and context for the research. It also broadly introduces the research question and its theoretical underpinnings as well as defining the conceptual framework. In addition, the chapter broadly introduces the historical context of literary translation in Africa and Kenya in general and more specifically between Gĩkũyũ and English. This background foregrounds the introduction to Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's work including the texts addressed in the two case studies in chapters 3 and 4. The introduction also outlines the anticipated findings of the research.

Chapter 2 presents a review of literature and critique, and grounds the research question within the context of important axiomatic and contemporary arguments using hectorosexism as a conceptual and analytical tool. This is undertaken in the wider context of cultural and subject transformation that I argue is necessitated by what has come to be known as 'the cultural turn'. I argue that this is a major theoretical and practical departure necessitating changes in translation in general.

This critique is further extended to the specific case studies in chapters 3 and 4 in relation to the source and target texts, *Caitani Mũtharabaini* (*Devil on the Cross*) and *Matigari ma Njirrũũngi* (*Matigari*) respectively. The synthesis makes up the final chapter which also serves as the conclusion. The two comparative chapters will include an application of the critique and strategies identified in chapter 2, and these will be tested in relation to their applicability and sustainability.

The general approach adopted in the work is inter-disciplinary. The methodology is strongly influenced by what are variously known as, black, African, feminist, lesbian and gay, womanist and women's perspectives that enable the use of subjectivity and location as methodological and epistemological tools. Robinson argues that these influence the attitude and approaches of translators. In a critique of what I call the axiomatic paradigm which we will address below, he argues that:

> ...the only way for a translator to get from personhood to toolhood is by denying his or her own personality – by systematically suppressing personal experiences, personal desires, personal preferences (Robinson, 1991:203).[1]

I hope to clarify what the implications of this are by the methodological approach I adopt through the use of subjectivity and its impact on society, translation theory and practice and, more importantly, on translators (Tharu and Lalita: 1993: xx). Simon and Venuti support the idea of the impact of subjectivity on methodology (Simon: 1992, Venuti: 1992).

Robinson provides useful insights of perspectives on translation and empire (1997:12) where he draws attention to the usefulness of polysystemic methods developed by Evan-Zohar (1971) and Hermans (1985). They introduced the notion of 'systems' and systematic approaches as being applicable to phenomenon, in this case literary and translation phenomenon (Shuttleworth, 1998:177). Shuttleworth describes this to include the impact of what he calls the 'dominant poetics' and the impact of the existing norms on the target system. Equally important is the *Skopos* theory (Vemeer, 1992, 1996) which recognises the importance of the impact of socio-cultural issues on translation theory and practice. According to Schäffner, skopos shifts from the linguisic based approaches to more 'functionally and socioculturally orientated concepts of

translation' (Schäffner, 1998: 234). This method finds similarity with strategies proposed from feminist, gay and black scholarship for instance, as they particularise and ground findings away from abstract and generalised theorisation into the concrete and specific while taking the socio-cultural, political and historical specificities into account. Lefevere and Bassnett have also pointed out the importance of taking the question of culture and politics into account in translation theory, practice and research (Bassnett and Lefevere, 1998). What is central for this thesis however, is that culture is not universal but specific to individuals and their 'communities' through choice, coercion or circumstance, and additionally that both culture and individuals are not static. The thesis therefore logically supports Massardier-Kenny's view that "...all interrelated issues should be taken into account" in relation to theory, practice and research (1996: 17). These ideas lead neatly to the justification of the use of hectorosexism as conceptual and analytical framework and a definition of what hectorosexism is, as it takes some of these approaches as given.

A. HECTOROSEXISM AS PARADIGM

The need for hectorosexism as tool arose while I was writing my dissertation for a Master's degree, where I ran into difficulty trying to (re)present what was then deemed an 'excessive' list of what I considered simultaneous oppressions which impinged on the individuals and communities that I was interested in studying. In the particular context of my work, these were expressed through imperial power, "race", ethnicity, disability, "gender", sexuality, Judeo-Christianity, to some extent Islam, Gĩkũyũ religious beliefs and traditional practices and class. It was difficult to use generalised terminology as it was to particularise, as the subject I was discussing was the question of a disparate group of African women from different social, cultural, religious, political

and economic backgrounds and their complex sexualities in the Diaspora. The difficulty of defining/describing this simultaneity and multiplicity of oppression has arisen for many scholars, but most notably, African/Black women and women of colour (Brewer, 1993:16) in other contexts. Morrison for instance argues that:

> My work requires me to think about how free I can be as an African-American woman writer in my genderized, sexualized, wholly racialized world. To think about (and wrestle with) the full implications of my situation leads me to consider what happens when other writers work in a highly and historically racialized society. For them, as for me, imagining is not merely looking or looking at; nor is it taking oneself intact into the other. It is, for the purposes of this work, *becoming* (Morrison, 1992:12).[2]

Like these women, I feel that this whole range of factors has an impact simultaneously on a large number of individuals and communities. My supervisor also requested that I minimise the long list, which I found conceptually difficult to do. Although I agreed to do this, I was concerned, as are many other women like me, that our experiences would by this requirement for 'brevity' not be acknowledged for what they fully were. Ama Ata Aidoo talks about the protestations against the attempts to discard terms like "Third World" and "First World" because, people fear that the alternatives are too much of a mouthful. She argues:

> This view clearly adds insult to injury. Because it insists that in order for some people to easily identify some other people, the latter should agree to have their identities truncated (Aidoo, 1991:152).[3]

In addition, I took into account Bakhtin's argument that it is important to make language one's own:

> Language, for the individual consciousness, lies on the borderline between oneself and the other. The word in language is half someone else's. It becomes "one's own" only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention. Prior to this moment of appropriation, the word does not exist in a neutral and impersonal language (it is not, after all, out of a dictionary that the speaker gets his words!) but rather it exists in other people's mouths, in other people's contexts, serving other people's intentions: it is from there that one must take the word and make it one's own (Mikhail Bakhtin, (cited Louis Gates, Jr., 1999:1)).[4]

In "making the word my own", I coined the term 'hectorosexism' to describe the worst possible sum total of instances the collection of oppressions could yield in any historical context for an individual or community (assuming collective attributes, e.g. gay community, women, black community etc.).

I used oppression as the common denominator to link these oppressions. I argued that the oppressions were linked and that this was evidenced through ways in which power is manifest through similar patterning as is evident below. The term denotes the discourses of colonialism in its broader meaning, either singularly or in its plurality. It denotes the forcible occupation, ownership or exploitation of a person, community, territory, nation or resources by another individual, community or nation/s for the purpose of benefit and

privilege based on (an) essentialist notion(s) of supremacy (wa Goro, 1996). In the particular case of Africa, for instance, this would include slavery, neo-colonialism, colonialism and settler colonialism. It would also include the multiple layers of patriarchy where this exists, for example, both African and imperial patriarchy. My argument then, was that this manifests itself by placing the African, peasant and working woman from the countries that were formerly colonised, at the lowest level of the social echelons of global society in terms of her output and recompense for it. This is within the private and public spheres. These positions are measurable in economic terms as well as other socio/political and economic indicators, such as the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), equality indices, life expectancy, per capita income, etc. (1986: 77). It is therefore possible to apply this definition to other areas of research, including translation.

The neologism *hectorosexism* also derives its meaning from an understanding of power that functions as a compulsory norm. It also draws from the name of the mythical figure Hector, famed for overpowering his opponents and from the term hector (deriving from the myth of Hector) which literally means to bully. On the other hand, it derives from the name Hecate, a fertility goddess and ruler of the "underworld", who accompanied Demeter in her search for her daughter. The term Hecto, also denotes a hundred and I use it figuratively to reflect the possibility of the multiple combinations of oppression and conversely those of resistance. This would include recognised and unrecognised forms of oppression and resistance and uses of power which exist or can exist, their complexity, interrelationship, mutability and the contradictions between and within them (Ramazanoglu, 1990: 182). It also alludes to the notion of heterosexuality and the traditional, predominant, patriarchal hierarchy of compulsory sexual power through gender. This is both in socio-economic and political relations, including

compulsory heterosexuality (Rich, 1984), as a paradigm for societal arrangements in the public and private spheres. This viewpoint has availed itself of perspectives gleaned from black women's experiences in pre-colonial, colonial and neo-colonial traditions. This definition includes the imposition of imperialist relations in the public and private domains reflecting the race, gender, sexuality, disability and class hierarchies as the site(s) of power encounters (hooks, 1981; Amadiume, 1987; Amos and Parmar, 1984). The relevance of the term is within the assumptions of a prevailing historical colonial and imperialist context.

I used the term as a conceptual and analytical tool to analyse the oppressions and solutions to it in the theory and practice of translation. In the past, I have used this tool to conceptualise oppression and solutions to it as it pertains to a number of different contexts as well as in the analysis of emergent patterns or tropes. Some examples of this include work undertaken on African women's sexuality, Trans-Atlantic slavery, the position of women in post-independence Africa, new migration and Diaspora communities and on values, ethics as an imperative in relation to work towards equality.

In this way, the term has proved to be a useful tool and I would wish to continue using it in this thesis for similar purposes (wa Goro, 1996). It will inevitably give rise to contention and to other notions and concepts, and I will coin neologisms within this thesis to support its development. This arises from the venture into new terrain and the use of such a method will therefore be used for clarity as far as possible, where the use of existing language might be ambivalent. I will use recognisable constructs as I have done here with the term 'hectorosexism' and explain these. I will also use emergent terminology that is already in limited usage and I will signal this where possible. It is, however, difficult to separate some of this emergent language from conventional

language as a number of people in their communities have been using it for some time, yet there is a need to communicate. To illustrate this point, some substitutions could occur around notions such as 'nationality' – instead of the derogative 'tribe' or 'native', or Kamau Braithwaite's use of 'nation language', instead of 'vernacular', patois, creole or dialect. Boyce Davies notes:

> Audre Lorde in "I am your Sister, Black Women Organizing Across Sexualities" shows how lesophobia and heterosexism get in the way of sisterhood even among Black women who want to claim the site of most multiplied oppressions… Women can communicate, work together with multiple languages. For this reason, Lorde's 'Zami' of Caribbean/creole origin is an important attempt at a redefinition that has not entered critical language in any significant way. Lorde was talking in her 'biomythography' about the way Carriacou women work together as friends and lovers. Similarly Gloria Anzaldua in "To(o) Queer the Writer – Loca escrita y chicana" speaks of the way in which her various identities converge, but also how European language and definition do not capture her identities" (Boyce Davies: 18).[5]

Similarly, Keenaghan notes that:

> Gays and lesbians have certainly been making themselves visible – but how they have been doing it is at least ambiguous as straight America's motives in tolerating, even encouraging, this unprecedented visibility. "If we are indeed everywhere, it is by no means clear who 'we' is" (Bersani, 1995:31). Not only is who we are contemporaneously variegated, but such definitions of visibility and identity are also historical and social variants (1998:275).[6]

Most of this vocabulary and more has entered the mainstream (at least in cosmopolitan places like London and is evident in the mass media), although still marginalised. Harvey describes camp in fictional representations of homosexual men's speech and the problems of diversity arising here (Harvey: 1998:295). Other examples include terms, such as "postcolonial", "post-feminist", and "postmodern" for instance, which although controversial, have given rise to new language and important discussions and may help to clarify meanings, definitions and continue to further debates, or in some cases, muddle the issues even further.

This desire to grapple with the myriad oppressions and their manifestations has given rise to explorations for terminology a fact that best encapsulates and defines this broad and complex phenomenon. I believe that the absence of terminology has had an impact on theory, practice and methodological approaches across the disciplines. There is a general consensus that a contestation of ideas and terminology exists, particularly within this area I have defined as hectorosexism. Williams in his introduction to *Keywords* makes an important observation in his enquiry into vocabulary and aptly points out that:

Of course the issues could not all be understood simply by analysis of the words. On the contrary, most of the social and intellectual issues, including both gradual developments and the most explicit controversies and conflicts, persisted within and beyond the linguistic analysis. Yet many of these issues, I found, could not really be thought through and some of them, I believe, cannot even be focussed unless we are conscious of the words as elements of the problems. This point of view is now much more widely accepted. When I raised my first questions about the differing uses of culture I was given the impression, in kindly and not

so kind ways, that those arose mainly from the fact of an incomplete education and the fact that this was true (in real terms it is true of everyone) only clouded the real point at issue. The surpassing confidence of any particular use of a word, with a group or within a period, is very difficult to question (1976:16-17).[7]

Derrida raises a similar point over naming and historicity as actual reality. In the debate on the term 'apartheid' between Anne McClintock and Rob Nixon he amplifies this point in relation to what he calls a "watchword", by pointing out:

> ...apartheid: A watchword is not just a name. This too history teaches us, as you should know since your're so concerned with history. A watchword is also a concept and a reality. The relation among the reality, the concept and the word is always more complex than you seem to suppose. The South Africans in power wanted to keep the concept and the reality while effacing the word, an evil word, *their* word. They have managed to do so in *their* official discourse, that's all (Derrida, 1986:362).[8]

Hectorosexuality as a conceptual tool can therefore be considered a mode from which to review theory and practice in general, but in translation, in particular, as a method, or, as Bassnett puts it, "lines of approach" (Bassnett, 1991:42). Further, it seems to be a more useful tool than periodisation, as has been demonstrated by Bassnett in her rejection of such a methodology, although time and place are important concepts contained in the notion 'hectorosexism'. I find her references to Emilio Gadda's diachronics useful for hectorosexism as critique:

We therefore think of every system as an infinite entwining, an inextricable knot or mesh of relations: the summit can be seen from many altitudes: and every system is referable to infinite co-ordinated axes: it presents itself in infinite ways (Gadda, 1974: 229).[9]

I am aware that the search and controversy for defining this space is still raging, yet my research must in the meantime proceed. In fact, there are very real dangers in what Morrison calls 'lobotomizing' in arguments which seek to universalise. She notes that: "A criticism that needs to insist that literature is not only "universal" but also "race-free" risks lobotomizing that literature and diminishes both the art and the artist" (Op. cit). Lygate also notes that:

> So far, the problems of terminology remain unresolved and one of the major concerns of Postcolonial scholarship and Women's Studies is the whole area of 'language'. Available language is restricted – both in words and images and yet the naming process must continue. It is not enough to use academically fashionable jargon. We have to move beyond meanings and reach deeply into the collective consciousness of everyday realities. Issues of identity, whether self-defined by women of colour as 'authentic' or imposed upon by others only become meaningful when the structural forces that have a direct bearing on interpretations of authenticity and truth are scrutinised and deconstructed. Mere articulation of experience or apolitical versions of reality alone become dangerously simplistic in attempting to chart women's experiences of Diaspora because the ways in which such articulation are permitted and the accompanying social practices that (disallow) them remain unidentified and unchallenged (Lygate, 1994).[10]

I find that the terms and ideas such as postmodernity, postcolonialism, postfeminist discussed above, and other similar discourses have not proved adequate in the practical applications particularly in developing a model or models that resolve the material contradictions for hectorosexism in both theory and practice. For instance, Bhabha poses the following question around these:

> How does the deconstruction of the 'sign', the emphasis on indeterminism in cultural and political judgement, transform our sense of the 'subject' of culture and the historical agent of change? If we contest the 'grand narratives', then what alternative temporalities do we create to articulate the differential (Jameson), contrapuntal (Said), interruptive (Spivak) historicities of race, gender, class, nation within a growing transnational culture? Do we need to rethink the terms in which we conceive of community, citizenship, nationality, and the ethics of social affiliation? (1994:174).[11]

A response to some of the 'signs' that have been adopted can be found in critics such as McClintock (1995) and Boyce Davies. The latter rejects some of the positions and definitions adopted and in the specific instance of the notion of 'post-coloniality' she posits that:

> My positions are that post-coloniality represents a misnaming of current realities, it is too premature a formulation, is too totalizing, it erroneously contains decolonizing discourses, it re-males and recenters resilient discourses by women and attempts to submerge a host of uprising textualities, it has to be historicized and placed in the context of a variety of historical resistances to

colonialism, it reveals the malaise of some Western intellectuals caught behind the posts and unable to move to new and/or more promising re-articulations (Boyce Davies, 1994:80:).[12]

A tool such as hectorosexism enables an approach or approaches which is/are singularly or simultaneously available for handling a wide range of issues at the theoretical and practical levels.

This enables the study therefore to focus on the subject positions of both writers and translators within historical frameworks (Berman, 1984). In this study, hectorosexism as a paradigm is used for analysis not only in theory and practice, but specifically of these positionings in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's works in the comparative study. The texts in question include the first novel in Gĩkũyũ, *Caitaani Mũtharabaini (Devil on the Cross)* translated by the author and his second, *Matigari ma Njirũũngi (Matigari)*, translated by Wangũi wa Goro.

B. BACKGROUND TO RESEARCH AND MOTIVATION

The research is prompted by the issues that arose for me in the translation of Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's children's books in the *Njamba Nene* series and the novel *Matigari* which drew my attention to the challenges of hectorosexism. It raised pertinent ethical and moral questions and dilemmas around the subject positionings of translators as readers and writers within historical social, cultural, economic and political contexts. Some of these dilemmas included issues of whether there are any gains, losses, omissions, amnesia or repression, or whether the translator was being called upon to collude with silences, or expose them and how these issues were responded to. This was important

in the light of Msiska's critique of Siegfried Smidt on the phenomenon of the scope of literary study, which could be extended to translation studies, where he observes:

> The approach shifts the focus of literary study from the author to the text and text to the reader, with the literary work regarded as wholly the reader's cognitive reconstruction. The reader is said to operate with a frame of the literary that he or she acquires through socialisation and tests out when confronted with a new text (Msiska, 2000:26).[13]

This approach to reading seemed appropriate to extend to the translation process as it raises questions about writers and translators and the inscriptions they bear in their readings and renderings of texts, a point made by Boyce Davies and Graves (1986). I felt that a critique of the key issue that I identified as hectorosexism would assist in establishing some answers to these questions and dilemmas particularly through theory, and concretely through a study of translated texts. I felt it important to revisit work that I had translated to 'objectively' study what I had done. Further, I felt that such an approach would assist in addressing the question whether any such findings may point to a relocation of both subject and culture. Such research would be at two levels, the first being that articulated by Boyce Davies in the idea of the "migration of the subject" and the second, one that I have termed the relocation of culture. This latter concept is one I have extrapolated from Bhabha's concept of "the location of culture". These ideas are explored fully in chapter 2. Bhabha argues succinctly that:

> It is in the emergence of interstices – the overlap and displacements of domains of difference – that the intersubjective and collective experiences of *nationness*, community interest, or cultural value are negotiated. How are subjects formed

'in-between', or in excess of, the sum of the 'parts' of difference (usually intoned as race/class/gender, etc.)? How do strategies of representation or empowerment come to be formulated in the competing claims of communities where, despite shared histories or deprivation and discrimination, the exchange of values, meanings and priorities may not always be collaborative and dialogical, but may be profoundly antagonistic, conflictual and even incommensurable? (1994:2).[14]

In my view, this relocation would be at a number of levels; the internal, external levels i.e. the nature of the culture of translation and movements within it and secondly, the broader space that it occupies as an entity. Thirdly and equally important, it involves the relocation of the subjects around whom translation occurs, i.e. writers, readers, translators, publishers etc. in/and their locations in the translation and cultural continuum. I will revisit these questions in detail in chapter 2.

Another major consideration is that there are the wider issues of reading and writing generally and the shifts imposed by the subjectivity of each reading which need to be taken into account. This includes the readings of the source and target texts, the various levels and layers of writing, reading, drafting, redrafting, translation and editing, from the start of the process to the consumption/s of the final product (Diaz-Diacaretz, 1985: 24-33). I address these issues in chapter 2.

The main reasons for the choice of these texts, as will become evident below, is how they broadly represent the essence of some of the issues of hectorosexism in different ways, the very subject of this thesis.

A simpler reason, which would apply to any study of translation such as this one is an interest in and knowledge of the languages covered by the source and target texts, in this case, Gĩkũyũ and English. I would hasten to add here that I believe that this mode of study could be broadly applicable to any interdisciplinary field of scholarship, but more precisely, to the fields of comparative literary, translation and language study. The primary focus of this work is however, literary translation.

A third reason is an interest in the development of corpus studies, which could point to patterns, which could yield useful findings for theory, practice and research and therefore have an impact on how these are conducted, or help clarify existing findings. This study however does not claim to be a corpus study, but a comparative study of two texts by the same author and their translations.

Yet, a further motivation has been prompted by the fact that many studies and theories to date have tended to focus solely and predominantly on the notion of loss in translation. The thesis proposes however, to address the different strategies that have been put forward to test the viability of re(dis)covery. This includes the discovery of narratives which may be 'lost', 'hidden' or 'forgotten" and whether indeed 'new' narratives emerge in instances where there are shifts in the subject positionings of the writers, translators, editors/publishers and readers. This is within the theoretical propositions of the relocation of culture and 'the migration of the subject' as seen above. This may clarify what happens on the other side of loss. Nkosi's invitation for scholarship to be undertaken to assess ownership of the translated text Matigari was a further challenge. Nkosi posited:

Finally, a more intriguing question about this orphaned text concerns its linguistic medium. Whose text is it in fact? How faithful is the English translation to the original text? How much of it is Ngũgĩ's and how much Wangũi wa Goro's, the translator? The question is even more intriguing when one takes into account the magnificent verbal satire of the English translation. One wishes that Gĩkũyu speaking scholars would add to the growing Ngũgĩ scholarship by doing comparative studies of his original texts and the translations (Nkosi, 1995:205).[15]

The case studies would shed light on the questions "Whose text is it?" and whether indeed the translation of *Matigari* in fact orphans it, amongst other issues as referred to above. Nkosi's critique above also raises the question of discourse ownership, fidelity, the question of research and the questions of the ethics of visibility/invisibility. These issues will be revisited in the case studies and synthesis in chapters 3, 4 and 5.

Such a study would contribute to the appreciation of some of the wider social and historical dimensions and their implication for development of translation theory and practice, particularly in the African context. It would contribute to the interrogation for instance, of writing, translation, oralation,[16] and subject positionality amongst others and contribute to the development of policies, theory and practice from alternative perspectives.

C. THE EPISTEMOLOGY OF HECTOROSEXISM IN TRANSLATION THEORY AND PRACTICE

For me, Sojourner Truth's assertion *"Ain't I a Woman"*, also the title of hook's book (hooks, 1981), established an important theoretical departure to what Bhabha's has theorised as the "location of culture" (Bhabha: 1994) and Boyce Davies as "the migration of the subject" (Boyce Davies: 1994), as established above. This position has been theorised since then, with the key work emerging from Angela Davis' text *Woman, Race and Class* which alerted modern theorists to the complexity of oppression, and enabled other oppressions to be interrogated and articulated in new ways. This is an important starting point for this research. The backdrop of an axiomatic paradigm of "a" translator and an invisible one at that, a predominant conceptual notion in contemporary translation into English makes this question critical. In describing the traditional view of how translators are viewed, Robinson states that:

> The translator conveys the meaning of the SL text to the TL receptor. Period. Nothing else. The translator is a window through which the TL receptor can perceive the SL meaning without distortion or obstruction. The translator is not a person, with personal experiences, personal desires, personal preferences. The translator is a vehicle. An instrument. A tool used by the SL writer to communicate with receptors whose language he or she does not speak; a tool used by the TL receptor to understand the words of an otherwise inaccessible writer or speaker. A mere tool, like a knife of a screwdriver. A medium, like a window (for sight), like air (for sound). A vehicle, like a wheelbarrow or a truck. Not a person (Robinson, 1991: 203).[17]

Both Bhabha and Boyce Davies problematise the fundamental questions of whether culture and subjects are located and if so, whether these are mutable and movable. This question inherently implies a questioning of the location of cultural players and production, but beyond that, it raises a more fundamental question of what a human being is and what ethical questions would emerge around culture and its social, political and economic specificities. An example is how to respond to the question: "Ain't I a woman?" raised by Sojourner Truth. Boyce Davies raises the same issue differently by raising an argument for 'unpacking" these terms – for instance, by raising the question: But what of Black Femaleness or Black womanness? (1994:8)

More importantly, this question and its wider implications raise issues about the identity and subjectivity of individuals and additionally, the very nature of communities in which individuals affiliate, or are affiliated to. It also impinges on issues of identity, subjectivity, consciousness, knowledge, agency and the 'permission' to read/be read, to enunciate/be enunciated within those or other communities. This in turn affects the notion of "fidelity" to wider societal notions ranging across a number of significant factors and players. These include the text, the author, readers and publishers and indeed, the cultural communities of readers, booksellers, etc. as sites of translation as process. In fact, Bhabha defines translation as:

> ... the performative nature of cultural communication. It is language *in actu* (enunciation, positionality) rather than language *in situ* (énoncé, or propositionality)[30] and the sign of translation continually tells, or 'tolls' the different times and spaces between cultural authority and its performative practices.[31] The 'time' of translation consists in that *movement* of meaning, the principle and practice of a communication that, in the words of de Man 'puts the

original in motion to decanonise it, giving it the movement of fragmentation, a wandering of errance, a kind of permanent exile'[32] (Bhabha 1994:228).[18]

The main idea under scrutiny here is that:

> The translation should be a faithful rendition of the work into English, it shall neither omit anything from the original text nor add anything to it other than such verbal changes as are necessary in translating into English (A Handbook for Literary translators (Pen American Center 1991:16).[19]

Linked to this is the question of the various channels through which translations filter and ultimately colour the final product through an anti-hectorosexist critique. Are these capable of filtering back through the translator and on to language itself? What is their impact on the target text and readers if indeed culture and subjects are located? Is it possible to sustain a methodology of "faithful rendition" given the hectorosexist constraints and if so, what are the implications for these?

The idea of "faithfulness" and therefore of fixed locations of culture(s) seems at odds with emergent knowledge and experiences as well as real changes in technological, scientific, social, political, economic and cultural developments, both locally and globally. Some of these issues are addressed in the subsequent chapters. Their very essence demands an inherent altering of meaning as part of evolutionary reality. Additionally, it seemed at odds with ideas of history, reality, language development and communication as ever evolving elements. Coining neologisms, borrowing, in fact, constant change and transformation are the very essence of their existence,

sustainability and usefulness. For instance, Ngũgĩ gives examples of how Gĩkũyũ language has borrowed from other languages (Ngũgĩ, 1988:225-230).

This debate, however, over faithfulness to axiom, in text, authorial intention, reader expectation or presumptions of reader expectation and ideology is not new to the history of translation. In fact, it is part of the debates across the translation process from the creation of the text, its translation, publication, review, readings, canonisation or rejection over time since St. Jerome, thought to be the first translator of the Bible into Latin. For instance, Lefevere argues that:

> These rules were long thought to be eternal and unchanging, centring mainly on fidelity or any number of its synonyms; in recent years most scholars writing in the field of translation studies have come to accept that such rules are mainly imposed by people of flesh and blood who commission the translation, which is then made by other people of flesh and blood (not boxes and arrows) in concrete situations, with a given aim in mind. In other words, the rules to be observed during the process of decoding and reformulation depend on the actual situation, on the function of the translation, and on who wants it made and for whom. For instance, fidelity will still be paramount in the translation of medical texts, but not in the translation of advertisements, in which case it may well be counterproductive (Lefevere, 1999:75).[20]

Some translation contracts have a specific requirement for this faithfulness to some 'accepted wisdom' or 'ideal'. This idea of 'faithful rendition' could include creativity, readability, faithfulness, originality and other criteria determined by genre, grammar and other predetermined norms (Schaffner: 1999; Toury:1999).

The main challenges to these ideas through a hectorosexist critique have come from a number of disparate quarters. They are best captured by sentiments expressed by Gloria T. Hull, Patricia Bell Scott and the late Barbara Smith in a book of that title (1982). *All women are white, all men are black, but some of us are brave*. This position focuses the question that Spivak articulates succinctly as to whether the subaltern can speak. Here, she brings into relief the possibility of a new position of enunciation in relation to translation-as-liberation, what she calls 'freedom-in troping' rather than what she calls 'translation-as-violence' (Spivak: 2002:164). In other domains, women such as Maria Mies (1986:77), Sen and Cowan (1985), Lorde (1992) and others have articulated new world-vision positions which challenge the status quo.

How such articulation translates into theory and practice is another matter and leads me to address some of the anticipated difficulties below.

D. SOME ANTICIPATED DIFFICULTIES

The complex issues discussed above in sections B and C above raise significant questions about methodology. The wide gaps between what Niranjana (1992:2) has called "asymmetrical relations" of power in her assertions with regards to colonialism are important and has applications beyond colonialism to other hectorosexist claims for instance those of race, sexuality, disability, gender and class. These have been expressed in various ways as will become evident in chapter 2. However, even here, contradictions between, within and across these abound, rendering methodological and conceptual approaches to hectorosexism even more complex. The problematisation of

the hectorosexist discourse and disjunctions within it remains a significant focal point of the research question and some of the anticipated difficulties.

The various theorised demands and claims include those of the liberation movements (such as women's liberation, disability rights, the civil rights, lesbian and gay rights, workers' rights and the independence movements amongst others), and present further conceptual difficulties for the standpoint from which enunciation takes place. Spivak's question above has sparked an intense discussion on what the subaltern signifies, and inherently, on the location of 'other' discursive voices. We return to this question in chapter 2 and the concluding chapter.

In challenging the axiomatic position of articulation Cixous for instance questions the very basis of the axiomatic assumption of a monolithic fixed position of enunciation in literary production. She writes that women must write through their bodies and create new codes that go beyond the discourses that hold her away from herself, away from history (1975).

Brennan, in describing the effect of racism on the significant critic and anti-racist campaigner CLR James calls the effect of racism 'a disorientation'. He makes a critical observation in relation to what he refers to as: "…the existential disorientation of writing without an outside base, in the crazy house of the U.S. intellectual consumerism" (see Brennan, 1995:152).[21].

He goes on to discuss the fact that even people of his stature and status are not spared of this disorientation: "For a variety of reasons that I have sought to cover here, the

disorientation affected even the likes of CLR James" (*ibid*). The same experience seems to be true for Tagore[22] and several others (see below, p.106).

Questions such as these of disorientation and the location of writing signalled by proponents like Cixous continue to have a significant impact on the renewed interest in 'location' of translation theory and practice, including this research. The various discourses across the different claims are rarely presented together, as is proposed here through hectorosexism as critique. How to implement this, however, remains contested and contestable as will become evident below through a study of the commonalities and disjunctures in the theories in chapter 2.

A key argument of the thesis however, is that many theorists and practitioners have continued to find it difficult to challenge such assumptions for a number of reasons which can be attributed to hectorosexism itself. They have also found it difficult to take on board the challenges wrought by the multiple and complex sites through which the cross-section of these issues are asserted, or how responses to them are made. Venuti (1998) recognises that such shifts in theory and practice will not be favourable or easy to implement.

This is more so with hectorosexism in translation and is exemplified by Smidt's recognition of translation as already being a difficult terrain. He observes that:

> The experience of translation clearly belongs to the special anxiety of always being only on the way to language, never quite there, of – as Canetti recalls – the imminence of having one's tongue cut off. Every translator faces the irrevocable sense that the measure of translation remains difference more than identity. The pain and burden of translation and the weight that every single

word, every choice, bears, mark the experience of translation as an experience in language par excellence (Smidt, J, 1990:3).[23]

Besides the challenges raised by the conceptual and linguistic problems, there are practical and ideological implications facing such claims. These debates are reflected in contemporary theories and practice well beyond translation as a discipline and predominantly in the western European tradition and by implication, globally, given the position of English in the world. The force of the contemporary arguments means that they are hard to ignore. Venuti describes the current state of world affairs as one of unequal cultural exchange: "... pitched against hegemonic English language nations and the unequal cultural exchanges in which they engage with their global others" (Venuti, 1995: 20).

A further complexity arises in translation itself, and this is raised by Ross who notes that:

"...the promise of the future is both dangerous and monstrous. The renewal of the future is also a dismantling of the past. The afterlife of langue in translation is misrepresentation and untruth, where they are equally representation and truth. In this aphoria lies the transgression of representation that is translation: less the renewal than the inexhaustibility of languages and truth" (Ross, 1990:38).[24]

Further contradictions arise such as in the case where Venuti has argued that English can be dealt with as a form of resistance against ethnocentrism, racism and cultural narcissism and further, the importance of translating minority literatures (Venuti, 1995).

On the other hand, Edward Said laments the problems raised by ethnocentricity in the theory and practice of translation from Arabic to English by arguing that:

> For all major world literatures, Arabic remains relatively unknown and unread in the West, for reasons that are unique, even remarkable, at a time when tastes here for the non-European are more developed than ever before and, even more compelling, contemporary Arab literature is at a particularly interesting juncture (Said, 1995:97).[25]

Several scholars in other disciplines recognise the problems deriving from the use of languages through which traditional perspectives of certain hierarchies and power relations are invariably manifest and presented as fixed. In anthropology for instance, Sturge identifies this in the following way:

> "But this is not the thrust of mainstream anthropology, for the discipline has traditionally been deeply implicated in colonialist claims of Western Superiority and impregnability. James Fabian, Talal Asad and others have characterised anthropology as the academic, legitimising arm of the colonialist enterprise (Fabian 1983:17)" (Sturge, 1997:25).[26]

I share Venuti's sentiment that it is necessary to develop a practice 'that is not just self-conscious but more self-critical (Venuti, 1995:309).

These sentiments as seen above in relation to the question of ethnocentrism can be extended to reflect the broader concerns encompassing issues such as gender, race, class, disability, sexuality etc. Indeed, there is recognition that even ethnocentrism or

any of the 'isms' are complex categories, reflective of the differences of race, gender, class and disability amongst others, and that none of these are thus "pure" in themselves. Such an analysis may lead to deconstruction of what Falk has called 'the normative wholes' of civilisations, nations, communities, families and individuals within them, as the traditional paradigms have allowed us to consider them (1992).

This research is, however, aware of the inherent dangers and contradictions in the theoretical 'lumping the issues together', in the quest for a conceptual tool (McClintock,1986: 11). However, I do acknowledge that ignoring the problem is not itself a panacea or desirable, but rather adds to the difficulties both for research, as well as for purposes of practice and theory. This work acknowledges that each trope of inquiry has validity and particularity and that research in each should be pursued meticulously. The work maintains that the idea of 'holding all else as equal' to develop a critique, not only in translation, but also across the disciplines, has not proved satisfactory. It has however lent useful insights for a universal framework as far as the various oppressions are concerned. This work in fact draws from the availability of particularised insights stemming from work for instance in gender in/and translation, translating postcoloniality, queer theories in translation, feminist perspectives etc. The shortcoming is that this approach often provides dichotomous frameworks often presenting the multiple sites of oppression as unconnected, in hierarchies or binaries without qualification. This will become evident in chapter 2. This often fails to address the complex and dynamic forms in which the different juxtapositions of power and oppression converge and in this instance the matrixes through which this multidimensionality can be tested concretely in the translated text or translation process.

In reality they face up to the sharp contradictions which are in evidence in theories for addressing racism, sexism, class, disability and homophobia, some of which are addressed in depth below and in the case studies.

In the examples given above through Said and Venuti in relation to ethnocentrism, this dichotomous framework falls into the difficulty of arguing from a single location while acknowledging the challenges raised by what they account for as 'other' issues (Todorov, 1986:374). These failures to address the wider range of issues and therefore argue for an all encompassing theory which goes beyond addressing unitary issues presents real difficulties in textual processing.

This difficulty is also evident in bell hooks' work where she falls into the same difficulty as Said and Venuti by focusing solely on race. She used Adrienne Rich's expression in relation to gender "...this is the master's language/yet I need it to speak to you", to express some of the complexities around race (hooks, 1995:295). In later work, she challenges this ambivalence and is able to clarify her position by arguing that:

> To achieve these both desired ends I had to formulate complex accounting for the intersections of race and gender, which needed unconventional forms of expression. I had to write with the trust that there would be readers willing to hear these different wordings, as well as the new insights they conveyed (hooks, 1993:145).[27]

A similar anxiety is present in Mama's work in psychoanalytic theory where she posited that:

In location of both myself and the research participants as members of a racial minority in contemporary Britain, I decided early on in the research to theorise subjectivity through the trope of race *instead* of gender (Mama, 1995:129).[28] [emphasis mine].

Andrade argues that:

There is no room for the necessary heterogeneity of the many facets of subject constitution and because, in the colonial or neocolonial context, race is generally the most salient category, gender is subsumed under its rubric. For example, JanMohamed's readings of the works of Isak Dinesen and Nadine Gordimer focus exclusively on European subjectivity and inevitably elide the complex set of relations their white female characters bring into play. This kind of analysis also encourages the conflation of categories; the violence of colonialism is translation into the emasculation (read: feminization) of male natives, a gesture that codes femininity pejoratively. Such analyses inevitably elide the gendered and racial violence to which female natives are subjected (1990:93).[29]

This demonstrates some of the conceptual difficulties posed by approaches which do not take "all inter-related issues into account" as a discourse in contemporary theory, a difficulty that calls for an all-encompassing approach to theory for any discipline.

Further complexities are evident within the categories of gender or race and the complexity of oppressions arising out of the differentiated approaches to 'blackness', 'whiteness' and ethnicity which are not homogenous. Also 'black' is not only a linguistically complex term, but also one which impinges on ideological and cultural

diversity and expressions of power around this (Boyce Davies, 1994:8). In fact, Ogudipe-Leslie argues that some 'high coloured' African-Americans are lighter skinned than the North Africans and who can pass as white, are considered black. She argues that the term black is a political metaphor, not necessarily predicated on skin colour but other factors (Ogudipe-Leslie, 1994:215). How do we approach these differences in translation theory and practice?

In my estimation, the fact that they are constructs that have an impact on outcomes in theory and practice necessitates a close scrutiny of the 'realities' they invoke in real time and place.

'Real' varied shifts within the global movements transform and impact upon physical, emotional, intellectual and psychic migrations and displacements. Mama for instance makes the poignant point around identity that there are conceptual difficulties posed by both race and gender, for instance and that not all societies categorise their citizens racially (1995).[30]

At another level, 'western' feminists have been grappling with the issue of gender which has been absent from the examples above. In similar vein to work on race, that on gender has tended not to include 'other' sites of hectorosexist oppression such as race, although there is an increasing awareness of the importance of doing so.

The argument is that this has a real bearing on reality, whether through texts, translations or physical reality, such as migration, colonisation, relationships between communities, individuals and the final texts, etc.

Another level of complexity is on offer through Levine's work. While acknowledging gender as presenting theoretical difficulties for the English language she calls it "a double betrayal" of a feminist translator who "mocks women and their words" (Levine: 1992). The question arising here is that of other 'betrayals'.

Massardier-Kenney argument demonstrates this point as follows:

> These issues directly confront the translator as woman who has to mediate between her desire to be visible in all it implies in terms of her own ideological investment and between the necessarily different ideological positions of the text she translates. Any attempt to bring into another language or another culture the racial or cultural "other"- women or persons of color [my emphasis] - inevitably implicates the translator-mediator in the exploitative conditions which link otherness to specific power structures "(Massardier Kenney, 1994:14).[31]

Langen argues that there are "constraints on non-sexist translation" (Langen: 1992). This demonstrates that even within feminism and similar sites of anti-hectorosexist practice, a number of complexities arise. This can be extended to wider issues. Von Flotow problematises this difficulty further by conceding to the difficulties as follows [emphasis mine]:

> What exactly is the role of the translator in making the voices of third world women heard in the West? How should she translate? For whom is **she** translating? Is she merely contributing to these women's exploitation, or is her work a meaningful contribution to international feminist goals? (von Flotow, 1997:3).[32]

In this example, the concern includes locating the female translator and goes beyond that to interrogate the site of translation. There is also an inherent assumption of a homogenous non-other 'feminist translator' in 'the translator' and 'she' above. These examples and those cited above demonstrate the tension between not only the axiomatic ideas and the contemporary ones, but also across and within each of these. It calls for a scrutiny of the interrelated issues through specific frameworks, in this case, a critical study of hectorosexuality in text. This includes the various ways in which they affect 'the culture/s and 'subjects' of translation both within the text and beyond. Spivak raises concerns about how "Third World" women are read in translation in the West by arguing that texts and meaning are part of the context from which they derive (Spivak, 1992:180).[33]

By extending the sentiments that had echoed the need to address the "other violations' (Venuti, 1995) and the various challenges mentioned above, I was led to reject the view of 'other locations'. For instance in Kanneh's otherwise helpful statement, she argued for the "...urgency to lay claim to the significance of *other* [emphasis mine] locations of identities that have been differently inflected by the psychic and economic forces of colonialism and capitalism" (Kanneh, 1998:38).[34]

More useful was Vieira's concept that relations should not be: "... grounded in binary power but on notions of fraying and weaving, of continuation and becoming, a becoming that operates at the threshold of fusion and distinction, permanence and transcendence..." (Vieira, 1997:192-3).[35]

The dominant outlooks in western traditions in translation and beyond, in English, or other European languages, have functioned outside the realm of this experience of the 'other' and have thus tended not to see them. Sengupta comments on this phenomenon in the following way:

> For, of course, the discursive parameters are such that they restrict the entry of texts that do not fit into their idea of the Other. The result of such a process of exclusion is that the source or the dominated culture is homogenized and domesticated, the polyphony of its existence obliterated and a unified, monolithic view of that culture is created as truly legitimate (Sengupta, 1995: 160).[36]

Minh-ha takes this argument further by suggesting that there have been efforts to even further distort this lived experience by misnaming or failing to name, or by deliberately distorting reality:

> You who has understood the dehumanization of forced removal- relocation - re-education, redefinition, the humiliation of having to falsify your own reality, your voice - you know and often cannot say it. You keep trying to unsay it for if you don't, they will not fail to fill in the blanks on your behalf and you will be said (Minh-ha, 1987).[37]

In a different approach, Audre Lorde suggested 'a new spelling to my name'. She identified herself through renaming, "Zami" to reflect difference and distance in her identity which at that time remained 'unnamed' in English (Lorde, 1996). Similarly,

Maxine Hong Kingston argued: "I learned to make my mind large, as the universe is large, so there is room for paradoxes" (Kingston Hong, 1981:34).[38]

As we noted above, the thesis seeks to explore how Massardier-Kenney's invocation to "...attend to the inter-relationship of all the factors – gender, race or class – that were present in the text" affects such dilemmas. I am also interested in exploring some of the emerging approaches which the equalities paradigms point to.

These approaches enable a revisiting of the question of how works are judged, good or bad translations? Are they good because they confirm the comfortable hectorosexist positions and privileges that we occupy, both in reality and ideologically (however unethical) or because they challenge us to new locations? This question, for instance, underscores Massardier-Kenney's positing of the difficulty of translating the term 'savage' in abolitionist writings within specific historical contexts (Kadish & Massardier-Kenney, 1994). Further arguments are pitched around ethical and esthetical considerations, yet others are located in extremes between, on the one hand, 'faithful' rendition of the target text, and on the other, 'faithful' rendition of the source text. I will return to this question of ethics and aesthetics in chapter 2 and in the synthesis as it is the central tenet of this thesis.

E. LOCATING THE RESEARCHER

I was born 'female' within the neo-colonial state, Kenya, at the cusp of 'independence'. I have now become 'black' through translation within a metropolitan European context of exile in the colonial 'motherland' (where the streets were supposed to be paved with gold), (see Selvon, 1956). Knight on Negritude describes this process as follows:

According to Fanon, the predicament of the Black only becomes apparent when *he* [emphasis mine] confronts the white world. His problem is, in a manner of speaking "**être-noir-au-monde-blanc**". As long as he is among other Blacks, his blackness is not apparent. It is only when faced with whites, "autrui" that he becomes Black and has to assert his existence. The look (regard) of the White (autrui) is not a look that frees but rather one that imprisons, a different, less physical but equally inhibiting form of the thraldom in which the Whites formerly held the Blacks – in this way is the dialectic of the master and slave updated and given new life (Knight, 1974:11).[39]

I have been in exile for being active in seeking a political and cultural solution to neo-colonialism and working as a feminist translator between cultures still in colonial/neocolonial contradictions. These issues are lived, experiential and quotidian. Am I an African, a mother, researcher, housewife, translator amongst other identities? What do these mean in terms of power and autonomy? I have translated one male and one female author. I encounter the complex issues of hectorosexism daily between the thin line dividing reality, dreams and theory. For instance the intertexuality borne out by the banning of *Matigari* and the consequence of having to live in exile, as a result of translation, as a gesture intended to liberate and contribute to individual and collective freedom, demonstrates this. "Who am I?" is a question which presents itself constantly as I grapple with the myriad issues of theory and practice forcing me to constantly think and rethink my identity, subjectivity and location in reality in relation to the question of agency.

I was fortunate to be in a position to translate Ngũgĩ from Gĩkũyũ. It was like a dream come true, the opportunity to translate, though not in 'classic' conditions, what seemed

to be between my two primary languages. However, was this so? My "second" language is the predominant language of intellectual, academic and official usage, at least outwardly and at the conscious level for the purposes of translations published so far. My "first" language remained latent while occupying a large emotional and psychological space for me. It gave me an opportunity to work between the 'conscious' and 'unconscious' languages of my being which I claim in equal measure as a multi-lingual translator. This brings into play the very private translations which I argue occur in the minds of translators. These places do not escape the force of hectorosexism. In this regard, Chefyitz observes that:

> Still, we recognise that problems of translation exist here as well, perhaps most acutely here, where the place of the person in the culture is also the place of the person between cultures. Here, problems of intercultural and intracultural communication intersect (Cheyfitz, 1991: xvi).[40]

Another complexity becomes apparent in Spivak's observation of the fact that: …the translator must be able to confront the idea that what seems resistant in the space of English may be reactionary in the space of the original language (*ibid*: 86).

Research of this kind, emanating from texts of literary merit, between English and Gĩkũyũ had not been undertaken. I found this a great privilege and I rose to Nkosi's (1993:205) bait for researchers to work on comparative studies of translations of Ngũgĩ's works. I also responded to Bassnett's assertion on the importance of research in translation where she argues that translation is a relatively new discipline (Bassnett, 1998:105).

I am however acutely aware of my own contradictory position of being a researcher and translator into English and am conscious of Ngũgĩ 's concerns around those he refers to as 'interpreters' (Ngũgĩ, 1998:71-102). Busia remarks on the phenomenon of identity through translation in this way:

> The interdeterminate aspects of "identity" that slide between the concept of "hybridity" and the concept of "translation" suggest, though, like the refracted image in a mirror, they cannot contain, the issues at stake for those of us - migrants, exiles and other kinds of homelessness – troubled by the anxiety of trying to name ourselves in different tongues and voices and place ourselves in or out of the manifold places from which we speak. Thus for me, this paper also has its origins in a series of incidents separated by time and different locations across the North American continent. Incidents which were profoundly felt at the time, yet remained for years without articulation. The question of the language or languages of identity I am articulating here is occasioned by incidents other than only the impulse to respond to the words of a fellow migrant. They take me beyond the present place, literally and figuratively, from which I speak (Busia, 1993:204).[41]

In other ways, this echoes the forced exiles which distance me from the resonances and vibrations of day to day present in this work. The challenge of the absent, taken-for-granted sounds and utterances, the expectations and acknowledgement of what I call multiple alienation. This work should therefore be considered prodigal, as it reaches back into the lost years and tries to project a future which may already exist or which can only be utopian in fact, an impossible translation (Ortega, Y. Gasset, 1992:93). It will reflect the intellectual and physical displacement of the translator researcher, which

have yielded new 'adoptions' and adaptations, which replace the missing (linguistic) home. By linguistic home, I also include the omissions such as those created by hectorosexism in both languages and the realities this yields. On a purely linguistic level, I have lived physically away from 'home' for nearly 20 years. In other ways, I have also lived "at home" in an anti-hectorosexist consciousness, which I have tried to turn to reality for almost the same length of time. I recognise that 'home' is not a place that one can return to, but a place that inspires a place yet to be in the sense that Morrison calls 'becoming' as we have noted above, and hence this thesis.

In this way, I am interested in the contested spaces in which the various theories are emerging at present and the strides that many people are making towards a different reality in theory and practice. In the sense of 'becoming', some issues have stirred a deep disquiet I have harboured since I translated *Matigari* in the eighties and reinvigorated me back to articulation. After a period of absence from translation theory and practice, I have returned, to find that the disquiet has not gone away, but grown after reading several texts in English, French, Italian and also several recent translations into English. Recent re-readings of texts such as *Matigari* and other texts, teaching in Translation Studies, in Race and Culture, and Black writing, as well as attending conferences in various places across the world, all reinforced this concern around hectorosexism.

As an 'African-feminist' residing emotionally in several spaces, this sometimes causes me great alarm and anxiety reflected in von Flotow's question around who the addressees of these works are and what function they are supposed to serve (1997). In trying to grapple with this, I have tended to extend the perspective of what Dale Spender calls "man made language" (1980) to encompass the ideas of hectorosexism.

In the following passage, she argues that:

> The radical feminist view, then, is of women who live and speak within the confines of a man-made [read hectorosexist] symbolic universe. They must cope with the disjunction between the linguistically validated male world-view and their own experience, which cannot be expressed in male [hectorosexist] language. Indeed, since language determines reality, [black] women may be alienated not only from language but also from the [black] female experience it fails to encode (Cameron, 1985:93) [interjections mine].[42]

I have sought to understand whether it is justifiable to expect an ethical code for what we translate or research and how we go about this. I have also wondered whether there are strategies which can be adopted which clearly locate work in its historic and historical contexts (Toury, 1999:3) and whether interpretative mechanisms to 'sanitise' the work, or give it a contemporary understanding is possible, admissible or desirable (Venuti, 1998:81). The work does acknowledge that ethical and moral questions need to be theorised as well as historicised both in reality but also within the realms of the imagination so that leaps that are made can transform society and drag it out of the reliance on hectorosexist axiom and its historicity as models.

For instance, I have wondered whether the debates posited between form and content, translatability, fluidity and transparency give rise to legitimate evaluative basis (Maier: 1998).[43] We shall address this issue in chapters 3 and 4 in relation to form and genre. Works are judged to be 'good', on, for instance, stylistic or poetic merit however

misogynous or racist. This question is addressed in chapter 2 where the various modes suggested for interventions through anti-hectorosexist practices will be explored. Von Flotow discusses the complexity of the so-called feminist norms even for transformatory practices which demonstrates some of the challenges facinghectorosexist concerns (von Flotow, 1998:3-13). Elsewhere, she makes a case for strategies that can be adopted to create some form of distance between translations which offend, and the new centers. We will address the applicability of such proposals and their usefulness in chapter 2. Maier (1998) poses theoretical questions around how literary translation is evaluated and the challenges presented by contested ethical considerations as does Venuti (1995:2-3). I hope that this research unveils this "becoming", what Spivak calls, 'freedom-in-troping".

Before looking at the theoretical issues around hectorosexism, the chapter turns to the wider context of the history, context and translation between English and Gĩkũyũ.

II. BACKGROUND AND TRANSLATING CONTEXT IN AFRICA, KENYA AND THE GĨKŨYŨ/ENGLISH INTERFACE

A. HISTORY OF TRANSLATING IN AFRICA: AN OVERVIEW

By way of background I address the question of translating in Africa which is home to the largest number of languages in the world, some of which are endangered (Crystal, 1999:56-58). I would argue that the presence of colonialism has served translation in two contradictory ways. On the one hand this has occurred through the introduction and imposition of European languages and cultures, and on the other, through the stifling of African cultures and languages. The colonial process was part of this process and has

served to disrupt and undermine the development of African languages. Bretzinger disputes this second view by arguing that:

> European languages are very often labelled as being the primary danger to African languages and cultural heritage. A closer look at the reality in most African nations today reveals, however, that it is African linguae francae and other African languages with a national or regional status, which spread to the detriment of vernaculars. Minority languages are still more likely to be replaced by those relatively few 'highly valued' African languages, than by imported ones. However, modern attempts reflected by, for example, the 'efforts towards indigenisation' of English in East Africa… are suitable to clear the way for English becoming more commonly accepted and used in more domains. This is how English finally may spread, even as a mother tongue (Bretzinger et al., 1991:40).[44]

One such argument was that this was done for the propagation of such lingua franca as part of the colonial project. This was the case with Swahili and Baganda in East Africa.

This view is of course, contested, and Bretzinger's position can be reviewed in relation to colonial practices and outcomes, but this is not the central interest of the research although it does have significant bearing on it. Mayor observes that loss of language inevitably deprives all humanity of knowledge and culture. He goes further to say that the extinction imposed by others causes a community to loose its dignity and freedom (Mayor, 2001:343). Fanon's critical work *The Negro and language* (1952) particularly clearly demonstrates this by pointing to the impact of the imposition of language on the black colonised people, particularly the alienation from the self and one's own

community and cultural values (1986). This argument is also one which is very central to Ngũgĩ's writing in Gĩkũyũ which he explained succinctly in his seminal lecture and essay *The question of language in African literature* in 1986. He later returns to the discussion of this question in *Penpoints, Gunpoints and Dreams* particularly in relation to the dichotomy between orality, coloniality and disenfranchisement (Ngũgĩ: 1998:103-128). My own interest in this research as pointed out above is the quest for exploring repressed, 'lost' or hidden knowledge, as I hope will become evident below. What does emerge clearly, however and the point that I would focus on, is the fact of the disruption of African languages, which becomes a matter of concern not only for colonised people both during and after independence, but I would argue, for all humanity. It also has an impact on translation.

The work of missionaries and colonial administrators has played an important role not only in the development of translation and interpretations, but also in the preservation of elements of language, history and culture in the written form. The translation of texts such as the Bible has influenced the preservation and development of oral languages, cultures and vocabulary as well as the registers and other features of the languages at the time of their translations. New ideas, meanings, ideologies and concepts have become part of the languages due to this. This has also prompted the creation of formal written languages and registers of colonial administration, governance and worship that did not exist before this (Cancel, 1993: 295). For instance, a Gĩkũyũ Bible exists, and further, it contains a glossary of new words, as well as a glossary of difficult terms (The Bible Society in East Africa, 1965:1413-1424). It gives entries for some of the Biblical names such as Adam and Eve, which I have rendered in literal translation in the example below. The italicised translation includes the possible translation within the

existing language, etymology and Gĩkũyũ mythology into which it could have translated.

Gĩkuyu Term/name	(Their) Translation	Term/name in English	(My literal translation of theirs)
Adamu	Person (here meaning man)	Adam	*Mũndũ*
Hawa	Muoyo, kana Hawa	Eve	*Mumbi*
Mũgai muoyo	God	Life, or giver of	(In Gĩkũyu
Ngai		life	=*Mũmbi)*

As can be seen from the example above Eve (English) can translate directly to Mũmbi within the Gĩkũyũ, but it is translated back into Hebrew in the 'Gĩkũyũ', hence Hawa. For some reason, the Bible translators decided not to equate for instance, Hawa with mumbi/Mumbi, which means creator, but also reflects the originating female deity of the Agĩkũyũ people. The relevance of some of these issues will become evident in chapter 2 and in the case studies. Rafael has described the translation of the Christianity Spanish into Tagalog and the colonising effect this has on the receiving culture (Rafael, 1993).

Nida's work provides several insights into the process of translation of the Bible. He draws specific attention to the dynamic equivalence approaches through which according to him, the translator draws "...aside the curtains of linguistic and cultural differences so that people may see clearly the relevance of the original message" (Nida and de Waard, 1986:14). This "clear" view does however raise significant questions on

positionality as is evident from the example above. Sanneh signals to these as anthropological and ideological interests by arguing that:

> Missionaries were deeply exercised about the direction in which they ought to proceed and in the initial stages some ungainly manoeuvres were made to avoid confronting the issues squarely. In the end course, the Methodists were unpersuaded of the wisdom of embracing the Zulu term for God, Unkulunkulu, fearing that they would be conceding more than they wanted to. So they coined the unwieldy term uJehova. The Anglican bishop of Natal in mid-nineteenth century, Bishop Colenso, for his part tried a more cultured modification of the Latin Deus to uDio (Maake, 1992:171.[45]

Maake describes the censorship and ideological direction that took place in the development of creative writing and translation in the South African languages. He argues that: "The beginning of creative writing was incidental to the missionary crusade which was to spread the word".[46]

However, when *Chaka* by Mofolo was submitted in 1910, it took fifteen years to publish. Maake argues that: "It provoked unprecedented controversy in the circles of missionary publishing and took fifteen years in limbo before A. Casalis, one time manager under whom Mofolo[47] worked at the press, eventually braved the storm and published it".[48]

In independent Kenya, the absence of government commitment to the development of positive language policies within both the colonial and the post-colonial era makes some

of this material such as the Bible etc. valuable as archival, research and historical material (Mazrui, 1998:144-153). This is of particular importance to translation theory.

In some parts of Africa such as in Kenya and Tanzania, attempts to develop a lingua franca have also produced a large literature derived from world cultures mainly through European mediation. This includes translations of African literatures (Alamin Mazrui, 1998:56-60).

The theorisation of the translation of thriving oral traditions in music, sermons, highly developed orature and culture may yet hold the key to translation in the future. Orature, according to Ngũgĩ and critics such as Thomas Jackson, was a term coined by Piu Zirimu for '...the close functional tie between the artist's verbal act and the immediate, ongoing life of the community (Jackson: 1991:7). Ngũgĩ uses orature as genre in *Devil on the cross* and *Matigari*. He defines orature as follows:

> The term orature was coined in the sixties by Pio Zirimu, the late Ugandan linguist. Its emergence in East Africa of the time was a result of wider debate in the politics of culture and a literary canon which erupted in Nairobi and Makerere and to a larger extent Dar-es-Salaam Universities (Ngũgĩ, 1986: 105).[49]

He further explains that:

> Orature in its suggestive connotations of a system of aesthetics and method and even philosophy was further developed in the Eighties by the pan-African, London-based performance group African Dawn."[50]

He cites Owusu's definition as follows:

> A common point of departure for many black artists is the defiance of formal artistic boundaries, specialisation and fragmentation of social experience. There is a conscious articulation of diverse and disparate elements of creativity, often organised in new and exciting spaces. Many black artists work in various media simultaneously, forging creative links, collaborations and alliances. This state of consciousness, a reflection of African and Asian attitudes to creativity, is what is called orature (Owusu, 1988:2).[51]

A case in point for instance, is the study of the great African epics (Ash, 2000; Obiechina, 1967; Diop, 2000). Ricard and Swaneopal (1997) have also made a strong case of new philology in collecting, publishing and "interpreting African texts with a clear understanding of production as well as the mastery of the language medium".

A further point is that most African countries are signatory to the *African Cultural Charter* signed in Port Louis in 1976, in which the development of African languages, letters and literatures is a commitment (OAU, 1976). The contradiction between paper policy and reality has continued to raise debate on African languages, something that had been raging for a while. This contradiction is best articulated in Obi Wali's paper '*The Dead End of African Literature*' which appeared in *Transition* (Wali, 1963, 3.10) which re-sparked the debate on language at the now famous Makerere conference in 1962. This paper and the debate were to have an immense influence on Ngũgĩ's life (see below). This question had arisen at the writers' conference in the *First Congress of*

Negro Writers and Artists in Paris in 1956 and the subsequent conference in Rome of the second congress. Wali wrote:

> The purpose of this article is... to point out that the whole uncritical acceptance of English and French as the inevitable medium for educated African writing is misdirected and has no chance of advancing African literature and culture. In other words, until these writers and their western midwives accept the fact that any true African literature must be written in African languages, they would be merely pursuing a dead end, which can only lead to sterility, uncreativity and frustration (Wali, 1963: 14-15).[52]

These trends described by Wali continue to reflect the nature of relationships between colonial 'subject' and 'master'. As noted above in the discussion of Fanon's and Ngũgĩ's work, the tensions of repression and resistance are reflected in the array and spectrum of the different kinds of work emanating from 'colonial discourses'. This term covers discourses before and after colonialism which, to all intents and purposes, need to be incorporated within translation theory and practice, particularly with reference to African languages. This includes the wholesale adoption of western cultures literally lock, stock and barrel, mainly through the broadcast and printed media and though literature and education and the propagation of culture in some cases. Adebola notes that:

> The general patterns that emerge show translation in Africa as a process that worked from the European to African languages predominantly, through the use of African intermediaries. The assimilationist policies which ensured the imposition of European languages as the official language has meant that the

literate do not necessarily need to read or write in their mother-tongues and in this, Gĩkũyũ is not excepted. Government policy articulated as early as 1909 discouraged the teaching of English to Africans (Adebola, 1983:15).

Zabus also discusses the assimilationist policies of the French who sought to suppress the teaching and writing in African languages (Zabus, 1991:19[53]; see also Mehrez, 1992). Kenya and Gĩkũyũ did not escape this colonising effect. Below, I address the background of translation in Kenya.

B. BACKGROUND TO TRANSLATION IN KENYA

Initially, both colonial and neocolonial Kenya continued with the importation of British culture, but this has more latterly given way to American cultures as global geopolitical powers shift and transform themselves on a global scale. Writing for the *Guardian* in June 1979, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o notes:

> Now our visitor might visit schools. The English language dominates a Kenyan
> child's life from primary school to university and after. Swahili, the all-Kenya
> language, is not only not compulsory, but is often offered as an optional
> alternative to French and German. There is total neglect of the languages of the
> nationalities that make up Kenya. Thus a Kenyan child grows up admiring the
> culture carried by these foreign languages, in effect western European ruling-
> class cultures and looks down upon the culture carried by the language of his
> particular nationality, in effect Kenyan peasant rooted national cultures. In other
> words, the school trains him to look down upon what is national and Kenyan and
> to look up to what is foreign even if it is anti-Kenyan. This process is hastened

by the literature he is made to study: Shakespeare, Jane Austen and Wordsworth still dominate the literary scene in Kenyan schools. The present language situation in Kenya means that over ninety percent of Kenyans (mostly peasants) are completely excluded from participation in national debates conducted in the written word (cited in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, 1981:43).[54]

While writers like Ngũgĩ lament this loss of contact with nationality cultures, other critics have moved further to theorise this cultural phenomenon, with many positioning themselves in different localities to study the emergent tendencies. Most of the studies have been undertaken in European languages and contexts where colonial and neo-colonial perspectives prevail. Most scholarship that has gained academic currency has done so particularly in the western metropolis and in European languages and what Spivak calls 'with-it translatese' (Spivak, 1992: 180).

As is the case in most African contexts, the history of translation in Kenya is varied given the diversity of languages and the range of the colonial experiences.

During the colonial period and after, the language of administration and instruction remained predominantly English. Several administrative documents were translated into the African languages and into Kiswahili. Intermittently, documents of significance to colonial administration were in turn translated into English as was other crucial information and knowledge about Africa, mainly from oral narratives and informants.

C. SOME TRENDS IN TRANSLATIONS BETWEEN ENGLISH AND GĨKŨYŨ – AN OVERVIEW 1900-1980

1. Translation from Gĩkũyũ to European Languages

Some of the trends fall within a broad range of materials. Those which can be considered in the literary category include oral narratives, historiographies, oralations, bilingual dictionaries and bilingual language texts (Pugliese, 1995). Gĩtiti cites Finnegan's account that:

> European collections and translations '...contain narratives of various kinds (including stories about animals and humans), historical texts, proverbs, riddles, vernacular texts describing local customs and very occasionally songs or poems (Finnegan, 1970:28, *ctd.* in Gĩtiti, 1993:112).[55]

They also include stories, lexicons, collections of proverbs and enigmas such as the trilingual Gĩkũyũ/Italian/English enigmas by Cognolo (Ndai na Gĩcaandi) translated by Vittorio Merlo Pick.

There are also documents such as letters by William Wyn Jones, (*Marũa ma mũgendi*), translated into English from Gĩkũyũ as *Letters of a traveller*, published in 1957. A number of collected short stories such as those by Rose Warũhiũ ('transcreated' (see below) directly from the oral versions) appear in 1960's, 70's and 80's.

2. Literary Practices in Gĩkũyũ

Like most African languages, Gĩkũyũ, has remained an oral language to the present day and not very much published work has emerged. This is through a combination of factors, including the colonial legacy. There are also complex issues related to lack of resources to purchase and produce books meaningfully. Lack of government commitment, resources and qualified personnel is another reason (Checole: 2002). These factors affect the cultures of reception. Irele argues that:

> The complex language problem in Africa has not been reduced by colonial occupation and rule, despite the energetic generalisations of those who maintain that the imposition of a single foreign language over a wide territory has been a source of unity. If anything, it is now causing a certain amount of confusion and malaise during the crucial period of transformation of territories composed of different peoples which are, in the main, mere administrative expressions, international politico-cultural realities. This state of affairs contains real, explosive possibilities, as the Indian experience demonstrates (Irele: 1963:178).[56]

Not many English speakers write Gĩkũyũ and most who do would have learnt it in specific colonial contexts and would have extreme colonial outlooks even within the language itself. Other reasons given are the feelings of shame, self-hatred and embarrassment about the sophistication of the language relative to English. This phenomenon is still manifest amongst many Gĩkũyũ speakers today who were and continue to be schooled in racist and alienating education, a rationale for colonialism which has continued, although this trend has begun to alter: Mazrui notes:

The (African) 'self' thus becomes increasingly consumed by the (European) 'other'. But the colonised gradually find themselves in a state of predicament. They get increasingly alienated from their Africanity as they seek to be European. They even work desperately to perfect their European language speech lest it betrays their African origin. The 'Negro' arriving in France, for example:

...will react against the myth of R-eating man from Martinique. He will become aware of it and will really go to war against it. He will practice not only rolling his R but embroidering it. Furtively observing the slightest reactions of others, listening to his own speech, suspicious of his own tongue, a wretchedly lazy organ –he will lock himself into his room and read aloud for hours – desperately determined to learn diction (Fanon, 1967a: 21,cited in Mazrui & Mazrui, 1998:59).[57]

There is also reluctance on the part of most middleclass writers/narrators to engage in the creative narrative experience in Gĩkũyũ although this is changing. This is for two reasons. The first is that orature in Africa remains a collective experience led by Gĩcaandi players in narrative, or Akũi in song and there is reluctance in dealing with it as a solitary, individualistic activity (see description of Gicaandi below in chapter 3). Secondly, the class-divide between the "literate" and "illiterate" causes a rift of suspicion and conflict based on real power. The elite do not usually wish to mingle with the 'lower' classes who are often the custodians of the language and they in turn view the elite with suspicion and fear based on existing power relationships which they regard as threatening. These attitudes are reflected in the publishing industry. It is felt

that the production of such work in Kenyan languages is not a viable economic activity (Ogude: 1999).

There is also the steep competition from cheaper, 'ideologically appealing' [read western] and better-packaged and marketed foreign language texts. The kinds of literature available cheaply includes romance books such as Mills and Boon, those by Barbara Cartland amongst others, thrillers such as those of what is known as the 'James Hadley Chase' genre (Ali M. Mazrui & Alamin A. Mazrui, 1998:152) and pornographic material. This is further compounded by social perceptions which view reading and buying books as a luxury both in time and resources in the face of the severe economic hardships which exist even amongst the bourgeoisie (Venuti: 1998).

3. Trends in Translations from English to Gĩkũyũ

A study of some of the important works translated into Gĩkũyũ from English reveals texts such as hymn books and the catechism, (Cancel, 1993:288; Biersteker, 1994:131; Pugliese, 1995). The Bible first appears in books of individual gospels followed by the separate old then new testaments and finally by the entire Bible. Some other texts include a wide range of topics such as health, language, ethics and agriculture. An example is Ismael Mũrithi Elijah's translation of *Pig Management for the farmer*, published in 1961. Other important documents of colonial administration include *Local Government in Kenya* by Sydney Hubert La Fontaine in collaboration with J.H. Mower translated by Mathayo Njoroge in 1955.

These texts reflect a haphazard translation policy with the exception of the religious texts, which seem more consistently organised. For example, the individual books from the New Testament seem to have been translated consecutively.

In the case of literary texts, J.M. Kelsall translated an abridged version of Tolstoy's stories, including *The Imp and the crust* in 1931. Of interest is the translation both into Kiswahili and Gĩkũyũ of the book *Talking Woman* by Jean Kenyon MacKenzie, translated into Gĩkũyũ by Timothy Kagondu and published in 1957. The same year saw the publication of the story of *The three giants* by Humphrey Norman and Charles Richards, translated by Fred Kago. Other texts include John Bunyun's *Pilgrim's Progress (Rũgano rwa mũgendi)*.

One might be surprised by how few the number of translations from English to Gĩkũyũ are, although this seems consistent with colonial practice elsewhere and in relation to 'otherness' as is evident in the data presented by Venuti. He argues that: "English is the most translated language worldwide, but one of the least translated into (Venuti, 1995a: 12-14), a situation that identifies translation as a site for variation" (Venuti, 1998:10).[58] The fact, however, of the small corpus of works in Gĩkũyũ has to be borne in mind.

The fraught history and nature of the colonial experience in Kenya and the particular interaction between the Agĩkũyũ and the British may account for this. It could also be a reflection of the wider culture of the Empire, particularly through the class of colonisers and their own appreciation of culture. The Kenyan colonialists are not known for their contribution to literature let alone to translation. The few exceptions of writers would include Karen Blixen, who was neither male nor English and therefore quite exceptional for the period. What is surprising, however, is the limited number of works translated

into Gĩkũyũ. The post-colonial period has seen a continuation of this trend with government opting for English as the national lingua franca and not developing a policy on the other languages as we noted above. These have therefore not been part of the requirement of the National Curriculum although 'foreign' languages, including French, German, Hindi, Gujerati and Urdu continue to be offered as part of the examination curriculum. It is against such a backdrop that Ngũgĩ's work and its translation are significant, as will become evident below.

III. GENERAL OVERVIEW TO NGŨGĨ 'S WRITING AND ITS TRANSLATION

A. BACKGROUND

Ngũgĩ's decision to no longer write in English implies that his communication with his readers from other languages, including Kenyan ones and English, is in translation. In his now famous farewell to English, Ngũgĩ wrote: "This book, *Decolonising the Mind*, is my farewell to English as a vehicle for any of my writings. From now on it is Gĩkũyũ and Kiswahili all the way" (Ngũgĩ, 1986: xiv).

This is a new departure for Gĩkũyũ literature in general and for Ngũgĩ's reception in translation in particular, in what has been called an 'epistemological break'. In relation to his previous work in English, Ngũgĩ argues that:

> ...there were obvious contradictions though these were more apparent on the stage than on the script. In the opening line of *The Black Hermit*, the peasant mother is made to speak in a poetic language reminiscent in tone of T.S. Eliot.

The elders from the rural outpost come to town for their son the black hermit and speak in impeccable English. So does Kimaathi, in *The Trial of Dedan Kimathi*, even when addressing his guerrilla army of peasants and workers in court. Admittedly it is understood that the characters are speaking in an African language. But this is only an illusion since they are conceived in English and they speak directly in English. There are other contradictions too: these characters speak English but when it comes to singing they quite happily and naturally fall back into their languages. So they do know African languages! (Ngũgĩ, 1986: 43).[59]

Ngũgĩ'swriting in Gikũyũ and the translation of his work into several languages, including English begins with *Ngahika Ndeenda*, (1976) (*I will Marry when I want*) (1976) and *Maitũ Njũgira*, (1982) (*Mother Sing for Me* (unpublished translation), which follows the publication of, *Caitani Mũtharabaini* (1980) which was written in prison in 1978. It was translated by Ngũgĩ and published as *Devil on the Cross* (1980). The publication of these is followed by the children's books in the '*Njamba Nene*' series and the novel *Matigari ma Njirũũngi* (1986) (*Matigari,* 1989). These have been translated by Wangui wa Goro. Ngũgi has also been the editor of the Gĩkũyũ journal *Mũtiiri* since April 1994.

B. CHOICE OF AUTHOR AND TEXTS

Ngũgĩ's work covers a whole range of literary genre to date including poetry, plays and novels which create an exciting departure from the existing literature in Gĩkũyũ. I choose to work on Ngũgĩ's work and Gĩkũyũ literature for this and other reasons, the main one being the obvious one of my own involvement in the translation process and its evolution between English and Gĩkũyũ, the subject of the thesis.

Secondly, I am the translator of the larger part of his works from Gĩkũyũ to English as outlined above and I have developed some insights in translation theory and practice in the language areas through his work. The work is also in keeping with my interest in the development of African language literatures (Gĩkũyũ in particular). I hope that this work will add to a growing scholarship and contribute to knowledge in Kenya, Africa and beyond, where I believe misconceptions, strong stereotypes and lack of knowledge still abound.

I felt that some of the existing African literatures in European languages, though most of them very important, were not self-conscious of the translation process they were undergoing (Adejunmobi, 1998:163-182). The suggestion here is that these works which borrow heavily from African idiomatic expressions and experiences do disservice to African literature by playing at the highly dangerous game of hybridity in my view and experience. They could contribute to both cultures enormously if they were written in African languages, as is slowly emerging through debates. This debate of African language remains highly contested and is often referred to as the Achebe/ Ngũgĩ debate arising out of a conference held at the Commonwealth Institute in 1984.

It continued along the lines articulated with Ngũgi supporting Obi Wali's view on the importance of African languages and Achebe supporting the continued use of European languages. Achebe asserts that: "I feel that English will be able to carry the weight of my African experience. But it will have to be new English, still full of communion with its ancestral home but altered to suit its new African surroundings" (Achebe, 1975:62).[60]

The debate evolves around the question of what is and what is not African literature and is posed mainly around the neglect of literatures written in African languages as opposed to those written, in what Ngũgĩ refers to as Europhone languages as we noted above (see p.51). Obi Wali's key argument was that:

> The distinction between French and German literature, for instance, is that one is written in French and the other in German. All the other distinctions, whatever they may be, are based on this fundamental fact. What therefore, is now described as African literature in English and French is a clear contradiction and a false proposition just as "Italian literature in "Hausa" would be. There is little doubt that African languages will face inevitable extinction if they do not embody some kind of intelligent literature and the way to hasten this is by continuing in our present illusion that we can produce African literature in English and French (Wali, 1963:13-15).[61]

Other critics argue that this form of literature is a legitimate addition to world literatures in foreign language or in the liminal new linguistic space they occupy, but they are rarely accorded meaningful recognition as they are often thought to be second rate writings. The criticism that they are neither English nor African is also leveled at some works, particularly the famous case of Amos Tutuola's, *The palm-wine drinkard* and

there may be some merit in this argument (Obiechina, 1967). There are still not many scholars able to undertake research, translation and writing in African languages partly due to resources, but also owing to lack of knowledge, lack of desire and the genuine threats that can be posed for them in working on a "dissident" author or 'seditious' work. We note Chakava's plight below when he published Ngũgĩ's work. There is also lack of incentive towards African language literatures as observed earlier, though this is changing (Ngũgĩ, 1988; Ali, M.Mazrui and Alamin, A. Mazrui: 1998).

Ngũgĩ's work interests me due to its range in evolution boldness (its concerns for contemporary human values of justice and equality) and most importantly for its humour and experimentation with form. As an engaged writer, Ngũgĩ 's work concerns itself not only with the human condition, but also the context of writing, the evolution of culture and creativity in that process (Biersketer, 1993; Greenfield, 1993; Balogun, 1997). These themes are reflected in his search for appropriate forms of representation in his work (Ngũgĩ, 1986:82; Ngũgĩ, 1998:124).

Ngũgĩ s decision not to write in English any longer prompted my interest away from working in European languages. These were the basis of my formal study and hence his decision is linked to my own practice of translation at two levels. The first is as executor of the consequences of his decision not to write in English (Ngũgĩ, 1986).

Perhaps what is more important and relevant for this thesis as well as the above is the statement Ngũgĩ made in *Decolonising the mind* and which is related the language debates discussed above (see also Karega,1980; and Gunner, 1984).
The second reason is my own interest in exploring translation from 'postcolonial', 'mother-tongue' as Source Language (SL) to 'postcolonial' Target Language (TL). This

phenomenon has relevance to the translation of Ngũgĩ's work as will become evident in the case studies. The themes of Ngũgĩ's work lend themselves well to anti-hectorosexist translation and critique. He is also one of the few contemporary writers in Gĩkũyũ who is published in translation into several languages and who enjoys a large international readership across the world.

C. NGŨGĨ WA THIONG'O: HIS WORK AND HIS CONTEXT

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o was born in Kenya in 1938 and has had a well recognised literary career as dramatist, short story writer, novelist, essayist, political activist, social critic, poet and publisher. His first works emerged when he was an undergraduate at Makerere where his first published creative work appears in *Penpoint*. His published work spans the years 1960 to the present. Ngũgĩ's appreciation of depth and scope of cultural history, creativity and words is evident. Gĩkandi observes that:

> Politics and ideology are key concepts in the triangular relationship between Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, a novelist who is conscious of the potential conflict between the artist and the ideologue, 'the eternal problem involving the delicate transmutation of not just a political idea but a political programme into art' (Gikandi, 1991:134).[62]

Ngũgĩ's work itself, quite apart from the challenges of translation, is an interplay of issues of hectorosexism. The text is a complex convergence of issues of imperialism, colonialism, patriarchy, sexism, sexuality, class, gender, of Judeo-Christian, Gĩkũyũ traditional and religious beliefs, American and English values (Balogun, 1997: x).

By 1977, Ngũgĩ had stopped writing in English, which is when his book. then considered as his last in English, *Petals of Blood* was published. This is the year in which he was imprisoned (Ngũgĩ, 1986). He began writing plays such as *Ngahika Ndeenda* (*I will Marry when I want*), (both co-authored and translated with Ngũgĩ wa Mĩrii) and *Maitũ Njugĩra* (*Mother sing for me*) (untranslated). He also wrote the children's books in the Njamba Nene series including *Njamba Nene na mbathitora yake* (*Njamba Nene and his pistol*), *Njamba Nene na Mbathi I Mathagu* (*Njamba Nene and the Flying Bus*) and *Njamba Nene na Cibũ Kĩng'ang'i* (unpublished). These have been translated by Wangũi wa Goro.

By the time Ngũgĩ wrote his famous "farewell to English" statement, he had written the two novels, *Caitaani Mũtharabaini*, published in 1980 (later translated by himself as *Devil on the cross*) and *Matigari ma Njirũũngi* (*Matigari*) followed in 1986.

The translation of Ngũgĩ's works not only into English, but also into other languages including Kiswahili, the national language, sparked an interest in translation of Gĩkũyũ literatures (Ngũgĩ, 1986: 84-85).

Initially, due to the multilingual nature of Kenyan society, where most people are trilingual, it is almost expected that Ngũgĩ's work, would at the very least, be translated into Kiswahili. Kiswahili, one of the two national languages of Kenya, is a compulsory subject in the Kenyan curriculum. Some of Ngũgĩ's work, including works such as (*The Trial of Dedan Kĩmathi*) written in English and co-authored with Mĩcere Mugo but translated into Kiswahili as *Mzalendo Kimathi*, were part of the Kiswahili curriculum.

The staging of the play, *The Trial of Dedan Kīmaathi*, in exile in England altered the reception of his work here. Ngũgĩ was also accessible outside Kenya through lectures in various places during this period (Sicherman: 1990). His three children's stories were translated and two were published in Kenya in 1986 and 1988. *Matigari ma Njirũũngi* was published in 1986 and received a hostile reception in Kenya. Sicherman notes that it is "... supressed by government the following February after selling 3, 346 copies" (Sicherman: 1990; See also Chakava, 1988: 241). The English translation is published in the UK in 1989.

D. BACKGROUND TO *CAITANI MŨTHARABAINI (DEVIL ON THE CROSS)*

The tale of Waringa is narrated by the Gĩcaandi player, a 'reader'/griot or interpreter of knowledge passed down from generations (Ngũgĩ, 1998:124). It evokes traditional oral narrative strategies. This is also true for the subsequent text *Matigari ma Njirũũngi* (*Matigari*). The text is a story of Warĩĩnga and and the strange happenings in Ilmorog. The back-cover introduces it in the following way:

> Despair drives Warĩĩnga to leave Nairobi and to seek refuge in her home town of Ilmorog. She travels by matatu taxi with an invitation in her hand - an invitation to a feast of thieves organised by the devil. These thieves, who used to be local businessmen and capitalists, vie with one another to boast about how they became rich. This celebration of corruption in all its forms forces Warĩĩnga to acknowledge that her life had been nothing more than passive acceptance of corruption itself (Ngũgĩ, 1980: back-cover).[63]

Caitani Mūtharabainī was written in Kamiti Maximum Security Prison in Kenya on toilet paper and is his first novel published in Gĩkũyũ.1980 (see Ngũgĩ, 1981 & 1986:63). It is his first narrative of this kind in Gĩkũyũ. It is also the first modern text of its kind in Gĩkũyũ and therefore in translation in any other language (from Gĩkũyũ) and the first text that Ngũgĩ has translated by himself. Ngũgĩ remarks that it was the first novel of its kind in scope and size in Gĩkũyũ language.

Writing on the Gĩkũyũ text, Ogude notes: "Again, given prison conditions – without proper writing material and in isolation from the rest of society – Ngũgĩ wrote out of exile, he wrote from a situation of displacement and fragmentation" (Ogude, 1999:47). The text was translated by Ngũgĩ and the critic Gecaũ, in an interview has commented that the original and target texts read as separate texts (Sicherman, 1990, 32: footnote).

E. BACKGROUND TO *MATIGARI MA NJIRŨŨNGI (MATIGARI)*

Matigari ma Njirũũngi was written in exile in Gĩkũyũ. Ngũgĩ, in the preface to the second edition to the translation writes that:

> It was only in 1997, under the new atmosphere of the struggle for multiparty democracy, that it was re-issued in its Gĩkũyũ language original so that today the two versions can rub shoulders in the country. But still the novel and its characters are still more 'free' in exile in the double sense of both language and country than they are at home in the native country and language (Ngũgĩ, 1997: preface; Ngũgĩ, 1991).[64]

In *Matigari*, the gender of the protagonist is not specified, a fact which raises several interesting theoretical questions in both the original and target languages for translations particularly around hectorosexist discourses. Matigari is referred to as both 'he' and 'she' for the purpose of this research (see Langen on her discussion of 'constraints on non-sexist language' (*ibid*). In its themes, language and form, the text raises the Gĩkũyũ language and literature to a new level compared to the first novel, *Devil on the Cross*. Ngũgĩ stretches the translator's ability as the bridge between Gĩkũyũ and world cultures (Balogun, 1997:58). An allegorical satire, it is the second novel in Gĩkũyũ by Ngũgĩ following *Devil on the cross*.

The narrator in an inimitable style invites the readers/listeners to place the story in any context, time or space that they wish. It is a story of a person who returns from fighting the colonialist Settler Williams and his lackey John Boy. Matigari returns to claim her land produce only to find that these have been passed down to the next generation and that she cannot find his family. Nothing much has changed except the inclusion of a few blacks in the echelons of economic and political power. If anything, they have succumbed to the cultural life of the colonising Europeans. The status quo of what she had left behind seems to have continued.

Matigari cannot understand this given the several years of absence marking the struggle against colonial, white settler rule. Matigari means 'those-who-survived-the-bullets', but it has deeper significance (Biersteker, 1993:147-8). This is addressed in the case study and re-translation. The search for the house yields yet new contradictions, amongst them, dispossessed workers (men) and 'stray' children and women, living at the margins of civilisation as exploited workers, street children. prostitutes respectively.

These are symbolically represented by the three characters Mūriūki, Gūthera and Ngarūro wa Kīrīro, respectively.

Matigari travels the length and breadth of the country in search of truth and justice. Though doubting his sanity, Gūthera and Mūriūki, a women and young boy/man accompany her.

The authorities begin to hound Matigari and this further perplexes him. She seeks to defend himself physically by reaching out for weapons hidden earlier, but keeps restraining herself as he has now girded herself with a 'belt of peace'. The book ends with him being hunted along with Gūthera the woman and the young man, Mūriūki. Matigari and Gūthera disappear in the river and Mūriūki goes to look for the weapons that Matigari had earlier hidden under a tree in a symbolic gesture of continuity in the search for truth and justice.

Translated into English by Wangūi wa Goro, *Matigari* was published in 1991 for the English readership both inside and outside Kenya, the birth place of both the writer and translator. The book received a hostile reaction from the Authorities, both in Gīkūyū and English which included the withdrawal of all Ngūgī's books from sales and the syllabus. According to Chakava, the book was suppressed after the sale of 3,346 copies (Chakava, 1988:241). As seen above, the book was 'banned' in the original Gīkūyū and in the English translation. Both its author and translator Ngūgī continue to live in exile. The text rights were also sold for the American, Swedish, Danish, German, French and Japanese editions (*loc. cit.*).

Matigari, an 'oral' tale in written form draws heavily from the Gĩkũyũ oral tradition and hence most of the stylistic features such as repetition, refrain and the rhythm of the story etc. (Balogun, 1997:78-79).

The form of the narrative is communal in genre, which involves the participation of the listeners. Ngũgĩ has incorporated their voices into the written form in an interesting device that will be addressed in the case study, as it is significant in the assessment of how to translate authorial authority. This is referred to commonly as orature as seen earlier and is distinct for this reason (Ngũgĩ, 1987: ix).

IV. CHAPTER CONCLUSION

The chapter outlines the aim of the thesis as an exploration of the complexity of the multiple sites of oppression, which impinge on the positionality of writers and translators through the trope 'hectorosexism'. The chapter argues that these locations are mutable and fluid and this gives greater impetus as to why they deserve attention in non-axiomatic ways in exploration of Massardier-Kenney's view that the translator 'should attend to the inter-relationship of all the related factors' in a given text (1994). The research then proposes the exploration of the various strategies on offer using the trope hectorsexism and provides justification for doing so. This it proposes to do through case studies of the texts introduced in this chapter, *Caitani Mũtharabaini* (*Devil on the Cross*) and *Matigari ma Njirũũngi*, (*Matigari*) to test the validity of the hypothesis of altering paradigms in response to anti-hectorosexist theory and practice.

The thesis anticipates that such findings as outlined above may lead to necessary relocation/s of authors, translators and/or texts, towards qualitatively new centres of

culture. These would reflect the altering paradigms required by discourses that challenge hectorosexism as has been demonstrated in this introduction. The research also anticipates that these issues are complex and as pointed out by Venuti, difficult to implement.

CHAPTER TWO

HECTOROSEXISM IN TRANSLATION THEORY AND PRACTICE: CONTENTS AND DISCONTENTS

I.   INTRODUCTION

This chapter seeks to pay closer attention to the problem and challenge presented by hectorosexism introduced in chapter 1, in general. I pay close attention to the issues, strategies and solutions proposed by the 'separate' equality trope theories. I also pay close attention to what Bhabha calls 'reinscription' (1994:191-192) and what Ross calls the 'good' for translation (Ross, 1996:332) in the quest for what I have called the ethics for a post-hectorosexist possibility.

These concepts are explored by paying particular attention to ideas that have been put forward by Bhabha (1994) and Boyce Davies (1994) in relation to the location of culture and subjects respectively, and their relevance to what translation theorists have referred to as 'the cultural turn'. I argue that these ideas have received increasing acceptance as having a significant impact on translation theory and practice and in challenging the axiomatic paradigm.

Through this, I address the location of the equality theories and the strategies they propose as a way beyond the axiomatic paradigm. I pay close attention to the similarities and differences in the strategies in the equality tropes and address their usefulness. I pay particular attention to those that are linked to the case studies in chapters 3 and 4.

Robinson's methodology of *vertere* as a way out of the traditional paradigm and towards an ethics of translation is explored. This includes addressing what its implications are for the equality paradigms and hectorosexism in particular against a number of other strategies. I also explore wider issues which affect the location of translation in relation to the necessity for change, including globalisation, science, technology and migration. The final section explores ways of transcending what I consider to be an impasse for a posthectorosexist possibility. I conclude by demonstrating the relevance of this critical analysis and these strategies to the translation of Ngũgĩ's work into English in relation to the case studies in chapters 3 and 4.

A. THE CULTURAL TURN AND ITS IMPLICATION OF HECTOROSEXISM

1. Overview on the History and Complexity of Hectorosexism

As we noted above in chapter 1, the concept 'hectorosexism' explores oppressions and their interface, based on notions of inequalities that exist. We explain it further in the context of Western translation theory in the Anglophone tradition.

The notion of hectorosexism in translation faces a number of conceptual difficulties in general and specifically in translation theory and practice, and additionally, within and across the equalities discourses as will be demonstrated below. The key issues include the location of translation culture, the definition of subjects and their locations, the challenge of what theory is in relation to the challenge of practice, and the challenges within the equality theories. This includes the challenges of evolution such as moving space, globalisation, science, technology (communication and travel) and migration.

2. Definition of Translation Theory and Practice in the Context of Hectorosexism

We should begin by addressing what the definition of translation theory and practice is in relation to hectorosexism and the contexts in which it arises, and its relevance to the texts. This question immediately raises the challenge of what translation is supposed to do and where it is located in history, in 'general' (Benjamin, 1992:18-41) and in relation to hectorosexism. It is therefore important to point out from the outset that defining translation activity, its theories and practices is a complex matter and is far from being clear-cut (Hermans, 1985: 10). In my view, given its specificity, it cannot be generalised (Susam-Sarajeva, 2002:195). In fact, Nida states that it is not possible to discuss translation outside its cultural base, which is concretely rooted in language and additionally that languages are themselves part of culture. He describes these as "the total beliefs and practices of a society" (Nida, 1996:18). Each context requires its own theories and practices. A strong case has been made of the significance of specificity, time, location, subjects and context, which all affect the definition. Nida, for instance, points out that:

> Definitions of proper translating are almost as numerous and varied as the person who has undertaken to discuss the subject. This diversity is in a sense quite understandable; for there are vast differences in the materials translated, in the purposes of the publication, and the needs of the prospective audience. More over, live languages are constantly changing and stylistic preferences undergo continual modification. Thus, a translation acceptable in one period is often quite unacceptable at a later time (Nida, 2000:131).[1]

The notion of culture is itself contentious and this further signals the complex nature of the translation space in addition to the related issue of hectorosexism under consideration here. Snyder argues that the cultural context is the most difficult to describe and that additionally, it is the most difficult to deal with in relation to translation theory and practise (Snyder, 1990: 145). A number of broad definitions for culture exist, amongst them, Ngũgĩ's who sees it as that which:

> '...embodies those moral, ethical and aesthetic values, the set of spiritual eyeglasses, through which [human beings] come to view themselves and their place in the universe. Values are the basis of a people's identity, their sense of particularity as members of the human race. All this is carried by language. Language is the collective memory bank of a people's experience in history. Culture is almost indistinguishable from the language that makes possible its genesis (Ngũgĩ, 1986: 14-15).[2]

Several proponents such as Sherry Simon, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, Dale Spender, Julia Kristeva, Louis Gates, Jr., and bell hooks draw attention to the fact that language itself is problematic.

Some of the challenges of hectorosexism include analysing these 'moral, ethical and aesthetic values' in culture and language described by Ngũgĩ, but in addition, on how they impact on subjects and also their general and specific impact of translation theory and practice over time. The challenges also exist for the sign, meaning, meaning transfer and literature as global tenets of significance.

In fact, even theory itself is placed under scrutiny as a complex matter and this is evident in the work of proponents such as Toury. He points out that the term theory is used too generally around translation and urges for 'a reflection of the kind of questions, needs and answers that would be considered admissible'. He argues:

> The real question is not what the object 'is', so to speak, but rather what would be taken to constitute an object, in pursuit of a certain goal, such that any change of approach would entail a change of object. This is so even if they all superficially fall under the same heading: It is not the label that counts, but the concept it applies to. And concepts can only be established within conceptual networks; i.e., as a function of the network in its entirety (Toury, 1995:23).[3]

Toury's view concurs with Bannet's argument that:

> The translation in question, then, is not in a single, isolated, marginal and clearly delimited, activity. Indeed, it is hard to know where it begins or ends. Nor is it a simple or straightforward matter for, as you may have come to expect, translation is – or has become – a both/and category.[4]

> Translation is a both/and category most obviously, perhaps because for translation, there have to be at least two- two languages, two texts, two writers – one of whom allows the other to be heard. Despite the myths we constructed in the 19th and earlier 20th century about invisibility and instrumentality of the translator's role, there can be no translation without a translator to give signs of/from **another** language and another text" (Bannet: 1993:164) [emphasis mine].[5]

This "otherness" is explored as a legitimate space in its own right, a further issue which demonstrates translation's complexity (Toury, 1995, 23-35).

Bhabha raises an additional point which problematises what a translation is, by pointing out that:

> There is no perfect translation or appropriation possible, because such hybrid works contest the meaningfulness of culture as embodiment in idealised modes of representation or judgement or conduct. In addition, they question the notion that criticism is only possible based on an ideal aesthetic distance between the critical and the cultural object or objective (Bhabha, 1997:9).[6]

The metaphoric nature of translation only makes this more complex (Tymoczko, *op. cit*: 279).

These issues raise significant questions for translation theory and confirm that dichotomies of simplicity and purity versus complex and imperfect translations are hard to find. The arguments put forward are those of good or bad translations as we noted above. I extend the complexity that this poses to the question of equalities and hectorosexism as these have a significant bearing on the strategies available out of what I consider to be an impasse in the Anglo-American tradition as will become evident below.

B. LOCATION OF AXIOMATIC TRANSLATION CULTURE

The challenge in definition in relation to context demonstrates the fact that the location of culture is one of the key factors affecting theory and practice within the Anglo-American or more widely in the Western tradition (Lefevere: 1990, 14-17, Toury, *op. cit*: 28-31) under scrutiny. Historically, the predominant view noted in chapter 1, that I have called the 'axiomatic' paradigm is one of an assumed monolithic location of culture and subjects, including cultural practices and theories in both the source and target cultures and implicitly within the translation space. This view seems to presuppose an underlying value-free world of relationships pre-ordained to work in an 'accepted' hierarchical order, or beginning with faithfulness to a core which Venuti describes as 'Judeo-Christian monotheism, Enlightenment-humanism, cultural elitism' (*op. cit.*). He points out that such a view privileges the world-view of one culture or cultural positioning and its known ideological, literary, as well as canonical history (Venuti, 1995:53; Louis Gates, Jnr. 1996:13) or what Deleuze and Guattari call 'the majoritarian standard' (1987-106). This, however, does not tell us very much about the context of the texts, their status, or the status of the relationship between the source and target cultures. For instance, their impact and significance on a colonised society would be very different from that of the colonising society. In the American case, Morrison for instance, problematises 'race' in writing as follows:

These speculations have led me to wonder whether the major and championed characteristics of our national literature—individualism, masculinity, social engagement versus historical isolation; acute and ambiguous moral problematics; the thematics of innocence coupled with an obsession with

figurations of death and hell—are not in fact responses to a dark, abiding, signing African presence(1992).

Further, in a different context, the relationships may be different in relation to translation between a formerly colonised and a non-colonising community.

The recognition of the predominant view described above, however, underscores and draws attention to what several other emergent discourses across the disciplines have demonstrated in relation to the complexity of culture, its content, context and its impact on subjects in particular and in general and, most importantly, its location. It has enabled an unravelling of the myth of the monolithic stance in both source and target cultures particularly in relation to the equalities paradigms (Tymoczko, 1998:297). Robinson, for instance, describes this axiomatic stance in the following way:

> Ever since Augustine and Jerome, translation has been seen as primarily a technical problem: there are certain obvious difficulties to be overcome, syntactical divergences, conceptual and other semantic mismatches between languages, intention and interpretation, segmentation and so forth and one focuses attention on them, on the problems, on how to do it right. How to do it best. How to do it most effectively. One need never even ask what or who determined "rightness" or "bestness" or "most-effectiveness", because that question has already been answered. It is implicit in the institutional hegemony of a Christian concept of translation as conversion. The translator's task is to stay out of the way so that God can do his work on the TL reader. Stand between God and the TL reader, certainly, but invisibly: as an instrument, an introvert, a window. The purpose behind this is to help God (conceived as the

Ultimate SL Writer) convert the TL reader, but the purpose is so monolithic, so universally accepted, so hegemonically built into the entire ecclesiastical institution, that the translator need not even be aware of it, let alone be able to articulate it" (Robinson, 1991: 210).[7]

In the context of this work, I would argue that this is particularly true of translation theory in the 19th and 20th centuries in Western tradition where a convergence of ideas has come together for historical reasons to form this hegemonic tradition (Bannet, 1994:164-5). This may have arisen because of a convergence of events such as the industrial revolution, intensive labour relations based on class, race, slavery, sexuality and gender which have impacted on the organisation of the domestic and public spheres in hectorosexist contexts in particular ways. This may also be a culmination of the combination of over a thousand of years of feudal and conquest histories where religion and Christianity in particular have played a significant role in Western European thought in addition to social, economic and political organisation. The scale and development of the structures and organisation were also beginning to be replicated in the size and structure of resistance for civil and equal rights, whether they were based on gender, anti-slavery, anti-colonial, workers rights or ecological rights etc. This extends from the micro levels of previous centuries, to the current global reality. I argue, as do the equalities proponents that this counter action has implications for the theorisation of translation and the location of culture and subjects.

As I argued above the hectorosexist paradigm privileges a dominant culture and a dominant cultural positioning. Bhabha describes this as "...a narrative strategy" and "an apparatus of power" which he argues produces a "continual slippage into analagous or even metonymic categories like people, minorities or cultural difference".[8]

Niranjana has been a key proponent in drawing attention to the ideological issues in relation to colonialism that are also applicable to hectorosexism in general:

> My central concern here is not to elaborate on the battle for "history" now being staged in Euro-American theory but to ask a series of questions from strategically "partial" perspective —that of an emergent postcolonial [read posthectorosexist] practice willing to profit from the insights of post structuralism, while at the same time demanding ways of writing history in order to make sense of how subjectifications operates (Niranjana, 1992:36-37).[9] [Emphasis mine].

Niranjana contexualises colonial axiom in similar ways to Bhabha's critique, by arguing that:

> The concept of translation that grounds western metaphysics is the same one that presides over the discourse of orientalism. Neither is prepared to acknowledge, in its humanism and universalism, the heterogeneity that contaminates "pure meaning" from the start, occluding also the project of translation (*ibid*).[10]

She states that "...the vocabulary of truth and falsehood, adequacy and inadequacy shows that current theory of translation still operates under the aegis of transcendental signified" (*ibid*), which here I read as hectorosexism.

Mehrez also points out that:

> The emergence and continuing growth on the world literary scene of postcolonial anglophone and francophone literatures from the ex-

colonies as well as the increasing ethnic minorities in the First World metropoles are bound to challenge and redefine many accepted notions in translation theory which continue to be debated and elaborated within the longstanding traditions of western "humanism" and "universalism" (1992:121).[11]

These views find support in Smidt's argument where he claims that:

What one finds is a fundamental shift, a topological shift, that calls into question several long-standing traditional concerns and presumptions of philosophers: that thought is not bound to any particular language, that language is to be understood as a vehicle to an abstract and non-linguistic world, that the language and style of philosophic reflections and texts are largely a matter of secondary importance and that philosophy has more in common with logical sciences than it does with modes of literature and art. This shift, the displacement of philosophic images and allegiances, reaches into the roots of Western tradition and into the very notion of "tradition" at all. That is why some of the efforts to give voice to the self-understanding of the thought animating this turn describe it as essentially "post-post-structural," "post-metaphysical," "postmodern" (Smidt, 1990:6).[12]

This shift exposes the privileging of the axiomatic paradigm which has existed and often masked assumptions of 'universal' values such as those based on ethnocentricity or class or other such 'justifiable' often unstated underpinnings as we have noted (Simon, 1996: 164). Simon challenges such broad sweeping notions of universalism by arguing that:

Those spaces which were identified as universal (the great humanist tradition, the canon of great books, the public space associated with democratic communication, the model of culture which sustained the ideal of citizenship) have been exposed as being essentially expressive of the values of the white, European and middle-class male. The universality attributed to these vectors of culture turns out to be supported by longstanding processes of exclusion and by the silencing of differences (Simon, 1996:166).[13]

I would argue that in the context of hectorosexism in the Anglophone tradition these processes of exclusion include values such as Anglo-American-ness, European-ness, African-ness, whiteness, blackness, proximity, universality, truth able-bodied-ness, bourgeois-ness, religion, masculinity, femininity, heterosexuality, gayness etc, as sites of purity and as hegemonic sites for the lack of or exercise of power and performance (Maier, 1998). For instance the question of what Africa or Europe are, leaves the wider questions of theory and practice open to debate. Schipper's argument which is relevant here is that it is important to "... identify the master's (male as well as female) voice, to recognize where 'the will-to-truth' masks the 'will-to-power' which pervades all discourse" (Schipper, 1993:47). In the context, Williams' description of these factors as the existence of objective, "unmediated voices of the 'the Idealised Other' by which those transcendent, universal truths find expression and which provide us with internalised censure or externalised approval" has resonance for me. She gives examples of terms such as the Noble Savage, The Great White Father, Good-Hearted Masses, The Real American, The Rational Consumer and the Arm's-Length Transactor (Williams, 1991: 9). She argues that these are posited as the "... idealized other whose gaze provide us either with internalized censure or externalized approval; internalized

paralysis or externalised legitimacy; or internalized false consciousness or externalized claims of exaggerated authenticity".[14]

The shift therefore calls for an analysis and reanalysis of those values posited as absolute universal truths and raises the possibility of addressing 'other', sites of enunciation in translation. Simon argues that the locus of translation is one where the positionality of enunciation is foregrounded, than any other writing activity (*op.cit*).

As is evident from these descriptions of what the shift compels, the key debates relate primarily to the distance that the target text and culture attains vis-à-vis the source text and culture and subjects, and hence, the context in which translation theory, practice and subjects are located (Penrod, 1993:39; Simon 1992:160).

This question of the location of culture and subjects is a key one because as Tymoczko's observes, it is a matter of power. She argues: "Translation is central to the interface of cultures in the world, part of ideological negotiations and cultural struggles, a form of intellectual construction and creation, a metonym in the exercise of cultural strength: it is a matter of power" (298), (see also, Bassnett and Lefevre, 1990: ix). Thus the arrival of the 'cultural turn' on the translation scene is an important intervention and departure as it acknowledges the presence of these axiomatic paradigms around power and the challenges they face and this is significant for hectorosexism.

B. THE CULTURAL TURN

This major shift in theory in general and translation in particular is a move away from the axiomatic position described above and which Bassnett considers as the formalist phase. This shift has been identified as 'the cultural turn' in the 1990's. The particularly significant input of the 'Manipulation School' acknowledges translation as a primary rather than a secondary activity as had been argued previously and one where power is exercised (Snell-Hornby, 1995:24-25; Hermans, 1985:8). This departure allows considerations of broader issues including "...text, history and convention" (Bassnett 1989:123) in translation theory and practice. The emergent voices advocate a shift from this axiomatic discourse, which they argue belies absolutist notions of truth and falsehood (see Niranjana above). What this means is that the sustainability of the axiomatic arguments is challenged.

The key arguments of the 'cultural turn' as we have noted above, is against the axiomatic or 'universal' paradigm which I would argue is based primarily a false premise as it impinges on a whole series of factors affecting culture and subjects. This includes factors such as language, subjectivity (Venuti, 1995:39) identity, location, distance, purpose, narrative, genre, form, history, process, text, author, translator, function and several others as we have observed in the chapter 1. I will return to these below in relation to the texts.

The appraisal therefore of the locations of practice and theory becomes significant for contemporary and future practice and particularly in relation to hectorosexism as will become evident below and in the case studies.

In Bassnett's view, this involves addressing the manipulation which takes place in relation to ideology to achieve a specific end, such as how a text is selected, the role of the translator, editor, publishing house, patronage, the strategies open to the translator, the context of translation and the anticipated context of reception (Bassnett and Lefevere, 1990:123). This is of relevance to the case studies, particularly in the case of *Devil on the Cross*.

The contribution of the cultural turn finds support from many interdisciplinary quarters and focuses attention on the fact that translation has played a key role in the shaping of societies. This shift is well reflected across the disciplines by critics and proponents such as Niranjana (*op. cit*), Bhabha (*op. cit*), Tymoczko (*op.cit*), Bassnett and Trivedi, *op.cit*, Trivedi (op. cit), Boyce Davies (*op.cit*), in relation to postcolonial studies, cultural studies critics Minh-ha (*op cit*), Hall (*op.cit*), Anzaldua (1981, 1991), Mohanty (1998), Spivak (1992), Said (*op.cit*), as well as by several others in ethnicity, women and gender studies. These include specific studies in translation by feminist critics such as Chamberlaine (1998), von Flotow (1997), Sherry Simon (1996) Kadish and Massardier-Kenney (1996). Other critics include Holmes (*op. cit*), Bassnett (*op.cit*), Lefevere (*op.cit*), Spivak, Derrida (1984), Williams (*op. cit*), hooks (*op. cit*), Massardier-Kenney (1997), Masingale Bell (1995) and Smidt (Op. cit). Others have focused attention on colonial relations, empire, postcoloniality and include Spivak, Bhabha (Op.cit), Maier (Op.cit), Dingwaney (Op.cit), Sengupta (Op.cit), Venuti(Op.cit), Chefitz (Op.cit), Robinson (Op.cit), Trivedi (Op.cit) and Niranjana (Op.cit) and Rafael (op. cit) amongst others. Yet several others who have pushed the debate further by challenging heterosexist insights from lesbian and gay perspectives and include Harvey (1998), Mira (1998), Diaz-Diocaretz (1985) Butler (1990), von Flotow (*op.cit*), Keenaghan (*op.cit*), Lorde (*op.cit*), Weeks (1995), White (1994) and Boyce Davies

(1994) amongst others across the disciplines. These insights have enabled insights away from the universalist model to more specific and/or generalised equalities sites, and is evident in contemporary theory.

Simon argues that:

> ...to study translation in a national context is to become aware of the multiplicity of intersecting functions and discourses in which it participates. The humanist vision of translation as peaceful dialogue amongst equals, as the egalitarian pursuit of mutual comprehension, is only one of a number of paradigms, which account of the dynamics of translation. If translation is taking on increased importance today as a way to conceptualize processors of cultural transmission, it is because we recognise that it participates in many different ways in the generation of new forms of knowledge, new textual forms, new relationships to language (Simon, 1992:160).[15]

The work of the 'cultural turn' critics challenges the ideological positionings in relation to what translation is and therefore impacts on what Bhabha calls 'narrative strategies' which contribute in part to meaning. This is within the complex trajectory through which translation is resultant and from which the communication process and means of transfer of ideas, meanings and reception are perceived between two cultures (Nida, 1986: 13; Tymoczko:279).

C.THE CULTURAL TURN AND THE NEW LOCATION OF CULTURE

This shift calls for an appraisal of what Bhabha has questioned as the location of culture. Bhabha's position, for instance, which concurs with Venuti's view that these selections take place in ideologically charged spaces as we saw above, 'in actu' rather than 'in situ' (see above), is significant. He argues that a rupture occurs in both axiomatic practice, but also the performative space of axiom, challenging not only its articulations, but the mode, means and process of this performance. He argues that these produce a new locus of articulation, which he calls a 'permanent exile'. One can of course argue that this is true of all culture and demonstrable through the various dimensions such as that of the hectorosexist moment which is the subject of these explorations. This shift in the location of culture is supported by Olsen's warning of the danger of "...perpetuating – by continued usage – entrenched centuries – old oppressive power realities, early on incorporated in language" (Olsen, *cit. in* Kolodney, 1992:224).

What is not clear however, is the nature of this locus/i, nor its/their moment as it/these can be seismic and therefore more visible or subtle (Falk, op.cit). For instance in the case I am making of the equalities issues, their simultaneity may be the catalyst which produces several relatively smaller ruptures to axiom, but in their totality might provided the quantum shift for the transformational performativity or vice-versa. The differences between them may also be the cause of their unmaking. For instance, our understanding of, or transformations in gender, race or gay issues in their specificity may raise clarity or conflict in 'other'sites. For instance, moments such as those of the civil rights movement, the women's liberation movement, or the end of apartheid seem to provide relatively large shifts for the performative space of culture on their own, and

also draw attention to 'other sites' of inequality even while not articulating these. Their creativity, pace, society's receptiveness to them and several other factors may or may not be the factor that causes hectorosexism to implode and explode. The recent issue of the appointment of a gay Bishop into the Anglican Church in the UK and his subsequent withdrawal and the tension this issue is causing at present between the 'mother church' and the 'outpost' churches outside England, particularly in Africa and within the church movement, signal the difficulties that these discourses face. Further, the tensions are reverberating not only within the church or amongst people of the Christian faith, but across local and global communities who are affected by gay issues in particular and equality issues in general. The same society has allowed the civil registration of same sex couples. This demonstrates that some of the contradictions which arise out of the particularity of each of the movements or of the movements in relation to each other could cause the quantum 'leap' to succeed or falter.

Bhabha refers to the 'temporal split' or 'time lag' that occurs through this difference and he gives the example of the presence of the English book in India where he argues that:

> It is to introduce into another locus of inscription and intervention, another hybrid, 'inappropriate' enunciative site, through that temporal split – or time lag – that I have opened up (specifically in chapter 9) for the signification of postcolonial [read posthectorosexist] {emphasis mine} agency. Differences in culture and power are constituted through the social conditions of enunciation: the temporal caesura, which is also the historical transformative moment, when a lagged space opens up inbetween the intersubjective 'reality of signs... deprived of subjectivity' and the historical development of the subject in order of social symbols" (Bhabha, 1994: 242).[16]

In an example of the English book as metaphor, he poses the question as follows:

> How can the question of authority, the power and presence of the English be posed in the interstices of a double inscription? I have no wish to replace an idealist myth – the metaphoric English book – with a historic one – the colonialist project of English civility. Such a reductive reading would deny what is obvious, that the representation of colonial authority depends less on a universal symbol of English identity than on its productivity as a sign of difference. Yet in my use of 'English' there is a transparency of reference that registers a certain obvious presence: the Bible translated in Hindi, propagated by Dutch Native catechists, is still the English book; a Polish émigré, deeply influenced by Gustave Flaubert, writing about Africa, produced an English classic. What is there about such a process of visibility and recognition that never fails to be an authoritative acknowledgement without ceasing to be 'spacing' between desire and fulfilment, between perpetuation and its recollection... [a] medium [which] has nothing to do with a center' (D, p:212)? (Bhabha, *op. cit*:108).

He concludes that:

> I would like to suggest that these crucial moments in English literature are not simply the crisis of England's making. They are also the signs of a discontinuous history, an estrangement of an English book. They mark the disturbance of its authoritative representations by the uncanny forces of race, sexuality, violence, cultural and even climatic differences which emerge in the

colonial discourse as the mixed and split texts of hybridity. If the appearance of the English book is read as a production of colonial hybridity, then it no longer commands authority. It gives rise to a series of questions of authority, that in my bastardised repetition, must sound strangely familiar.[17]

Was it a badge, an ornament – a charm – a proprietary act? Was there any idea at all connected with it. It looked startling in this black neck of the woods, this bit of white writing from beyond the seas.

In repeating the scenario of the English book, I hope I have succeeded in representing colonial difference. It is the effect of uncertainty that afflicts the discourse of power, an uncertainty that estranges the familiar symbol of English 'national authority' and emerges from its colonial appropriation as the sign of its difference (Bhabha, op. cit: 113).[18]

This point aptly demonstrates the power of manipulation where he maintains that translation cannot be viewed as a neutral or innocent activity (Robinson, 1999:200). It also demonstrates the importance of positionality between the source language(s)/culture(s) and the subject(s), be it that of the reader (translator or reader proper) and their positionality in relation to the target language and culture (Penrod, 1993:39).

This also impacts on the additional factors such as the efficiency/proficiency of the translator, knowledge, identity, subjectivity and the reception attitudes, patronage and attitudes to 'subcultures'. The question of power, referred to above, is also significant. Additional factors include consideration of values, ideology, taste, knowledge, skill,

tools, history, education, cultural exposure, attitude, acculturation, culture and identity as carriers of values. Some of these values may or may not be tangible or measurable in an empirical and scientific sense or immediately. These could pose as psychological (Bell, 1998:190), as history, knowledge or ignorance; they could pose as tradition, denial or cultural memory, and are therefore more difficult to glean owing to their immediacy.

Further, this in-between space (Maier and Dingwaney, 1998) of translation, raises pertinent questions in relation to the contradictions in those 'moral, ethical and aesthetic values' described by Ngũgi above, within each of the cultures, i.e. source and target, relating to matters such as religion, ideology, tradition or transition and movements between and across the cultures concerned e.g. colonial relations, or gender relations in a given situation. The two key issues therefore are, firstly how does the translation activity deal with the tensions arising around hectorosexism within each of the cultures, i.e. source and target (as they do not exist in harmony in their base cultures), and secondly, how are the hectorosexist issues resolved in translation? I will return to this issue in the case studies below.

Bhabha argues "Cultural translation desacrializes the transparent assumptions of cultural supremacy and that very act, demands a contextual specificity, a historical differentiation within the minority positions". Niranjana also posits the notion of double inscription in the colonial context which I extend here in general as a multiple inscription in relation to hectorosexism. Critics such as Derrida, Cixous, Kristeva, Moi, Saussure, Irigaray, Hall, and Louis Gates Jnr. also describe différance, meaning both difference and deferral where they argue that meaning is never truly present but is only constructed through the potentially endless process of referring to other absent

signifiers. Moi argues that the 'next' signifier can in a sense be said to give meaning to the "previous one and so on ad infinitum" (Moi, 1985:106) and this is of relevance to this work.

The above arguments demonstrate the importance of the growing consensus that seems to now exist within the cultural movement that theory and practice are spaces of contestation which necessitate addressing the complexities which arise in such contexts. As noted, Massardier-Kenney argues that: 'all interrelated issues should be taken into account'.

The fundamental question therefore is whether there is scope for self determinacy, for 'others' to hear or speak, for a recovery of objects lost in the haystack of axiom, or lost through the looting and 'othering' that occurs in that hegemonic space? It raises the question of whose right it is therefore, to determine who speaks, where they speak from, how they speak and what they say. More importantly, it raises the question of whether their voices are heard. Spivak's question whether 'the subaltern can speak' therefore, remains critical against this backdrop of legitimacy and power in the hegemonic space. This has become a theoretical mantra with regard to criticism of the axiomatic paradigms which ignore or neglect the presence of these significant 'other' enunciatory positions such as the one described above by Minh-Ha, in chapter 1, whether wilfully or otherwise. We will return to this question in the case studies and the concluding part of this thesis. What we can argue here therefore, is that the embodiment of those "moral, ethical and aesthetic values" described by Ngũgĩ, is not clear-cut given that the complex translation space which exists in the hectorosexist context.

D. MIGRATION OF THE SUBJECT

The additional question of the location of the subject within this contested cultural space adds a further dilemma to the translation landscape and has further implications for translation. Above, we addressed the significance of subjectivity, identity, agency and will, given that translation takes place in ideologically charged social-cultural and political contexts in which as Robinson argues people of flesh and blood are involved. The equalities theories have demonstrated that their sites of articulation and practice differ from the axiomatic paradigm either by enacting resistance, e.g. through silence, through choice of text, but also the mode of articulation, as has been so aptly demonstrated by feminist translators (Massardier-Kenney, 1997: 55-69). They introduce new strategies such as those introduced in writing with notions of 'écriture féminine' (De Lotboitinière-Harwood (1991) and similar strategies which I will call 'traducture'[19] which can be extended to the emergent strategies from the equalities paradigms, i.e. 'traducture feminine', 'traducture Africaine', 'queer traducture', etc. These strategies are pertinent in dealing with the issues of power and authority as they raise questions about the translation subject on the translation continuum i.e. editor, translator, reader and bookseller and inherently questions about the product and positionality. This stance supports the view of proponents such as Lacan (1977:284) and Hall who argue that representation cannot be based on language and discourse alone and that the subject of discourse cannot be outside discourse. Hall argues that the "...subject cannot stand outside power knowledge as its source and author' (1997, *ibid*: 55).

This idea is supported by Diaz-Diocaretz's observation that the subject is not a *tabla rasa* and this notion can be extended to all subjects on the continuum of translations. In fact, Hall, in reference to Foucault's work argues that "Subjects may produce particular

texts but they are operating with the limits of the episteme, the discursive formation, the regime of truth, of a particular period and culture" (Hall, *op.cit*: 55). Further, the impact of intertextuality (Louis Gates Jnr: op. cit): in these new genre are significant in the shaping of the subject (reader, publisher, translator) and communities in the shifting landscape of signification addressed earlier (Barthes, 1979; Derrida: 1978; Irigaray: 1985; Kristeva, 1989:328; and Louis Gates, Jnr.:1996). This will become evident for its significance on the case studies. This is more evidently so in the diminishing spaces through technology, migration, and globalisation and ever wider circles of intercultural interactions, locally, nationally and internationally in the so-called time-space compression (Cronin, 1998:151).

Niranjana for instance, above, identifies the locus of articulation as a 'Euro-American' one (*op.cit*), inherently discussing the subject's culture, their positioning, their subjectivities, identities and agency (Bhabha, 1994:171-197) in relation to articulation in time and context. This is significant yet complex in a context where I am arguing the case that society is not made up of monolithic or homogeneous subjects or cultures and that this is significant not only for the individual subject, but for the communities of 'subject cultures' or what Vossler calls language communities (Vossler, 1932). We also noted above the complexity arising out of von Flotow's use of the term 'feminst translator'. The transition in transglobal transformation calls for greater attention to be paid to these shifting cultural and social formations of meaning and identity, but also the inherent implications of this on theory and practice. Knowledge is also universal and not limited to colour, sexuality, class, ability or gender. This stance reinforces the view of 'cultural turn' critics who inherently posed a problem for the notion of universality espoused by the axiomatic school, as we saw above, in relation to 'standardisation', 'homogeneity' or 'fixity' in relation to culture as a system or systems of values, even

within (a) perceivably recognisable community or communities. This case has been argued by postmodernist, feminist, postcolonialists, black and queer critics such as Boyce Davis *op.cit:* 154), de Lauretis, (1990:15) Anderson, (1983:68), Yuval Davis (1994), Butler (1990), Spivak (1999) and Bhabha (*1994*).

Mudimbe who questions the formation of identities in relation to their authorisation supports this view. He dismisses the "authorisation" of 'communities' and their hierarchies by asking the fundamental question. "…who is in charge of defining "ethnicities" "identities", "differences"? Where could one find them as pure essences, bearing witness to their own originary ways?" (Mudimbe, 1994:54). Foucault also argues, "The individual is not to be conceived as a sort of elementary nucleus, a primitive atom, a multiple and inert material on which power comes to fasten or against which it happens to strike" (1978:98).

On the other hand, Mudimbe's view on the material impact myths have on individuals is supported by Volosinov's contention that all meaning is contextual, (cited in Moi: 157) and secondly that "…The ideological chain stretches from individual consciousness to individual consciousness, connecting them together". He argues that: "Signs emerge, after all, only in the process of interaction between one individual consciousness and another. An individual consciousness itself is filled with signs. Consciousness becomes consciousness only once it has been filled with ideological (semiotic) content, consequently, only in the process of social interaction" (*ibid*).[20] He further goes on to state that, "…consciousness itself can arise and become a viable fact only in the embodiment of the sign", here signs taken to mean culture and identity (Volosinov, 2000:41).[21]

Conversely, the 'universal' formulations of culture and the particularised subjectivities and identities (collective and individual) which have been borne out of the hectorosexual situation and its reverberations, echoes and reflections, signal the 'return' to idealised individual and collective identities within the new global dispensation of television, internet, multilingualism and travel. The two simultaneously unattainable identities are sought due to the challenges raised by the 'new' and troubling identities that individuals and societies (communities) have to grapple with within this challenging moment of the cultural turn where the wheel has only begun to turn. The subjects' physical, real and emotional locations and their relationship to power are therefore important factors in relation to identification and therefore translation theory and practice.

Boyce describes these as hyphenated spaces of 'place, location, dislocation, memberment, dis-memberment, citizenship, alienness, boundaries, barriers, transportations, peripheries, cores and centers'. She argues that:

> It is about positionality in geographic historical, social, economic, educational terms. It is about positionality in society based on class, gender, sexuality, age, income. It is also about relationality and the ways in which one is able to access, mediate or reposition oneself, or pass into another spaces given certain other circumstances (153).

The question here is whether it is possible to establish ethical and moral parameters for the new 'hybrid' or 'hyphenated' identities and what their implications are for posthectorosexist translation theory and practice. More importantly, whether the 'turn'

will be complete and what new loci of power will evolve? We shall return to this point in the conclusion.

E. OTHER ISSUES: GLOBALISATION, MIGRATION, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

In addition to the question of hyphenated 'identities' resultant from new global dispensations and their impact on identity, agency and subjectivity, further and similar challenges are posed by technology and science, through electronics and eugenics. This presents real shifts in meaning including naming and identification of the real/virtual, artificial intelligence or modification of the genetic structures of plants and animals (such as robotics, GM crops or clones) which are quite altered in reality in our present time and/or immediate future. The quantum leaps presented by the existence of the likes of Dolly the cloned sheep (now dead) or cloned humans and the mouse with a human ear on its back have already demonstrated this. Are they translations or the real thing? How real or unreal is the virtual world which yields material responses and what can be extrapolated from this for translation? Such developments pose real issues for hectorosexist positioning which argues in 'pure' terms within one or two cultures. The axiomatic paradigm seems to be too rigid to accommodate the transformations demanded by change, whether wrought by changing human societies, wilful or stray transplants, the compositions of those societies, their ideas, meaning, understanding, but also the challenges of science and technology.

Additionally, globalisation (Singh: 1996), migration, immigration policies and travel yield greater matrices of communities and identities than has hitherto been known due

to facilities in communication, media, 'cosmopolitanisation', urbanisation and travel. Translation therefore is a necessity of present realityThe hyphenated individuals described by Boyce Davies of the 'migrant' subject with the expression 'mestiza consciousness' are therefore important to take into account in working out an ethics for translation theory and practice in the transformed global space.

In places like Kenya, many 'Kĩkũyũ' people speak at least three languages and in urban areas, four, including the Kenyan Creole Sheng. This 'multilingualism' is common to all the Kenyan nationalities. These communities can no longer genuinely lay claim to monolingualism or bilingualism. This heteroglossia carries languages and values in complex ways and is manifest of the migrating subject described by Boyce Davies in their localities world-wide, whether they move physically or not. For instance, many of us identify as Kenyan in a way our great-grand parents and grandparents could not have possibly done owing to travel, education (e.g. studying foreign languages), reading, colonisation and changes in communication such as the advent of the radio, television (colour television), the cinema, and the internet. This means that even the notion Kenyan-ness is under challenge to change and transform its meanings on a daily basis and calls for re-examination in relation to all theory and practice. This includes translation theory, practice, and the case studies under scrutiny here.

II. IMPACT OF EQUALITY THEORIES ON HECTOROSEXISM

A. OVERVIEW

Given the above discussions on the nature and location of culture and subjects and their impact on the cultural turn, I would argue that the equality theories and practice need to pay closer attention in their strategies in relation to hectorosexism. I would argue that

one would expect several of the equalities issues to share a number of commonalities and divergences in their responses and approaches to hectorosexism. We have also noted the complexity and seeming contradictions around the shifting subject and cultures and, in addition, the tensions around agency and the wider social will for change. We noted above that location, history and context impinge differently on the subject and culture and that any of a number of permutations or transformations could alter the landscape within an indeterminate period and have an impact on theory and practice. We have also noted that it is important to take all 'interrelated issues' on board given the development of power which produces differentiated hectorosexist inequalities in different cultures at different moments for sometimes different reasons.

In light of these complexities, I explore some potential commonalities and disjunctures that exist or can exist across the equalities strategies and the light they shed on the possibility and potential of a post-hectorosexist paradigm.

B. RESONANCE AND DISSONANCE IN THE PATTERNS OF OPPRESSION IN THE EQUALITIES PARADIGMS

1. Resonance in the Patterns of Oppression

As can be expected, given the broad debate raised by the above challenges, the equality theories seem to share a number of commonalities in their reception of oppression and their approaches to resisting the hegemonic frame and reflecting the shifting landscape. This is evident in examples gleaned from a wide range of interdisciplinary research including those already mentioned above. These commonalities should be considered as non-exhaustive owing to the complex and ever-shifting nature of culture and

subjects, and the factors such as war and scientific practices such as eugenics, which may be placing new demands on our understanding and definitions.

Addressing key patterns, does, however, provide a useful basis upon which to begin an assessment of how critics and practitioners have responded to them. This is the case in relation to translation theory and practice and the impact of the strategies and models they have proposed and, further, ways in which they can respond in the future. For instance, some of the features common to all the equality theories in their resistance to the hegemonic frame include claims against issues such as marginalisation, concealment, repression, othering, stereotyping, caricature, distortion, stereotype, containment, disfigurement, rejection (defacement) and censorship. This includes confiscation/destruction, imprisonment, jailing, exile, banning, torture and death at various times in history, some of which I address below.

JanMohamed in relation to colonialism writes that, "This typical facet of humanistic closure requires the critic systematically to avoid an analysis of the domination, manipulation, exploitation and disfranchisement that are involved in the construction of any cultural artefact or relationship" (JanMohamed 1954:78). The construction of identities, culture and history, theory and practice based on arguments of pseudo-scientific and pseudo-legal nature or religion set the backdrop of modern colonial hectorosexist theorisation in this era. People's inferiority is posited as an absolute unchangeable essential truth, such as the inferiority of black people, or the 'abnormality' or madness of disabled or gay people.

As argued above, these oppression are closely related, or occur in concert with each other (as in the case of African women as argued earlier), yet I have decided to distill

them into separate categories where possible in order to be able to apply them to existing theory and practice and in the case studies. This approach also allows an assessment of their usefulness in counter-discourses and practices.

a.   *Marginalisation and Concealment and Repression*

One of the responses that the equality theories have identified is marginalisation. This includes factors such as concealment and repression to varying degrees. A number of key proponents, such as Boyce Davies (1994:153), Louis Gates, Jnr. and Hall, provide a view on the notions of 'signifying' and the 'gaze' respectively in representation and the ideological direction this is given by positionality. Hall invites us to look at a picture of Andre Brouillet's, 'A clinical lesson at La Salpetière (given by Charcot), in 1887 (Hall, 1997:52) and draws attention to a number of significant factors in the moment of production of knowledge and meaning by asking a series of critical questions. These include questions about centring the subject, the kinds of knowledge being produced, relations of power, the gaze of the onlookers (here those in the picture, but implicitly the viewer of the picture), the age and gender of the subjects etc. It also includes the relationship of the viewers to each other in the frame, the message that the patient's body conveys, and the sexual connotations of the image etc. These questions of positionality are relevant to translation theory and practice and we will return to them in the case studies.

In another example in relation to Ophelia's suffering, Kolodney succinctly argues that our attention is focussed on Hamlet, confirming Sherry's view above about the position from which we are supposed to view (read) and empathise. She argues that: "It is after all, an imposition of high order to ask the viewer to attend to Ophelia's suffering in a

scene where, before, he'd always so comfortably kept his eye fixed firmly on Hamlet" (Kolodney, 1993:226).[22]

Maier discusses similar concerns in translation (1995:5) in her translation of Octavio Armand's work where her search for the mother figure in the text and the absence of the mother are causes for concern.

A similar example of marginalisation exists in relation to language and the postcolonial context where Cronin argues that:

> If translation has traditionally suffered from lack of visibility then there is a sense in which translators working in minority languages [read hectorsexist language] [emphasis mine] are doubly invisible at a theoretical level. First, there is the general failure to include theoretical contributions from minority language in translation theory anthologies. ... Second, there is not always a willingness to acknowledge that translation perspectives from the point of view of minority languages will not always be those of major languages. Advocacy of non-fluent, refractory, exoticizing strategies, for example, can be seen as a bold act of cultural revolt and epistemological generosity in a minor language, but for a minority language, fluent strategies may represent the progressive key to their very survival (1998:147).[23]

At the extreme end, such margnalisations include acts of censorships of all kinds, some which are taken as "commercial" decisions, or in more extreme forms, in the banning and burning of books or the killing, jailing, torture and exiling of authors, publishers and translators to silence their voices. In chapter 1, we noted the banning of Ngũgĩ's

work in both Gĩkũyũ and in Swahili and English translations and its removal from the Kenyan curriculum (English medium), as well as his exile. These have served to marginalise him to a whole generation of Gĩkũyũ /Kenyan readers, some who were born in 1982 when he went into exile and would now be in their twenties. This exemplifies Cheyfitz's view in relation to imperialism where he argues that "…imperialism historically has functioned and continues to function by substituting the difficult politics of translation another politics that represses these difficulties" (Cheyfitz, 1991: xvi).[24]

This includes the total or partial negation and denial of the existence of the 'rest'/others of the world; a world centred on the "we", "us" and which views 'all else' as the 'other'. Thus, marginalisation can also take the form of diversion, by addressing say an 'orientalist' discourse rather than dealing with 'the Orient' for its real heritage and culture, as we have seen above (. In this sense, I am critical of Venuti's use of the term 'minoritising' by which he centres or re-centres a 'hegemonic' discourse by a subtle play in theory and produces effects similar to what Spivak has called "with-it translatese" in theorising 'minoritising' effects. Cronin argues that even "minoritising" of languages is "not static but dynamic" (Cronin, 1995: 85-103).

Language, too, and the use of metaphors which are intended as criticism or for new models against hectorosexism do not escape its force. These include concepts and metaphors such as the following: 'The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a more progressive union': (Hartman: 1993; see the case studies below), 'belles infidèles', 'the oppressor's' language' (Rich, op.cit; hooks, op.cit) which although seemingly liberatory, are themselves loaded. To demonstrate the point, I will give an example of the metaphor of 'les belles infidèles', one which has already been critiqued by ("white") feminists such as von Flotow. She argues that: "A concomitant

revision of the discourse of translational relations has led to rethink metaphors such as *les belles infidèles* which are used to describe translation in terms of gender hierarchies and to rewrite such 'translation myths' as that of the Pandora's box" (von Flotow, 1997: 3).[25] Here too, the question of which tools are to be used is not so clear or simple.

I have looked further into this metaphor in relation to 'black feminist perspectives' in contexts of colonialism and slavery and come to a conclusion that black women have never been viewed as beautiful in the sense that I 'read' *belles* or *infidèles* drawing from hooks' and Jewells' work. I read the term *belle* (today) to being synonymous with white, blond, thin, able-bodied, and portrayed as being from the upper classes and heterosexual. Jewell examines the relationships between female slave and the slave owner and describes the portrayal of the slave female as that of 'the bad-black-girl', or 'Jezebel' and how this was used to explain this relationship. Nowhere is the coercive power or brutality of the slave owners described. The black slave women were portrayed as having the responsibility of corrupting their masters with the evil, aggression and seduction (Jewell: 1993).[26] Jewell in fact argues that images of the desexualised Mammy and aunt Jemimah or the hypersexualised Sapphire and Jezebel were the ones which were historically used to depict black American womanhood. hooks (1982) supports this view. If it is equated to translation practice, such metaphorical casting of '*belles infidèles*' has far reaching implications than even the white feminist gaze allows.

In this instance the assertion by Simon that "…feminist theory aims to identify and critique the tangle of concepts which relegates both women and translation to the bottom of the social and literary ladder" (Simon, 1996) readily invites the questions, which translations and which women?

In this sense, Bhabha's argument below is useful in elucidating this point:

> Without such a reinscription of the sign itself, without a transformation of the
> site of enunciation – there is the danger that the mimetic contents of a discourse
> will conceal that the hegemonic structures of power are maintained in a position
> of authority through a shift in vocabulary in the position of authority. There is
> for instance a kinship between the normative paradigms of colonial
> anthropology and the contemporary equality theories discourse of development
> and aid agencies (Bhabha, 1994: 242).[27]

Venuti's terminology of 'domesticating' and 'foreignising' practices goes a long way in clarifying issues of the hegemonic and axiomatic paradigm. I find it a more practical formulation to hectorosexism than the notion of minoritising. An additional point made by Kwieciński relation to Polish translation which is worthy of note is the view that hegemonic discourses are themselves subject to change as follows. I concur with his view that: "But terms such as minority/weaker/minor culture are clearly relative and describe particular cross-cultural encounters rather than permanent qualities" (Kwieciński: 1998:183).[28]

In my view, the women of the world constitute over fifty percent of the world's population and all the equalities groups of disabled, lesbians and gay men and black people together must constitute the majority (Kolodney, 1993:234). Another argument is that the Chinese speaking population of the world by itself constitutes a large proportion of the world's population, therefore, a more accurate global term for describing the power relationships between peoples and groups of peoples needs to be deployed. Further is the dichotomy between notions such as "them" and "us" which

have existed in western scholarship, theory and practice. I argue that the underlying assumptions behind this way of thinking limit the scope of translation and do not go very far in their attempts to describe the unstated differences assumed in such formulation. The ever-changing social, technological and scientific worlds also invite revisiting of terms such as these. Further, translation in general, in as far as it relates to two distinct languages, is always about "them" and "us". Such a concept is, therefore, in both theory and practice, redundant, as it is an oxymoron. Smidt infact alludes to this transfer as uniqueness, turning to a new and different universality. He argues that:

> The problems of translation only begin with the boundaries of tradition that, despite all else is largely unified: French to English, English to German, Greek to Latin, etc. It is rather beyond the margins of our own tradition that we are forced to the knife point, the sharpest edge, where we must confront the measure of our languages (Smidt, 1990:7).[29]

It may be worth reiterating the view that some difficulties arise because these issues are themselves constructs and more to the point, they are constructs in the un/making (Sterba, Kourany and Tong, 1993: 15).

b. Omission

Another pattern which is linked to marginalisation is omission, which if we were to use the example of the picture alluded to above in relation to concealment, would be a removal or non-appearance on the frame altogether. This includes examples of texts such as Ludvic's given below in relation to censorship, which includes omission from the canon. Another example includes a case where black workers in the UK were

airbrushed from a Ford billboard advert to depict only the white workers. In another example, Reiss explains that a source language text of an advert which appeared in a German sales promotion using the slogan, 'Black is Beautiful' "...could not be retained in the translation into English of a whole sales promoting text, if that text is intended for South African buyers" (Reiss, K: 2000:168). I assume here that Reiss means white South African buyers under Apartheid. In literature this exists as a silence, where only the story, say, of colonialism or heterosexual world is told. von Flotow gives an example of the translation of Simon de Beauvoir's *'Deuxieme Sexe'* by a male translator and points out the omissions in a classic text which has shaped Western feminist thinking in the Anglo-American world which I discuss below (von Flotow, 1997: op. cit).

c. Distance, Othering and Difference

Sengupata claims that "... translations of texts from cultures that are not civilizationally linked and among which exists an unequal relationship, manifest extremely complex processes (Sengupta, 1998:159). Some axiomatic theorists argue a case in 'civilisational' incompatibility to avoid addressing the existing differences which exist. This has received significant attention through theorisation of 'orientalisation' seen above, as savaging, exoticising etc. Carbonell describes what is posed as a problem of 'distance'; a claim of civilisational difference expressed as exoticism thus: We may wonder to what degree it is legitimate to convey a sense of newness and/or cultural distance that is always experienced in the act of reaching the foreign text (Carbonell, 2002).

It also raises questions of positionality in relation to what Venuti calls 'foreignisation' and attitudes that play more happily away rather than at home. Massardier-Kenney states that:

> ...these issues directly confront the translator as woman, who has to mediate between her desire to be visible and all that it implies in terms of her own ideological investment and between the necessarily different ideological positions to the text she translates. Any attempt to bring another language to another culture the racial or cultural "other" – women or persons of colour – inevitably implicates the translator mediator in the exploitative condition which link others to a specific power structure (1994:14).

A case in point is the colonial encounter, which, unlike gender for instance is usually represented as a separate national and/or linguistic phenomenon. Not all cultures translating into and out of each other have colonialism embedded in their cultural, historical and therefore linguistic understanding or reference for different reasons. An example is the absence of translated literatures or translators from cultures considered 'other' in for instance what is construed the 'mainstream' in the English speaking world. Tadjo, describing the translation of her work by Wa Goro argues that "a few people have said 'But she is not English native speaking', meaning that she is not European! (Tadjo, 2001:25).

Translation unlike any other discipline is about "Otherness" (Wolf: 2002,: 181). It provides the ideological basis of the notions such as cultural distance, untranslatability incompatibility and incomprehensibility discussed above. This is more so of culture, but also of linguistic elements. In the case of gay culture and literature, Harvey argues: Babuscio, a historian suggests that camp emerged as a gay response to society's

penchant for "a method of labelling "[that] ensures that individual types become polarised (Babuscio, reprinted in Bergman (1993: 20-1) (Harvey: 1995: 454).

In relation to racism and colonialism Robinson and Chefitz address questions of Empire and its assumptions of power and the myths which lock identities in dehumanised "otherness", "bestiality", "savageness", "oriental-ness", exotic-ness" etc. Fryer's exposition on the systematic development of the concept of race and racism as they relate to the British Empire as well as Hall's work (see above) on representation are significant. (Fryer explains how ideologies of racism have involved including the use of phrenology, teleology, evolutionism, anthropology, social Darwinism, Anglo-Saxonism and religion, etc. to justify oppression (Fryer: 1984 61-77).

Proponents such as Bhabha, Sturge, Robinson and Niranjana have demonstrated examples of the colonising effects of anthropology on translation. In the colonial context, Sengupta also describes the force of the presentation of "specimens" that are "simple", natural" and describes even how Tagore was compelled to "perform to the image" of the East as it is known in the English speaking world of the West (Sengupta: 1996:162). She cites Ashis Nandy's perception that '... colonialism legitimised itself by "drawing parallels between childhood and primitivism"' (loc.cit).

d. Distortion

Distortion, like omission includes falsifying facts whether consciously or unconciously. I would define it as a wilful detouring of the facts in fiction or in reality, for instance, the creation of a wrong impression, as we have noted above in relation to the construction of race and racism described by Fryer. For instance, racism as anthropology argued that black people were closer to apes than to Europeans (humans)

and therefore intellectually inferior and in need of civilising and humanising. This challenge to conform to such ideology explains Massardier-Kenney's difficulty in translating the term 'savage' (1994). Diaz-Diocaretz (1995) also gives the example of the 'aberrant' decoding of homosexual discourse.

The translation of Virgil's *Eclogues*, especially of *Ecologue I* is such a case that has remained almost unnoticed in Spanish, or, at least, has been silenced and thus distorted. In this particular poem, the thematic centre is the Shepherd Croydon's laments over his unrequited love for Alexis. This monlogue, in the translation by the poet Jual del Enzina in the fifteenth century, is Christianised and the sorrow of Croydon is transformed with the intense shyness of a poet-to-be ("que se transforme en timidez de poeta metido a panegirista novicio", (Bayo 1959:27-28, 33-34) (*op.cit.* 55-56).

Diaz-Diocaretz gives yet another example of the translation of the same *Ecologue* by Felix M. Hidalgo where in this instance Alexis is substituted by a shepherdess Galatea – which she argues accordingly to Mendez Pelayo is due to "… moral concern and finesse which dignify Hidalgo" (*loc.cit*).

e. Caricature

I would define caricature as the deliberate exaggerated form of stereotyping and distortion supposedly aimed at creating amusement. It is founded on slandering a community or individuals from identifiable communities and is considered harmless fun. The 'Hottentot Venus' stands out as a stark example of this practice. Gilman discusses the caricature of Sarah Bartmann who was exhibited nude in Europe, and later an autopsy was performed on her body particularly her genitalia to make a scientific claim. This was used to argue the 'primitive' nature of the Hottentot's structure (Gates,

Jr. 1986: 238). Caricature is seen through this kind of stereotyped iconography of beauty in the nineteenth century and the use of science, and art to confirm for instance the 'lasciviousness' on the part of the African woman (1986:232-233). The purpose of caricature exists in literature, such as through racist representations. For instance, JanMohamed demonstrate the use of racist subgenre in colonial texts through what he calls the Manichean allegory. He cites the conclusion drawn by Hammond and Jablow's after surveying four centuries of British writing about Africa in the following way: "...whether confident or doubtful, the writers describe Africa in the same conventions. The image of Africa remains the negative reflection, the shadow of British self image..." (Hammond and Jablow's (1970) cit. in JanMohamed, 1985:91).[30]

f. Stereotyping

Stereotyping, like caricature, is a major discursive strategy within hectorosexist discourse. Bhabha argues that:

> ...stereotypes are not a simplification because it is a false representation of a given reality. It is representation that, in denying the play of difference (that the negation through the Other permits) constitutes a problem for the representation of the subject in significations of psychic and social relations (Bhabha, cit. in Niranjana, 1998: 10).[31]

Stereotype is a wilful and repetitive distortion which lends negative 'unchangeable' attributes of characteristics to an individual or group. Examples include generalisations such as simplicity or stupidity of women and black people, or sayings or beliefs such as 'all men are rapists', 'all people are heterosexual', 'all black people are lazy', 'women like to gossip', 'women drive badly', 'all Jews are stingy' etc. Brandishing such views

with authority gives an impression of hegemonic superiority and normality on the part of enunciation. Hazel Carby suggests that the objective of the stereotype '… is not to reflect or represent reality but is to function as a disguise, or mystification, of objective social relations'. Hill Collins argues that these controlling images are designed to make racism; sexism and poverty appear normal, and an inevitable part of everyday life" (Hill Collins: 1993:119; see also Carby, 1985: 301; and Bhabha, 1994: 66-8). Hills Collins' article which begins with a quotation of stereotypes from Trudier Harris' 'From Mammies to Militants' (1982) demonstrates these stereotypes in an ample way:

Called Matriarchs, Emasculator and Hot Mama, Sometimes Sister, Pretty Baby, Auntie, Mammy and Girl. Called Unwed Mother, Welfare Recipient and Inner City Consumer. The Black American women had had to admit that while nobody knew the troubles she saw, everybody, his brother and dog, felt qualified to explain her, even to herself (see Collins Hills: 1993:119).[32]

Other racial stereotypes exist which explain 'otherness' by depicting for instance the 'primitive nature' of Africans, as in prime/natural, savage (Bell and Massardier-Kenney, 1994:168-182) and 'bestial','value-lessness' of the African people's lives and their 'exoticism'/'bizarrness'. Bhabha observes that the nature of the stereotype is its rigidity. As JanMohammed argues that '…once the triangular trade became established, Africans were newly characterized as the epitome of evil and barbarity" (JanMohamed, 1985:81). Texts of such literature relating such stereotypes abound, including in 'canonical' texts such as Conrad's Heart of Darkness, Robinson Crusoe's Treasure Island', Gide's work and his relationship with North Africa, Baudelaire's relationships with the 'exotic', and writings such Out of Africa by Karen Blixen (see, JanMohamed: 91-92). We noted examples of exclusions and distortion of women's literature and gay literature above in

chapter 1. These occur in formulary expressions and in words, sentences, clichés, themes, characterisation, as well as suggestion where these are well rehearsed as will become evident in the case studies, but can also be the subject of whole texts.

g. Absorption, Appropriation and Containment (Assimilation)

Assimilation is another way of negating difference. Examples include forcing the enslaved and colonised people to speak and think in English and acquire the English way of life. Macauley's famous *Minute on Education* best exemplifies this absorption. He argues that:

> We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect (cit. in: Curtin, 1971:178-90).

Other examples include forcing a male world or white view or language on women or black people respectively. Paniker describes the continuation of such practices long after independence by describing how a student had their head shaved in or around 1995 for speaking a single word of Malayalam in class (1996:39). The same can be said of appropriation which occurs when gay texts are read as heterosexual. Containment can occur through controlling and limiting distribution of 'sensitive texts' as we note with the example of Leduc's book as will become evident below.

h. 'Orientalising'

A further effect is 'orientalising'. We discussed above how Spivak describes the danger of a false sense of familiarity with a foreign text or author, especially with third world texts which focus on women writing. "In that case, the feminist 'bond' existing between translator and author must not be used to erase the cultural gap" (1992:2).[33] This seems true for absorption, appropriation and containment of all hectorosexist issues. Above, I gave the example of minoritising as a concept, which I argued is a recentering of hegemonic perspectives. Keenaghan's example in relation to Bellit's translation of Lorca's 'Oda a Walt Whitman' makes the case succinctly, where he states that Bellit paradoxically reproduces the "...figural markers of homoeroticism and containing that homoeroticism within the limiting space of metaphor" (Keenaghan 1998:201).[34]

A similar case of containment is made in Rich's example (see Diaz-Diocaretz above) when her friends 'read' her work as heterosexual and tell her that they find it applicable to heterosexual relationships, thus denying its lesbian base. In a separate example, Boyce Davies makes an argument against a rush to 'post' everything colonial before it has been properly aired. Other examples include the fact that for instance gender in one culture does not necessarily translate directly and neatly into the same values of 'genderness' in another culture or race etc. as noted in chapter 1. We also noted the example that Spivak gives in relation to 'Palestinian women's writing' which totalises the experience of one or a few Palestinian women's writings into a homogenous whole. Mira also points to the differences between English camp and its translational equivalence in Spanish (Mira: 1996).[35] This is also true of French materialist feminists who do not translate directly into British feminism, but draw attention to différence and differance and new issues specific to the material conditions for feminism in the French

context. Feminism is itself contested by the multiplicity of feminisms whether in France or in translation.

i. Banning, Censorship, Torture and Death

The ban on Violette Leduc's book was finally lifted in France after 50 years. Leduc, according to Stuart Jeffries, was regarded as one of France's greatest unknown writers, (Jeffries, Observer, November: 2000) "...her work was admired by Jean Genet and championed by Simone de Beauvoir". Her book is a lesbian tale of school-girl passion which is probably why it failed to be published. Gallimard did publish a sanitised version of the text under the title *Ravages* "...which dispensed with the first, sexually explicit pages of the manuscript".[36] Jeffries further adds that: "Gallimard argued that the time was not right for such a frank depiction of youthful homosexuality. He and his senior editors feared the author could face a scandal and perhaps even conviction for obscenity, if the novel was published in its entirety" (Jeffries: *Loc. cit*).[37]

The censored pages were published separately in the 60's. It is not until the year 2000 that it was published as *Isabelle et Thérèse* by Gallimard but this is too late for the author who died in 1972. The absence of Leduc's work from the canon and perhaps that of many other writers from the equalities groups must affect how these are theorised in their own context and in other cultures. It clearly affects the formation of canons and of literary standards, of what is good, or acceptable in the source culture and therefore in the target cultures. Gallimard wrote "It is with total agreement that we judged it preferable to postpone the publication of the text... But there was never any question of me refusing to publish it". The absence for instance of a writer such as Simon de Beauvoir to second wave feminism and to postmodernity and existentialism

would mean an immense loss. In this sense, we cannot even begin to imagine the significance of the absence of Leduc's work from the canon and additionally to Anglo-American and other lesbian and feminist developments. De Beauvoir's work was itself subject to censorship according to von Flotow (1997:49-50). She argues that there is an unmarked deletion of over ten percent of original material by Howard Parshley, the American professor of zoology who translated the 1953 edition.

At the extreme are cases of torture and death becomes the ultimate form of censorship and banning. The example of Salman Rushdie's *Satanic Verses* where the fatwa was declared against him is one which is well known, although this has now been lifted. His book was burned and banned in some countries. This is another form of censorship and banning. His Japanese translator Hitoshi Igarashi died in 1991 for translating the work. I have also described Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's imprisonment in chapter 1, and the experiences that his publisher underwent.

The above provides a broad over-view of some commonalities in patterns that hectorosexist oppression has produced in relation to the equalities issues.

III.   STRATEGIES FOR ADDRESSING COMMONALITIES

As a result of these commonalities, some of the responses that the equality theories have enlisted have common ground as described below.

A. ÉCRITURE

In the initial phase they seem to require strategies of assertion, resistance and visibling through effects such as 'écriture' or ('traduction' in this case), described by Cixous

'writing black' (see Boyce Davies, hooks: 1989)' or colonial 'writing back' (Ashcroft at al. 1998) or feminist writing back, e.g. Maier, hooks, Showalter, Massardier-Kenney, von Flotow, Chamberlaine and Simon among others. Other strategies include black, or/and feminine/feminist or/and queer or/and lesbian translating (such as camp), (Harvey, Mira, Keenaghan, Diaz-Diocaretz, White, Brossard) or 'subaltern' writing 'Spivak, Bhabha, Niranjana, Rich, Lorde, etc., what Louis Gates, Jr. calls 'signifyin(g)' practices (1988, preface, 1986:408).

Gates posits:

> How else are we to define theories of our literatures but to step out of the discourse of the white masters and speak in the critical language of the black the vernacular? I agree with Baker that this challenge confronts Edward Said and Gitayari Spivak just as it confronts Baker in Louis Gates, Jnr. We see it as a problem, as an opportunity, as a possibility, while they do not … yet" (Gates Jr, 1986:409).[38]

B. THICK TRANSLATION

In addition to écriture, others identify paratextual writing, thick translation (Appiah, 1993), feminist thick translation (Wolf, 2000), revisioning, "rediscovery, republishing and returning to circulation previously lost or otherwise ignored works (see Kolodney above). Others like Levine (1991) argue for subversion as we noted above. Others still suggest that women continue to tell their narratives such as in black ways without necessarily reacting to the hegemonic discourses, as there is continuity in the trajectory, say of black women's narratives from Africa into slavery and into the present (Jordan, 1989, 29-59).

There are, however, misgivings about how much some of the elements will yield and whether they are not still tinkering with hectorosexism's master plan and digressing from more meaningful projects such as creating new canons. There are also concerns as we noted above, about how to distinguish these from the hegemonic frame and from each other. Yet proponents who have tried to disentangle the patterns of commonalities of the hectorosexist web have found new contradictions. An instance is the suggestion by von Flotow of subversion as a feminist strategy such as 'supplementing, hijacking, prefacing and footnoting' (von Flotow, 1991: 69). The criticism levelled at her by critics such as Massardier-Kenney is that there is nothing new in these strategies as she maintains, that there is nothing particularly feminist about them. She asserts:

> If we look at the explanation of these strategies, we find that it is not the strategies that are feminist, assuming the notion feminist itself is clear and not controversial, but rather the use to which they are put" (Massardier-Kenney, 1997:57-58).[39]

Massardier-Kenney states that von Flotow's use of supplementing, for instance, "...compensates for the differences between languages or constitutes "voluntarist" action on the text looks very much like the old translation strategy called compensation" (*ibid*). She cites Delisle who argues that such strategies were typical of medieval translators.

Massardier-Kenney raises an additional point which supports my argument on the methodological dilemma. She critiques von Flotow's use of the term "hijacking" in the same way as we have noted the critique of the notion for 'belles infidèlles' above, and argues that this will only '... contribute to obfuscate further what "making the

'feminine' in language"' means and prevent translators from reflecting upon the actual process of the text'. She argues that:

> ...such borrowing of terms contributes to the view that feminism is an unnatural act of violence, that making the feminine visible can only mean distortion and extortion... *(op.cit)*.[40]

Von Flotow is however aware of these contradictions. Despite these I argue that the strategies are interchangeable in their applicability to all the areas of oppression and are not exclusive to any one area in relation to hectorosexism and that care needs to be taken in relation to the specificity of the contexts of the source and target texts, the translation space and narrative itself. I also argue that the commonalities in the responses to hectorosexism have presented difficulties owing to the specific claim of each equalities trope to a form of strategy such as 'écriture' which many associate only with feminine writing or with feminist writing. This point is exemplified by Woolf's assertion on thick translation above. In addition to the challenges posed by the commonalities, it is important to address the divergences, which are addressed below as they both seem to pose an impasse beyond hectorosexism.

IV. DISJUNCTURE IN THE EQUALITIES THEORIES

Despite the existence of the commonalities addressed above and the contradictions these raise across the equalities issues, several tensions and disjunctures need to be resolved for a new paradigm which encompasses 'all the interrelated issues' to emerge. The key challenge has been the strong arguments, mainly in their singular and/or dualistic locations of articulation and the issue theorised as difference. These take us back to the

exploration of the theoretical formulation 'But some of us are brave' alluded to above, and which remains at the heart of this work.

These tensions are varied, and occur in different locations, but they are also dependent on the wider moral will for change, for freedom, what Spivak calls "freedom-in-translation" (Spivak, 1999:164) and in other cases on resistance to change. What emerges is that some of the concepts addressed in the commonalities are also the basis of disjuncture in some instances and in this way create an impasse or break-through for a viable strategy for challenging hectorosexist practice(s). There are however, other related and general issues which affect the translation of equalities and I will address these below.

A. DIFFERENCE/DIFFERENCE

As noted above, difference and differance remain the key disjunctures in the equalities arguments and are best exemplified by Bhabha's argument below where he states that :

> The enunciative position of contemporary cultural studies is both complex and problematic. It attempts to institutionalise a range of transgressive discourses whose strategies are elaborated around non-equivalent sites of representation where a history of discrimination and misrepresentation is a common thing among, say, women, blacks, homosexuals and Third World migrants. However, the 'signs' that construct such histories and identities – gender, race, homophobia, postwar diaspora, refugees, the international division of labour and so on – not only differ in content but often produce incompatible systems of signification and engage in distinct forms of social subjectivity. To provide a social imaginary that is based on the articulation of differential, even disjunctive,

moments of history and culture, contemporary critics resort to the peculiar temporality of the metaphor. It is the arbitrariness of the sign, the interdeterminacy of writing, the splitting of the subject of enunciation, these theoretical concepts produce the most useful descriptions of the formation 'post-modern'" cultural subjects (*op.cit*:176).[41]

Within difference, the main tension manifest in the equalities theories is that of hectorosexist hierarchy being posited around each equality concern depending on the subject's perception of their own identity, location, their ideological stance in relation to an equality issue in general and in relation to others (Rich, 1987), the real issues of hectoro-power. Spivak is critical of the privileging of specific tropes and theories and in an example questions the ignorance of the historical frame and the question of location of theory, practice and subject, as noted above. She describes it as translation-as-violence, by drawing attention to the problem of what she refers to as "Third-worldist" pedagogy. She argues that it is an "...imposition of **our**[42] [emphasis mine] own historical and voluntarist constitution". In a further example she states that: "...our [my emphasis] own mania for "third world literature" anthologies when the teacher or critic often has no sense of the original languages, or of the subject-constitution of the social and gendered agents in question (and when therefore the student is at a loss), participates more in the logic of translation-as-violation than in the ideal of translation as-freedom in troping. What is at play here is what can be called "sanctioned ignorance", now sanctioned more than ever by an invocation of "globality" – a word serving to obliterate the irreducible hybridity of all language (Spivak, 1999:164).[43] Von Flotow reiterates this point by giving an example of the attitudes taken by some western feminists, which she finds hypocritical, by arguing that there are 'benevolent liberal

feminist interests' couched in 'the vague desire to remedy racial bias within western feminism" (von Flotow, 1997:84).

Yet there is the argument that not all (white) women, gay, male or black translators are sensitive/insensitive to gender or feminist issues, although some may question the wisdom say of insensitive/sexist men translating feminist texts or homophobes translating gay texts or racists translating 'black' texts. Diaz-Diocaretz points to the cultural differences even amongst women, a fact which can make translation challenging (1985:19). The case also exists where an anti-hectorosexist text will require different approaches and these may well be reproduced by a feminist or non-feminist translator, or present critical approaches to a woman or male translator who may not be feminist per se. Barret-Brown, writing on feminist knowledge argues that the Women's Liberation Movement rejects the possibility that oppression was caused by either naturally given sex differences or economic factors alone. She argues for the importance of "…consciousness, ideology, imagery and symbolism 'for our battles' (1982: 37).

Simon describes translation as an important work of solidarity in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries amongst women particularly in the translation of anti-slavery narratives (Simon: 1992: 58). hooks has also provided an insightful suggestion for resolving this dilemma in terms of political solidarity within sisterhood. She argues that:

> The idea of "common oppression" was a false and corrupt platform disguising
> and mystifying the true nature of women's varied and complex social reality.
> Women are divided by sexist attitudes, racism, class privilege and a host of other

prejudices. Sustained... bonding can occur only when these divisions are confronted and the necessary steps taken to eliminate them. Divisions will not be eliminated by wishful thinking or romantic reverie about common oppression despite the value of highlighting experiences all.... share" (hooks, 1993:391)[44]. (see also Masingale-Bell, 1995:52-74).

Other critics pay attention to what (white) women as writers or black feminist writing or 'écriture feminine' or gay writing do or fail to do in relation to all the equality theories as we have noted above. For instance, in relation to black women's scholarship, Patricia Collins argues that:

> The dilemma facing Black women scholars engaged in producing Black Feminist thought is that a knowledge claim that meets the criteria of adequacy for one group and thus judged to be acceptable knowledge claim my not be translatable in the terms of a different group. Once Black feminist scholars face the notion that on certain dimensions of a Black women stand point it may be fruitless to try to translate ideas from an Afrocentric feminist epistemology into Eurocentric feminist epistemology into a Eurocentric masculinist epistemology, then the choices become clearer. Rather than trying to uncover universal knowledge claims that can withstand the translation from one epistemology to another, time might be better spent re-articulating a Black women standpoint in order to give African-American women the tools to resist their own subordination. The goal here is not one of integrating Black female "fold culture" into the substantiated body of academic knowledge, for the substantiated knowledge is in many ways,

antithetical to the best interest of Black women. Rather the process is one of rearticulating a preexisting Black women's standpoint and recentering the language of existing academic discourse to accommodate these knowledge claims. For those Black women scholars engaged in this rearticulation process, the social construction of Black Feminist thought requires the skill and sophistication to decide which knowledge claims can be validated using the epistemological assumptions of one but not both frame-works, which claims can be generated in one framework and only partially accommodated by the other and which claims can be made in both frameworks without violating the basic political and epistemological assumption of either" (Collins Hill, 1989a:772).[45]

This view seems to be supported by Jordan's view on language where she argues that:

You can not "translate" instances of Standard English preoccupied with abstraction or with nothing/nobody evidently alive into Black English. That would warp the language into uses antithetical to the guiding perspective of its community of users. Rather you must first change those standard English sentences, themselves, into ideas consistent with the person-d assumptions of Black English. While both world views share a common vocabulary, the ideas themselves defy direct translation (Jordan, 1992:36-54).[46]

Louis Gates, Jr. also posits that:

We are justified, however, in wondering aloud if the sort of subjectivity which these writers seek through the act of writing can be realised through a process

which is so very ironic from the outset: how can the black subject posit a full and sufficient self in the language in which blackness is a sign of absence. Can writing with the very difference it makes and masks, mask the blackness of the black face that addresses the text of Western letters, in a voice that English that speaks English through the idiom which contains the irreducible elements of cultural difference that will already separate the white voice from the black? (1986:12).[47]

A further factor which complicates this issue is the sometimes 'arbitrary' nature of the occurrence of rupture based on situational dynamics. This could include factors such as the personalities involved in the translating and publishing processes, the text itself and other related issues taking place historically, say a war, or a crash on the stock exchange, or the passing of Affirmative Action Legislation etc. These could have an immediate adverse or positive effect on the strategies to be adopted in relation to hectorosexism. As we noted above this could happen spontaneously or could be part of a longer process for that quantum leap and process which may not be immediately tangible (see Falk above). I am thinking here for instance, of the impact on recovery, that the availing of the work of Harriet Jacobs' *Incidents in the life of a slave girl, written by herself,* brought. Though influential and important in its time it is only in the 1970's that it come to the full attention of scholarship world-wide and the American literary and history canons.

In addition to the key point raised by Bhabha and other proponents above in relation to the question of the the location of culture, I will address a few of the key contradictions discussed in the commonalities to support the general point while pointing out that these are just a fraction of the myriad possible permutations. This is owing to the sometimes

arbitrary or specific nature of power dynamics, and in some cases history, as we noted above.

Elseworth makes an important observation on differences in methodological approaches in translation and other goals which might further explain and clarify practices such as minoritising or 'Third-worldist' pedagogy. She argues that these belong to '...other spheres of interest' by pointing out that:

> Now I don't dispute that political correctness is a matter of ethics, but it cannot be ethically correct to make amends to exploited peoples for abuse and suffering by applying a translation method to their works that diminishes them as works of art. That would be further exploitation in order to still one's own conscience (Elseworth, 1999:5).[48]

Such a view is applicable across the equality theories but is also applicable to the hierarchies emerging out of each, and reflective of axiomatic hectoropower here. It enables a reiteration of why Spivak's question whether the subaltern can speak is relevant for several reasons. The first is one applies to concepts such as 'minoritizing', argued by Bhabha, where the positionality of the terminology endangers the project of transformation. Such a view exemplifies Elsworth's view that this "belongs to other spheres of interest' additionally evoking a response to the question raised earlier in relation to Mudimbe's question about who authorises such identities. Secondly, there is the problematic tension posed by the implied *supaltern* [formulation mine] (as opposed to the assumed subaltern in Spivak' now famous articulation) to the equation which raises two adjunct questions. The first is can the supaltern, does, or should the *supaltern continue* to exist when claims to transformation and change are being made

and secondly, can they speak? Todorov, discussing 'otherness' argues that, '...we are united by a common human identity, and it is this which renders possible communication, dialogue, and in the final analysis, the comprehension of Otherness – it is possible precisely because Otherness is never radical... Affirming the existence of incommunicability among cultures on the other hand, presupposes adherence to a racialist, apartheid-like set of beliefs, postulating as it does insurmountable discontinuity with the human species, '(1986: *op.cit*). We already noted Kanneh's observation of this in the introductory chapter (see p. 29 above) about the "urgency to lay claim to other locations". I will return to the second question below, in relation to both hectorosexism, but also 'across' the equality theories as currently theorised.

Suffice it to say here that this question poses the key question in relation to the impasse and may provide an answer to the rhetorical question 'Ain't I a woman?' in relation to translation theory and practice. It raises the question of who holds the custody to meaning and who has this right to enunciate as already noted. It points to the importance of the questions raised about which voices are to be heard and the enunciatory positions from which they speak as we noted above in relation to Spivak's famous question.

B. MULTIPLE LOCATIONS OF HECTOROSEXISM

A further and related issue has emerged from interdisciplinarywork in relation to the multiple locations through which hectorosexism is manifest. This includes the wider culture, the translation culture, the text, the form, content and the cultural habits of the source and target cultures, and the subjects of culture (both within and outside the text) and their locations.

For instance, Kolodney, on the novel noted the following in relation to the uses that form was put. "Jean Kennard (1978) sought to understand why and how the structural convention of the novel even in the hands of women writers inevitably work to imply 'inferiority' and necessary subordination of women" (1993:223).[49]

C. UNFRIENDLY TEXTS

Another contradiction arises around the question of unfriendly texts in relation to hectorosexism and this also raises the question of authorisation and the enunciatory position in relation to unfriendly texts (Maier, 1995:5). Muir, for instance, from her standpoint finds that she cannot dissociate the Nazi imprint from the language as a whole and feels excessive distaste for the rhetoric of power:

> I find myself disliking the purposive control that will-power dominating the German sentence. I dislike its weight and its clotted abstractions. I have the feeling that the shape of the German language affects the thought of those who use it and disposes them to overvalue authoritative statement, will, power and purposive drive. (But to turn classical German to democratic English – that is the difficulty) (Muir, 1959:95, *cit.in* Simon 1996:78-79).[50]

Maier however, argues that the translator should get "under the skin" of ideologically unfriendly texts both of antagonistic and sympathetic works (Maier 1996:4) and suggests that it is important to "... give voice to make texts that raise different questions and open perspectives". Von Flotow finds this posture hypocritical (1998). My view is that the context and relevance should determine the translation action. Gaddis Rose also

argues that if what she calls the différend is too 'considerable', then perhaps the translator should think of 'bailing out' (*Op.cit*:65).

D. TRANSLATING HECTOROSEXIST 'OTHERNESS'

A related point is one of translating 'otherness', which is what translation proper should always be about. The key debate around foreignising and domesticating strategies (Schleiermacher, 1992: 36-54, Venuti 1992a, 1992b, 1998) and between source or target oriented approaches remains important in relation to hectorosexism. The representation of 'otherness' includes taking some unethical practices in relation to hectorosexism, as Maier points out above. Needham makes the point succinctly in relation to Lewis' translation of Nancy stories which he observes are translations at the level of transmitting the oral to text and also at the level of transmission of language and culture (from Jamaican to English):

> I have suggested ways that Lewis' translation of Nancy stories not only reproduce colonialist ideology, but also unwittingly preserve features of performance that subvert and/or displace the dominant discourse of the target language. Evoking the features of previous linguistic performances enables us to reread his texts as productive sites of conflict and new signification rather than re-productive sites of hegemonic control (Needham, 1995: 115).[51]

He makes the significant criticism in his reading of these translations by observing that:

> Lewis effectively "colonizes" his sources, making them conform to the contours of a dominant discourse on the "primitive". Yet to leave the argument at that

would be to restate the tautology that "domination dominates" (Porter, 49) and to reproduce the colonizing gesture whereby "alien" voices are "always already subordinated, dominated, othered" (Porter 57) (*ibid*).[52]

My interest however in these translations would be to see what non-'colonizing' strategies would offer in relation to the Nancy stories and Needham's ambivalence and his inability to go beyond this criticism points to the dilemma posed by hectorosexism. This is particularly the case with texts of historical value (Needham, *loc cit*).

E. REAL VERSUS FICTION

A further point relates to one raised by Moi in terms of our expectation of what literature should or should not do. With this point, she also raises the question of reality versus fiction by stating that:

> Instead, writing is seen as a more or less faithful reproduction of an external reality to which we all have unbiased access and which therefore enables us to critisize the author on the grounds that he or she has created an incorrect model of reality we somehow all know. Resolutely empiricist in its approach, this view fails to consider the proposition that the real is not only something we construct, but a controversial construct at that (Moi, 1985: 45).[53]

The level of intervention as suggested by the "visibility" school therefore raises fundamental issues about fiction and the intention of the author. issues which are very difficult to gauge, particularly the latter. As we observed above. hectorosexist discourse has its world- view as the real, the universal.

The key equalities criticism however of this representation of truth and falsehood is that this 'incorrect model of reality' somehow always seemed tipped in favour of hectorsexism. Diaz-Diocarez points out that:

> Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. As well as issues of writing, reading is key to translation, both in relation to the translator and end reader and issues of translator function can be drawn from these discussions (Diaz-Diocaretz, 1985:15).

Msiska draws attention to the problematic nature of codes of readership by pointing to the polysemic nature of the reader who is not predictable. He refers to the important work done on reader theory, particularly Iser's observation as follows:

> The phenomenology theory of art lays full stress on the idea that, in considering a literary work, one must take into account not only the actual text but also and in equal measure, the actions involved in responding to that text. Thus Roman Ingarden confronts the structure of the literary text with the ways in which it can be (kondreisiert) (realised), (Iser, cit. in Msiska, 2000:19).[54]

This has application in translation in relation to the production of an 'equivalent' text. Both the translator-as reader and end-reader codes become significant in what have come to be known as target oriented strategies such as those discussed by Toury (1995).

The question of who enunciates is also linked to the question of what is enunciated. Who selects the texts to be published and translated? (see Bassnett above on

authorisation and patronage). Venuti's approach is that the target culture should determine the translation strategies based on the knowledge of what is excluded and what the hierarchical ordering is in that culture and language. He does not take into account what the excluded cultures may wish to have published. For instance, we will never know what impact the availing of Leduc's work may have on reception of gay and lesbian literature today or on what is considered the canon of French or European writing.

The above question raises issues about the agency and reading capabilities of society who, on the whole, are peers of translators, (themselves readers) who are most likely to be impacted upon by the same impetuses as the translating 'community' described above in relation to the translation continuum.

In Scott's translation of *Euguélionne* he manages to demonstrate that translatory strategies that align themselves against hectorosexism are possible for anyone who sets out finding the appropriate tools (Scott: 1999; see also von Flotow's: 1997:23). Scott demonstrates that 'tra ducture' is available as a tool for anyone to use. This however has met with the disapproval of many feminists who feel that this is a 'gesture' which potentially undermines insights which may be gained by women/feminist translators. I am however, not of that view, and feel that the ethical direction used in Scott's work is useful. Some women have argued that men should not translate feminist texts as they are once again ursurping a 'female' space through male power. What the feminists may be having difficulties with is his motivation and this too is a consideration of hectorosexism. i.e., is his a token gesture of political correctness or is he converted to the feminist cause?

F. BACKLASH

A further issue that is worth considering is that of the hectorosexist backlash. A large amount of work done by critics from the equalities movements demonstrates that their work has faced 'backlashes' (see Faludi (1991); Boyce Davies, (1994:80-89)) and by discourses recentering from different angles of hectorosexism using their own terminology, language and strategies such as declaring the movements dead, or totalitarian. In the case of sexism, Boyce Davies refers to the notion of 're-maling'. She describes it in the following way: "A recent account told to me by a friend, on the looming threat of demise of the London carnival argued that its former leader kept raising the 'S' word each time there were attempts to 'modernise' it. Her argument apparently was that she objected to bureaucratic take over of the carnival as it had always been a people's festival, first set up to commemorate their survival from slavery and that this remained at the centre of the purpose of the carnival!" The route to emancipation is therefore littered with cycles of resistance and counter-resistance through reassertions of hectorosexism and hectoropower. We have already noted above of the possibility of coercion of even emancipatory ideas in the example of theorisations given such as in the case of Venuti's terminology 'minoritising' or what Boyce Davies has signalled above as a rush beyond the 'posts'. However, in the case of Venuti use of the terminology, I realise that the foundational conceptualisation of the term 'minority' in America may have different connotations there, and that, my reading of the term may be a problem of translation, although I very much doubt this.

Thus, when Scott addresses the gendered nature of the text in the translation of *Euguélionne* by Bersianick, he calls to attention to the care required on the part of the

translator to remain faithful to the original intention of the author and some of the potential problems of loss that occur, say in the translation of the phrase:

ST: *-Le ou la coupable doit être punie*

TT: The guilty one must be punished whether she is a man or a woman (see von Flotow, *Op. cit*: 22).

The English text does not tell the reader the trouble the author of the original has taken to specify the gender nor the problems this poses for a male of female translator who is sensitive to gender issues. This raises the question of how we disentangle the new strategies from hectorosexism within the axiomatic stance and across each of the contemporary equality trope theories in ways that are meaningful without turning the world (back) into the old 'universal' ones, or the new ones based on the old?

This position also requires a reflection on who "we" implies? (Rich, 1987:2) as we saw earlier in relation to Spivak's own positionality. Do some concerns such as those posed by a hectorosexist dominant hegemony not also arise in this anti-hectorosexist location? Where can those who are "guilty" through linguisitic heritage, birth and choice stand to describe say a gay, working class, black or disabled reality negatively without resorting to the hectorosexist heritage? Here, I can only reiterate the challenge raised above in relation to the singular and dualist models.

G. 'RULES OF RECOGNITION'

The final point is related to the fear of establishing what Bhabha calls 'rules of recognition' or what are essentially norms (Nord 1991:100) or conventions (Hermans, 1999:81) or simply a checklist which is applicable to hectorosexism within the context

of the texts in question. Bhabha argues the case clearly by highlighting how the sign is used to describe non-related essences owing to history, context and location. In the past, it seemed possible to establish do's and don'ts. The destabilising of centres however seems to make critics wary of being considered didactic and authoritarian even though the claims for the case is a strong and necessary one as will become evident in the case study in chapter 4 in relation to myth-making. Hermans argues that '...rules do not have to be explicitly agreed", but that "... they presuppose common knowledge and acceptance" (*ibid*: 81). The logic of decentering of authority is the establishment of new centres of authority from new perspectives, thus rules become unavoidable and inevitable. On a cautionary, or perhaps even approving note, Hermans agrees with Fokkema (1989:4) by arguing that conventions/norms can become 'victims of their own success' (*Loc.cit*).

V. PAST THE HECTOROSEXIST IMPASSE AND TOWARD A POSTHECTOROSEXIST POSSIBILITY

As is evident from the arguments above, no final solution for accommodating these complexities has been found yet, or a general linguistic or material consensus, that illusive metatheory (Gaddis Rose: 1990:58-59, Simon, *op.cit*) or 'endstates' alluded to by Falk (see below). This seems to present an impasse for the contemporary equalities issues of how to get beyond hectorosexism. Bannet's observation on Babel seems apt where she argues that "In Babel, there is discontinuity, dissemination and difference, but also such rivalry, conflict and confusion that it becomes impossible to "build a city" (Bannet, 1993:158).

Given these challenges, is it possible to argue for a theory or framework for and against the hectoroframe and if so, what strategies are available? We turn to this question in the final section of this chapter below by addressing a number of appropriate proposals that might enable the containment of the simultaneous complex demands for both the particular and the universal in the construction of new norms for anti-hectorosexist practice.

We have demonstrated that despite the dilemmas posed by the convergence and divergence of the arguments of the contemporary equalities, there is a general political, moral and ethical will which at present points towards change. One of the dilemma's this presents then, as we noted above, is whether the strategies used should remain specific or whether they should move to new, general and wider applications given the disparities and complexities.

Despite the seeming complexity and chaotic demands and cacophony of 'Babel' and hectorosexism for all aspects along the translation continuum, the arguments for an ethics of translation remain compelling as they are necessitated by a broader will against oppression. I believe, as do many critics that a posthectorosexist reality is not only possible, but inevitable. Critics like Robinson make a convincing case that the impetus for change is here, is inevitable and cannot be stopped:

> The impetus for change is already there and cannot be stopped. The dismantling of the Middle Ages over the past six or seven centuries has progressively tapped the repressed personal experience of the so-called lower orders, encouraged by its exploration and expression, farther and farther down through medieval hierarchy: first the bourgeoisie, then the levels of the proletariat, then the

unemployed, then the homeless, then the insane and the infirm: first free white land-owning (sp) men, then free white men, then free men (blacks now included, slaves freed,) then women, then children; first God, then the prophets, then the apostles, then the monks and priests, then secular writers (artists and intellecuals), then ghost writers and novelizers, now translators - perhaps copy editors and secretaries are next" (Robinson,1991: 207).[55]

Simon also observes in relation to feminism that:

What comes into focus through this "missed meeting" is the diversity of intellectual alliances through which feminism has taken shape. As has become evident in the unfolding of this un(fair) exchange, the impact of translation first revealed the surprising disparity of these alliances, and then opened a space for dialogue and realignment." (Simon, 1996:85).[56]

Von Flotow also concludes that: "The complexities and disunities resulting in the interplay of these factors are more productive however, than consensus on the sometimes sensitive issues they address" (1998:12). She points out for instance, how there was resistance to French feminism into English, and how this revealed the differences between French and English feminisms (von Flotow, 1997:86). She states that women began to revise the theories they may have had about solidarity and understanding because of addressing the differences. Bannet also warns of the challenges this faces, by pointing out for instance that once poststructuralism was introduced into the academy, "…it became apparent that the 'co-ohabitation of languages working side by side' was not, in practice, very blissful (Bannet. *op.cit*: 159). Similarly, Gaby Weiner arguing on educational policy evaluation for social justice

makes a case against arbitrary democracy. The fact that subjects are located, and that translation is not a neutral process, enables the specificity of each context to be taken into account (see p.93). She is critical of MacDonald's democratic evaluation model where he advocates that:

> In a pluralist society, **he** [the evaluator] has the right to use his position to promote personal values, or to choose which particular ideologies **he** shall regard as legitimate. **His** job is to identify those who will have to make judgements and decisions about the programme and to lay before them those facts of the case that are recognized by them as relevant to their concerns (MacDonald, 1975, Weiner (1993: 119) [emphasis mine].[57]

Smidt, in fact, goes further in proscribing what he describes as a 'reversing gesture, which I will revisit below and which he argues would "blast the borders of the Western tradition" (Smidt 1990:7).

My view is that although the cultural turn is a long and slow process, the wheel has gone past the critical stage in Western theory and practice. This moment which Bhabha reads as 'cusp' (173) is reflected in the hesitations of contemporary theorists such as through the 'but' in the expression, "...but some of us are brave", above, the 'yet' in hooks'/Rich's expression, in "This is the Master's language yet I need it to speak to you" and the 'still' in Hall's observations above. These views reflect the tension of a specific moment in the cultural turn in translation, not only of (in)difference, but also of (in)equality. It enables us to closely interrogate what the moment of 'permanent exile' alluded to by Bhabha really means. Whether the 'cultural turn' is something which can be completed is a matter which remains to be seen and is dependent on the wider will

for 'translation as liberation' (Robinson,1991: 248) or 'translation as freedom (Spivak) in a global context of political, economic and social upheaval, of resistance and intransigence. The formation of what Bhabha has called the post-modern cultural subjects noted above goes a long way to support the view that the post-hectorsexist location of culture and subjects is attainable. I argue that this has to remain a political and ethical project and that it needs to take into account real inequalities which produce the social and economic order reflected inside literature (and translation) and the processes, conditions and subjects responsible for its production.

The question however, of what and where those "borders would be blasted" to? as Smidt claims is an important one for as Falk aptly notes: "To be ready requires amongst other things resources for change, conceptions of process (means), visions of end states (alternatives) and an overall image of human nature and freedom that affirms self-transcending energies" (Falk, *op.cit*:132).[58]

Douglas Robinson calls for 'situational' ethics which seem to demand more than just what Flotow has called 'rheteroric' and seems to demand a commitment to ethics, in essence to be what Said has called a 'witness in truth' (Said: 1991).

Elsewhere, Said envisions what he calls a secular space: "We may speak of secular space and of humanly constructed and interdependent histories that are fundamentally knowable, although not through grand theory or systematic totalization" (Said, 1993; 310). We also noted at the beginning of this chapter the need for what Bhabha calls 'reinscription' (1994:191-192) and what Ross calls the 'good' for translation (Ross, 1996:332). I believe that these are prerequisite in the quest for an ethics and politics that takes on board the commonalities and the differences which enable the mapping of

new locations of culture and subjects. Holmes, for instance makes the case for determining specific transfer rules from source to target text, using a multi-dimensional map (Holmes: 1994: 49,) "...using several pairs of opposites and graphing translation choices simultaneously according to several parameters (Tymoczko, 1999:57). In a different context, Lordes calls it a place 'where human' need is centred as an oppositional desired place as opposed to what we are conditioned to be oppressive practices (Lorde: 1984). In this kind of mapping, Boyce Davies draws a sharp distinction between nomadic subjects and calls for subjects who are moving to specific places for definite reasons.

The key questions facing the equalities issues out of the impasse therefore, includes questions not only of whether, but also of when, where, by who and how.

A. ISSUES FOR A POSTHECTOROSEXIST REALITY

1. Language

Bannet argues that we need a language which is constantly adapting itself, reinventing itself, constantly making and unmaking itself to speak the both/and complexity of life:

> Same am forever and at the same time, always different. And thus come and go, change and remain, continue and return without any circle. Exposed and open in this endless becoming. And without ever prevailing over the other. For they do not separate. Which is to say that they are to be confused with one another" (Bannet, 1993: 112).[59] (See also Vieira below on 'becoming' and Morrison above).

For instance, she raises the question of how it is possible to differentiate the issues confronting gender locally/globally and the issues confronting say, race, gender and sexuality both globally and locally and within the historical frames of the past/present and future which sometimes cohabit people's thoughts and practices. A case in point is the debate over timing, slippage and the slippery use of the terms such as (')Nigger(') (Louis Gates, Jr., 1998 Op. cit: 13) and (')Queer(') based on positionality and in this case, oppositional positionality. The issue about how to recognise these also arises given the danger of conflating the issues (as we noted above in what Keenaghan has called social practice), and also the reliance of language on its own historicity such as in the use of the sign 'Nigger'.

2. Pluralism, And/Or

The moment of impasse therefore produces an impulse for an and/or solution. This view, as well as the various positions occupied by the equalities theories and practices, point to a pluralistic model (Spender, 1980:102-5) and I will try to chart a model which enables such an accommodation of those 'end states' in translation theory and practice in the context of hectorosexism. This and/or model points to what I have termed a posthectorosexist reality for the contemporary period, and from this an 'or' model may emerge.

Kolodney in relation to feminism advocates "a playful pluralism" which I believe can be applied to translation in relation to the above (Kolodney, 1993:235). She argues that: "If feminists acknowledge ourselves as pluralists, then we do not give up the search for patterns of opposition and connection. Probably the basis of thinking itself; what we

give up is simply the arrogance of claiming that our work is either exhaustive or definitive. (It is after all, the identical arrogance we are asking our non-feminist colleagues to abandon). If this kind of pluralism appears to threaten both the present coherence of and the inherited aesthetic critera for a canon of 'greats', then, as I have earlier argued, it is precisely that threat, which alone, can free us from the prejudices, the strictures and the blind-spots of the past.

Bhabha makes a similar point where he argues that these new identities are 'neither one nor the other' (Op.cit.) and it is this ambivalence and newness which presents the impasse but perhaps the solution.

This view does not seem to be shared by Irigary, in relation to women and she argues that:

> When women want to escape from exploitation, they do not merely destroy a few "prejudices", they disrupt the entire order of dominant values, economic, social, moral and sexual. They call into question all existing theory, all thought, all language... They challenge the very foundation of our social order whose organisation has been prescribed by the patriarchal {read hectorosexist} system (Irigaray, 1993:377),[60] [Emphasis, mine].

This desire to seek the both/and is reflected in Kourounay, Sterba and Tong's argument against a metathory as follows:

> It is typical for 'male thinking' to seek the "one, true, feminist story of reality. For post modernists such a synthesis is neither feasible nor desirable... It is not

true because the "One" and the True" are philosophical myths that culture has used to club into submission the differences that, in point of empirical fact, best describe the human condition (1993:25).[61]

Yet not all approaches can be 'a playful pluralism' given some of the conditions against which hectorosexism has to be countered such as the case of imprisonment, death, torture and banning of books.

Thus, such a mapping of 'situational ethics' would need to enable a disentagling of the new strategies from hectorosexism within the axiomatic stance and across each of the contemporary equality trope theories in ways that are meaningful. This would enable new parameters to evolve, without turning the world (back) into the old heterogeneous universal or a new heterogenious one based on the old (Bhabha 1994:110). In a complex shift of 'both/and', the arguments for pluralism seem to favour sameness/difference in terms of strategies, while maintaining difference and diversity (Ross, 1990:334). Kolodney argues that:

> The very idea of pluralism seems to threaten a kind of chaos for the future of literary inquiry while, at the same time, it seems to deny the hope of establishing some basic conceptual model which can organize all data-the hope which always begins any analytical exercise. If literary inquiry has historically escaped chaos by establishing canons, then it has only substituted one mode of arbitrary action for another-and, in this case, at the expense of half the population. And if women openly acknowledge ourselves as pluralists, then we do not give up the search for patterns of opposition and connection-probably the basis of thinking itself; what we give up is simply the arrogance of claiming that our work is

either exhaustive or definitive. (It is, after-all, the identical arrogance we are asking our non-feminist colleagues to abandon). If this kind of pluralism appears to threaten both the coherence of and the inherited aesthetic criteria for a canon of 'greats', then, as I have earlier argued, it is precisely that threat which, alone, can free us from the prejudices, the strictures and the blindspots of the past (Kolodney (1993: 234).[62]

As we noted above with Hall's model, what Bannet calls both/and, there is caution about leaping hastily from the specific equality theories models which are relatively new, to newer, conflated and less defined models. This is because, as we observed above, translation is always a political act in what Tymoczko calls metonymics of translation. She argues that this is not a matter of abstract interest.(1999) t. They cast an image of the source text and the source culture; they have political and ideological presuppositions and impact; they function in the world".

Robinson's *vert* model, although not intended for hectorosexism per se, seems to point to the possibility of this 'playful pluralism' and I use it below to develop a tentative model despite the reservations and challenges pointed out above. This is because I share the view that change is desirable, necessary and inevitable. I argue for a conscious shift in the relocation of culture and subjects of translation practice, based on an ethics of what Ogudipe-Leslie calls 'critical transformations'. Simon argues that:

Contemporary feminist translation has made gender the site of a consciously transformative project; one which reframes conditions for textual authority (Simon, 1996:167).[63]

Being "brave" may also include a requirement of the visioning of an alternative present and future for what those desirable moments described by Falk as 'end states' and by Bhabha as "reinscription" might look like. Robinson also suggests that the model should enable an enjoyment, a willingness to backtrack, to start again, to take risks, to risk incoherence, to risk failure, enable the translator to 'please yourself and your reader (255) and this flexibility makes it appealing. This idea concurs with Sarajevo-Susam's criticism of the strategies and she calls for '... a coherent set of concepts and models , which can be applied across the board to all possible text types written in all possible languages at anytime in human history...' (Sarajeva-Susam, 2002:1995).[64]

B. VERTERE – METHODOLOGICAL WAY OUT OF THE IMPASSE

As I have demonstrated above, there are different approaches on offer to address the various inequalities in translation from the disparate and diverse voices and situations. These approaches have prompted me to look for a tool or tools which would be widely available and which could be used in any situation arising out of the inequalities to challenge the 'universalist' approach which we noted is 'supported by longstanding processes of exclusion and by the silencing of differences' (see Simon, above).

Despite the theorisation, Robinson's model of that he calls 'vertere', which he has derived from Burke's 'overturners' or versions of the Confessions (Robinson: 198-199) seems compelling and is explored here as complementary to the equality theories and as a counterbalance to the seeming impasse they face against hectorsexism (1991:173).

Vieira used the term 'reverse' in describing the postcolonial condition of translation in Brazil (1998:184). I will demonstrate its usefulness below. Although not directed at the

hectorosexist concerns per se, as argued here, nor directed either to the universal or the particular challenges that these raise, the *vert* model(s) seem(s) to sum up most of the strategies proposed above. It also seems to relate directly to the ethics of translation and is flexible to the specificity of each context. It provides an important framework within broad parameters from which to tackle the 'vertical' and 'horizontal' equalities issues and the diversity these require, as I will demonstrate below.

Vertere simply means to turn (Robinson: 194). Robinson posits it as a model for "reversing" what he sees as Augustinian adherence to Roman Catholic hegemony which he believes has been part of Western civilisational conditioning that he refers to as "ideosomatic programming". He argues that:

> One implication of the Augustine *verts* in other words, might be that there is not textual neutrality, no use of works that is "purely" informational or constantive, no "innocent "conveying" of meanings from one language to another... If you refuse to pervert, you convert. If you refuse to convert, you pervert. Whether you know it or not, whether you like it or not (Robinson, 1991: 200).[65]

Robinson's position seems to confirm the cultural turn's position and clarifies some of the issues as tested out in this instance through hectorosexism. It also accords with Massardier-Kenney's view which we have already noted that it is important to take all the interrelated issues into account. In accordance to what many of the equalities arguments have proposed this method includes ways of turning as we saw in the examples given above and in several cases, of reversing the 'universalist' hectorosexist order (Bassnett, 1998:135). This method appears to support the accommodation of

diversity and plurality, sameness and difference. This has resonance for me in what what Vieira refers to as weaving and fraying as discussed above.

The key turning tools that Robinson identifies include diversion, introversion, extroversion convertion/advertising, perversion, aversion, subversion and conversation.

I will demonstrate their applicability to the equalities paradigms below as I understand them to be applicable to hectorosexism and using some of the examples above, although Robinson has given adequate explanation and application of each which are relevant to and adequate for this study.

1. Aversion

The first of the *verts* that I shall address is aversion. Robinson argues that his model of aversion would include teaching the reader to throw off what he calls 'ideosomatic programming' and "learn to live". His argument is that:

> We must learn to hate the role that we have been trained to perform. We must learn to see that it is not us that it is an addition to us, a kind of emotion brain implant that we can fight and get rid of (249).[66]

Maryann DeJulio in discussing her translation of Olympe de Gouges describes her strategies for translating 'sauvage' (1994:130)[67] but also her explorations of translating gender in such contexts.

> One of the many qualifiers in Gouge's play, her use of *sauvage* is among the most interesting. Each time she uses the word *sauvage*, she recalls nature and

the origins of liberty and equality. Similarly, my translation of *sauvage* recalls nature with the epithet "rude", that is, primitive or natural. I only use the cognate "savage," which connotes bestiality, to emphasise misunderstood racial tensions: "Compassionate being to whom I owe my life and my spouse's life! You are not a Savage; you have neither the language nor the manners of one; are you the master of this Island?" (Valere to Zamor) [I, 6] (*ibid*).

She refused to be compelled to act 'faithfully' to the text and signals that she is a subject with agency. In this way she also makes herself visible as a translator. We noted already how the writers are using *écriture/traductire*, by 'writing through the body', such as Edward Kamau Braithewaite who talks of nation language. Others noted above include Cixous, hooks and Jordan and Louis-Gates Jnr. through signifying. bell hooks has talked about ways of knowing, through solidarity (hooks, 1993:391). Other critics such as Dingwaney and Maier have demonstrated the possibility of this solidarity through collaborative work (1995), which requires, in Boyce Davies' words, that the subjects on the different sides of the lines to 'migrate' to new and validating centres of articulation.

2. Introversion

Another *vert* that Robinson proposes is introversion which he describes in the following way:

> The ideology of introversion gives you two choices: Invisibility through successful role conformity, or invisibility through scandalous deviation. Be a good role-robot that does its job perfectly and so never draws attention to itself. or a rebellious human being who does not do his or her job at all and is better

ignored, excluded from public view, lest other people get the same idea. Obey the rules and inhabit the faceless centre. Break the rules and get exiled to the invisible periphery (Loc.cit)

It would seem that introversion sounds similar to invisibility, faithfulness to the author, with the difference being that the translator should be aware of the ethical issues but deliberately opts to stay within the axiomatic requirement. We noted above through the examples given by Tymoczko and Cronin in the translation of postcolonial literature of the need to remain faithful as a deliberate strategy. This has also been demonstrated to be the case in the translation of feminist texts by feminist translators. Cronin argues that: Advocacy of non-fluent, refractory, exoticizing strategies, for example, can be seen as a bold act of cultural revolt and epistemological generosity in a minor language, but in a minority language, fluent strategies may represent the progressive key to their very survival (1998:147).

3. Extroversion

In his model, Robinson views introversion as incontrovertibly linked in an oppositional duality with *vert* Extroversion. He argues that extroversion is the first step to liberation. He argues that:

> If a translator does not introvert all personal experience, desire and so on, he or she merely expresses it, in the root sense of that word: presses it out, forces it past the idealised introversional barriers out into the world, hurls it in the faces of the people who enforced his or her humility. For the intrumentalised introvert, extroversion is an act of hostility, a way of saying take that (Op.cit. 205).[68]

This seems to be similar to 'foreignising' suggested by Venuti where the text resists the dominant language and cultural values in order to draw attention to the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text.

Examples from the equalities paradigms could include, particularising, camp, zaming and dyking etc. i.e. (coming out of the closet), 'talking black' and staking their own place, the "inappropriate other" of Chela Sandoval (1991), as they reject the positions of "otherness" endowed on them by what we noted above as "inner voice (Volosinov): and seek an inherently specific voice which calls attention to their own specificity. A good example is what Mira (1998) calls knowledge of homographesis, the specific codes, slang, rites and symbols which distinguish gay texts through performative power. We noted the example above of extroversion through Keenaghan's discussion of the translation by Jack Spicer, 'Replacing Lorca's androgynous homograph with the gay body' (Keenaghan, Op. Cit). This can include such devices as display, parody, humour (Harvey, Op. Cit) and other 'in your face' strategies that are similar to feminist and black discourses.

Other examples include Appiah's call for 'thick translation'. Zabus and Wolf demonstrate that this methodology can be applied to feminist approaches through what she calls 'feminist thick translation (Zabus: 1999;Wolf, 1999) 'feminist thick translations'. These include annotation and footnotes which is similar to the strategies proposed by von Flotow. Diaz-Diocaretz argues that:

> The problems and options involved in translating texts by women brings to light in its essence the ideological property both in feminist and lesbian texts and woman-identified texts in general and in the need for the **translator-function** to

consider his/her ideological presuppositions and dispositions in the respective contexts of communication. A relevant area is the relationship between source and receptor texts seen from the focus on non-obligatory deviations and the translator as mediator. Under some circumstances, the text can be disambiguated and not only the message but also the content can be changed by modifying the possible conditions under which the text will be reveived (cf. Eco 176:150) (Diaz-Diocaretz, 1985:44).[69]

4. Conversion

Additionally and what seems closely related to extroversion is conversion/advertising. Robinson argues that conversion is what translators of secular texts seek to do. "Bible translators, however much they talk about "conveying" the content of the SL text in as faithful a way as possible, obviously want to help God and the SL writers convert the TL reader. Secular translators (translators of secular texts), however much they talk of conversion, by so patently aligning themselves with the SL writer's intentions lean towards conversion too" (Robinson, 1997:199). This exemplifies Nida's definition of purpose of translation noted above (*Op.cit*), but is used here for a different effect, not that of conforming to the monolithic stance, in this case of hectorosexism, but to a different kind of conversion, i.e. to the potential of a post-hectorosexist possibility.

Writers such as Caroline Cooper uses the term 'wuman tongue'. Brossard uses *'Lovhers'* and Kristeva, 'jouissance' and put language to uses that would be seen in English as a defamiliarising effect through both "speaking through the body" advocated by Cixous, but additionally, by 'defamiliarising' standard codes. In so doing, they

confirm hooks' use of what she calls "vernacular" and of which she states: "There, in that location, we make English do what we want it to do".[70]

5. Adaptation

Adaptation involves engaging in the text more heavily than is required by 'faithful' word for word translations. It advocates a sense for sense approach meaning that the potential for intervention is greater. It was favoured by the French in the 17th and 18th Centuries when it was more prevalent (Bastin, 1998:80).

6. Subversion

Robinson describes this as "underturning". He states that this "...in terms of the translator's dialogue with the TL receptor is an undermining or overthrowing of some fundamental assumption or expectation that the receptor brings to the translation, or to translations in general" (*232*).[71]

He further states that "...subersive translation is the undermining of reader's expectation or assumptions or trust in order to replace them with or redirect them to another and more beneficial set..." (*ibid*). He gives the example of this conditioning in relation to the "normal" somatic response, say, of the Psalms where he directs all his thinking to the repression of the somatic response in a phrase like: "coveting my neighbour's ass". He states that: I do not think of rumps, I think donkeys; and when he talks about the cock crowing, I don't think of penises, I think of roosters' (Robinson, *op.cit*: 225). Levine's *The subversive scribe* is replete with examples of subversion. She argues that the title is "...meant to jolt the reader out of a comfortable (or uncomfortable) view of translations

as secondary, as a faint shadow of primary, vivid, but lost originals (*see* Vieira, 1998:171-193) on the paradigm shift required to translate postcolonial literature). The poem by 'Erotique' Yourcenar (1982:94) seems to convey the weaving and fraying alluded to by Diaz-Diocaretz, as the reader is forced to pay close attention to the subject and context of the poem through language and content. She uses masculine and feminine metaphors subject pronouns interchangeably. Another famous example is Amos Tutuola's *The Palm wine drinkard* at a linguistic level. He uses the language available to him and makes it do for him what he wishes. At a more deliberate level, are writers such as Achebe of whom Kolb observes:

> By using local versions of English, writers like Achebe are not only able to accommodate their hybrid cultural identities, but also to 'subvert' empire by 'writing back' in a European language".[72]

7. Perversion

Another *vert* that Robinson advocates for ethical purposes is Perversion. Here, he argues that perversion is "...the warping of the reader's trust beyond replacement or redirection: a confusion, an unravelling of response, a stymieing of response, a putting the TL reader at sixes and sevens with regard to the SL text. The subversive translator is a revolutionary: the perverse translator is an anarchist or nihilist". Elsewhere he argues that this is precisely the ethics of such an approach because it enables a '...dismantling of those assumptions, exposing the fraudulence of the king's new clothes but leaving the viewer in doubt as to whether the nakedness thus exposed belongs tot he king or to the child who cries out, "But the King is not wearing anything!'"

Robinson gives the example of Derrida's perversion. He states that this infects "...the privileged category with the excluded difference, playing first with the separability of fruit and skin and the position of the core in relation to that "unity", then busying his tongue around the image of the royal cape, quilting and embroidering it, as he says, the translator does as tailor of the cape – as translation:

> Mais on en infere que ce qui compte, c'est ce qui se passe sous le manteau, a savour le corps du roi, ne dites pas tout de suite le phallus, autour duquel une traduction affair sa langue, fait des plis, moule des formes, coud des ourlets, pique et brode. Mais toujours amplement flottante a quelque distance de la teneur (238).[73]

> But one infers that what counts is what comes to pass under the cape, to wit, the body of the king, do not immediately say the phallus, around which a translation busies its tongue, makes pleats, moulds forms, sews hems, quilts and embroiders. But always amply floating at some distance from the tenor. (Graham's translation, 194)" (*ibid*).[74]

He goes on to observe that:

> For Derrida, it is the translation itself, of course, the translation that embroiders itself, following Heidegger's principle that language speaks us, but speaks us specifically (in Derrida's perversion of Heidegger's language mysticism) in a falling away from purity that makes the unity of tenor and language that Benjamin and Heidegger both yearn after impossible. The language (the Saussurean langue that was missing in Gandillic) that speaks us here becomes a

tongue (not to mention lips) in the throes of fellatio: no heterosex, no assault on the SL hymen; translation as a royal fellator, not even the translator, translation itself is down on its knees amidst the wide folds of the royal cape...." (Robinson, 235).[75]

8. Diversion

Yet another vert that Robinson describes is diversion which he states "becomes ethically serious when it "...becomes tinged with subversion, with fun at the expense of some text or expectation regarding a text, or when it drifts into diversity as divergency, errancy, the kind of wandering past accepted boundaries that breaks new paths". He describes this divergence as the:

> Turning from the SL toward the TL, not knowing what lies ahead, not plotting the turn in advance, not coding it, not pinning it down. Not molding and then building a bridge and refusing to take a step toward a TL that does not exist until you turn to it, on a road that your feet from under them and every step you take. Being willing to backtrack, start again, set off in a new direction – and to return to the first path if the second one does not turn out to your liking. Being willing to risk getting lost, to risk incoherence, to risk failure. Being willing to please yourself, without being sure that your reader will be pleased. Being willing to please yourself and your reader, even though you know the critics will probably hate it and the normative theorists condemn it. Doing it-for fun. For fun as self-therapy, as a growing up into playfulness of childhood, a growing out of rigidly solmnized adulthood, self-protective maturity" (Robinson, 255).[76]

9. Conversation

The final *vert* that Robinson addresses is conversation, which he says is the ultimate

strategy of the *vert* family. He argues, as does Levine, that translation is conversation in

what he calls "somatic relating". He sees translation as capable of bringing about

change, conversion:

> "...not into institutionally controlled doctrine, not to a way of seeing that
>
> excludes and includes, not to a set of taboos, but to an open-ended compositional
>
> relatedness, a nomadic sensitivity to idiosomatic needs inside and out, in your
>
> own body an the body of the person you are conversing with, in me and you, a
>
> playful awareness of who we are that is potentially redemptive... (.[77]

An example of this is Levine's *Subversive scribe*, as a conversation on the effects of

translation to her, the experience of translating Cabarera Infante and Severo Sarduy,

Carlos Fuentes, etc. We also noted above the translation of Keenaghan's discussion of

Spicer's translation of Lorca's *'Oda a Walt Whitman'* where the writing and translation

began to have a dialogue, i.e, between the author and the translator. (Keenaghan's,

1998: 275)

Levine argues that:

> A translation should be a critical act, however, creating doubt, posing questions
>
> to its reader, recontextualising the ideology of the original text. Since a good
>
> translation, as with all rhetoric, aims to (re)produce an effect, to persuade a
>
> reader, it is in the broadest terms, a political act. A good translator performs a

balancing act, then, attempting to push language beyond its limits while at the same time maintaining a common ground of dialogue between writer and reader, a speaker and listener (Levine, 1991:3).[78]

That is the ultimate conversation. It enables a re-visioning in all its meanings, visioning the past, refocusing ones present vision, but also adjusting the vision of the past to a more accurate perception. This is what I have called rediscovery, because it interrogates the author (Millar, 1986:102-120), translator and therefore the shifts in the source, target and translation spaces. This resonates with what Chela Sandoval (1991) calls "polyphonous other" and seems to concur with Msiska's strategy discussed above for adjusting reading strategies to accommodate "otherness" which Levine also seems to advocate. It allows what Kolodney calls "a playful pluralism" (1993) a creative use of genre, form, language, punctuation, themes, away from axiomatic practice.

VI. CHAPTER CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I sought to answer the question whether the subaltern can speak by looking for a tool or tools through which the impasse can be breached in the quest for a posthectorosexist possibility. We explored the reasons why the impasse exists by looking at the impact of the shifting locus of culture and subjects away from the axiomatic stance through the theorisation of the cultural turn.

In the next section, I explore the relevance of this knowledge to the translation of Ngũgĩ's work which seems to engender such responses with its epistemological departure. In the next two chapters, I will address the key issues facing the translation of these texts, and how they have been addressed. I also address their potential translation

in relation to the strategies available. Ngũgĩ's decision to write in Gĩkũyũ and the significance of these texts as literary pioneers is also an important factor as we noted in chapter 1. The questions raised also reflect Ngũgĩ's shift from writing in English, and in the second text, his departure in not translating his own work into English. The thematic concerns of the text also raise challenging questions in relation to hectorosexism. I continue to explore the question of the location of culture and subject and the impact of the above strategies to the culture and subjects of translation as theory and practice.

CHAPTER THREE

A STUDY OF HECTOROSEXISM IN THE TRANSLATION OF *CAITANI MŪTHARABAINI* (*DEVIL ON THE CROSS*)

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter addresses the question of hectorsexism and the strategies employed in relation to the translation of *Caitani Mūtharabaini*. I address some of the issues which arise in relation to the theories and strategies addressed in chapter 2 with respect to retranslation (Niranjana: 173) and assess its necessity. I argue that this is a strategy necessitated by the recovery of 'lost' narratives which this chapter will explore. As we noted in chapter 2 in relation to the equalities paradigms, this could entail 'traducture', writing back, or purely a recovery exercise as the examples demonstrate. Some aspects also defy these approaches due to the complex and embedded nature of hectorosexism as will become evident. The chapter specifically addresses translation in relation to what has come to be known as Ngũgĩ's 'epistemological break' (Ngũgĩ, 1986:44; Mojola: 2002). This includes an exploration of the thematic concerns and content of the text, metonymical issues of intertextuality, metatext, subtext, context and text, including form and themes particularly through naming and characterisation. I also explore issues of the narrative voices and attempt to 'isolate' authority, and the enunciatory voice in a text which self-translated.

I also explore the impact of hectorosexism on some linguistic issues and the challenges they pose for translatability. These are addressed through the specific hectorosexist

historical context of Kenya and its interface with English, which is itself one of the thematic concerns of the book.

To conclude, the chapter addresses the question of authority both of the translator/author and in what I argue may be a back-translation, or transcreation/adaptation. This gives useful insights on positionality and identity and issues of shifts in culture and subject in contexts of heteroglossia (Bakhtin: 1982: 89, cited in Venuti, 2000:296).

II. HECTOROSEXISM IN CONTEXT

A. OVERVIEW

As I noted in chapter 1, *Caitani Mutharabaini* (*Devil on the Cross*) is chosen for study for the magnificence in the crafting of the allegorical satire (Ogude, 1999: 56; Balogun: 1997; Lovesay: 1992). We noted the significance and departure of this text to the reception of Ngũgĩ's work which has been called an 'epistemological break' due to its stylistic and linguistic departures. Ngũgĩ decides not only to write in Gĩkũyũ, as we noted in chapter 1, but also uses orature and the multigenre including multiple voices, fully.

Ngũgĩ had in fact written a hundred pages of a book in 1976 with the title *Devil on the Cross* in English (Ngũgĩ, 1986:81) (see Willis' discussion below on the translation of *Vivre l'orange*). He had also tried translating *Petals of Blood* into Gĩkũyũ and failed (Sicherman, 1992:32). Sicherman also notes that Ngũgĩ had found it enormously difficult to translate *Caitani Mũtharabaini* into English (30). As noted above, the Gĩkũyũ text was written in prison in Kamiti Maximum security in 1978. Between 1984 and 1986, over 1600 copies of the book were sold. These sales seem to have been

influenced by Ngũgĩ's conscious use of orature and his use of the Gĩkũyũ language and the written form resembling what would be called a novel to engage with his 'readership'. This text follows on from the influential performances of Ngũgĩ's plays at Kamiirithu and the National theatre for which he was detained. The target reception includes non-literate communities of Gĩkũyũ and non-Gĩkũyũ speakers.

In common with several of Ngũgĩ's other books written in English prior to writing *Caitani Mũtharabaini*, Ngũgĩ's thematic concerns for the issues I have identified here as hectorosexist, is clear. These include the tensions between modernity and tradition within an imperialist framework. Ngũgĩ explores the tensions between the rural, urban, cosmopolitan and global worlds. He addresses issues of religion, race, gender, sexuality and class. Seen within the wider context of the corpus of his work there is continuity and consistence in his empathy with the underdog, the poor, often peasant or worker and/or female. Evans observes that:

> ...All his novels are sensitive to the burdens that Kenyan women have to bear. Muthoni and Nyambura in *The River Between*, Njoroge's two mothers in *Weep not, Child*, Mũmbi and Wangari in *A Grain of Wheat*, Wanja and Nyakinyua in *Petals of Blood*, are all in their own ways "resistance heroines and the strongest symbols of cultural identity" (Evans, 1987: 131-140).[1]

This text and *Petals of Blood* (English) preceding it share the identifiable postcolonial Kenyan setting between Nairobi and Ilmorog (Evans, 1987:130). Evans refers to this as a carry-over although for the Gĩkũyũ reader this is not strictly true apart from those who have read Ngũgĩ's work in English.

The similarities in the texts and Ngũgĩ's knowledge and his earlier writing raise issues about originality/transliteration/, (re)writing/transcreation, (Mukherjee, 1994:76-85) into English. This includes 'back-translation'and adaptation in both languages as issues of importance in the context of shifting cultures and subjects. Commentators such as Moreduwun (1998), Bandia (2001) and Gyasi (1998) argue that similar texts in the corpus of African literature particularly in English are already translations. This raises questions of what the translation of a transcreation from English to Gĩkũyũ to English becomes as is the case of the text translated from English, to Gĩkũyu to English, *Devil on the Cross*. Ngũgĩ had begun writing a similar text in English.

Bardolf in fact, uses the term 'retraduit' in her reading of text :

"…et pourtant, il est une fois de plus difficile d'echapper aux ambiguités crées le paradox d'une expression écrite en anglais defendant une culture partuculière" (Bardolf, 1986:40).[2]

"…and even so, it is also difficult to escape the ambiguities created by the paradox of writing in English stating a case for another specific culture" (Bardolf, 1986:40) [My translation].

She further goes on to state that:

Apres l'avoir **retraduit** en anglais, travail douloureux et peu satisfaisant selon l'écrivan, il decide de ne plus donner lui même la version en anglais de ses roman.

After having **retranslated** it into English, a tedious and thankless task according to the author, he decided to no longer involve himself in the English rendition of his writings {my translation}(Bardolf, 1986:48).[3] [Emphasis mine]

B. READERSHIP

1. Overview on language and readership of the texts in the specific translation interface for the two texts

One can argue that the 'translations' of Caitani *Mũtharabaini* and *Matigari ma Njirũũngi* in the original and the translations into English and other languages seem 'targeted' at various levels of audiences/readers as follows. These include the following language group patterns which are not exhaustive:

i.	A Gĩkũyũ Aural group
ii.	A Gĩkũyũ Aural reception/and or readership
iii.	A Gĩkũyũ readership
iv.	A Gĩkũyũ/English readership
v.	A Gĩkũyũ/other language readership, e.g. Gĩkũyũ/German
vi.	A Swahili readership (which includes a wide East African constituency, many of whom speak another language
vii.	A Swahili/ Gĩkũyũ readership
viii.	A Swahili/other language readership, e.g. Swahili/German, or Swahili/English
ix.	A Kenyan/English readership (which includes all Kenyan nationality language readerships)

x.   A more generalised English readership (international)

xi.   An English, other language readership

xii.   Other language readerships (translations)

We shall not enter into a discussion here on the implications of each specific one although some are important as will become evident in the case studies below in the discussion of heteroglossia.

2. Shifting Reception Culture: Overview on the Target 'Readerships'

My contention is that the original text already addresses different levels of readerships and seems to already take the question of translation into account from the onset i.e. English and Swahili speaking addressees are already evident in the source text given the heteroglossia of Gĩkũyũ /Kenyans. Meyer describes such multiple locations of writing as diglossia in sociolinguistic terms and this is described further by Crehan as:

> "...a situation in which two dialects or languages acquire specialized function according to the social context in which they are used. Diglossia in this sense can exist without bilingualism, as it does in many developing countries".

Thus, English is the dominant language in Kenya, whereas Gĩkũyũ and Kiswahili are dominated languages despite the fact that English is spoken and understood by only a small minority of the population (see Crehan, 1993; Mazrui; 1998, Ngũgĩ: 1986).

I would argue that Ngũgĩ, in writing the original text, is already aware of these levels of 'lingualisms' in the reception of his work, following the experiences at Kamiriithu and

the huge success of his previous work, both in and outside Kenya. Most people who are literate in Kenya are literate in English and I would argue that this would influence their reading and reception strategies. Ngũgĩ is therefore aware that the work is likely to require a translation and that this particular text will attract a large readership/following, if only for its scripting in prison and also it being his first full narrative text of this kind in Gĩkũyũ. The fact that Ngũgĩ is the translator of the text is an additional important feature that would generate interest in this work. As noted above, the Gĩkũyũ play co-authored and translated with Ngũgĩ wa Mirii had already set a precedent in terms of international and national language audiences. Ngũgĩ s work in translation is also not a new concept as his works are translated into Kiswahili by the time this text came to be written.

Of interest to this thesis however is how the author/translator in the original text goes about addressing hectorosexism for his various readerships and audiences, for instance, the impact of this on the 'formal' or 'proper' translation. The research confines itself to the strategies adopted in translating hectorosexism in the English translation, although it is difficult to ignore the multiple layers of the adressees, and the slippery 'original' and translation.

The complexity of the shifting culture of the subject of author, translator, and reader and text described in chapter 2, is exemplifed in the readings of Ngũgĩ's work by Ogude, Balogun, Sicherman and Evans, as I will demonstrate below. In relation to reception, Evans for instance states that:

> ...Properly the work should be read aloud and communally in its original
>
> Gĩkũyũ. An individual private reading of the English version can obviously not

do justice to a work whose principal significance lies in the Gĩkũyũ language. But in the novel which is so intimately concerned with Ngũgĩ's individual and communal identity, it is also significant that the images of women are such a prominent feature. Wariinga the female protagonist of *Devil on the Cross* is a successor to the line of heroines who have become increasingly central to the structure and meaning of Ngũgĩ's work (137).[4]

Evans recognises the authorship for the Agĩkũyũ readers, yet in the second half of the paragraph talks about the English speaking readers who are familiar with Ngũgĩ's other heroines which strictly, 'pure Gĩkũyũ' readers are not, given that this is Ngũgĩ's first text in Gĩkũyũ. She seems to think of authenticity only being available through the original text for a 'pure' community. This view on her part validates Venuti's view that:

This view of authorship carried two disadvantageous implications for the translator. On the one hand, translation is defined as a second-order representation: only the foreign text can be original, an authentic copy, true to the author's personality or intention, whereas the translation is derivative, fake, potentially a false copy. On the other hand, translation is required to efface its second-order status with transparent discourse, producing the illusion of authorial presence whereby the translated text can be taken as the original. However much the individualistic conception of authorship devalues translation, it is so pervasive that it shapes translators' self-presentations, leading some to psychologise their relationship to the foreign text as a process of identification with the author (Venuti, 1995:6-7).[5]

Evans does not seem to the take the hybrid nature of the original and of Kenya into account. Further, Evans seems to idealise Gĩkũyũ culture as pure and fixed in some distant communal time where reading, like traditional story telling, assumes, in her view a communality which I do not think Ngũgĩ is deliberately evoking as a reality, but as a desired and present/future utopia. This is true owing to colonial history and the epistemological context of Ngũgĩ's own radical departure of writing in Gĩkũyũ, his class, social standing, status, the specific circumstances and the reasons of his imprisonment and writing the book in prison under neo-colonialism. Secondly, there is a large literate reception for the work not only in Kenya, but world-wide. Balogun acknowledges this awareness of what Bhabha has called a 'hybrid' context and reads the writing and by implication, the reception as deconstructionist.

Another factor which Evan's critique does not seem to take into account is that not everybody in Kenya can afford to buy or read the book due to financial, linguistic and time constraints. The target reception of Ngũgĩ's Gĩkũyũ text cannot be generalised as can be done in literate cultures where the book is part of the social and cultural fabric of society in certain circles of social class as is the case in the West. Kamiriithu is also not a 'traditional' Gĩkũyũ community but one forged consciously partly as a result of colonial legacy and also through the conscious efforts of the community. Ngũgĩ has documented the process of developing the adult literacy programmes and theatre there (Ngũgĩ, 1986:44-45) thus creating a self-conscious sense of community in a shifting neo-colonial landscape. Thus, Evans' reading demonstrates an idealised, pre-colonial view of Kenya/Gĩkũyũ and this affects her 'reading' of the context, text and its translation (Sicherman, 1986). Her claim that a text should be read orally reflects some of the perceptions which arise out of stereotyping, as reading aloud could be true of writing in any language and culture. It is also determined by the context of the reading,

taste, culture and reading abilities of the readers. It is also dependent on the purpose for which audiences have texts read to them. Talking books or the readings which take place in cultural centres or during church services are good examples of communal oral reception. Further, this view is erroneous in relation to Ngũgĩ's work, as it is a well-known fact that this text is read widely across the world, including for academic and other purposes.

The reception of this text as oral is partly predicated on the fact of the context in which it was produced, i.e. Kamiriithu and Kenya and the political factors around it including the razing of the theatre to the ground, the banning of the performance of the plays, noted above, Ngũgĩ's imprisonment for these plays, the cost of books and illiteracy. Even literate Gĩkũyũ and non-Gĩkũyũ people joined in these reading-as-performance sessions, owing to their acculturalisation in the oral tradition and their novelty . I would argue that this produced a completely new performative departure for both orature/literature in Gĩkũyũ and Kenyan culture, thus extending the 'epistemological break'. It brought together literate and non-literate communities and cut across class and nationality in its reception despite its being scripted in Gĩkũyũ. Ngũgĩ's earlier English language texts had not had such a reception. What makes *Caitani Mũtharabaini* a more intriguing dramatic text, given its place in Gĩkũyũ literature as a pioneering text, was the fact that it was read in taxis and in public places such as bars. Ngũgĩ describes this experience in the following way:

> One amusing aspect of all this was the development of "professional readers" –
> but in bars.

These were people who would read the book aloud to the other drinking but attentive customers. When the reader reached an interesting episode and he discovered that his glass was empty, he would put the book down. 'Give him another bottle of beer!' some of the listeners would shout to the proprietor. So our reader would resume and go on until his glass was empty. He would put the book down and the whole drama would be repeated, night after night, until the end of the novel (Ngũgĩ, 1986:83).

C. NGŨGĨ WA THIONG'O AND TRANSLATION

This has had an impact on the translation into English because, after the performances, people would want to read the book, and occasionally share it with others. Additionally, it is important to bear in mind that Ngũgĩ is not new to the English language or to translation when he embarks on the translation of this text. Not much about Ngũgĩ as a translator is known although the two works he has been involved in and his new book to be published soon will provide a future basis for a better-placed assessment. However, as we noted above, he found it a 'travail douloureux' or 'thankless task' (see p. 162 above). He has stated in interviews that he has used a free-style to translate the texts. He also states in an interview with me that he has not tended to use Gĩkũyũ dictionaries in his translations, but has relied on research within the communities around him and his knowledge of the language. It should be noted here, however, that Ngũgi is an author who 'engages' in the translations of his works, particularly in English. This is true of his previous works in Gĩkũyũ including *Ngahika Ndeenda (I will Marry when I want)* (co-authored and co-translated with wa Mirii) and in this case his own translation of *Caitani Mũtharabaini*. He was also closely involved in the translation of *Matigari ma Njirũũngi*, working closely with both the translator and the publishers through the

various drafts and editions (see chapter 4 below). This involvement has an impact on authorial authority and I address this below in relation to hectorosexism and power (see discussion above on Levine's translation of Cabarera Infante's work). Given this complex cultural shift, it seems important to address the impact of the epistemological shift to reading and reception strategies in the instance of translation for the Gĩkũyũ readership. This would better illustrate and support my point on shifting cultures and subjects, in this case, with regards to translation and reception.

1. Ngũgĩ's 'translation' into English for a Gĩkũyũ readership

In his translation for the English-speaking readership, Ngũgĩ is clearly very aware of his Gĩkũyũ speaking readers in his 'transcreation', writing or translation of the text. Most readers/audiences of Ngũgĩ's work who fall in the English-speaking reader category will most likely have a spoken knowledge of the source language. I first read this text in translation and as Ngũgĩ's other texts in English I made several cultural references in Gĩkũyũ and in 'Kenyan'. This supports the notion of heteroglossia discussed above and the emergence of a 'multilingual' African culture and an elimination of alterity across some of the languages of Kenya, as a very African phenomenon. As I argued above, and to give my own case as an example, I speak Gĩkũyũ, Kiswahili and English as one 'language' in the Kenyan/ Gĩkũyũ context to varying degrees depending on location. Brisset introduces the concept of 'reterritorialization' (Brisset: 2000:346) in a context where the boundaries between translation, source and target 'texts' are more amorphous than the assumed 'pure' source and 'pure' target languages. Thus, in this text, the presence of words in several identifiable languages in the original and translated texts including the English and Swahili text read for me as one text as argued in chapter 1. (see Steiner's example (see below, p. 226). This is true whether the text is in Gĩkũyũ or

in English. The best example I can give of this is though the use of proper nouns, such as the names of characters and of places as Ngũgĩ uses them as part of his narrative device. This plays a significant role in the 'original' text which we will discuss below as naming is woven into the fabric of the narrative as will become evident. This illustrates Msiska's point above in relation to reading strategies which is important here for translation, both in relation to Ngũgĩ the translator and additionally the Kenyan/ Gĩkũyũ readers of his 'translation'. For instance the name of the narrator, the Gicaandi player, is not translated into English. Many Gĩkũyũ readers of the source text would not have encountered a Gicaandi player. Ngũgĩ's role therefore as writer and translator goes beyond story telling and extends to that of educator/teacher/excavator for the source language reader and this goes to exemplify the extended roles of conscious writers and translators in heterosexist contexts. Ngũgĩ revives a dying art in both form and as narrative device and additionally recentres it in Gĩkũyũ narrative strategy. In this case this narrative strategy is oral, orature, writing and translation, thus giving it a new life in both source and target cultures. This is a clear case where there are shifts in culture and subjects, including the author, the readers, the translator and the various cultures (see Zabus' discussion of reflexification below). Gĩkũyũ readers are thus able to learn about the important cultural role of the Gicaandi player (oral/aural, but also receive the new 'textual Gicaandi player' – both as a fictional narrator but also through Ngũgĩ as an author. In discussing the form of the text, Balogun notes that, "...its composition is governed by an aesthetic philosophy that is radically different from earlier practices in African language novels (Balogun, 1997:59).[6]

He further comments that:

Hence, Ngũgĩ's new novel – the product of a master craftsman [emphasis mine] – is consciously balanced generic art that credibly sustains multiple readings at the level of different genres, when Fagunwa's novels – the products of Africa's pioneering attempt at writing the novel remain at the interdeterminate level of one genre trying to become another. Of course, the late Fagunwa did not have the level of Western education or the exposure to postmodernist literary sophistication that characterize Ngũgĩ's experiences and an intellectual writer and world figure (*ibid*).[7]

2. Translation for other "readers" of the Gĩkũyũ text and English translation

As we noted above, several Gĩkũyũ/English readers and English reading critics, some of whom are already familiar with Ngũgĩ's work in English, have tended to treat this text as a seamless continuation of his previous work as will become evident below. This has also been the case with the reception by the same groups of his play *Maitũ Njugĩra*, (*Mother Sing for me*) in Gĩkũyũ, which is yet unpublished in both Gĩkũyũ and English. I do not think a published translation into the English exists. This is remarkable and gives a broader context of the reception of Ngũgĩ's work in Gĩkũyũ by local, national and international audiences, some of whom had already seen *Ngahika Ndeenda (I will marry when I want in Gĩkũyũ* (Bjorgman, 1989:57-60). The absence of linguistic frontiers in the reception is evident in the production of critical and scholarly work generated by both Gĩkũyũ plays at the local, national and international levels, including by critics such Ingrid Bjorgman (1989) amongst others. I would argue that this performative element of Ngũgĩ's work to live multilingual audiences owes some of its success to a translatability of the human experience and drama which depends on more than verbal and linguistic access. They rely on their latent knowledge of history, but on intertextual

knowledge of Ngũgĩ's work, whether they are literate or not, whether they speak Gĩkũyũ or not. Thus, the play *Ngahika Ndeenda* (*I will Marry when I want*), which was co-authored with Ngũgĩ wa Mĩirĩĩ was read/performed without interpretation to mixed audiences.

Yet, the reception of the play *Maitũ Njugira* (*Mother Sing for me*) raises another issue of translation (interpretation) or the inverse of what I call oralation, i.e. SL text to speech in TT (see Bjorgman's discussions of the performance of *Maitu Njugira* and the participation of non-Gĩkũyũ audiences (87)). This only replicates the performance of heteroglossia in the ST but also the literate/illiterate divide. This example applies in different ways to the shifts in reading and reception cultures which apply to other levels of readerships that I have outlined above. This supports Brisset's argument in relation to what she calls reterritorialization (Brisset: 2000).

Below, we turn to the textual issues which this performance and translation, (including translation 'proper') encounter. This includes the translation of metatext, text and context where, I would argue, that this ambivalence extends.

III. A STUDY OF THE METATEXT, SUBTEXT AND TEXT IN THE TRANSLATION OF CAITANI MŨTHARABAINI

A. OVERVIEW

As we noted in chapter 2, and as will become evident in chapter 4, the author uses metatextual, subtextual and textual myths to ground the narrative in the Gĩkũyũ/ Kenyan context within the specific history of colonialism and neo-colonialism (see Parrinder: 1982 on African myths). The myths (Von Flotow: 1998; Kristeva: 1989: 292-3,) and

narratives are presented as 'common knowledge' despite heteroglossia and the target readership. I argue that the latent knowledge of these metatextual myths is assumed in the original text as is common in most cultures. This aspect seems to validate Moi's observation that "... Textual production as a hightly complex 'overdetermined' process with many different conflicting literary and non-literary determinants (historical, political, social, ideological, institutional, generic, psycohological and so on" (Moi, 1985: 45).[8] I would argue that in this text some of this latent knowledge is embedded in the metatext, subtext, and text in several ways as I will demonstrate below. This has implications for the translation.

1.   Translation of text, metatext and text

These narratives contain metatexts and subtexts which are drawn from the cultural habits of the various cultures that are the reality of contemporary Kenya. They include habits and cultures such as Christianity, politics, religion, Gĩkũyũ culture and emergent Kenyan culture. However, I would argue that Ngũgĩ's own identity, status, acculturalisation, ideological inclination, subjectivity and education and his location in history, are also key factors. Balogun (1997:154) and Sicherman (1992: 259-275) for instance both draw attention to Ngũgĩ's as a mythologiser, while other scholars such as Gikandi draw attention to the realism of his work.

The use of key motifs which are Gĩkũyũ and Ngũgĩ specific (if only because he is the main writer in the language during this period) in the corpus of his work are also part of the context, metatext and subtexts. For instance, the Gĩkũyũ originary mythology is amalgamated through complex multigenre with other mythologies which reinforce hectorosexist, patriarchal orders, including that of white supremacy and imperial power, the myth of creation in Christian and Gĩkũyũ orthodoxy and Marxism. Thus, the

misogyny which Warĩĩnga suffers from cannot be pinned down to any one source although each is recognisable at various instances despite the ambivalence present. The use of deconstructionism renders these familiar symbols simple and complex to read and translate because they are at once real and fictional. For instance the cover of the Gĩkũyũ text depicts a picture of fat bellied capitalist crucified on a cross surrounded by foreign bank-notes. Ngũgĩ subverts the Christian myth and crucifies the imperialist "devil" and this could be seen as satirical, yet in the neo-colonial state, the suffering of the poor at the hands of the rich and through religion is real and thus their desire to crucify the 'devil' is far from satirical. In a single gesture of 'crucifying' the devil, several hectorosexist oppressions are addressed including heterosexual violence against women, theft, greed, misogeny, and racism, while at the same time countering the discourse of punishment of 'innocence' on the cross. The narrative is ambivalent in this way throughout and it is thus impossible to take anything, including the characters, at face value only, despite the seeming linearity of the narrative.

One of the key metatexts which is common in most of Ngũgĩ's work is the myth of Gĩkũyũ as the founding father of the nation and its patriarchal origins. Ngũgĩ continues to embed this myth which is present in the Gĩkũyũ language through idiomatic expressions such as 'Gĩkũyũ ni oigire', '*Amu Gĩkũyũ ni oigire...*' (p.46) and, '*nikio Gĩkũyũ or ringi oigire*' (*ibid*) which translates to 'Gĩkũyũ once said' (p.52) and 'That's why Gĩkũyũ also said' (*ibid.*). In another instance: *Gĩkũyũ oigire wĩigĩire ndahũũtaga. Ũi Gĩkũyũ arĩ mũkĩgu akiuga ugo?* (p.56). "Gĩkũyũ said that he who has put something aside never goes hungry! Do you think that Gĩkũyũ was a fool when he said that?" (p.62). This simple device, common in Gĩkũyũ, reinforces the narrative in a patriarchal mode. It does not pay tribute to Mũmbi or the knowledge systems deriving from her. It reinforces the patriarchal myth of beginnings around Gĩkũyũ and undermines the myth

of matriarchal beginnings of Gĩkũyũ people in what is in effect an-overarching metatext common to all of Ngũgĩ's works. In the example, Ngũgĩ's use of the expression – Ta uria Gĩkũyũ oigire which translates as 'as Gĩkũyũ said' thus recentres the metatext and subtext of the myth of patriarchal beginnings which is contested within Gĩkũyũ orthodoxy and which I would argue, is influenced by Western orthodoxy. Kiarie for instance challenges this orthodoxy in her poem '*Mukengeria*' as follows:

Mũkengeria

Maitu

You have been called many things

The one with sealed lips

Sojourner

As though you lived alone like a wizard

A stranger in your home

You have persevered through much Maitu

You deep sea-swell of silence

Letting them name you names

As though you accept that you are a stranger

Visitor in your own yard

One who comes,

Lips sealed;

When you seal your depth on the inside

What shall we say of the outside?

(Kiarie, 1994:103)[9] [My translation]

In another instance, a number of originary accounts exist, but it is not clear how much influence hectorosexism, (particularly Christianity, racism and sexism) has on these. These include divergent accounts such as Kenyatta's *Facing Mt. Kenya* (1968), Shaw's *Race, Sex and Class in Kenya* , (1995) Gakaara wa Wanjau's work (see Pugliese, 1995) and Leakey's *The Southern Kikuyu before 1903* (1977). Most of them seem to be written by men or white women. I am not aware of any written work in this area by a Gĩkũyũ woman apart from the oral narratives.

In the case of this expression which is of overarching importance in setting the context as an uncontested patriarchal one, a subversive or accurate translation strategy would propose a translation such as: As wise Mũmbi said. This would be more accurate, if we took Mũmbi to mean "Creator" or foundational diety of the Gĩkũyũ **Queendom** [emphasis mine].[10] In fact, many Gĩkũyũ people refer to the nation as '*Nyũmba ya Mũmbi*' (literally Mũmbi's realm). Mumbi is not to be confused with God the creator of Judeo/Christian mythology as we noted in chapter 1. Ngai (God) is not directly associated with the creation myth in Gĩkũyũ cosmology. Ngai is an omniscient and omnipotent presence. We also noted the Bible translation of Eve into Gĩkũyũ is not Mũmbi but Hawa and I feel that this has additionally influenced Ngũgĩ's interpretation of the Gĩkũyũ originary myth as it has done to Kenyatta's. The Adam and Eve story also fits in well with the question of the origins of Gĩkũyũ and Mũmbi. This question of origins remains philosophically unanswered in Gĩkũyũ as in many other cultures, so there is a tendency to substitute the aspect of God creating Adam and Eve to Ngai creating Gĩkũyũ and Mũmbi quite readily as I did in my childhood (see Maake on p.47above). A comparable interpretation is to be found in Mary Phil Korsak, who, using a feminist reading of the Hebrew text, has demonstrated similar biases in the translation of *Genesis* in what she argues the Deity says to Eve (1999:2). The

excavation work for African women has yet to happen, and Van Sertima's work has already produced important insights (1988).

Another example of some difficulties arising with the translation of the originary myth into English is that of colonial translation of Mumbi and the daughter deities into mortals. A subversive translation would accord the deity Mumbi her rightful place in English knowledge systems.

"Gĩkũyũ" also symbolises the father of the nation state, in Ngũgĩ's case both Gĩkũyũ and Kenya (Ogude. op.cit; Ogundele, 1995:111-131) and Ngũgĩ uses him as a symbol for Kenyan nationhood in the original text. Some critics read him as only a symbol of the Gĩkũyũ nation. Thus reclaiming/reinventing the matriarchal or feminist orthodoxy, or mythology, would give a new meaning to the nation state and give it attributes of reproductivity/aesthetic productivity encompassed in the concept 'mũmbi' (Shaw, *op. cit.*; Bhabha, *op.cit*:139-170).. Boemher notes, in relation to the repesentation of workers and revolutionaries in Ngũgĩ's work, that women are stereotyped as only reproducers and nurturers of the nation,

Another 'neutral translation of such an expression which grounds the text would be to translate the expression to 'As the wise of old said', but to my mind this would evoke other narratives in English say, of Moses in Judeo/Christian orthodoxy or Virgil etc. whether stated or unstated, thus decontextualising the narrative. It would also remove the cultural specificity of the narratives standpoint, which is a Gĩkũyũ/Kenyan one. Viswanatha and Simon (Trivedi, 1996:170) refer to the 'naturalisation' which takes place in similar instances and give the example of the translation of the poem 'The Bridge of Sighs' where Christianity is equated with the ideals of Aryan tradition with

which the Kannada reader is familiar. A possible solution for the Gĩkũyũ *'Gĩkũyũ ni oigire'* could be translated as: "As wisdom has it", because it could apply to any wisdom, including that of the young, of men, of women of the past or of the future.

Another difficulty that arises with this particular example of narrating the nation is the apparent centring of the narrative in Gĩkũyũ logocentrism and nationalism which at one level it does both consciously and unconciously as Ogude has pointed out. A translation of Gĩkũyũ culture, would evoke Kenyan/Gĩkũyũ anti colonial history and given its relationship with the English language, because Gĩkũyũ nationalism in Gĩkũyũ does not evoke those anti-Kikuyu and anti-Mau Mau narratives that English does almost automatically. Given the colonial history between Britain and Kenya, this would require a sensitive translation. In chapter 4, I have addressed this issue through an example of the translation of the term 'kaburu'.

In my view, such metatexts and subtexts foreground other myths and thematic treatment, including other stereotypical myths such as those around gender demonstrated here through the suppression of Mumbi and the matriarchal power and origins of the Gĩkũyũ. The focus on Wariinga who is the main protagonist of the text, makes gender a useful tool through which to analyse some examples of translating. The focus includes the study of myths such as: women are not 'workers', myths about the role of women in the liberation struggles, women as ready-to-yield and women's lack of agency. We will address just some examples amongst these in relation to stereotypes as well as naming and characterisation in the subsequent section.

3. Translating Hectorosexism in Theme and Style

a. *Women are not real workers and real workers are men*

This partriarchal grounding in the metatext continues 'logically' into the text. Ngũgĩ's representation of Wariinga, as a helpless 'failed' woman arises out of his concern for the plight of women. However, a number of stereotypes about women and her characterisation create ambivalence. Although it is true that women suffer oppression, the stereotypical views about them do not assist in her emancipation in my view. For instance, women are presented as not being real workers, and that real workers are men. In the Gĩkũyũ and Kenyan context the inherent hectorosexism represents challenges for translation at two levels: The first is within the characterisation of Wariinga and the second, in her representation as will become evident below. Until she becomes an engineer, she is not a 'worker' or, according to Ogude, until she studied 'male' subjects (99 & 116). Ngũgĩ seems to take the Western view of women's 'domestic' work as not being work (Leonard and Delphy: 1992). In any case, in Gĩkũyũ and Kenyan culture, such a notion as 'housewife' has not existed except for a small handful of women, and even so, only after independence. Gĩkũyũ women have traditionally worked like beasts of burden. Additionally, even in the West, feminists have continually challenged the notion of 'domestic' work not being work. As these kinds of jobs increasingly become part of the labour market, such as cleaning and child care, so it becomes clearer that they have economic value. Feminists and women have also been asking for their domestic work to be included in the GDP and for it to be waged (Kaplan, 1992:38-41). In Gĩkũyũ culture even prior to colonialism women have always done the hard work of tilling the land and producing food due to the division of labour. During colonialism,

when men went away from the land for waged labour, women had to do triple shifts covering not only the domestic work, but also their own work and that of men. Cavici notes that:

> Women have no part in Kikuyu public life, exept that of being wives to their 'lord and masters" and the mothers of their children. However, a Kikuyu (man) might not do whatever he liked with his wives and daughters. He was expected to treat them according to and could only expect from them what was laid down in customary law. The particularly heavy duties which were in custom laid on women were: raising children, providing enough from their gardens to suffice the whole family and frequent guests, performing the greatest part of the agricultural work, providing water and firewood for domestic use, thatching and plastering the huts, carrying loads usually foodcrops and firewood, (but it could be anything else), not only to the homestead, but also to the market places or other distant locations and back (Cavici, 1977:20).[11]

Proponents such as Shaw, Prestley and Nabudere argue that Gĩkũyũ women were coerced into wage labor as early as 1925 and their roles changed from a peasantry into a proletariat (Shaw, op.cit.; Nabudere 1981; Prestley, 1992: 67-80 and Umoja papers: 1987). It is also clear from historical accounts and records that women were in constant organised resistance against colonial and neocolonial coercion and Presley argues that:

> Except for the shared burden of participating in communal work projects on roads or earthworks, women were rarely compelled to work for Europeans in the first thirty years of colonialism. However, the colonial regime specifically targeted women as desirable laborers in the Wold War I era. Strong-arm tactics

were used. After reforms were made in the recruitment system (1925) and after women were directly taxed (1934), compulsion was no longer permissible nor necessary. The wage labor dynamic conflicted with the traditional domestic production for women as well as men. Women's normal responsibilities remained constant so that they had a double burden of domestic agricultural production and farm labor for European settlers. The new function did not complement their role as food producers for the peak demand for women's wage labor conflicted with the traditional agricultural cycle. Until the latter part of the colonial period, Kikuyu women had little control over the few means to seek redress of the condition of their employment the nature of their employment, or renumeration they received for their labor.[12]

Data for instance from my home district collected for women agricultural workers indicate that, on average, 3,098 women were working as waged workers in 1923 with this figure rising to 5,477 in 1926 and 27,000 by 1956 (Presley: 57). These figures are high for the population densities at the time. Presley also demonstrates that there were jobs in the waged market that men would not do because they were traditionally seen as women's jobs. These included carrying for the caravans, road building and working for the low paid agricultural work on plantations. In a reported personal account in Presley's work, one of the women narrates her experiences:

We started asking for our freedom when we were young girls during the war in 1914. We started putting murram and tarmac along the road and were forced to push the leveller. We made the European feel angry. At that time, one girl was killed on the road. She was beaten in the head and died, they were being led by Kinya[j]njui (sic). Then Harry Thuku was jailed. And our parents said we

shouldn't work on the roads but that time we were caught again when there was a fight at Nairobi and the fight was because the women asked for the men's pants.[13]

We were brought to a coffee estate here. We were picking coffee and cultivating and after five weeks we were given thirty shillings and no food. There was a man who was looking after the women and if he saw that you left one part uncultivated he would beat you. A girl called Njeri was beaten and her leg was broken. After that we stopped doing the work for picking coffee and cultivating as well. When Harry Thuku was sent to Somaliland our parents refused to let us work. We were doing shaking a scratching (pretended illness) while working on the estates to annoy the Europeans. We did this so that Harry Thuku could be released) 20 (*Op.cit*: 51).[14]

This would demonstrate that textualising this bias in the source text already raises a challenge for translation.

b. Women's lack of agency and their involvement in "workers" liberation struggles

Ogude observes that from the beginning of the narrative, the writer focuses on Wariinga as a victim whose life history demands narrative ordering. (Ogude, 1999:77). There are numerous examples of this in the text. When her parent's land is sold, under colonial rule, Wariinga goes to live in town with her uncle where she falls prey to the wiles of the Rich Old Man, a friend of her uncle's. He showers her with gifts for sexual favours and she soon falls pregnant. Muturi, the workers' leader, saves her and she becomes a secretary. Here too she becomes prey of Boss Kihara's attentions, but she resists him

and loses her job. Her boyfriend also rejects her for class reasons. This lack of agency allows Ngũgĩ to portray women as ready to yeild, a myth I will explore below. Muturi the worker conscientizes Wariinga to use her whole person for a political ends, instead of sacrificing '..her hands, brains humanity and thighs'. She then becomes a mechanic and takes a stand against sexual harassment and exploitation of workers. Her liberation comes not from conciousness of both gender and class difference, but of class: Ogude observes that:

> When Muturi entrusts her with the gun – a rather ironic use of the phallic symbol as the expression of liberated womanhood, given Ngũgĩ's self confessed 'progressive' stand on gender politics – we are told:
>
>> she felt courage course through her whole body. She thought that there was not a single danger in the world she could not now look in the face. All her doubts and fears had been expelled by the secret which Mũtũri had entrusted her.[15]

In relation to the strategies, it is difficult to see how such a text, which has already claimed a 'progressive' stance, could be subverted in translation. For instance, Ngũgĩ presents Muturi (another man) as her saviour. Ngũgĩ sees the incident of the trust with the gun as a liberatory experience and, like Ogude, it is one with which I am uneasy. This is not so much to do with it being phallic symbolism, but because of the power relationship and lack of agency included in this act of 'trust'. Ngũgĩ clearly sees gender politics subordinated to class politics and history is replete with accounts of surrender of agency by radical women in left movements, by women such as Alexandra Kollontai in *Love of Worker Bees* or even de Beauvoir's *Farewell to Sartre* in the hands of 'progressive' men. They always seem to literally end in tears and the contradiction

between class and gender. This subordination of gender oppression is well argued by Heidi Hartmann in her article entitled 'The unhappy Marriage of socialism and feminism' (Hartman: 1993). The myths that real workers are men and that real revolutionaries are men is hard to translate where we know that in the African context women engaged in the armed struggles against colonialism (Ogude, *op.cit*:124) and performed difficult physical manual work in both traditional and colonial roles, and in the struggle.

It would include for instance subverting the translation of Mũtũri the worker which implicitly means a male 'builder' (or metal worker) with the Gĩkũyũ female name, Mumbi, who I believe is also of a higher order in Gĩkũyũ cosmology as we already noted above. It is the name of the creation diety, but also refers to the more aesthetical aspect of creativity, such as reproduction but also production, including care, building, ceramics, sculpture and women's work in general.

Instead, Ngũgĩ portrays Wariinga his female protagonist as *femme fatale*. We will address the significance of her name below, but suffice it to state here that it does not have any historical significance.

Through this characterisation as victims without agency, the underlying subtexts and metatexts of the notions of women's lack of agency their lack of involvement as "workers" or in the liberation struggles is asserted. The translation of this into English doubly confirms western stereotypes of women not being real workers and African women more so. This includes the inherent notion that 'Real workers are Men' in the source culture which is then retranslated into English and reaffirms these stereotypes as

we noted above in chapter 2, and it also plays to racist stereotypes of Black people being lazy.

c. *Women* as easy sexual prey

Inherent in this depiction is another stereotype that: African women, (including daughters, wives and mothers) are easy sexual prey. This complexity is confirmed by Boehmer that: "Whether as lover, prostitute or potential mother, it is essentially as sexual partner that the male characters are drawn to them. Considering the prevalence of Biblical imagery in Ngũgĩ, we thus see the women defined either as Mother Mary whose name is that of the (Gũthera + Purity) long suffering Mũmbi, whose name is that of the mother of Gĩkũyũ, or as the prostitute Mary Magdelaine, Wanja, who leads men, both the Capitalist (Kimeria) and their opponents (Munira) into perdition. (Boehmer, c.1991:11).[16] This stereotype is achieved through thematic treatment, but also through the treatment of the character Wariinga including her naming which I will address below in the section on naming and characterisation. It is also achieved through phrases uttered by the various voices, including Wariinga herself in phrases such as 'Kareendi of easy things, ten cent Kareendi' (p.18) etc; 'women's thighs are the tables on which contracts are signed' (p.19).

d. *Solitary figure*

Additionally, Wariinga is depicted as an isolated female figure without female friends or referents. The solidarity and resistant agency present in Gĩkũyũ /Kenyan/ African/ Black/ women cultures is absent. I wondered what she might have gained from knowing that she is not an individual suffering sexism from individual men and phenomenon but

that some or all aspects of hectorsexist oppression are experienced in gendered ways and experienced by many women in her society. Her depiction seems unconvincing given that in Kikuyu culture, gender divisions, socialisations and gendered groupings remain important even within contemporary society (Shaw, op. cit). We learn that:

TT

"Wariinga had no one from whom she could discover the answers to her many questions..."

We also learn that: "Wariinga had no friend or relative who could lighten her load.

So Wariinga struggled on alone, contemplating this expedient and that one, turning on this over this and that solution in her mind, comparing countless alternatives, trying to work out how she could vanish from the face of the earth...(147)"

The absence of women's voices guiding her in a traditional Gĩkũyũ and national modern society divided along gender lines and the absence of female agency and solidarity which are a traditional part of social organisation in both modern and traditional Gĩkũyũ culture is therefore surprising. Their absence too in a country where feminist consciousness and solidarity was becoming a reality at the time the book was being written. Even in a the colonial tradition, organising women in welfare and other social organisations was a norm at both national and local levels and this tradition survived after independence to the present day. These include mothers' unions, women's welfare organisations such as Maendeleo ya wanawake (progress for women) etc. This is remarkable too because of the presence of her mother in the story and of Wacu, the woman in the matatu ride to Illmorog. Very little solidarity is shown between the two

women, which in Gĩkũyũ culture is almost unimaginable. One might argue that this is a work of fiction and does not reflect reality as Kristeva argues. However, as it is so heavily reliable on other 'historical' facts for its success, it seems unreasonable not to expect it to be a fair depiction of the suffering that women undergo without stereotyping them.

e. *Translating Ambivalence*

An example of ambivalence in the translation of equalities is given for instance through one of the narratives where the robbers are showing off their wealth and prowess. The passage alludes to the man being so wealthy that he decides to have two of everything in order to differentiate himself from the wives of ordinary and poor people. But then, his wife also decides that she too would like to be like him and have two of everything too for similar reasons as his. His response is as follows:

ST:

Rĩria ndaaigwire aagweta ũhoro wa indo icio ciao, ati akoragwo na igĩri haandũ ha kĩimwe, ngĩimaka mũno. Ndiamũhithire kana ngimũhuuha kana ngĩunirira ũhoro. Ngimwira o rimwe atĩ nii ndingĩmugiria agĩie na tũnua twĩri, nda igĩrĩ, ngoro igĩrĩ, kana o kiiga kiingi giothe kĩria aangĩririĩiria. No kĩu, atĩ kĩogererewo kĩĩngi, aca! Aca! Nikiamwabia asahau hiyo kabisa. Naake akiuga ati aakorwo nĩ uguo, o naanii ndiingikigia na iiri! Ngimũũria na mang'ũrĩ: 'Ureenda igĩri ciaki? Njĩĩra, igĩri nĩ cia ki? Naake akĩĩngayakayia: We ũreenda ĩĩri ya kĩ? Ĩiri ni ya kĩ? Wagia na ĩĩri, naani no mũhaka ngie na igiri. We must have equality of the sexes.'

"Ngĩng'ũrĩka o kũng'urĩka o ũũ wega! Ngĩmwĩra atware equalities icĩo Rũraaya kana Ameerica. Here we are Africans, na no mũhaka tũpractice African Culture. Ngĩmũrĩĩnga koobi ĩmwe. Akĩrekia rũbu ũtukĩ gatagati. Ngĩmuriinga ĩngi. No ngĩthĩĩ kũmũriinga ya gatatu agithareenda. Akĩuga niĩ ngĩe na ĩtatũ kana o ikũmi. We nĩ eekũiganwo ni kimwe.

TT

'When I heard her mention two female organs and say that she would be able to have two instead of one, I was horrified. I told her quite frankly that I would not mind her having two mouths, or two bellies, or multiples of any other organ of the body. But to have two...no, no! I told her to forget all that nonsense. Then she started arguing, and said that if that was to be the case, then I wasn't going to be allowed two cocks. I asked her bitterly: Why do you want to have two? What would you use two for? If you have two, then I must have two. We must have equality of the sexes.

'By this time, I was really angry! I told her to take her equalities to Europe and America. Here we are Africans, and we must practice our African culture. I struck her a blow on the face. She started crying. I struck her again. But just as I was about to strike her a third time, she surrendered. She said I could have three, or ten. She would be satisfied with just one".

A number of issues arise here in the target and source cultures in this text. For a long time, and it is certainly true today, many women live in conditions where they are unaware of their rights and the views, such as those of inequality and violence, are the norm. It is not until very recently in the UK for instance that the matter of domestic violence has become a matter of public policy. The female character's 'surrender' to the

will of her violent husband is close to reality in both source and target cultures. Although the whole passage is a satire and parody, it is too close to reality, and could therefore be lost on the readers in both source and target cultures. In the source culture, this only confirms the views that Kenyan men and women espouse about the woman's place in society. Such a passage, although intended satirically may just confirm the views they held about women's position in society and the treatment she deserves. Legislation against domestic violence is not yet enshrined in Kenyan law. Such as passage could also feed Western stereotypes about black men which have existed in Western psyche about their oversexed nature.

The intended humour and satire therefore does not translate easily across cultures and compensation is necessary (Hatim and Mason, 1990:202). The view that equality and feminism are western values is also one, which is still commonly held to this day and is used to oppress women further. Ngũgĩ's authority, both as writer but as an opinion maker could carry great weight in the source culture by leading people to believe that these are the views that he espouses and advocates. The same is true for the receiving culture.

In terms of interventionist strategies, this is a difficult passage to translate. I would not want to transform the greedy men into women by reversing the roles of the characters, say in terms of addressing gender. For instance, one of the issues with this text is a grammatical one in relation to the subject pronoun which, in the language, is not gendered. As will become evident in the study of *Matigari* below, there is no distinction of the subject pronouns as gendered in Gĩkũyũ. This can only be discerned by the gender in this case determined by their genitalia. Ngũgĩ uses the term '*indo*' also used for objects (= thing), and qualifies it like most other gender neutral terms by

adding "cia atumia" = 'women's things' (denoting female gender). This slang term for genitalia 'indo'is not gendered and Ngũgĩ has had to translate the term equivalent to 'thing' to 'cock' and 'female organs' as it would be too ambivalent to say 'thing' for male and 'thing' for the female in English for the passage to be effective. Interestingly, the gender specific terms equivalent to 'cock' and "'female"' organs do exist in slang or popular usage in both languages. Ngũgĩ has not, however, used these in the ST. A 'subversive' or 'hijacking' retranslation would read as follows:

TT

> When I heard him mention two dicks and say that he would be able to have two instead of one, I was horrified. I did not lie to him or try to appease him or to avoid the issue. I told him right away that I would not mind if he had two mouths, two bellies, two hearts or any other organ of the body that he so desired. But, that one, that he should have an extra one of that one, no way, no way! *Nikamwambia asahau hiyo kabisa.* And he in turn said that if that was the case, then I too could not have two. I asked him angrily, "what do you need two for?" Tell me, what do you need them for? And he started growling: What do you need two for. What are two for? If you have two, then I must have two. We must have equality of the sexes. I got really cross then. I told him to take his equalities to Europe or America. Here we are Africans and we must practice our African culture. I struck him a blow across the face. He let out a howl in the middle of the night, and surrendered. He said I could have three or ten. He was content to have just the one.

Through this example, I have illustrated some of the difficulties that arise through attempting to approach the translation of Wariinga from a gendered critique or to hijack

the narrative. The passage would swing to the other extreme by depicting her as a violent, power-crazy hysterical woman. I used the term 'growling' as a "subversive" antonym of the term Ngũgĩ has used for 'arguing' but in the Gĩkũyũ the term 'akĩĩngayakayia' used is more derogatory and stereotypical and translates more closely as 'nagging'. This fails because it only confirms the view that men are strong, purposeful and powerful as opposed to women's nagging which is derogatory.

Additionally, I have addressed the challenges posed by the narrative style owing to their basis as an already biased one despite the humour and what it is trying to achieve.

The ambivalence of the deconstructive or 'progressive' stance which I contend is heavily steeped in hectorosexism in subtle understatements makes this text difficult to retranslate and to apply some of the strategies proposed against hectorosexism owing to the reliance of the text on gendered stereotypes, as discussed in chapter 2.

In another example, in terms of characterisation and the representation of gender particularly the females, Ndigirigi observes that:

> She remains an example of much heralded strong Ngũgĩ women character, strong but nevertheless women who are all passion, with no clear-cut programs for redeeming the socity, characers who inevitably and invariably need men to conscientize them and to channel their passion towards positive change in society. Wanja in *Petals of Blood* and Gũthera in *Matigari* are the same as Wariinga (1991:108).

Similar criticism has been made by critics such as Boehmer. We will address the implications of this below in the casting of the characters in gendered stereotypes in the section exploring the translation of naming and characterisation.

g. *Naming and Characterisation*

i. Overview

The underpinnings of Ngũgĩ's work raise immediate complexities for translation strategies around hectorosexism in naming and characterisation as a concern. This demonstrates Bhabha's (*op.cit*), Ogude's (op.cit) and Andrade (1990:95) problematisation of how the nation is narrated given the symbolism of the text as nation. Delgado also demonstrates how constructs such as 'Kenya' act as both narrative strategy and what Bhabha calls 'an apparatus of power', of "disemmination", which writes women. She asks the pertinent question of their involvment in this 'narration of the nation' to use her term (Delagado, 1999:130-145).

Simala, for instance, demonstrates how metaphors and naming that seem naturally embedded in language are used in Kiswahili to narrate women and explores the 'attitude', a social science term - to understand how this narration takes place. She cites Anderson's definition of the five ways in which this is done, including through emotional appeal, consistent use, targeting, directionality and intensity (1997:35). She also gives examples of some key words that are in common usage that narrate women and their positionality. Some include Mwana – meaning child, asali – honey, bao la mkahawani –a hotel bench or pebble game (meaning loose woman). Chiriku – Finch

(garrulous), bidhaa (property), etc. She cites the meaning of kapu as "...a big wide-mouthed flexible basket used for all purposes... Considering the multipurpose use of a basket in Swahili community, a woman termed "Kapu" is one who is indiscriminate in her sexual relationships with men. She accommodates men of all ages, sizes, tastes and social background. This is what is least expected of a Swahili woman. Being open for grabs by all means is a sign of indecency and immorality" (Simala: 1998:23).

Other works which give further useful insights on images of women in Kiswahili literature include "The images of women in oral literature: a survey" Matteru (1982) and "The images of women in Kiswahili Prose Fiction" (Mbugouni, 1982). These insights are useful for reading and translating the nation in this text, and Wariinga in the narration of the gendered nation in such a context.

Von Flotow's question of the extent to which the translator's role become overtly political seems relevant with regard to how such narratives are translated (von Flotow 1997:14; 25, 27, 43). Tymoczko (see below) unequivocally argues that the translator should be 'politically engaged' and provides a framework for this engagement as we noted above in chapter 2.

In *Caitani Mutharabaini*, the narration of women through stereotypes and negative character portrayal arising from the metatextual, subtextual and textual assumptions addressed above is carried into the naming of the characters and in the text. In both texts, the question of naming is very important as it is integral to the narrative as is the case in most of Ngũgĩ books. It is difficult to subvert such names or to find a good reason to do so. The use of footnotes or some form or paratextual material (such as

criticism or research such as this), helps to unravel the hidden meaning through what Appiah calls 'thick translation'. Ndigirigi makes the point that

> ...character names and character types [are]mediators of theme in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's fiction. A cursory look at his fiction reveals that these two aspects become evident features of Ngũgĩ's style in *Petals of Blood* and are used to maximum effect in *Devil on the Cross* and *Matigari.* (Ndigirigi, 1991: 97)[17].

This statement demonstrates the heteroglossia of the Gĩkũyũ/ English reader for both the source and target texts and is supported by Ndigirigi who further states that:

> The system of characterisation and naming in Ngũgĩ's later fiction has received mixed reactions from the few critics who have been able to identify the author's deliberate choice of character names. Basing himself on an article by Cyril Treistar, Gordan Killan, though unaware of the correct meaning of some of the names he cites, has touched on the realizable semantic potential in the names, concluding that the names help to add depth of meaning to *Petals of Blood*. Lewis Nkosi has dismissed as unlikely such names as "Sir Swallow Bloodall" that Ngũgĩ gives the leading capitalist in *Petals of Blood*.

Peter Nazareth also makes the observation that:

> The novelist must trust his tale and his reader. He need not hammer home his message, as when he gives characters names like "Cambridge Fraudsham", "Chui" (Leopard) and Sir Swallow Bloodall"(*ibid*)[18].

As we noted above, Ngũgĩ's use of naming in nearly all his work has been specific. but has shifted in use (Lovesay: *op. cit*). The names are interwoven into the parody, dialogue, caricature and pathos within the narrative devices and strategies. Ogude observes that Ngũgĩ's use of names changes in his later 'novels' to symbolise class where before he used the characters to depict "...certain general values and qualities..." Ogude argues that:

> The use of the grotesque and of generic names, for example, becomes ways and means of figuring, not only individual character, but whole groups. The grotesque image of the body and names become signifiers that draw our attention to the values and norms of a social group or class as fixed... Characters are therefore, an important aspect of the symbolic structure within the narrative. They are allegorical to the extent that they are parallel {with} (sic) what takes place in society (Ogude, 1999:67).

How these are written and translated within the text is of importance to the study not only reception, but, in relation to the translation of hectorosexisms in both cultures as is demonstrated below.

An additional important point raised in the naming, is one related to the multiple layers of symbolism that Ngũgĩ uses, for instance in relation to Marxism as Ndigirigi points out. In this respect, Msiska's call for an approach of 'critical hybridity' in reading these texts, is relevant (Msiska, 2000: 2). What he does not point out however, is how much the translation process is central to this critical hybridity.

Translating naming as a significant narrative device in this text, is a further challenge owing to the use of symbolism at different levels. In terms of symbolism, Ndigirigi for instance states that this naming device can be traced to the Marxist world-view of Marx and Engels. Ndigirigi argues:

> The names that Ngũgĩ gives his characters become foregrounding features which draw attention to the social traits that he describes. They aid him in description and analysis of reality. As such, they are interpretative signposts which allow the reader to see the character as representative figures, as part of a larger framework. They act as the basis of character tropes" (1999:97)

In this text, these have not been translated. In fact, Ndigirigi's study of these names and their meanings is significant for translation because it acts as paratextual material for 'reading' the translation in English. Only the Gĩkũyũ /English addressee of the text would have access to the narrative device. It is, however, interesting to note that Ndigirigi does not refer to translation in his study, not even in his bibliography. I would argue that this is owing to heteroglossia on his part. Ngũgĩ has, however, embedded some of the meaning in the translated text. Some of the examples from both Ndigirigi and from Ngũgĩ's translations include:

Nditika wa Gũũnji – one who carries many burdens

Ndigirigi - *Gatheeca* – the one who pierces. (Ngũgĩ translates this as Kingstock presumably a kind of bird (108)

- *Kĩmeenderi* - smasher (100).

ST

Kĩmeenderi abatithitio uguo hĩndĩ ya wĩhũũge nĩ ũndũ wa ũria aameendeeraga aruti-a-wĩra na arĩmi anyiinyi.

TT

He was given that name during Emergecy because of the way he used to grind workers and peasants to death.

Other names include:

Kĩhahu – the one who scares

Gĩtutu wa Gatanaguru - "a big jigger" (*Op.cit*: 101).

In the English text the names are not translated but the characters are described in graphic detail which is sufficient for enabling the reader to associate the name with his attributes. Ogude and other critics have had to rely on Ndigirigi and other translators for the names (see Sicherman 1990: x-xi).

It is difficult to translate the 'Gĩ' – and 'kĩ' in front of the names into English. They either amplify and/or is/are often pejorative while the opposites ka – such as in Kareendi, form the diminutive e.g. for reendi (lady) and is often endearing or renders things or people as unimportant or of lesser significance respectively.

The key names which I study in detail, are those of the protagonists and they are used to demonstrate the embedding of hectorosexism through naming and characterisation and the challenges these present for translation. This is examined mainly through Ngũgĩ's use of ambivalence in relation to reality, narrative style, fiction, satire, character and character trope at the same. These include the names of the protagonists Wariinga and Mũturi, both which are discussed above and which I compare with Gũthera and Ngarũro wa Kiriro in chapter 4.

ii. Translating Hectorosexism in the name Wariinga

According to Ndigirigi, her name Wariinga "...could be loosely seen as rings".
Wariinga of *Devil on the Cross* refers to a woman who wears rings as adornments, thus
translating as "of rings" – or the "ringed one". Ngũgĩ translates her in the narrative,
"Take a girl like me, Mahua kareendi" which is not translated into English in the text. It
translates as "flowery lady". As noted above, Kareendi is a diminutive of reendi –
derived from lady in English, but means something like 'sugarpie-honey-babe'. (This
usage and translation is generational, cultural and time specific). My generation would
have used the more colloqual term 'mũhiki' – which literary means 'bride', but in the
context means "chick". In Gĩkũyũ, young people today use the term geerũ – derived
from English 'gal', which although older in English is more contemporary in Gĩkũyũ.
(My son tells me that the current term in English now is that a person is 'fit').

Ngũgĩ directly translates Kareendi to 'Darling flower'. Ngũgĩ tells us the attributes that
add up to her, what I consider her 'babeness' as follows: – 'Beautiful Kareendi – flower
of my heart... Darling flower of my heart'.

In her characterisation, Ndigirigi argues that: "a cursory glance at the bourgeois
character's habits and presumptions in *Devil on the Cross* show that the women is
regarded as a decoration, a flower to adorn means lives..." (1991:98).

I read other meanings into the name as follows:
Wariinga – similar sounding to kuringa – showing off.
Mũriinga – flexible metal cord which can be moulded or bent to the required shape and
used to make jewellery for instance, or something temporary.

It is also close to another Gĩkũyũ phrase: wa riinga - when you crossing over. These meanings may be subliminally implied (or I could be over-reading them), but the visual representation of Wariinga is one which a Gĩkũyũ reader would discern. It seems to match some of the attributes that Ngũgĩ has given Wariinga. This issue would impact on what Tymoczko calls 'politically engaged' translator and as we have noted in the strategies against hectorosexism.

The second meaning is in keeping with Ngũgĩ's ideology that in the revolutionary struggle, women can be moulded by men to become revolutionary. In *Njamba Nene*, Njeeri is moulded by Njamba Nene (his name literaly means Big Hero), the male protagonist and hero. In *Matigari*, Gũthera is moulded by Matigari and Mũriũki and in this text, Wariinga is moulded by Mũturi etc.

Wariinga in her characterisation is a *femme fatale*, always rescued by men, fainting, blacking out, dreaming, committing suicide, always seeking to escape, portrayed here as signs of weakness. She also keeps hearing voices and male ones at that (including the devil's), not her own. They tell her how she must lead her life. She is not only dependent on the actions that "men" involve her in, but also, their thoughts and voices which tell her what to do. Wariinga is about to blackout and a man appears to rescue her" "You nearly fell," said the man who was holding her. "Come sit in the shade of the building (see page 68). She eventually blacks out and soon hears sounds. On recovery, she finds the man besides her (14 –16) and again he interprets or "**clarifies** for her things that she had herself thought" [my emphasis].

TT

"She did not understand all the things that were hinted at in the arcane language of the man. But here and there she could sense that his words approached thoughts that she had herself heard about one time. She sighed and said: Your words have hidden meanings. But what you say is true".

Her name is bound up with other general characteristics that emerge from the text about women, for instance that they are 'easy to yield' (their thighs are alluded to several times in the text). This includes stereotypes some of which are steeped in sexual connotations. Other examples point to her political naivety and lack of agency such as the point when she feels suicidal. This is a far cry from Register's suggestion that a feminist strategy should provide role models, instill a positive sense of feminine identity by portraying women who are "self- actualising" whose identities are not dependent on men" (Register *cit.in* Moi; *op. cit*:47).

Through her 'bendability' or pliability (by men) she is depicted as a plaything for men as is demonstrated below through characterisation which reflects her name. A 'kapu', as we noted above in the use of words in Swahili to characterise women which is also common in Gĩkũyũ.

Another stereotype that we observed above, and one that emerges through the various narratives and accounts given throughout the text is one where women are easy sexual prey for men and this is reflected in her name. This hectorosexism in the women's characterisations and naming, and therefore her lack of agency is difficult to understand both in the original and the translation, although what Ngũgĩ is trying to do is depict women in a positive light by drawing attention to their plight (as symbolic of the

nation). Although maintaining her name name in Gĩkũyũ in the translation masks this

for a non-Gĩkũyũ reader, I would argue that translating her name is a difficult thing.

Her English name Giacinta, is almost synonymous with Kareendi in Gĩkũyũ (something

like 'a Jane'), this is not evident in the English translation. During the research I talked

to a number of people in London and asked what they would call a woman depicted like

this. I came to understand that there are terms such as "Sharon", "Tracy", Essex Girl. "a

Jane" or "a Sheila" which were locational, regional, generational and race specific and

reflect location and class based cultural stereotypes. The translation of the name poses

real difficulties as it perpetuates the misogyny of one culture into another. If the name

is translated to its target culture equivalent, say, "Essex girl" if that is the appropriate

'equivalent' it would not only confirm the stereotype of the source language, but

perpetuates both the target and source language stereotypes. Such a translation would

require knowledge of the target language stereoytypes as we noted through the

examples of Swahili above. Clarity about our own perception of what is 'acceptable' to

the cultural location of the target readership, which we noted above through Msiska's

arguments on the theory of reading African literature, is a difficult thing to do in the

context of hectorosexism, particularly by a conscious translator. I would further argue

that, in the context of hectorosexism, it is an undesirable thing to do. This would shift

hectorosexism and a foreign narrative to a different and specific location and culture,

thus domesticating it. Several proponents including Tadjo point out the importance of

maintaining cultural specificity in translation (2001:26).

In terms of misogyny in the source text, the naming and characterisation does not do

anything to improve Wariinga's condition once she is emancipated, as she will have to

keep her names for all time. Mũturi, however, from the outset, has a respectable name

and is endowed with heroic characteristics - he is already a revolutionary, just by his name whereas she, through naming, is depicted as a fallen woman.

iii. Translating Mūturi - the worker/builder

By contrast, the male counterpart and real hero of the tale (although Wariinga is the protagonist) is Mūtūri wa Kahonia Maithori whose name means "the builder or "maker" who heals tears (compare to Ngarūro wa Kĩriro in *Matigari* in the following chapter). He rescues the lost Wariinga in the disillusioned country. He is the one who also links workers (male workers) in various places. He is the champion of the workers. Ndigirigi also reads into him another well known Gĩkuyu folkloric hero also named Mūturi.

> At another level, Muturi is the folkloric smith who has come back from the smithy to deliver his wife from the suffering inflicted upon her by the ogre (which capitalism is shown to be). (Compare to the underlying narrative of Ndiiro which informs *Matigari* in chapter 4) (1987:108).

Mūturi evokes multiple readings for the Gĩkũyũ reader and these meanings are not present in the translated text, which reads like a text about a male worker who rescues an oppressed woman for a reader without the background Gĩkũyũ metatextual and subtextual knowledge. His name and characteristics, i.e. the one who builds, the unbreakable one, contrasts with Wariinga's whose characteristics and name as we noted above depict one who is flimsy and bendable. Instead, Wariinga the name of the female protagonist does not have an important historic significance in traditional or modern

Gĩkũyũ culture.   If, as de Lotboitinière-Harwood suggests, translation is a political activity, how are these to be dealt with?

Balogun argues that:

> What Ngũgĩ, like all folk narrative artists has to do is constantly locate the ideal blending of the real and the fabulous that best suits his own specific artistic purposes. He consistently does, but what most critics have to recognise is that he is realistically motivated by the fabulous detail of his narration (Balogun, 1997:140).

It thus becomes clear from this example that a deft sensitivity to the complex issues being addressed and others being omitted has to be applied in translation strategies. For instance the subversion of Wariinga and faithfulness to Mũturi can coincide in the example of naming and characterisation. Although Ngũgĩ takes some hectorosexist issues into account, he remains biased in others, thus presenting a good example of some of the challenges facing hectorosexism, as we already know the racist stereotypes that have faced black men in a colonial and neo-colonial Kenyan context.

This might seem to question the mode of hectorosexism as a critical paradigm as inadequate, but I would argue that to the contrary, it demonstrates where the strategies have worked or failed for both the text and translation in such a text. This has an undeniable influence in the resolution in translation of the myths, metatext and even some subtextual issues, as will be seen below, such as in the case of the myth that all revolutionaries are men.

Interventionist strategies such as those proposed by Robinson and the equalities paradigm would include, for instance, subverting the translation of Mũtũri which

implicitly means a male 'builder' (or metal worker). This could be subverted with the Gĩkũyũ term, Mũmbi, which means creator in the gendered productive roles in traditional and neocolonial society (Ogude, 1999:116). The Gĩkũyũ female name is also of a higher order in Gĩkũyũ cosmology as we already noted above, as it is the name of the creation diety, but also refers to the more aesthetical aspect of creativity, reproduction, including care, building of houses, art, ceramics, sculpture and what is viewed as 'women's' work in general etc. This would valorise women's work. As the text exists now, she becomes a hero only when she does 'men's work. There are clear implications for translation as will become evident in the case study on *Matigari*. Excelling in "women's" work and being a revolutionary etc. is not enough.

Additionally, Wariinga is condemned to a single life whereas Matigari, in the subsequent text for instance is rewarded with a family (a wife and children, a home as will become evident in chapter 4), despite the fact that the story does not have a happy-ending). Similar examples exist in other areas of the text, but before addressing these I turn to examples in relation to form.

g. Translating Form

i.　Orature

We noted the significance of the oral tradition (Okpewho, 1977, 1979) and orature in chapter 1, and in the context of this text which enables an exploration of a complex range of issues in relation to translation. This includes an analysis of hectorosexism and its varied layers of hierarchy which are difficult, owing to the deconstructionist approach not only to form, but to other familiar motifs that Ngũgĩ has used. The fact of the allegorical satire makes an analysis of hectorosexism more slippery both for criticism and translation. As we noted the text is addressed at several 'communities' of

readers and reading habits, ranging from the 'illiterate' Gĩkũyũ to the sophisticated academics among whom rank non-Gĩkũyũ readers. The simultaneous address of the written form, translation and orature is also significant for hectorosexism. In relation to form, we must pay attention to Zabus' reference to translated texts to which there are no originals which she refers to as reflexification. She gives the example of Camara Laye's *Enfant Noire* and explains that it tries to (re)present Malinké culture in French (*loc.cit*). This is pertinent for the readers of the translation who do not have the benefit of knowing the original, or being in touch with the underlying assumptions of the source text, which in this case exists in some ways, and does not exist in other ways, owing to its uniqueness as a 'backtranslation' or transcreation of *Petals of Blood*.

As noted above, Ngũgĩ's work is well known worldwide to English speaking readerships particularly in the Commonwealth as it has been part of the school and university curriculum. It has also enjoyed extensive translation into several other languages. As we noted above, many have failed to receive Devil on the Cross as a translation into English and have added it to the existing corpus in English owing to the assumed seamlessness of the translation space between Kenya, Ngũgĩ's work and English. In this sense the specific study of the form, particularly the translation of the gicaandi player should elucidate the translational element in testing out hectorosexism.

ii. The Gicaandi player

A number of key issues arise out of translating the Gicaandi player – some of which are contained within the text and others, which go beyond the text. The Gĩcaandi players were privileged griots, who traditionally, practised the written and oral art form on which they received apprenticeship over several years. They are griots whose roles

cover not only the aesthetic form, but also criticism, mediation, acting as criers, carriers of history and several other functions through narrative/song.

In the Gĩkũyũ text, the gĩcaandi player is depicted as being traditionally male. Although presented in the neuter in the text, partly as this is narrated through the first person, a point I will return to below we can assume that he is male. In Gĩkũyũ grammer the third person is always in the neuter unless preceded by a masculine or feminine noun such as a proper name or gendered attribute. During the research,[19] I have been able to establish that the gicaandi player was male, but I also have to admit that the people I interviewed were all male and none of them conceived that the Gĩcaandi player could be a woman. They had clearly never heard of one. I am also aware that in the language, there were gendered art forms which enabled different kinds of knowledges to be conveyed through different media by different groups in society, thus the priviledged 'authorial' authority in the sense of knowing was collective rather than individual although the gĩcaandi player was priviledged. Thus, in performance, the Gicaandi player could receive a response through women's genres or from male, youth performative genres, and these did not need to be verbal..

In the text, Ngũgĩ for example depicts the Gĩcaandi player through a heterosexual/male gender perspective through the subtle use of the neutral "nuu" – "who" and other devices, as I will demonstrate below:

Example:

ST

Nũũ ũmũthĩ ũũngĩtũhũũrĩrra gĩcaandi na atũthomere agĩtũtaũragira marebeta maria maakoragwo maadĩnkiitwo mbũthu ĩo iguru? Nũũ ũmũthĩ ũngitũkunyĩra wandindi ĩgaambage ta mũgaambo wa mwanake akiuha mwendwo wake akiuma gũtua njũgu

mūgūūnda, kana akuima gūtaha maaî gîthima kîri nguruungainî mūkūru, kana akiuma

kianda kwenja ndūūma kana o kuuna kîgwa (53).

TT

Who can play the gîcaandî for us today and read and interpret the verses written on the

gourd? Today, **who** can play the wandîndî, the one string violin [my emphasis] making

it sound like the voice of a **young man** wooing **his love as she** comes back from

picking peas in the field or fetching water from a cave in the valley, or digging up

arrow-root, or cutting sugar cane in the slopes of the valley? [All emphasis mine.]

Potential retranslation:

Who can play the gîcaandî for us today and read and interpret the verses inscribed on

the gourd. Today who can play the wandîndî, making it sound like a young suitor

wooing a loved one returning from picking peas from the fields or from fetching water

from the watering places in the valley, or digging up arrow-root or cutting sugarcane.

Ngūgî draws attention to the gendered division of labour in the text by using simple

allusions. In the interventionist retranslation, a suitor of any gender or sexual

persuasion could be wooing their loved one.

Further significant comments of relevance in relation to authorial authority in the

translation in relation to this passage demonstrate that Ngūgî has used intratextual

translation for the wandindi – by explaining that it is a one stringed violin in the English

translation. He also adds further information in the last line of the quotation, by adding

the words 'slopes of the valley' to this passage which are not contained in the source

text.

The misreading of the Gĩcaandi in translation by critics as a postmodern rather than a traditional narrative form such as orature (Ogude 1999: 32-34) to assert a Gĩkuyu/Kenyan/African identity is therefore surprising. This is because elsewhere Ogude notes for instance how Ngũgĩ 'redefines the oral tradition' and alludes to Julian's important work on the oral/written interface. In fact, he surprisingly acknowledges the success of the text in English, not the rendition of the oral/written interface through translation, but through the use of the third person narrative which he argues is common to both cultures (Ogude, 1999:95).

For similar reasons Balogun too also misreads Ngũgĩ's translation of the Gĩcaandi player as narrator and Ngũgĩ's seeming relinquishing of the authorial voice to this medium of narration. In this way, I find Balogun's observations below problematic. "Ngũgĩ's innovations consists then of the difficult task of transforming a novelist, who retains the act of novel writing, into primarily a griot, who also differs from the traditional griot by using contemporary {read western} medium" (61). [interpolations mine].

Balogun identifies Ngũgĩ as the aspiring would-be griot by remarking that: ...he is only a novelist aspiring to be a griot -a would-be griot-novelist, who inelegantly combines old and modern idioms (*Loc.cit*). He consid ers this privileging of the traditional griot over the author to be unconscious while I would argue otherwise, as does Gititi. (1993).

This contradicts his view of Ngũgĩ' as a mastercraftsman and his assertion that Ngũgĩ has used the traditional oral medium to weave this au/oral narrative.

What Ngũgĩ, like all folk narrative artists has to do is constantly locate the ideal blending of the real and the fabulous that best suits his own specific artistic purposes. He consistently does but that most critics have to recognise is that he is realistically motivated by the fabulous detail of his narration (Balogun, *1997*: 40).

Part of the problem is that Balogun is reading the text as an English novel with all the attendant expectations that that might yield in a conservative way, with a discernible authority of the omniscient narrator. If he read the text as a translation, he would expect anything to happen including the undermining of the traditional "western"authorial voice by narrative fragmentation which Ngũgĩ alludes to in his theoretical work. If Balogun is conversant with Ngũgĩ's conscious use of orature in his earlier works even in English and of which *Petals of Blood* is the best example, he would be aware of this use of multilayered, multiple voiced and multiple location which does not privilege any onenarrator. To date, *Devil on the cross* is the best example of fragmentation and disruption of assumptions of authorial authority in Ngũgĩ's work Perhaps Ngũgĩ, as Lefevere argues, chooses:

...to oppose the system, to try and operate outside its constraints... by rewriting works of literature in such a manner that they do not fit in with the dominant poetics or ideology of a given time and place" instead of "adapting to the system" and saying within the parameters delimited by its constraints (Lefevere 1992a:13, cited in Nam Fung Chang Vol. 4, no. 1:1997).

Harlow alludes to this use of different narrative styles in this text in the following way:

Critical to the multiple narratives and styles in the novel is the cultural struggle Ngũgĩ witnesses in Kenya between the people and the government officials and bureaucrats, a struggle which climaxes in the plane crash and the popular cult which develops around the fallen idol (Harlow, 1987:196).

In other ways, Ngũgĩ not only succeeds in enacting tradition through the gĩcaandi, but he also enacts the question of literary aesthetics through excercising postmodernity through form, text and context. He uses all the available tools of genre, themes, naming and characterisation in both cultures in the 'original' and 'translated' text. Ngũgĩ also uses intertextual, subtextual and metatextual references in metonymic moments which biographically reference to his own life and Kenya's history while remaining within the fictional mode. This best exemplifies the use of Gĩcaandi as not only a medium of fiction as is often expected of the English novel but a medium that can be used for autobiography, i.e. realism. Ngũgĩ's writings are sometimes prophetic or reveal autobiographical details and about historic events.

Despite his glimpses at the deconstructionist departures in Ngũgĩ's work at several levels), Balogun, like Ogude, by receiving the text through the formal European form (the novel in particular), as well as within the context of the corpus of Ngũgĩ's work in English fails to 'read' the translation of the form. I would therefore argue that this should be accepted as a new conceptualisation of narrative emerging from orature, translation and the Gĩkũyũ oral/aural tradition. It is for this reason that I have hesitated in calling the text either in Gĩkũyũ or English a novel as it is a new departure in both for different reasons. This includes the use of multigenre of which this narrative voice is but one enabler. In fact, in my view, Ngũgĩ has done something quite remarkable here, through the use of the various narrative voices, including his own. He has killed the

authority of the author in the sense of the authoritative author of the novel through the use of the multiple narrative voices and this carries through into the translation. This idea resonates with Ingarden's reception concepts addressed above and Fish's reception theory (1980) where the latter rejects an objective work of literature in the universal sense that is accepted (see Eagleton, 1996:73-75). This allows another narrative feature common in Gĩkũyũ oral/aural tradition where no single narrator has authority over any narrative but these are seen as belonging to the collective and historical regeneration of society. This has implications for the copyright for both the author and for the translator as will emerge below. Ngũgĩ is asserting that neither the gĩcaandi player, nor himself, nor the other narrative voices holds a privileged place in narration, a fact borne out by the practice of the aural tradition as a democratic form not only of artistic form but of aesthetic criticism. This is evident in other African cultures such as the epic narrative form through the griot which is not the exclusive domain of one 'griot' or gicaandi player. Ash (2000) discusses the important role of the griot in the epic performance and their power as does Diop (2000). The griot are endowed with the task of carrying history and the aesthetic of conveying history, including creativity, but the rest of society is allowed and has a right to participate in the narration, the aesthetics and relevance. They can enlist the services of another griot for a counter-narrative. A griot or 'gicaandi' player can be swayed to change their narrative if it does not accord with the predominant views and aspirations of the participants but equally, if the griot is displeased with any aspect of life, s/he will use the performance as a tool for criticism or social commentary. Hence, Ngũgĩ's use of the multiple narrative voices including his own, demonstrates the power, interplay and interdependence of the narrator's/griot's authority, including his own as author.

Coupled with the authority of the translator, Ngũgĩ extends this role of the griot to the target language culture, with the translator acting as griot three times over, i.e. Ngũgĩ the author, Ngũgĩ the Gĩcaandi player (both the text and the fictional gicaandi player in the narrative), and the translator. I would argue further that Ngũgĩ uses intertextual, subtextual and metatexual references both as author and translator for historical documentation including autobiographic purposes and hence his use of the gicaandi player, multiple voices and the multigenre give him various vantage points from which to do so, as translator. We already observed that Ngũgĩ had already begun to write a book with a similar title in English which he then 'retranslates' from Gĩkũyũ to English.

The implication of this is that the translation of form should be addressed critically in the context of hectorosexism. This should be done through the acknowledging the foreignising effect where new information, beyond our accepted understanding, in this case of the novel, of the narrator, of the form of the narrative is brought to light as a new phenomenon in the source culture. This is evident both through the translation of the narrative and through the Gĩcaandi. The work of the (English speaking) critics has demonstrated that the failure to read the text as a translation interferes with their appreciation of the deconstrutionist use of form as itself an anti-hectorosexist strategy. What is not clear is whether their entrenched reading styles or the failure of the translation is responsible for this.

Similar deconstructionist uses of style through devices such as epithets, the epic, formulary expressions, proverbs, songs, dialogues, parody, idioms, riddles and framed narratives supports the use of the Gĩcaandi as narrative genre. We shall address examples of these in *Matigari* in chapter 4.

h. Translating authority

The appraisal of the gĩcaandi as form also raises the significant question of authorial and translatorial authority and location as has become evident in the discussion above. As demonstrated, there are moments in the original text that we are unsure as to whose opinions are being voiced, those of the narrator, particularly the gĩcaandi player's, Ngũgĩ's, the translator's, Ngũgĩ's, the author's or the characters'. Some have suggested that Ngũgĩ uses these as vehicles to offer his view and thus unlike the usual expectation of a steady and consistent narrative voice, Ngũgĩ is able to 'spread' his views across the wide range of credible characters. This would be true as it is a work of fiction, yet what is challenging here is the conflicting views of the various voices, even those that he empathises with, such as Wariinga's whose voice, which is used to depict her low self-esteem. It is therefore very difficult to pin down authorial/translatorial hectorosexism in this text, and as such a wide range of positionalities is adopted by the various locations of narration.

For instance in the middle of the text is the following passage which either stands out starkly, or which it is easy to miss:

TT

> When the British terrorists, together with the homeguards, their faithful watchdogs, *you sterile bastards: you sold your country for the sake of your bellies* – [italics mine] saw that they were about to be defeated by the Mau Mau guerilla forces, they increased their indiscriminate torture and oppression of the peasants and workers of the whole country (Ngũgĩ 1982:138).

The presentation of the hypenated marks and change of tense from past participle to present, perhaps indicates Ngũgĩ's **real** voice through the direct address form 'you' intervening and addressing the sellouts (Ogude, 1999: 145). We are of course aware that the text is scripted in prison and these lines may well be intended for those who imprisoned him, as he knows the dangers of telling them so directly. Ngũgĩ also knows that if the toilet paper that he is writing on is confiscated, then the primary and possibly only reader of the text will be his gaolers. In fact, it is now known that Ngũgĩ lost the prison manuscript.

Ngũgĩ's other writings before this text and subsequent ones, including *Petals of blood* and his non fiction writings show Ngũgĩ's own disquiet with this group of political players. Thus in the middle of an oral aesthetic work, Ngũgĩ is able to make direct social/political commentary, in a direct voice. Here, once again, the context of writing, the role of a traditional griot, challenges the western norm where fiction and art are generally expected to remain separate from other forms of writing, such as journalism or political commentary. This stretches the translation to absorb new aesthetics and purpose in the target language. This line is the only one in the text where Ngũgĩ directly intervenes as himself in the narrative, rather than as the gicaandi player. This is, of course, a mirage as the whole text is by him and serves to remind the reader of Ngũgi, the man in prison.

Another example of authorial authority can be observed in footnotes – Ngũgĩ uses telling footnotes which seemed directed away from the Gĩkũyũ speaking readership. He points out that: "In the original work, written in Gĩkũyũ, certain words and phrases appear in English, French, Latin and Swahili. In this translation all such words and phrases are printed in italic form" (Ngũgĩ, 1982:10). As well as drawing attention to the

text as a translation these footnotes are a subtle invitation to the Gĩkũyũ reader of the translation into English to refer to the Gĩkũyũ text. They can also be read as an address away from the Gĩkũyũ reader.

We also noted that footnotes may not be useful in this multiple voiced text, say in the case of Wariinga's appearance. The stylistic ambivalence used to portray Wariinga's view of herself and that of the narrator opens up a new interpretive space where the deconstruction of the narrative allows a less male centred voice to be heard. This ambivalent presence of the author (noted above) in the text as a voice amongst others makes it very difficult to assess the boundaries of authorial authority and in addition the boundaries of self-translation. It is therefore difficult to assess the shifts in relation to hectorosexism. The intertextual relationship with other texts in English, particularly *Petals of Blood*, and the English version, *Devil on the Cross* only increases the voices and broadens the narrative space for the reception of the translation. This text affects the theorisation of authority where the translator and author continuum is in fact part of the griot tradition in Gĩkũyũ oral narrative forms, by allowing not only multiple retellings, but also the retelling in multiple locations. The author/griot thus becomes the author/translator/griot defending his new action in the new translatory domain which does not conform to the traditional dichotomy of gicaandi/participants, or author/translator, but extends to the English corpus through translation. The use of symbolism also presents multiple narratives and meanings in the different domains, which I believe, are deliberately constructed to translate as such. It presents the translator as a continuum with the cyclical new complete art form, unique to the context of heteroglossia as follows:

...translatingback/griot/orature/writing/translating/translatingback... The potential for the perpetuation of this cycle is endless (see Biersteker below, p.228; also see Njogu,

p.226). The simple reason, at least for the genuinely multilingual reader, is that there is no translation here. The multilingual reader who shares this unique space with the author, becomes therefore, the true reader of this text in both its original and its translation (see Brisset p.175 above and Mehrez p.252 below).

IV. CONCLUSION: POSITIONAL AMBIVALENCE IN THE SHIFT OF CULTURE AND SUBJECTS

Through the epistemological shift, Ngũgĩ has changed the relationship between English and Gĩkũyũ with this text. What this chapter has demonstrated clearly is that shifts in authorial and translator positionality as a continuum in both target and source text, defy the tidy dichotomies of narrator, gicaandi player, writer, and translator that the axiomatic paradigm asserts. This has an impact on the strategies of transfer where translation is yet another narrative voice. As we noted, it shifts the readers' perceptions of Ngũgĩ's work through ambivalence.

The use of stylistic and thematic devices, however, presents a further challenge in this text which simultaneously addresses issues of hectorosexism as its primary concern, while it is itself caught in the hectorosexist space. The use of multiple voices makes it difficult to discern whether this is the author's 'intention' or whether these are old age entrenched prejudices. The stylistic issues make it difficult therefore to challenge hectorosexism, for instance in the case of gender through devices such the multigenre and multiple narrative voices, ambiguity and riddles. The text also plays with realism and fantasy, through allegory and satire of the neocolonial nation state which, as the author depicts, is stranger than fiction.

Further, through form and its participatory nature, the author invites the reader to resolve the enigma of Wariinga's life the way that they will. The serious message of the narrative, despite the farce and parody, is not lost on the reader in the source and target cultures despite the heterosexual complexities and ambivalence.

I therefore feel that the the ambivalence in the texts makes it difficult to find the right strategy for translating the text although I have demonstrated the impact of some of the retranslations of some stereotypes which entrench hectorosexism further and which were not intended in the source text.

The new departure in this text, the conscious translation of orature as form is the most powerful and challenging element of this text as a translation and in particular the use of the multi-genre. It allows the author/translator to dispense with the need for elaborate interventionist strategies.

My concern however is that the overriding hectorosexism in the source text is carried across into the translated text uncritically through sustained use of hectorosexist assumptions, language and ideology which confirms the various statuses of inequality and also evokes similar and further readings in the target language as we noted in chapter 2. This may be partly due to the proximity of the author/translator/text/ intertextuality and positionality around hectorosexism in general in 'both' cultures as has been demonstrated. The use of language, metatext, subtext and text would require interventionist strategies such as paratextual explanation, or intratextual interventions which Ngũgĩ has used to effect for other purposes as I have described in the examples above.

By his awareness of the treatment of anti-imperialist and antisexist themes; by centering a female/ or a sort of feminist protagonist, by dealing with issues of misogyny and and racism, by addressing workers' issues, Ngũgĩ is able to easily translate hectorosexism and the oralation as new concepts into Gikũyũ and back to English through a faithful rendition. My view is that he could have gone further in both the original and translation of hectorosexism as the English language is more accommodating of equalities than Gĩkũyũ is at the material time. This is true particularly of class and gender. The use of ambivalence and the deconstructionist style make it difficult for uniform interventionist strategies.

Further, as we noted, the fact that Ngũgĩ has previously written in English, places this translated text peculiarly at 'home' with the rest of his work in English. This is more visible in terms of translation style, thematic issues, use of language, intertextual reliance on his previous work, style etc, which are I would argue are very similar to this text. As we noted, this creates ambivalence around absolute boundaries between cultures, and shifts the understanding of translation as being between cultures, to one of being part of culture. We noted the various levels of readership/reception at which his work is targetted. This confirms my argument about the shift in the location of culture and the shifts in subject positionality. In this respect, it has shifted the reader in two senses. The reader is interested in coming closer to the source language and culture, by studying the texts in both languages or researching amongst source language speakers in order to understand the text and culture. Secondly, it has shifted the source language reader to read the translations with an awareness of the source language text as has been demonstrated through Ndigirigi's study of naming and characterisation in the text. Further, it has brought the source language reader and the target language reader closer.

by creating a larger community of interest around this book. Previously, Ngũgĩ's work was only available to the anglophone community and cultures to which it had been translated. In this context, the source language reader is introduced into the cultural frame of reception alongside all the other readers in the various world languages.

The ambivalence (see Bjorkman on enigmas etc. in the oral form in chapter 4) in the text, a forward and backward movement resembles what Vieira calls Antropofagia of de Campos (1981 and 1986:45 cited in Vieira – 96) particularly his view of the nation. He sees it as "... a dialogical movement of difference... the rupture instead of the seismic graph of fragmentation rather than the tautological homologation of the homogeneous" (De Campos, 1981). Vieira in this way introduces the notion of 'dismemory', "... the translation project which unleashes the epistemological challenge of discontinuity but reunites threads into a new fabric, a translation project which murders the father, means in his absence yet revers him by creating a continued existence of him in a different corporality?" (ibid). This appears to be true in relation to hectorosexism, as I will argue in relation to the subsequent text.

The ambivalence towards the 'murder' and the 'reverence' of the father is the key problem that the quest for the 'permanent exile' has to contend. It demands careful reading and critical shift in approaches to not only the text, language, context, themes, but close attention to the subtexts and metatext that the narrative confirms. The ambivalence in this text is demonstrated to reside in the three spaces of the source text, the translation space and the target texts reflected by the reader/listener (Ogude, *op. cit*: 97, Julian, *op.cit*). It also resides the heteroglossia of the reader and the 'foreign' readers and the text as a cultural artifact in both languages.

Despite the overriding ambivalence in relation to hectoropower demonstrated above, the text is a useful example of Robinson's model of the ultimate conversation through writing, translation and reception, whereby the use of deconstruction shifts the location of the writing subject, the translator and the source and target texts and cultures. A new paradigm therefore emerges and demonstrates that cultures are not static, and that artifacts and peoplecan shift to new locations of articulation.

The text was also written twenty years ago and this is therefore a retrospective critique. In this regard, it was a pioneering epistemological project for writing, translation and hectorosexism and is still relevant to the wider issues of society and of translation at present. It reflects that ambivalent moment theorised in chapter 2 as the 'yet', 'still', 'but' in relation to hectorosexism and which I argue is symptomatic of this era.

The following chapter is a study of the subsequent work *Matigari* upon which the epistemological departure does not depend nor weigh heavily. We address how the author addresses similar challenges both in the source text but also the differences which arise in the translation.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE TRANSLATION OF HECTEROSEXISM IN *MATIGARI MA NJIRŨŨNGI* *(MATIGARI)*

I. INTRODUCTION

The chapter addresses the strategies employed in relation to hectorosexism in the translation of *Matigari* in relation to the issues raised by the theories and strategies addressed in chapter 2 and 3. The chapter addresses hectorosexism through a study of the translation of context, metatext, subtext and text. In this text, the reader/listener is invited to place the narrative in any context of their choice. These are explored through a study of form particularly through the themes, genre, narrative voices and through the attempts to identify the "separate' authorial enunciatory voice in a text which is not translated by the author.

Particular attention is paid to the question of translation and hectorosexual authority. I undertake a study of some of the linguistic issues which arise and the challenges they pose for translatability. The chapter attempts to situate the authority of the author, the translator and of the reader against the argument of shifting cultures and subjects. I use the third person and first person interchangeably in discussing the translator. I found this useful for clarity, particularly in differentiating the material sourced externally in relation to the translator, my own observations as translator, or from the researcher position. The quotations and passages from the translation are from the first edition (1987) unless otherwise specified. The chapter relies on the works of the two critics Balogun and Ogude whose studies of the text are the most comprehensive to key issues.

They have, however, not dealt with the translation element of the text, which is what this chapter seeks to do. The first section undertakes a study of translation of hectorosexism in metatext, subtext, intertext and context.

II. TRANSLATING HECTOROSEXISM IN TEXT, METATEXT, SUBTEXT, INTERTEXT AND CONTEXT

A. OVERVIEW

In similar vein to *Caitani Mũtharabaini*, the thematic concerns arise out of the historical context reflected in the corpus of Ngũgĩ's writing in general. We noted that the text is a multigenre in chapter 1. Unlike *Caitani Mũtharabaini*, *Matigari* is a linear narrative in the more formal tradition of the novel. Ngũgĩ states that: "The story is simple and direct" (Ngũgĩ: 1987: vii). It is, however, new despite this apparent formalism, it draws heavily and more consciously from the oral tradition. Balogun sees it as a reconceptualisation of the novel (Balogun: 1995:350-365). He argues that:

> Yet, *Matigari* is one important novel of the late twentieth century which emphatically denies the verities of the old realism at the same time that it establishes unambiguously new norms for the new realism. The ultimate paradox is that both the old and the new realisms have exactly the same objective – a faithful representation of reality; the only distinction is in the radical differences in their methods for achieving this common objective. Even more paradoxical, however, is that ultimately the new realism is not all new but only a re-perception or reconstruction of what was already there in the old realism but had previously been denied (Balogun, 1995:350).[1]

We noted the ambivalence of the gender of the protagonist, *Matigari ma Njirũũngi*, who also give the book its title. The text is translated simply as *Matigari* in English. We will address the title and meaning of *Matigari* ma Njirũũngi below.

B. THE TRANSLATION AND TRANSLATOR OF *MATIGARI MA NJIRŨŨNGI*

Matigari was my fourth translation into English, having translated the three children's books in the *Njamba Nene* series. In the sense of "becoming", translating Ngũgĩ's work had deep and painful significance for me. This was so particularly in the instance of the movement from text to my own individual development and shift in subjectivity, and the discoveries of language and identity that I was making. These have had a huge impact on my life and transformed not only my thinking but also my being at emotional, psychological, intellectual and cultural levels within historical contexts that are global. I should explain this as it is significant for this research. It shifted my world-view from a 'colonial' perspective that I had been schooled in, to rethinking the world from a different vantage point that was being offered though my mother tongue and culture. These have always been latently present in my thinking and hence my agreement with Msiska's theorisation of the notion of 'hybridity'. What the translation work did is draw my attention to this hybridity and hence turned it into a critical discourse. Thus, whilst I agree with Msiska's formulation, I would point out that not all readers with a hybrid potential are aware of its critical potential. This critical awareness has influenced my perception and appreciation of the location and relationships between languages and cultures, between peoples and their impact on entire communities and individual within them within contexts of heteroglossia discussed above. I had already begun to reflect on these issues as a student in Modern European languages in Europe.

but the formal reconnection with my mother tongue clarified the issues of ideological and power engagement between individuals and languages.

I wondered how far issues of subject location impinged on the final text production, theory and practice within the context of unequal power relationships. It became clear to me that it was impossible for these to take place in an ideological vacuum (Wa Goro, 1991) and that as we noted above in chapter 2, every translator is called upon to consciously or unconsciously take up positions while they translate (see p. 94 above).

This viewpoint seems to concur with Kanneh's view that:

> The importance of locating the speaker or writer - whether geopolitically, racially, culturally or in terms of gender - and in this way, contextualizing the theoretical or analytical 'knowledge' that is being presented is significant (Kanneh, 1998:33).[2]

This position finds resonance in Biersteker's work, where she comments on the evocations of the reading of the text as follows:

> My reading of *Matigari ma Njirũũngi* is of the novel as response to this call. I read it as a novel that reinvigorates links between past and present insistence upon truth and justice by revitalising, restoring and critiquing revolutionary and resistance voices and languages that have been and are being silenced when they demand liberation. *Matigari ma Njirũũngi* is a novel that provides challenges and guidance for progressive writing and study, through the ways it demands of

us revolutionary change in our reading and writing practices (Biersteker, 1993:152).[3]

In the case of the translations from Gĩkũyũ to English, the texts themselves, I had to negotiate with the challenges raised by hectorosexism in general.

At a linguistic level, the question of my own locatedness as a translator from a colonised society within the two and more linguistic cultures of hectorosexism continues to be a subject of personal interrogation in my translational work as this thesis demonstrates. It takes me away from the task of translation and the text to ponder on my own location in time and space. I understand Gĩkũyũ which is my mother tongue and in addition, Kiswahili and English, the national languages of Kenya. I also speak and understand French, Italian and Spanish. My own reality as a multilingual speaker from an early age has given me insights and attitudes which challenge the binary systems of language acquisition, knowledge and translation. This defies the notion of hierarchical or categorisation into boxes, as seems the dominant view in the western Euro-American language teaching and translation tradition. I believe that languages in the realm of the mind exist in a continuum and multi-lingualism only gives multiple perspectives of reality or multiple perspectives from which to look at a single phenomenon as I have demonstrated with the study of the translation of *Devil on the cross* above. A cup does not stop being a cup because it is understood as mug, or beaker in English, or as *tasse* in French. The mental capacity to cope with different names for same phenomena exists in the 'monolingual' space say of English, which has an extensive and rich vocabulary. This question of continuum is illustrated by Steiner's cheval//Pferd/un cavallo (Steiner, 1975:122). Steiner asks the pertinent question whether languages do not momentarily "...press upon the body of speech which he is actually articulating" when a natively

multilingual person speaks. Steiner goes further to question whether, "...there is a discernible, perhaps measurable sense in which the options I exercise when uttering words and sentences in English are both enlarged and complicated by the 'surrounding presence of pressure' of French and German (*1975*: 124)?" His own personal experience best illustrates this point:

> My natural condition was polyglot, as is that of children in the Val d'Aota, in the Basque country, in parts of Flanders, or among speakers of Guarani and Spanish in Paraguay. It was habitual, unnoticed practice for my mother to start a sentence in one language and finish it in another. At home, conversations were interlinguistic not only inside the same sentence or speech segment, but as between speakers. Even these three 'mother tongues' were only part of a linguistic spectrum in my early life. Strong particles of Czech and Austrian-Yiddish continued active in my father's idiom and beyond these, like a familiar echo of a voice just out of hearing, lay Hebrew.

> This polyglot matrix was far more than a hazard of private condition. It organized, it imprinted on my grasp of personal identity, the formidably complex, resourceful cast of feeling of Central European and Judaic humanism. Speech was, tangibly, option, a choice between equally inherent yet alternate claims and pivots of self-consciousness. At the same time, the lack of a single native tongue entailed certain apartness from other French schoolchildren, a certain extraterritoriality with regard to the surrounding social, historical community (Steiner, 1975:121).[4]

My argument is that the extent to which this impacts on the essence of the multilingual and multicultural translator has not been fully appreciated in translation studies, which is still thought of in relation of source text to target text. The 'hybrid' context of heteroglossia calls for a different theorisation of this phenomenon as the case studies reveal.

I have known Ngũgĩ and his work for over twenty-five years and am one of a handful of translators into English from Gĩkũyũ at present. The potential for translating does however exist widely for many Kenyans, as pointed out above, as many of us are 'multilingual hybrid' readers. Further, the exploration of the subject positionings of the author and the potential readership of his work in general has also been of continuous interest to me and form part of the research.

Additionally, the theoretical question of reception of literary work from colonised languages of former colonisation into English raises important questions of how power is negotiated between cultures as will be seen below. Gikandi's criticism of the reception and to an extent the translation of the text into English is pertinent. Gĩkandi notes the following:

> Yet any description of *Matigari* as a simple novel raises a more fundamental questions. Do Ngũgĩ's readers consider the novel simple, or is simplicity the defense mechanism of metropolitan readers who are condemned to read it in relation to their modernist standards. This question is particularly troublesome to me because I seem to be dealing with two literary objects – *Matigari* (in English) and *Matigari Ma Njirũũngi* (in Gĩkũyũ) – two different artefacts selectively directed at two antagonistic audiences (Gĩkandi, 1991: 161-167).[5]

This raises the important question of the real and the translated. To best illustrate this, we should turn to the character Barbara Windsor and ask how much of her is in evidence in the character, Peggy Mitchell who she plays in East Enders. Is that her real person, her real hair, her real accent? We could ask similar questions about translators and in this instance the translation of *Matigari* in a colonial relationship of 'asymmetrical relations' of power as noted above (Niranjana,1992). Does the artist compete with the activist and where is the anti-hectorosexist translator? Who is she and what does she become? What mediations of the text occur in these axiomatic/non-axiomatic contexts? This view derives from the seeming epitomised experiences of representation at the point of interface as we noted through the ambivalence in *Devil on the cross*. The crossroads in and beyond the body, of subjectivity, identity and text, seem to draw several ideas for a different order in the lived and experiential such as the quest for equality. It is one to which individuals and communities can and do aspire for, as physical, psychological, emotional and intellectual phenomena as seen above and as has been demonstrated above in this thesis.

The texts, are intertextual themselves, players in the emancipation process, and they wittingly and unwittingly determine not only their own fates but that of their writers, translators, publishers, bookshops and readers due to their location in real history and in real lives. The 'banning' of *Matigari* for instance, in an act of confiscation from the publishers has meant that Ngũgĩ and I have remained in exile (see Ngũgĩ's foreward to *Matigari* and also Sicherman, 1990:x). Henry Chakava the publisher for Ngũgĩ's books including *Matigari*, has written about the violence and harassment he experienced from the authorities for the publication of this work. He describes the constant threats through telephone calls, loss of earnings, physical attacks and psychological torture

sustained loss of contracts and confiscation of books. There was also the added disruption of his social life (Chakava, 1995, 13-28).[6]

The translation is the reason of 'home' from 'home' in Britain, to the 'motherland' with all its ramifications for my life and indeed the work whose key themes are to do with colonialism, and for that matter, British colonialism and its aftermath. Thus, translation, rather than residing in the 'body' of text, resides in the daily bodily existence of the translator who is forever 'branded' by it. In this case, far from being the emancipator at another level, the act of translating (although in itself radical and perhaps subversive in the neo-colonial context), becomes the jailer in more ways than one. One, is the obvious external consequence of translating a 'wanted' text. The other, which is internal, is the grappling with the several layers of oppression that the text throws at you, the reader/translator, whether intended or not as this study reveals.

The translation of *Matigari*, a 'subversive' text was prompted by an interest in the transformational role of translation as part of over-all practices for social transformation referred to as 'troping-as-freedom' by Spivak (see below) and by Schipper as will-to-truth (see above).

In terms of practice, *Matigari* was translated in exile, a fact which made it difficult and costly due to lack of access to a natural literary and linguistic community. This experience was at its most acute when I worked on the final draft in Belgium without English or Gĩkũyũ speaking people to whom I could refer. I had access to the 1964 dictionary and also to the author by phone, or through meetings or in writing. (Ngũgĩ was in Sweden at the time when I completed the final draft of the text). On several occasions I researched through my family and friends both in and outside Kenya.

Research would have been easier in London or Kenya, as I would have been able to talk to colleagues. This had also been the case in the translation of the children's books. The stigma attached to Ngũgĩ and his work by the Kenyan government made the group that one could consult limited, even in exile.

Some of the obstacles encountered included finding contemporary, bilingual, English/Gĩkũyũ and monolingual Gĩkũyũ dictionaries. The existing dictionaries were old, with the most recent one at that time being the 1964 and 1975 editions (Biersteker, 1994:131). These were developed during the colonial period. The updating of these dictionaries is taking place slowly, but is constrained by lack of resources, motivation and personnel. Despite paper commitment to adopt English and Kiswahili as the national languages, the practice has been to play down the development of the other languages within the national neo-colonial policy (Ngũgĩ: 1986; Mazrui and Mazrui, 1998; OAU, 1976). The result of this is the impoverishment and lack of commonality in language usage and orthography given the very large community of speakers numbering at present somewhere between six to nine million and the wide geographical dispersion. There has also not been much reason for inter-regional interaction owing to the existence of a 'national' culture expressed in Kiswahili and English, and an absence of ethnicity based cultural development. The only unifier is the radio and religion. This is partly due to the fact that the languages are largely oral and there is a lack of standardisation in the few written materials. No overall body oversees the development of the language. There is also the challenge of the various dialects and the range in vocabulary and usage. This is true for other Kenyan languages. The language still thrives as an oral language (Karega, 1980), but manifests high levels of diversity and difference. This meant that some of the words used by Ngũgĩ appeared foreign to me

although we come from communities which are separated at the time by no more than 15 km. There are also factors of age and gender.

Fortunately, I had access to Ngũgĩ which was useful for the research necessitated by the translation. I also spoke to my mother frequently on the telephone and she willingly assisted with researching and explaining certain words and concepts when Ngũgĩ and other Gĩkũyũ speakers were unavailable.

C. READERSHIP

The target readership would be similar to that of *Caitaani Mũtharabaini (Devil on the Cross)* and seems targeted at five levels of audiences/readers. As we noted in chapters 1 and 3, these include a Gĩkũyũ oral audience, a Gĩkũyũ readership, a Kenyan readership and a more general English speaking international readership and others. Balogun notes that "While the primary target audience is the Gĩkũyũ speaker, the non-Gĩkũyũ traditional reader of his previous Anglophone African novels was also very much in Ngũgĩ's mind as he composed his novel in the Gĩkũyũ language. The experience of *Devil on the Cross*, his first novel in Gĩkũyũ, assured him that the audience of his English-language novels would read his Gĩkũyũ language novels in translation (Balogun: 145). We also noted Ngũgĩ's awareness of the status of the reception of the work as being part of the creative process (Ngũgĩ, 1986:82) which is of significance to this text. Ogude 1999, Gĩtiti, (1995:214) and (Msiska: 2000) discuss the author's awareness of the reader. Ngũgĩ has also taught literature and spoken world-wide over the duration of his career and has a perception of the type of readers his texts attract (Ngũgĩ: 1986, 1998). He is even aware of the negative experiences of the reception of his earlier work in English, his work at Kamiriithu and the reception of *Caitaani*

Mũtharabaini. These experiences include consequences such as imprisonment and exile and harassment (Chakava, 1995:20-21). By the time this text is written, Ngũgi already enjoys a significant readership both in and outside Kenya. Exile deprives the author of 'original authority' functioning away from his perceived primary target readership. The banning of the book and his exile, expose the work to a ready market through the "international" English version and other translations. Ngũgĩ notes that:

> An English translation of the novel was then published in London in 1991 [sic].
> Here is another irony. For a time the novel existed only in English and in exile
> abroad, thus sharing the fate of its author. Two years late copies of the book
> could be sold in Kenya; thus, in its English language form, the novel and the
> character could be read in Kenya, but not in its Gĩkũyũ original (Ngũgĩ,
> foreword:1987).[7]

The fact of Ngũgĩ's exile also attracted a large readership/following if only out of curiosity or empathy in addition to the fact that this was his second novel in Gĩkũyũ and the first after the 'farewell statement' in 1986 (see page 55 above). Despite this, Ngũgĩ points out that "...writing in Gĩkũyũ has been rewarding because in addition to having a good readership in that language, some of his books have been translated into English, French, Swedish and other languages directly from Gĩkũyũ" (Ophili, 2001:29). The multilayered nature of the heteroglossia similar to that referred to by Brisset (see above, p.175), of the Gĩkũyũ/Kenyan and international reader requires sensitive transition of the text as I will demonstrate. There would also have been an undoubted interest in his second novel in Gĩkũyũ. Ngũgĩ's exile also brings him into direct contact with his readership outside Kenya. As we noted above, Ngũgĩ had received considerable support

from the UK when he was imprisoned and therefore had a constituency here that would be interested in his work. Ngũgĩ writes in English in the preface to the first edition:

> Written largely in exile in the quietness of my one-bedroom flat in Noel Road, Islington, London, in 1993, the novel has had its prophetic moments (Ngũgĩ. *loc cit*: 1987).[8]

In the preface to the second edition he writes:

> The novel was written within my first three years of political exile from Kenya which I love. My writing the novel in Gĩkũyũ was when there were hardly any significant speakers and reader and it was my way of trying to cope with the harsh conditions of exile to make a connection with Kenya (Ngũgĩ,foreward, 2000).[9]

I would argue that in fact there is a radical shift in readership expectations given this fact of exile. I also believe that the exile shifts the reception of both the Gĩkũyũ listeners and readership and that of the translation.

The shifts in authority are a further matter of interest in the case of an 'external' translation in relation to hectorosexism. In this research I was interested in seeing whether there were differences in approaches and attitudes to authority in the translations of the two texts by the different translators. In addition, as stated above, I was interested in exploring whether a 'female'/feminist viewpoint in male authored or masculinist text for instance impacted on translation strategies and decisions in relation to hectorosexism. We shall discuss this below.

The interterxtual issues around *Matigari* such as it's translation in 'exile' and the publication of the English edition as the 'original' after the 'banning' of the original Gĩkũyũ and English texts in Kenya raises further interesting questions about authority and origins. Several Gĩkũyũ readers were unable to access either the original text in Gĩkũyũ or the Kenyan edition of the English translation which means that the 'international' version acquires the status of 'originality' at the material time. There are no differences in the texts apart from the covers and printing quality and design. The International English text also has a wider readership due to the low levels of literacy in Gĩkũyũ, fear and stigma and low book buying capacity both as a result of cost, in addition to cultural, economic and political repression. There was/is generally a low level of reading in Kenya and more so in the nationality languages which were not taught or promoted in Kenya and which have been discouraged since colonial times as we noted in chapter 1. Sicherman's data on the sales of *Caitani Mũtharabaini* showed that about 1500 books in Gĩkũyũ were sold over the period of three years (Sicherman, 1990: 17).[10]

III. SUBTEXT, METATEXT, TEXT AND CONTEXT

A. OVERVIEW

In addition to the context, the text shares several of the underlying metatext, subtext textual and intertextual issues with *Caitani Mũtharabaini* (*Devil on the Cross*) and indeed with the rest of Ngũgĩ's work. These in the original include Christianity, Marxism, Gĩkũyũ cosmology and culture, Kenyan, colonial, African and English cultures amongst others such as those produced by the gendered and racialised subjects. Anne Biersteker describes these in the following way:

As a reader I am challenged and intrigued by the revisions in *Matigari* ma Njiruungi of Brecht, Muyaka, Martin Carter, Shaaban Robert, Gakaara wa Wanjau and Gĩkũyũ folktales amongst other tales. The novel raises questions about revision, parody, critique, appropriation concerning texts that I have previously taken very seriously. It raises these questions, and infact I think forces confrontation with them, particularly those of us who have read Ngũgĩ's writing because the works most extensively revised in *Matigari ma Njiruungi* are Ngũgĩ's previous works, including *Ngahika Ndeenda, Detained, Decolonizing the Mind* and *Caitani Mũtharabaini* (Biersteker, 1990: 153).

I drew from the latent knowledge of these in translating *Matigari*. I was aware of some of them through the oral tradition, through education, through religion, travel, research and a study of literature including Ngũgĩ's works. I was also aware of some of the motifs from my translation of the children's books and the wider corpus of Ngũgĩ's work. Some of the motifs include the Gĩkũyũ originary story of Gĩkũyũ and Mumbi, the important sacred tree and several others as noted above. Some of the latent knowledge I had is also part of the folkloric heritage which I share with Ngũgĩ and with other Gĩkũyũ people and is part of the repertoire of oral knowledge that we draw upon for reference. For instance, we noted Ndigirigi's deployment of his oral knowledge in reading *Caitani Mũtharabaini* in English in chapter 3. This is also true for other critics. For instance, this is evident in Kimani Njogu's observations below.

The intense presence of the short story in Ngũgĩ's longer fiction is a major postcolonial intervention at the core of redefining the African novel. In the postcolonial project, narrative voices are collectivized and artistic creativity

subverted from the private domain of the individualised novelist as conceived in the Western tradition. Novelistic creativity in the postcolonial narrative that Ngũgĩ seems to be advocating is rerouted back into the public domain of storytellers where it belongs, at least in Africa. Undoubtedly, this rerouting is one of Ngũgĩ's strategies of oralizing and reshaping the borders of the postcolonial novel through the reactivation of the oral narrative as a site of enunciation (Njogu, 1995:336).[11]

The juxtaposition of these varied subtexts, metatext, intertext and text, their deconstruction and the satire present challenges for the translation of this text, as they do for *Caitani Mũtharabaini* owing to the ambivalence they create (Balogun, 162). For instance, I remember the impact of the Gĩkũyũ myth of how men overthrew women's rule which we have noted above. I recall how as a child, I used to be incensed by this tale. Growing up with feminist consciousness and in the postcolonial context and family where equality of men and women was supported and facilitated through education, the assumptions of such narratives seemed to run counter to everything that we were trying to be. I also grew up amongst Agĩkũyũ women who did not seem to agree with the story. They tolerated it in public but scoffed at it in private. Many women know that for patriarchy to thrive, such a view would have to be tolerated as long as it did not threaten their well-being. When the women's wellbeing was threatened for instance by colonialism they very quickly discarded these expectations and went into head-on confrontation with the armed authorities. An example is the case of the arrest of the trade union leader, Harry Thuku, in 1927 when the women went to Nairobi Police Station to demand his release and told the men to give them 'their trousers' if they were not going to get their leader out as Presley's, Shaw's and Likimani's work demonstrates. This was also true of the instances when there was

colonial pressure for Gĩkũyũ women to do waged and unwaged work as pointed out by Presley (see also Bjorkman, 1989; Umoja: 1987; Shaw:1995).

B.TRANSLATING METATEXT AND SUBTEXT

The use of a sentence such as *Nigwo moigaga* – which translates as – that is what they say, or *Kwiragwo ati* – One hears tell that, are common phrases I heard prefixing the narrating of these stories which indicates that the women took them with a pinch of salt. There was also scope to ask if the women believed this and they always laughed and said that they did not. This is particularly true of the story of Wangũ wa Makĩri, who is supposed to have disgraced all women by accepting a wager to the women from the men to take her clothes off to determine whether men or women should be the rulers (Shaw, op.cit). The culture is organised along male and female lines and each has its own narratives and accounts of society. These do not always tally. These narratives provide a subtext to the Gĩkũyũ reader and are difficult to translate without paratextual materials such as this thesis or Ngũgĩ's own documentation in English of the processes accompanying his work or a study such as that undertaken by Gĩkũyũ critics as we noted with the translation of *Devil on the Cross* above. Ngũgĩ has also written prefaces to the two editions of *Matigari* which I will address below in relation to authority. The paratextual writings which contextualise his earlier works include *Barrel of a Pen, Detained, Decolonizing the Mind,* and *Moving the Margins. In Gunpoints and Penpoints,* Ngũgĩ for instance talks about the old man Ndiiro as he does in the preface to *Matigari*. The story of Ndiiro is one such traditional story that provides both the metatext for *Matigari,* Gĩkũyũ folkloric narrative, and acts as a building block for both the form and content of the narrative (Njogu. 1995: 338). In the introduction Ngũgĩ states that:

This story is based on an oral story about a man looking for a cure for illness. He is told of a man Ndiiro, who can cure his illness, but he does not know how to get to him. So he undertakes a journey of search. He meets different people on the way and to each he sings the same description of the old man Ndiiro (1987: Ngũgĩ: vii).

TT   Tell me where lives old man Ndiiro

       Who, when he shakes his foot, jingles

       And the bells ring out his name: Ndiiro

       And again: Ndiiro (*ibid*).

Ngũgĩ then uses this well known Gĩkũyũ narrative as motif of an oral narrative for the search which Matigari conducts for his house and his family when he return from the liberation war in the forest. In relation to gender, the possibility for instance of a woman undertaking such a search in this text is therefore ruled out by the metatextual reference to Ndiiro. This is embedded in other metanarratives related to Gĩkũyũ gender roles as I have demonstrated, which enables Matigari's role to be read as male, as metatext, text and subtext alongside other such devices in the text. The question of gender is explored substantially below.

This metatext and several others including others such as those based on Christian orthodoxy, colonialism, imperialism, Marxism etc. impact on several other factors for translation such as Ngũgĩ's invitation to the reader to place the text in any context that they wish. The invocation to the reader/listener reads as follows:

ST

    Rũgano rũũru rũtegerirwo mũndu wothe wendeete ng'ango cia gwitungira:

Na mũndu wothe ũraatuĩria na akaandĩka ũhoro wa kĩrĩra kia ndũire kia

ndũũrĩrĩrĩ cia Aabirika.

Na mũndu woothe wendeete gũkũria kĩrĩira gĩa thiomi cia ndũũrĩri cia Aabirika.

ITHA

Rũgano rũrũ nĩ rwa gwĩtungĩra.

Ciiko iria irĩ ho nĩ cia gwĩtungĩra

Andũ arĩa marĩ rũganoinĩ ni a gwitungira

Rũgano rũreekikira bũrũri wa gwitungĩra

Mũthomi – Rwĩkĩre bũrũri ũria ũkwinyeedera!

Ningi gũtiri ati niri rwekĩkĩre

Ira; iyo, kiumia kĩu kĩraathirie?

Mwaka ũcio ũraathirire?

Kana miaka ikũmi yaathirirre

Mũthoomi –Ĩkira mahiinda maira ũũkwinyeendera!

Ningi rũtirĩ atĩ nĩ ha rwekĩkĩire

Haha kana haaria

Itũũra rĩĩri kana rĩĩria

Rũgongo rũũrũ kana rũũria

Mũthomi – Ĩkira mahiinda maria ũũkwĩnyeendera!

Niingi rũgiri atĩ ni ha rwekikiire

Haha kana haaria!

Itũũra rĩĩri kana rĩĩria

Rũgongo rũũru kana rũũria

Mũthomi – Reke rwikikire haria ũũkwinyeendera!

Ningĩ rũtigayanĩĩtie mahiinda na nuguta

Kana na ndagika

Kana na mathaa

Kana na mithenya

Mũthomi – Gayania mahinda ũria ũkwiyeendera

ũga ĩtha, ngũganire

Tene tene mũno bũrĩri ũtari rĩĩtwa…

TT

TO THE READER/LISTENER

This story is imaginary

The actions are imaginary

The characters are imaginary

The country is imaginary – has no name even.

Reader/listener: may the story take place in the country of your choice!

The story has no fixed time

Yesterday, the day before yesterday, last week…

Last year….

Or ten years ago?

Reader/listener: may you place the action in the space of your choice!

And again, it does not demarcate time in terms of seconds or minutes

Or hours

Or days

Reader/listener: may you allocate the duration of any of the actions according to

your choice!

So say yes and I'll tell you a story!

Once upon a time, in a country with no name… (Ngũgĩ, 1987: ix).[12]

In the first English translation edition, the dedication, which is a translation is printed in italics and separated from the rest of the story by the author's note for the English edition. It is published in italics on the top left hand of the page vi as follows:

This novel is dedicated to all those who love a good story; and to all those committed to the development of literature in the languages of all the African peoples.

Then follows a note on the English edition on page vii and viii which is written in English by the author. The narrative then addresses the reader listener translated: 'to the reader listener' in the evocation 'itha'.

In reality, this term is not a dedication in the English sense, but an evocation signalling the beginning of the story such as: "Are you ready? so that we can begin", and signals to the beginning of the oral performance (Okpehwo, 1990).

This invitation is very important, as it literally 'allows' the translator as reader and writer to do with the text as she will. I will discuss the question of this authority below.

The key reason why I introduced this dedication as the title of the evocation is that at the end of each stanza, there is a one line appeal to the reader/listener – mũthomi, which literally means reader. I was aware of the potential and actual oral reception of the source text and I did not want it 'lost' in the translation, so I translated the term more widely than the term 'mũthomi' allows for in the stricter sense. I therefore translated it for the reader/ listener to draw attention to the oral dimension of the reception that the source text was undergoing.

Ogude argues that:

Ngũgĩ intimates that the story-telling is a weaving process that involves both the narrator and the target audience (Ogude: *1999*: 97).[13]

He also draws attention to Julien's comments that story telling in both texts:

'...intimates a telling between the speaker-writer and the listener-reader and inside that telling-listening there are, as Bakhtin would have it, other tells and listeners' (Julien 1992, p.145, *cit. in* Ogude, *ibid*).[14]

This is evident in the invocation for instance, for the reader/listener to place the story in a country of their choice enables this possibility. Msiska notes the position that places the African reader in:

... an ontological duality, simultaneously a reader, a subject of literacy ideology and a listener, a son or daughter of the soil. His reader-subjectivity locates him in the universal semiotic and cultural frame of reading and his oral listener connects him to his or her soil. This is a major contribution to the conceptualisation of the experience of reading an African text, drawing our attention to the intricate subjectivity of the reader, something lacking in most theories of readership, including those of African cultural nationalists and the Constance Phenomenological School (Msiska, 2000:24).[15]

This point seems to concur with Balogun's who points out that:

...it would seem as if *Matigari* has been written by Ngũgĩ deliberately to deconstruct reader's traditional modes of reading, textual interpretation and

reception. Usually, we separate orality from writing, oral simplicity from textual complexity and propaganda from art, but in *Matigari*, these distinctions are invalidated to promote new literary aesthetics (1997:166).[16]

Through the translation of the term *mũthomi* as both reader and listener, the translator provides a theoretical grounding of the cultural context of reception which is implicit in the source text, context and culture. As well as the more obvious reader, I was also aware that the term *mũthomi* in Gĩkũyũ also refers to 'believers', many who are often 'illiterate', but are conversant with the written word of the Bible and the scriptures through the oral/written medium. In my experience, those considered illiterate are often familiar with the textual presentation of the Bible, the hymn-books and prayer books and can locate the common hymns, prayers and readings in the text.

An additional point related to context and deconstruction is that the invocation to the reader to read the text as they will is not as generous as it firsts sounds. There are further clues which point to the particularity of Kenya as the setting of the text including cultural and linguistic references. These include expressions such as "As Gĩkũyũ said..." which we have addressed in chapter 3. For instance, we can deduce that the country is a former British colony which comprises Africans, Asians and Europeans. Their names and characteristics point to a narrative set in Kenya, in my reading. Other clues include the fact that Swahili is a commonly spoken language in this country, just as Christianity is an important religion in this country. The country was once colonised by the Portuguese and the Arabs (1987: 45). Thus, through elimination we know that the country is not South Africa or Namibia or the USA and so on. Gĩtiti makes the case for the text as a Kenyan text as follows:

Ngũgĩ's tale takes place "in a country with no name" (1989: ix). The actions and characters in *Matigari* are not confined to a fixed time or space. Despite the authorial disclaimers, however, it is clear that *Matigari* is set in the Kenya of Danial Arap Moi's police state with its carryovers from the no less brutal Kenyatta regime (Gitahi, 1995: 216).[17]

Lewis Nkosi, Ogude, Biersketer and Gikandi also share the view that this is a Kenyan tale. Maughan-Brown (1991: 170-180) sees Matigari as a Christ-like figure. Balogun (op. cit: 166) and Biersketer see multiple readings in the text as I do. Biersteker is critical of one – dimensional reading in these narratives. In fact, she disagrees with Maughan-Brown's reading of Christianity in the text.

"Maughan-Brown argues that Ngũgĩ, "presents Matigari as a Christ-like figure," and this argument seems plausible to the extent that Matigari is both presented by the novel and viewed within the novel as "Christ-like" (Biersteker: 1990:143).[18]

In my translation, I saw this as a possible reading by following each of the potential readings across the text. I also know from the reading of *Caitani Mũtharabaini* that there was a reading constituency that would read it both seriously and as an allegorical satire. The multiple possibilities of such a reading exist in the text and more as we noted above and as I will discuss below. The country could be any neocolony of which there are many examples world-wide. There are also other clues provided through metonymy and intertextuality. As pointed out above, I believe that these texts were written with different readerships (including the large 'translation' readership of which I form a part) in mind as I have discussed above in chapter 3.

Biersteker best sums up what Ngũgĩ has done through these readings and refers to the postmodern nature of the text, in the example with the ending:

As Matigari smiled to himself "wrapped" his AK47 (Barrel of a pen) in a "plastic sheet" and buried it to the "central root" of a tree, so too Ngũgĩ has hidden history in his writing as a socialist realist gicaandu player. He has invited us postmodernist readers to become, if we choose to do so, revolutionary readers, in a circular sense if no other, who smile, as we read that Mũriũki dug up all the things that Matigari had hidden (175) and consider that *Mugumo "Fig tree"* was the title of Ngũgĩ's first short story (Ngũgĩ, Decolonising the mind: 70), but now is a term that does not require English translation or that *Matigari ma Njiruungi* may be as much as postmodern as a Gĩkũyũ translation and revision of both *Petals of Blood* and *Ngahika Ndeenda* (Biersteker, 1990: 156).[19]

Thus the narratives come together to point to the specific but also general historical moment through a deconstruction and simultaneous construction of a new metatext, new myths and therefore grounding metatext, 'texts' (of old and new myths), subtext and context (Balogun). This recognition by readers of the translation, in my view, is part acknowledgment of the challenges that such postmodernist texts such as *Caitani Mũtharabaini* and *Matigari* place on translation in relation to fidelity and infidelity. The text is itself a departure, both in the source and in the translation and thus calls for oralist postmodernist approaches to translation. For instance, Biersteker points out that the term *mũgumo* does not require English translation. I take this to mean that the readership of Ngũgĩ's other texts in English (like herself) will already know what it symbolises both in Gĩkũyũ culture and in the corpus of Ngũgĩ's work in English. This

is another example of intertextual, metatextual reliance in the reflexification/translation process. In the translation, I also had to take new readers into account thus making the meaning of 'new' words available.

On close examination of the text, this familiarity has been achieved through what I would call a progressive process of translation from domestication to foreignisation. As the mũgumo is such a key motif in Ngũgĩ's work and this text, the translator 'works' the word from the beginning of the text to the end to 'domesticate' it within the text. At the beginning, the term which appears on the first page of the text, is dealt with as follows:

ST

Akĩigera hũgũruruiini cia rũũĩ agicaria mũti mũna. Rĩĩrĩ rĩĩngi akiona mũgumo gatuambaini.

Text as Translated:

He walked along the banks of the river. Then he saw what he was looking for a huge mugumo, a fig tree [my emphasis], right in the middle of a cluster of other trees.

At the beginning the translator provides the meaning intratextually. By the end of the text, she dispenses with the translation that the mũgumo is a fig tree and leaves it as the 'mũgumo tree' in the English translation as follows:

Page: 172 – If we hurry we might get to the mũgumo tree before they catch up with us.
Page: 173 – 'Mũriũki, cross the river and bring me my AK47 from under the mũgumo tree.
Page: 175 – …under the mũgumo tree, Mũriuki dug up all the things that Matigari had hidden.

Page: 175 – He stood for a while under the mũgumo tree.

No footnotes are made in the source, to explain that that this is a significant and sacred tree in the Gĩkũyũ text because this is an inherent part of Gĩkũyũ culture. Its importance is also implied in the text for both source and target reader. Another example is the song on page 4:

ST

Kũũngĩrĩ gũkia

Kũũngĩrĩ gũkia

Nĩ gũkĩĩre na gwa...

Ngayane maaĩ na thaambĩri

Nĩ gũkĩĩre na gwa thererũka

Akĩririkana ũrĩ maagaandirio nĩ maaĩ ũũ atĩ gũtirĩ waiguuaga kahiũ mwĩrĩ marũmiite thaano. Ĩhii cia bururi. Thakame yaao ĩgĩtukana na tĩĩri. Makĩrũmukia thaano ũguori, maarĩ arume.

TT

If only it were dawn

If only it were dawn

So I can share the cold water with the early bird (4)

The water numbed their skin so that none of them felt the pain as the knife cut into the flesh. Before this moment, they were mere boys, but by the time they unclenched their fists, they were men. Their blood mingled with the soil and they became patriots, ready for the armed struggle to come.*

A footnote note is placed in the English text as follows:

"*A reference to mararanja (Gĩkũyũ): a festival of dance and song performed during circumcision. The description also alludes to the initiation ceremony preceding armed struggle (4)".

The use of footnotes here demonstrates that the translation is addressed at both Gĩkũyũ speaking reader of the English translation and others through the specific reference to *mararanja* in Gĩkũyũ. The source text makes no reference to the festival which is implied in the Gĩkũyũdiscription. The footnotes also draw attention to the foreigness of the text to other non-Gĩkũyũ readers but additionally inform contemporary Gĩkũyũ speakers who may not be conversant with this traditional practice. At another level, the use of 'foreign' words in Ngũgĩ's work and in the corpus of African literature is normative and this footnote thus contextualises the translation as part of the African literary corpus. In *Petals of Blood*, Ngũgĩ uses no less than one hundred and fifty terms in Kiswahili and Gĩkũyũ. Arndt's observations on the similar usage in Igbo-lexification and the Igboisation of Standard English are insightful. She observes that this necessity arises out of difficulties in equivalence and the innovation of the English language, but more importantly that it becomes a decolonising act regardless of the will of the author (Arndt, 1998: 84-96). The case of Amos Tutuola's *Palm wine Drinkard* has been well discussed in this respect (Venuti, 1998:174-6). Mehrez uses the term 'métissés' to describe heteroglossia which is also present in *Caitani Mũtharabaini* and *Devil on the Cross*, as we observed.

She states that:

> These postcolonial texts, frequently referred to as 'hybrid' or 'métissés' because of the culturo-linguistic layering which exists between them, have succeeded in

forging a new language that defies the very notion of a 'foreign' text that can be readily translatable into another language (Mehrez, 1992:121).[20]

Other critics describe this as 'code-mixing' in contexts of heteroglossia (Masingale-Bell: 1994:52-53), which we also noted in chapter 2 in relation to hooks' use of the expression the 'master's language' and how this interacts with African-American English.

At another level, I was aware of the negative impression colonialism had created around such festivals as *mararaja* which were considered pagan and satanic. I therefore found it useful to challenge the stereotypes (von Flotow, 1998) as noted above.

C. TRANSLATING HETEROGLOSSIA

As noted in the section above, the source text relies on several words in Gĩkũyũ, English, French, Latin and Swahili which are dealt with in ways that draw attention to this 'code-mixing' as in the translation of *Caitani Mũtharabainĩ*. English speech is italicised in the English translation and this draws attention to the fact of the text as a translation (Ngũgĩ, 1982:10). As well as drawing attention to the text as a translation, I used the footnote to invite the Gĩkũyũ reader to refer to the Gĩkũyũ text. It can also be read as an address away from the Gĩkũyũ and Kenyan reader who, I have argued, seems to be the primary addressee of the English translation.

D. TRANSLATING GENRE AND THE *GĨCANDI*

We have noted the importance of the form and genre of the text in chapter 3 and in the background above. The use of the multigenre in *Matigari* as in *Caitani Mũtharabaini* concretises Ngũgĩ's desire to stay within this medium as I will demonstrate below. Balogun, in my view, accurately identifies the form of this text as a cross between the oral (Julien, 1992) and the written tradition.

> Since traditional novelistic criticism has not provided tools for the analysis of a work like *Matigari* because the category is new, we must turn to the scholarship in oral tradition, where critics have recognized the 'gray areas' (Foley:164) in which orality and literary interface to produce texts that exhibit what Walter Ong calls "literate orality" of the secondary oral culture (160). Ong distinuishes the primary oral culture, in which orality is not a choice, from the literate culture that merely aspires to create secondary orality—in other words, literate orality. Orally derived texts have distinctive characteristics that set them apart from works determined by the norms of the written tradition, such as the Western novel, whose history is almost synonymous with the history of writing and literacy in the West (Balogun, 80).

Balogun also observes that:

> Ngũgĩ's phenomenal transformation of the conceptual characteristics of the novel as genre, which undoubtedly constitutes the most significant development in fiction since the discovery of Latin American marvellous realism, has been largely ignored for obvious reasons, not least of which is the fear that his Gĩkũyũ

novels promote Gĩkũyũ cultural hegemony in Kenya. In addition, the theoretical proponents of cultural hybridity who currently dictate the terms of the multicultural debate in the West casually give Ngũgĩ the nativist cold shoulder, conveniently forgetting that the multicultural pluralism they advocate implicitly recognises the universalism of every particular culture—a recognition that, in fact, informs the centreal thesis of Ngũgĩ's culture and language theory".[21]

E. TRANSLATING GENDER

Ngũgĩ uses what I would call 'écriture ' orature Africaine masculine' in reference to Matigari ma Njirũũngi (*Matigari*) and Caitaani Mũtharabaini (*Devil on the Cross*) drawing from the concept of 'écriture' and 'écriture' feminine extending the concepts developed by proponents Derrida and Cixous. The ambivalence in the latter text camouflages this as we noted but in *Matigari*, and it is easier to interrogate. It rises questions for the translation when the generic form and content is appropriated to écriture orature masculine and transformed not only by this male author, but to a written "European" écriture/traducture masculine which in form resembles a Western novel at the present time. We noted this in relation to Kennard in chapter 1 in relation to the novel and how its use in the hands of women writers is seen to imply 'inferiority' and necessary subordination of women" (see p. 129 above).

Nnaemeka posits the question whether one can have reasonable knowledge of modern African women writers without taking a 'measured walk in their mothers' gardens'? (Nnaemeka, 1994: 137) which supports the question raised whether there were women gicaandi players in relation to form in *Caitani Mũtharabaini*. The same question

applies to African women translators in relation to this new art form. Arndt remarks that:

> It is indisputable that African women writers can find narrative skills in the garden of their mothers which enrich their own literary texts aesthetically and which, in addition, Africanize and decolonize the genres used as well as the English language itself. For one thing, the authors gather narrative devices which make oral narratives an artistic experience. Amongst this is the integration of the proverbs, songs and riddles, narration in direct speech, the use of repetitions, digressions, ideophones, irony, satire, symbolic praise names and first names as well as of similes, metaphors and allegories which refer to the described world of narratives, such as motifs, subjects, standardized figures as well as conflict and figure constellations, form oral literature (Arndt, 1998:9).[22]

This supports the argument that the use of genre influences the positionality of the narratives in gendered positioning and therefore impacts on translation. We noted the narratives told by Gĩkũyũ woman in the preceding chapter, told to Cora Presley. Below, she gives reasons why she believes that women's involvement has been downplayed. Maina's collection of Mau Mau songs also demonstrate a clear distinction of the use of the oral tradition in gendered ways in the freedom struggle. These women's songs give strong insights as to the gendered nature of accounting (particularly in formal historiography which in Kenya has been male dominated (see Preistly's comments below). A case in point is the demands recorded by the 'nationalist movement' which viewed itself in male terms despite women's involvement in it, a point I will address below. An example is Article 9 of the Kenya Land and Freedom charter which consisted of 79 articles. It reads as follows:

'We strongly object to foreigners sleeping with our [emphasis mine] wives and daughters; we also oppose the imprisonment of females and the carrying of passes (Kinyatti, 1987:16).[23]

At another level, the personification of matigari (a noun meaning - those who survived the bullets) as a male character, creates difficulties for the translation due to hectorosexist mythmaking. In fact, it negates the revolutionary potential of women as feminists or as catalysts for social change, a point made succinctly by Ogude and one which I have made above in chapter 3. In relation to the revolutionary *in Devil on the cross*, Balogun observes that:

While Mũturi is fully formed, Wariinga and Wangari are rapidly growing in social consciousness as a result of deepening oppression and exploitation at the hands of the Kenyan bourgoisie (1997:71).[24]

This personification entrenches the notion of 'male' heroes in both the source and target contexts. We noted in chapter 2, the devaluation of African womanhood through colonialism and this only plays into the double stereotype in the target text (Ogude, *op. cit*: 54). Once Matigari and subsequently Matigari/ Mũriuki – (the resurrected Matigari) are epitomised as male, patriarch, father of the nation, the myth of male 'matigari's is recreated and perpetuated in both cultures. This negates history but also distorts history as well as women's contemporary efforts for equality and emancipation.

Presley has observes that:

The major works on Kenyan nationalism and Mau Mau do not place women at the centre of the organisation. If they are mentioned at all, women are credited with a minimal importance and accomplishments. These descriptions fail to show the historical development of women's involvements in the key issues and events of the nationalist movements; they do not focus on the many achievements and sacrifices of Kikuyu women. Data on the women's involvement in Mau Mau and the importance of their contributions comes from two sources. First, the British colonial government was quite aware of the potential power of women. In the annual reports, DCs frequently chronicled individual political acts by women and wrote of the political mood of Kikuyu women. They often commented on women's impact in sustaining nationalist ideas and activities. Second, oral data collection reveals that there was a nucleus of women in Kiambu district who took on the task of organising rural resistance to colonialism in Central province" (Presley, 1992:123).[25]

Presley has given a number of reasons why there is misrepresentation of women's involvement in Mau Mau, which may account for Ngũgĩ's choice to personify matigari/muriũki, i.e the survivors as men. She gives the following three.

1. Family ties with Mau Mau men

2. Involvement of women in households where men were not involved (see pg 150)

3. The resources in historical reconstruction has been based on an urban/bourgeois and middleclass population. Most of these would undoubtedly be men. The assumption of gender roles in political roles including decision making and the conduct of war which was traditionally a male arena in the traditional division of labour (*ibid.*).[26]

Another reason could be straightforward bigotry, both of colonial and local apologists for colonialism including race and gender bigotry. The point not made by Presley is the low level of documentation of Mau Mau for a considerable time, whether by western or African scholars and the tremendous resistance to its documentation.

In her autobiography Likimani also demonstrates this involvement by women (Likimani, 1985: 60-74). Unpublished Umoja documents demonstrates that not only the centrality of women to the struggle, but the broad range of their involvement both in relation to their walks of life and their participation (Umoja, 1987). Kinyatti's translations of the songs he collected, *Thunder from the mountains,* demonstrate this. The collection includes songs such as 'Death of a patriotic woman', 'The Olenguruone Struggle', 'When we arrived at Olenguruone', 'Women of Muranga' etc. (Kinyatti, 1980). Several of the other songs also reflect the involvement of women and children. Bjorkman's work reflects the personal accounts of women' involvement (Bjorkman 1989). Ngũgĩ, also reflecting on the fate of Kamiriithũ and the play Ngahika Ndeenda which was banned and landed him in jail, states:

> The fifties saw the Mau Mau armed struggle. Kenyan women played a heroic role of fighting in the forests and mountains and in prisons and detention camps and in the homes. They were everywhere.

This is the kind of history and struggle that the play *Ngaahika Ndeenda (I will marry when I want)* celebrates (Ngũgĩ, 1982:120).[27]

These located positions continue to be asserted through various other locations in the text including proverbs, idiomatic expressions, riddles and framed narratives which confirm a hectoro-order of the narrative despite the readings and deconstructions that

are possible. They include stereotypes and distortions about women such as through Gŭthera's depiction as a "helpless woman".

ST - Gŭthera agĩthugumira ni guoya (26) –

Literal translation – Gŭthera wet herself in fear

TT – a gush of urine ran down her legs.

At the critical revolutionary moment when Matigari has to go back to the forest he says:

TT - 'I don't want you to lose your lives before your time has come. Let us say goodbye to one another here. I shall go and recover my weapons from under the tree. Then I shall claim my house with new might and right'.

'Please let me come!' Mŭriuki begged. 'Don't leave me behind'

'I will come **too**' [emphasis mine].

'Yes. **We** are the children of *Matigari ma Njirŭŭngi*', Mŭriuki said. We are the children of those who survived the war.'

'And their **wives** [emphasis mine] as well! Said Gŭthera, smiling. 'Or which other **wives** [emphasis mine] and children are you looking for?' (139)

Ngŭgĩ also uses specific gendered nouns – woman (p.30, p. 31, p.159), 'defenceless women (p.31) and so on, in the case of the men, Ngarŭro and Matigari and Mŭriŭki the boy.

In several other ways, Matigari's, Ngarŭro's and Mŭriuki's personification as male. the écriture orature maculine, and the hectorosexist stereotyping of gender in general, render the invitation to place the characters in any form we wish as they are imaginary. unsustainable in translation. Other stereotypes include women as prostitutes, women

without agency, women as *femme fatale*, women dependent on men to rescue them in gendered ways including in their social emancipation as demonstrated which make it even more difficult. Although Wariinga is the 'protagonist' of *Caitani Mūtharabaini*, she is still a 'secondary' character like Gũthera because she is a victim and they both need 'heroes' to save them. In both texts women are depicted as *femme fatale* (Wariinga in *Devil on the Cross* faints where Gũthera in *Matigari* urinates on herself). Gũthera is shot and lands in Matigari's arms bleeding. Mũriũki the male child survives and grows to become the Matigari of tomorrow reinforcing the myths of male nationhood and male liberators. The women in both texts are also depicted as easy sexual prey, etc. Similar issues arise for the other hectorsexist issues. The underlying mythology is however present as has been noted by Ogude who notes that:

Ngũgĩ understanding of the historical processes in Kenya is too deeply embedded in dependency theory to allow for a nuanced understanding of the complex colonial and postcolonial experience in Kenya. Ngũgĩ articulation of history from a dependency perspective cannot allow him to deal wth specific contradictions and local divisions within Kenya and Ngũgĩ is therefore forced to surpress certain histories (Ogude, 1999: 32-33).[28]

In *Matigari*, this positionality is evident in many ways, despite the invitation to read this text in the way that the reader wishes (see discussion of Scott's translation of gender above on p.124). I will explore the options of the translation of gender and the strategies the translator has used through the exploration of theme, content and genre. We noted in chapter 2 and 3 above the specific expressions of hectorosexism in ways that are complex to delineate. The reference here to gender has to take for instance the colonial and colonial context into account in addition to the 'traditional' expectations of

the society which I read as Gĩkũyũ/Kenya for translation purposes for reasons amplified above.

As in chapter 3, some of the discernible hectorosexist issues emerge in this text also, partly from what I described as 'écriture Africaine masculine' describing the positionality the author adopted. We noted in the example above, how the initiation ceremonies were gendered and segregated. It also distinctly spoke of the boys – *ihii* and men using the specific term, arume. We also discussed the gender of the protagonist and as male above. In the Gĩkũyũ, the character is written in the neuter and we do not know the character's name until page 20. The first word and sentence in the book read as follows:

ST

Aagwete mũciinga AK47, na guoko kwa ũrĩo, rũhi rwa ũmotho akaigĩrĩra thiithiinĩ agacũũthĩrĩria mũrĩmo ũũrĩa ũngĩ wa rũũĩ ta ũrĩa aaneeka ng'ongo nyiingĩ, mahiinda maingĩ, mĩaka mĩingĩ, mĩena ĩna ya rũhuuho.

'Agwete', is the 'compound' subject + verb A = he/she, 'gwete' from kugwata – to hold in Gĩkũyũ. Without a context, it could be read either way as that is how the language works. The passage is translated in English as follows

TT

He [emphasis mine] held an AK47 in his right hand. His left hand was raised to shield his face while he looked across the river, as he had often done over many years, across many hills and valleys, in the four corners of the globe.

In the English the character is gendered as male. In the translated text, the male gender pronoun is used six times in the first sentence establishing the character as male. In the translation, the question of Matigari's gender is translated – Aari mundu murume kana mutumia? - Was he a man or was he a woman? Who was he? (Ngũgĩ, *op.cit*:158). This could have been translated: Was he a man or was she a woman?

Biersketer observes:

> My understanding of "Matigari" was also informed by a discussion with Carol Sicherman following a presentation of an earlier version of this paper. She told me that when Wangui wa Goro began translating the novel she attempted to avoid English pronouns marking gender. Pronouns are not marked for gender in Gĩkũyũ and thus the gender of Matigari is ambiguous, in the sense of multigendered for much of the novel and in the sense gender free throughout the novel" (Biersteker, 1993: 147).[29]

She also explains that:

> I did not realise that "Matigari" as a name has had such a resonance. In my limited understanding of Kenyan history and Gĩgĩĩkũyũ, I had metaphorically interpreted a narrow literal reading of the title/and title character's name. My initial literal and symbolic readings now seemed based on an incomplete and limited understanding of the history of the multiple meanings of Matigari/matigari. With the history of collective name provided by Gikandi as well as Gitahi's and Sicherman's explanations of the inherent ambiguity of the name in the novel, I had a more complete understanding of how the sources drawn upon for the novel and how the name and term Matigari ma Njirũũngi work in the novel (148).[30]

Wa goro has stated that:

> This was one of the more difficult questions to address in the translation of the
> book as much of the suspense of the story in Gĩkũyũ depends very much on our
> not knowing explicitly that Matigari was a man. But we know from many direct
> and indirect indicators, such as his dress and the way that others address him,
> that he could only be a man. So I decided to go for the masculine pronoun as
> early as possible although in the Gĩkũyũ the pronoun used is the third person
> singular in the neuter (wa goro:1997).[31]

Other examples of linguistic features which determined the strategy I adopted for the
gender include:

ST

Kai utaroona ndĩ thoogwo (26)

TT

Can't you see I am old enough to be your **father**? [emphasis mine] (29)

ST

"Kai, ũtũraga ku mũthuri ũyũ? (p. 26)

TT   -"Where have you been living old **man**?" [emphasis mine] (p. 29)

Other examples include gendered personal nouns such as men, woman, women,

boy etc.

TT " ...and call up my people...My **wives** [emphasis mine] (p.6)

- Wives [emphasis mine] (p. 38,39)

The man [my emphasis] did not alter his pace... (p. 7)

It was also my experience that people rarely referred to women as 'mũndu' although the term generally refers to a person. This is also true of other 'mu' class nouns such as those referring to professions such as the mũruti wa wira, mũurutani, mũrutwo, Mũũhunjia – the worker, the teacher/lecturer, researcher and priest respectively, are translated through the male subject pronoun (see pgs, 91,92,93) very much in the same way that traditionally, these terms were considered masculine in English or in French; le medicin, le travailleur, le chercheur, le professeur, etc.

Another clue is Matigari's description of Gũthera which is reminscent of Wariinga in *Caitani Mũtharabaini*. If one responded to read the text in the way they wished, and decided to read Matigari as a woman, this would change the translation entirely. In this particular passage, only the gender of Matigari needs to change for the subversive translation to take effect.

> What a beautiful woman, thought Matigari, a woman with teeth that gleem white like milk, a mass of hair so black and soft, as if it is always treated with the purest of oils. Yes, a women who is neither too short nor too tall; neither too fat nor too thin. So well built that her clothes fit her as though she was created in them! See how well she wears her flower patterned lasso around her shoulders so that the flaps fall gently it folds over her shoulders and breasts. It was difficult not to stare at her. What was such a rare beauty doing in a dingy bar?"
> (Ngũgĩ, 1987:27-28).[32]

If the translator had accepted Ngũgĩ's invitation and read Gũthera in any way they wished, a subversive reading and translation of the above text would yield a gay, a drag-

queen or lesbian Matigari. Below are two retranslations that demonstrate this. The first is of the opening of the text viewed above.

TT:

She held an AK47 in her right hand. Her left hand was raised to shield her face while she looked across the river, as she had so often done over many years, across many hills and valleys in the four corners of the globe. It was all over now, but she knew that she had to be careful...

She went down to the river and bent to wash her face and hands. So chilly. It reminded her of other waters in the past which had been just as cold. She remembered how, then, they had sung through the night in the open air:

If only it were dawn,

If only it were dawn

So I can share the cold waters with the early bird.

The water numbed their skin, so none of them felt the pain as the knife cut into the flesh. Before this moment they were mere girls/transvestites/queens but by the time they unclenched their fists they were women/men/gays/queens. Their blood mingled with the soil and they became matriots/queens, ready for the armed struggle to come.

Ogude goes further to state that:

For example, the Mau Mau songs testify to their simultaneous commitment to the house of Mumbi – to the Gods of Mt. Kirinyaga, to liberating the land and

also to the future Kenya ruled by Kenyatta (Kinyatti 1980, Kabira and Mutahi 1988; Ogude, 1998:34).

Similar parallels can be drawn from the other equalities issues in the text as in the instance of the intersection with "race". We noted some of the complexities which arise through hooks, Masingale Bell, Massardier- Kenney and Eric Cheyfitz for instance, in chapter 2 in relation to 'translating' to what hooks calls the "oppressor's language". We noted in chapter 2 the difficulty of translating the term 'savage' in anti-abolitionist material (see p. 35, 135 & 140 above). Similar challenges arose in the translation of *Matigari*. An example of the difficulty was how to translate the term '*kaburu*'. The term was used to describe a white fascist settler colonialist. I had difficulties translating this term into English. After debates with the publisher and editor we settled for the more 'neutral' term 'settler' – a seemingly neutral, non- loaded term in English. In Gĩkũyũ, however and to the Gĩkũyũ and Kenyan reader, the term 'settler' carries as much weight as 'kaburu' and is in fact a more accurate translation into Kenyan English. I could have however persisted with the term '*kaburu*' and provided a footnote for the international reader as I have done with words such as '*mararanja*', discussed above. This would introduce this term into the international language in the way that words like 'kiosk' and 'safari' have done. This would also be in keeping with Ngũgĩ's writing in English where features such as italics are used as part of the narrative strategy as I demonstrated above and as will become evident below through the example of the use of naming and characterisation in the text.

F. TRANSLATING HECTOROSEXISM THROUGH NAMING AND CHARACTERISATION

1. Overview

As we noted above, Ngũgĩ uses naming and characterisation as part of the form and thematic narrative strategy. Ogude aptly observes that the characters are subordinate to the narrative. I would argue, however, that in all instances, the characters are allegorical, both in their attributes and in their naming.

"In a way, Ngũgĩ validates Barthes' theoretical supposition that characters are in act mere tropes in the narrative (Barthes: 1974, pp.178-9). To this extent, Ngũgĩ is challenging the traditional notions of complex characters as the hallmark of a good narrative. He attaches great value to the story and to how the same narrative could be rendered persuasively in the postcolonial narratives originally written in Gĩkũyũ. Thus, elements that are traditionally considered central to the novel form, such as credibility of character and complexity of plot structure are inevitably subordinated to the dominant discourse in his narratives – the absurd drama of the postcolonial state in Kenya. However, Ngũgĩ's characters remain mechanical allegorical symbols; they are mere signs that draw our attention to Ngũgĩ's sense of Kenyan history and not to other competing versions of the nations's history and the politics which underpin its multifaceted layers (Ogude, 1999:108).[33]

Owing to the complex multigenre that this text is, it would be simplistic to read the names and characteristics identified here in one-dimensional ways as I pointed out above. Ngũgĩ's evocation to read these narratives as the reader/listener wishes points to

the multiple layers of meaning that are available (Balogun, Op cit: 62) and the translation process can unearth further layers in the target language as I have demonstrated with the example of the term 'kaburu'. The names here can therefore be read as generic or as specific.

Over and above the multidimensionality of the characters from singular to plural tropes and types as with *Caitaani Mūtharabaini* the author deconstructs knowledge in a postmodernist way owing to the mesh of complex intersections impinging on the specific cultural moment and location. We noted the juxtaposition of various world outlooks and how they impact on differentiated subjectivities such as 'race', gender, class etc, which Ngũgĩ explores with great care despite the hectorosexist privileging of the hectorosexist trope.

For instance, we noted that Ngũgĩ draws on the symbolism and male superiority as a 'given' in the oral tradition through a number of tropes which impacts in the naming of his male heroes. This coincides with the male hero tradition trope in the English novel (see Kolodney in relation to Ophelia above, p.94). Intertexually, a long line of male heroes emerges in the corpus of Ngũgĩ's work, just as a line of weak women, who are lacking in agency, can be traced. The male heroes include Njamba Nene, for instance, the hero and protagonist of the children's books who is comparable to Mūriũki in Matigari. Other heroes include General Ruheni in *Njamba Nene* and his pistol, Karega in *Petals of Blood* and Mūturi in *Caitaani Mūtharabaini* (see Ogude:137). Mūriũki is given 'masculine' characteristics and mystique especially towards the end of the text when he symbolically 'inherits' Matigari's weapons and becomes a 'Matigari' himself. These aspects, despite the author's intention that Matigari be viewed as a neutral collective heroic figure, are unavoidable and implicate the source and translated text

through the use of this and other similar building blocks that negate any other readings. These include proverbs, framed narratives, riddles, the reliance on metatexts and subtexts, songs and other narrative devices which underscore hectoropower in the original and the target culture.

From a gendered translation point of view for instance, if one took a Christian reading of the text and read the characters as the Holy Trinity, Matigari's attributes still remain those of God the father and Mũriũki's as those of Jesus. Where Gũthera, the Pure,fits in, with her characterisation as a prostitution and lack of agency, is harder to see. It seems quite unlikely that she represents the Holy Spirit although her name means Purity. It is not clear whether she is Mary Magdalene or the Holy Spirit at different levels or whether Ngarũro wa Kiriro is the Holy Spirit? Another reading is of a heterosexual family, with Matigari as the father, Gũthera as the mother and Mũriũki as their child.

Boehmer makes the claim that:

> The family 'romance' in which the male artist, leader or citizen hero addresses himself to his national mother (land, home, concept of nation) in tones variously deferential or reverential, is enacted again and again in literature and history of national movements (Boehmer, 1992:235).[34]

This reading fits in with the traditional models of patriarchal families, whether English, Christian or traditional Gikũyũ. It also fits in the model where gender is subordinated to (male) class struggles (see chapter 5 below). In other ways, *Matigari*, in the source and translated texts, occupies the traditional role of the male heroic protagonist of the Western epic novel, but also of the African epic, despite the author's attempts to make him a collective and interchangeable generic hero representing all in society. Balogun

makes the case that: "The characteristics exhibited by Matigari, on the other hand, show the greatest affinity for the most developed genre of oral narrative – the oral epic (Balogun, 1999: 80)".[35]

In Gĩkũyũ, for instance, the name Matigari is generic for both men and women and could have been translated as such. I have demonstrated above how this has been undermined by other factors in the narrative, thereby making it very difficult to sustain. Matigari also means 'those who survived the bullets', meaning men and women and children who were involved in the armed struggle against colonialism. This is symbolised by Matigari, Gũthera and Mũriuki at that level, what Matigari refers to as my 'house', 'my family'. The Gĩkũyũ term for the commune is 'nyũmba' probably drawn from the generic name for all Gĩkũyũ people, "nyumba ya Mũũmbi". From research carried out during the translation, I also found out that the term means 'comrades' in Mau Mau and also post independence language. Critics such as Ogude and Balogun (49) who are not Gĩkũyũ-speaking and Biersteker (147), have been able to pick up the Marxist reading although these details are not footnoted or explained in the original and source texts. This may be drawn from intertextual reading of Ngũgĩ's other works, another significant feature of the translation. By personifying such qualities in the text and gendering them, the process of myth-making and of centering a maculinist orature are perpetuated for all time, within the covers of the book and beyond.

The other significant characters are Mũriuki the young man/boy. Mũriũki is the name given to a male child who replaces a child or person who dies. In the Gĩkũyũ belief system people are named after their own person/spirit (like the Igbo Chi – see Arndt 1987:86) or spirit of the person if they have died. Mũriũki literary means the resurrected (hence the reading in Christian mythology of a Christ-like figure).

Biersteker reads the name as "resurrection and rebirth". However, in Gĩkũyũ there is a female equivalent for this rebirth through the female spirit Njooki – she who returns i.e. the resurrected. In a Christian reading, however, there is no scope for resurrecting the woman, who in this narrative at any rate, has no agency but is dependent on Matigari (the father/revolutionary/God the father/ Gĩkũyũ patriarch). There is also the presence of the worker, Ngarũro wa Kiriro who seems to represent the holy spirit.

We have noted descriptions of the translations of pronouns that 'give away' Matigari's gender in the translation (see discussion of Scott's translation of gender p.124/5 above). In the Gĩkũyũ text, the suspense is held to page six because as pointed out above, the Gĩkũyũ language maintains the personal pronouns in the singular and plural in the neuter.

ST: Matigari ari ũ? -

TT: But who was Matigari.

ST: Ari mũthuri kana mutumia.

TT: Male or female?

Yet we also noted in chapter 1 the potential of using both the subject pronouns interchangeably in a 'defamiliarising' or 'foreignising' gesture. The opening lines could translate as follows:

Potential retranslation:

She held an AK47 in his right hand. Her left hand was raised to shield his face while she looked across the river, as he had done often over many years. across many hills and valleys, in the four corners of the globe.

Another potential retranslation

S(he) held and AK47 in hes (or his/her) right hand. Hes (or his/her) left hand was raised to shield hes face as s(he) looked across the river as s(he) had done often over many years, across many hills and valley, in the four corners of the globe.

Wa Goro has left the title as *Matigari*, as signifier for both the protagonist and for the symbolism of those who survived the bullets. As a strategy, she used a footnote on page 20, for the intratextual meaning which is given in the original as 'Mūndū wa andū' – which literary means, 'the one for the people' or patriot. Wa Goro's footnote, on page 20 footnote reads:

> "Matigari ma Njiũũngi (Gĩkũyũ) literally, 'the patriots who survived the bullets' – the patriots who survived the liberation war and their political offspring".

Wa Goro explained that:

> The term, which I did not know, is also very specific to Mau Mau coded speech. Mau Mau was the movement involved in the armed struggle against the British. It was a secret society and had its own language for describing its activities and its personnel. This vocabulary is not ordinarily available to all Gĩkũyũ speakers. It would be very difficult to gather all this information as a non-Gĩkũyũ reader, on looking at the title. It would be very difficult to represent all these meanings in English. I reduced the title to *Matigari* as I thought that in English, *Matigari ma Njirũũngi* would be too much of a mouthful and it does not give the non-Gĩkũyũ speaker additional information. I also wanted to popularise it to the Gĩkũyũ/English Kenyan reader by using a catchy sounding title, but not

departing from meaning or intent. Several people ask me in Gĩkũyũ: "Niwe ũtaurite *Matigari?*" - "Are you the translator of *Matigari*", although they know the full title of the text in Gĩkũyũ as *Matigari ma Njirũũngi* so the strategy seems to have worked for the Gĩkũyũ/English readership (wa Goro: 1997).[36]

Below we turn to a study of the translation of names and characterisation in relation to hectorosexism.

2. Translating Gũthera

Gũthera is the second key character in the text alongside Mũriuki and Ngarũro wa Kiriro. Gũthera – means the Pure, or Purity. Biersteker reads her to mean "pure, clear, have commonsense" (op. cit: 149). '*Mũthingu*', is the term for a holy or pure person. Her name is built into the narrative, and the idea of virginity is alluded to in the parable of the woman who refused to sacrifice her body to save her earthly father during the war and he was killed as a result. As a 'revolutionary' she 'sacrifices' her body twice, once to save Matigari (her revolutionary father) and the second time to save the 'house'. The deconstructive element is that although she is a prostitute, her name suggests her purity, both politically and sexually.

She, like Warĩĩnga in *Caitaani Mutharabaini* (*Devil on the Cross*), is depicted initially as a prostitute, with an aimless life and then she becomes a revolutionary with the guidance of Matigari. Ogude's observations in relation to gender in *Petals of blood* are relevant here. He notes:

Although Ngũgĩ's use of the image of the prostitute for the character of the most liberated woman in the novel is significant, it raises a number of contentious issues in gender studies that Ngũgĩ fails to resolve" (120). She is portrayed as naive, helpless and is the subordinate character in the text. She too can be read in several ways like Matigari, Her name might be a translation of the Christian name (Purity) from English (121).[37]

Biersteker also discusses the characterisation and argues that she too is ambiguous. She argues:

Gũthera, in current Kenyan terms means: "to be transparent;" i.e., to be uncorrupted, honest, unambiguous. Gũthera the character, in the beginning of the novel does not appear to be this. She is a prostitute who has been victimized by the police. She tried to pick up Matigari and mocks Matigari.... It is only when she repudiates the last shred of idealism that Gũthera is able to free the imprisoned Matigari, liberate herself from prostitution and false consciousness and reconcile the apparent ambiguity of her name. Gũthera, whose name literally means clarity and commonsence, thus personifies ideology as theory that has rejected idealism and become praxis in struggle (Biersteker, *op.cit*: 149).[38]

Gathoni (the shy or embarrassed (little) one), in *Ngaahika Ndeenda*, Gũthera in *Matigari*, Njooki in *Njamba Nene*, Wariinga in *Caitaani Mũtharabaini* and Wanja in *Petal's of blood*, continue as negative female stereotypes and it blends in with similar attitides in the Western novel tradition with male protagonist heroes. When we first meet Gũthera, she is in the bar and laterwe encounter her being harassed by the policemen and their dogs. We literally encounter her on her knees in contrast to

Matigari and Ngarũro who have resolve and authority. The irony of the fact that Matigari has been away in the forest for several years and Gũthera works in a bar a meeting place where information is readily exchanged daily is not one which escapes the translator. This preponderate portrayal of a naïve female, who is lacking in agency or who is cowardly etc., is particularly pertinent as we will note in relation to the male heroes who I look at below. This decision in the source text in relation to the characterisation of Gũthera informs the wider translation strategy as it provides an overview on the author's positionality. I felt that this, "… can foreclose on any hope of mutual textual expression" to paraphrase von Flotow in relation to strategies, and decided to translate this faithfully.

3. Translating Ngarũro wa Kiriro – Wipe your tears…

By contrast, Ngarũro wa Kĩriro (the worker), like Mũturi in *Caitaani Mũtharabaini*, (*Devil on the Cross*), whose name means "wiping away tears"(translates literally to 'the one who turns grief around), Gĩcaamba in *Ngahika Ndeenda* and Karega in *Petals of blood* are all worker/hero types. Ngarũro gives the first section of the book its title. Ngarũro is depicted as the real worker. Biersteker reads him as "social change", or "mourning to change" Here again, the myth and stereotype of the male revolutionary leaders and male workers is perpetuated, although Ngarũro, like the other characters are generic types as we noted in the examples explored in chapter 3.

In these examples I have demonstrated how Ngũgĩ uses characterisation and naming in building his narratives and the real challenges that these present for translation because they blend in with already existing hectorosexist knowledge and positioning in the target language, only doubly so, owing to racism. There seems no simple way in which

all these different layers of meaning and multigenre within the intercultural matrix

ranging from Judeo, Christianity, Marxism, Gĩkũyũ mythology, English language,

colonialism, racism and Mau Mau mythology can be unravelled simply.

Below, I address how hectorosexism is manifest through other sites by exploring

mistranslation and authorial authority.

G. TRANSLATING AUTHORITY IN *MATIGARI*

Unlike *Caitaani Mutharabaini* where it is difficult to make a distinction between the

authorial voice and the translator's voice owing to the fact that the author and translator

are one and the same person, there is no such difficulty with this text. Wa goro in a

seminar at Middlesex University argued that she uses her own voice (1997). This use of

voice is complicated further by the existence of a corpus of Ngũgĩ's work in English

which avails his 'voice' to this reader/listener as I have demonstrated through a study of

some criticism. In this text as in the children's books, I would argue that a separate

translator's voice can be heard and Gĩkandi above has alluded to the 'sanitised' nature

of this translation.

I was interested in establishing how a feminist translator deals with a hectorosexism in a

male-authored text in relation to authority, but more importantly, where the omniscient

narrative and narrative voice are imbued with hectorosexism. I experienced

discomfiture with hectorosexism in general, such as gender stereotyping and the use of

masculinist discourses for a project which was itself trying to grapple with

hectorosexism in general and recognised the contradictions. I felt that it was important

for this contradiction to come through in the translation in respect to what Maier has argued in relation to 'getting under the skin' of difficult texts.

I also felt that the deconstructionist experiment on the part of the author which critics like Balogun and Ogude have identified was significant in signalling to a willingness and necessity of moving the parameters of both meaning, as well as aesthetic expression. I also believed, as I still do, that it is important to trust the reader of whom the translator is a part and encourage a debate in relation to the hegemonic discourse. This is because the debate on equalities has been part of reality in the last two decades and in the West and worldwide these discourses have taken centre stage. I was also aware of Ngũgĩ's general strategy through discussions, through his public speeches, through his writing and through criticism. For instance, in a comparative study of the story telling narrative in African American narratives and Ngũgĩ's method, Meehen and Mustapha observe that:

> :...the resonances between the subversive use of storytelling in African American slave narratives and the novel and *Matigari*, suggest the importance of Ngũgĩ's theoretical polemic. Decolonising the mind inaugurates a new way of understanding a specific aspect of decolonizing practices, namely the construction of resistant discursive spaces (Meehan and Mustapha, 1995: 249).[39]

This challenge however has remained as I argued in chapter 1, but I felt it worthwhile to present the complexities for the readers to address. I felt that the author was not providing simple solutions to complex question but leaving them as unanswered questions and I knew this. This also reflects the Gĩkũyũ aesthetic of the polemic of orature and oral performance which is often public and participatory (Bjorkman,

1985:78-79). Ngũgĩ the writer too, like all of us in society is not outside the complexity of this debate with ready-made answers and I wanted to present the text as best I could to open up dialogue both around the texts, around the author's stance on ethical issues, and also around the translation. I felt that interventionist strategies would undermine the impact of Ngũgĩ's own engagement with the contradictions that the hegemonic issues present to his personal and literary life and which he continues to document. For instance, there is an invocation for the reader to place the narrative in whatever context, time and place that they choose.

I felt that these contradictions are also part of a wider public debate as is his location in history as author, his fiction and non-fiction which form the metonymic space and moment of a specific trajectory of world culture. For this reason, I felt that the text is an important record of history 'tolling' the author in his historical time. As this is part of a wider historic(al) moment which is part of Ngũgĩ, his style and the wider corpus of his work, I felt that it should be read as faithfully as possible in what Keenaghan calls 'social practice'(see above, p.149). I was aware that there were robust debates taking place on hectorosexism across the disciplines which could interrogate the issues in Ngũgĩ's work and that the role of the critic and that of the translator could remain distinct at the material time when I translated this text. In the introduction to the Likimani's book, the editors point out that:

The 1970's and 1980's have seen an explosion of publishing by, about and for women. This new list is designed to make a particular contribution to this process by commissioning and publishing books which consolidate and advance feminist research and debate... (Editorial Advisory Body in Likimani: 1985).[40]

Thirdly, I knew for a fact that there were writers who were grappling with say, feminist issues more directly in their works. I therefore judged it unethical to bring some of the discourses and findings, say of African and black feminist writers to a male author at a time when their work was just beginning to gain recognition for its departures Ngũgĩ would have gained undue credit for new and emergent work which was evolving elsewhere, for instance in the women's movement, and it is my contention that such work could only be emerging within the women's movement. We noted above the significant issue of the location and migration of the subject (see above).

Fourthly, I felt that the collective of 'new' writers and writers yet to be ('some of us are brave' alluded to above) might be in a better position to write and translate that text which addressed hectorosexism as they should. (A case in point is the clear departure that has emerged through the translation of Rich's work or that of Brossard). I had read several published and unpublished manuscripts and been part of African and black women's writing dialogues to know that something new and powerful was on its way in what has now emerged as black/African women's writing. The work of writers like Amadiume (1987), Miriama Bâ, Dangarembga (1989), Alice Walker, Nawal El Sadaawi, Toni Morrison, Ama Ata Aidoo, Abena Busia (1988), Ogudipe-Leslie (1994), Buchi Emecheta (1986), Maya Angelou, Bessie Head, Carole Boyce Davies and Anne Adams (1986) amongst others, was beginning to be published and receive the proper recognition and attention it deserved during the period that I was translating *Matigari*. I had to seperate what I knew and was learning as a feminist reader/writer and what I judged and knew to be Ngũgĩ's positionality. This was quite difficult to do, but working in close collaboration with the author and clarifying his views against mine enabled me to have insights into the author's 'intent'. Working collaboratively on research and editing also helped to clarify some of these issues. This enabled me to

make translational decisions that I could morally live with. I have documented some of the discussions I had with Ngũgĩ and others are reflected as editorial decisions in archival material which reflects some of the processes and dialogue between the Ngũgĩ and myself. Ngũgĩ and I would edit the drafts separately and then have robust discussions about our choices. I would then be left to incorporate or discard those changes that I felt appropriate because I had a 'feel' and therefore authority for the translation which I felt Ngũgĩ respected. This same collaborative process is reflected in Tadjo's work and she argues that:

> With Wangui wa Goro, I knew that there would be a point where I would just have to let go and let her to [sic] continue with the text on her own. (Tadjo: 2001:26).[41]

I thought that the use of a preface as has been suggested by von Flotow would highlight some of the translational issues that I encountered and some explanations for my decisions. In a conference paper in Texas wa Goro pointed out that:

> You will note that the text of *Matigari* carried a foreword in English by the author. One hopes that this preface, will be the subject of discussion and scrutiny by many who are interested in translation, relationships between translators and authors (not to mention male authors and feminist translators) in the translation context of our time. As we speak, the American edition is in preparation and I have just asked the publisher whether I can include a preface for that edition to rectify the error which occurred in the first text. He informed me that he would check with the author, or maybe, the text is better off without the translator's intervention as the work has received adequate attention from scholars about the

way in which the author has addressed hectorosexist and other issues in the text (Wa Goro, 1998).

The prefaces for the two English editions are written in English by the author. They are not part of the translation, although they appear in it and do not exist in the source text. These prefaces do not exist in the Gĩkũyũ texts. It is a different cultural artifact addressed at different readerships as the author addresses his English reader/listener directly. In the 1997 US edition, Ngũgĩ addresses the 'American' reader directly "I hope readers of the American edition will enjoy the story. They do not have to look beyond their shoulders in the fear that the state authority will haul them in prison for reading a story about a man whose interest is in the quest for truth and justice". It is not addressed at the translator as reader as it is written after the translation. *Caitani Mũtharabaini* however carries a preface in Gĩkũyũ.

Although I would have wanted to write the preface, I was not worried about what von Flotow has called 'making the female/feminist translator visible' although I understand the importance of this stance (von Flotow, Op. cit). In writing this thesis and in my public discussions of this work since it was published, I have been 'public'. I was more concerned about ethical issues in relation to the 'limits' of intervention and the fact that this could be put to progressive or hostile ends in the context of this work owing to the wider political space. Further, it would require the 'authority' not only of the publisher but also of the author.

It also raises questions about censorship which reflects other areas such as publishing and writing. Louis Gates, Jnr. argues that censorship is to art what lynching is to justice (1990:137).[43]

These decisions already contain elements of 'visibling' and 'marginalising' when a text is privileged over another. My view is that this question belongs to the larger domain of cannonisation, about the democratic spaces of writing and publishing which have an important relationship with translation.   Which books are privileged for translation, which translation is canonised and what the wider translation publishing policy and culture are, then becomes the significant question through which to discuss translation. I was aware that the translator of this text would be visible either way because of the landmark in modern African literature the text was going to be owing to its being Ngũgĩ's first novel after his 'farewell to English' statement (Arndt:1997:28). Balogun points out that the Anglophone reader "... knows that *Matigari* like his predecessor novel *Devil on the Cross* will be translated for them (op. cit: 140). I also became aware of the potential of a wide range of tools that were available to me including paratextual commentary such as that suggested by Wolf (1998) and what Zabus (1991) has called 'cushioning' (intratextual translation) and contextualisation such as in the example given above of *mararanja* (see Arndt, 1997:33). Owing to Ngũgĩ's public profile, the translation was generating considerable attention even before it was published as we noted above in Biersteker in relation to her research conversations with Sicherman above and Sicherman's own work. I was also being interviewed and speaking on the matter of translating *Matigari* to audiences in Europe and America since 1986, before the international English edition was published in 1987.

I also realised during the process that the author's intention is an elusive matter even for the author. Their intention could be altered by their being a reader of their own texts, or of the translated text. I could not claim to be representing the author's intention, but being in the in-between space that is translation (Maier, 1985:23) which serves the

source and target text and cultures. This, in my view, is the space which brings two languages and cultures into dialogue as best as a translator can manage and is imbued with their own take of the world prior to and at the material moment of translation.

I therefore felt, for many reasons, including the ones alluded to above, that this text was itself part of an ongoing 'conversation' in the sense that Robinson implies for the vert strategies. That the source and translated texts are part of a conversation between cultures, between texts, between the author and his readers, between the author and the translator, between the author and the source culture and between the author with himself (as reader). The amount of scholarly work (including this thesis) on Ngũgĩ attests to this, including his writings, clarifications and revisions.

In addition, *Matigari* also signals the translator's presence with an acknowledgement on the cover and a biographical note on her appears on the sleeve of the hardback and the back of the paper-back alongside information about the author.

The visibling of the translator in such contexts is also as ambivalent as the text. An example includes the translation of the acronynm for Kiama Kiria Kirathana — KKK (The ruling party). The symbolism of this in English did not need footnotes in English. However, the acronym of the names of companies which appear in English in the source text, but which form acronyms in Gĩkũyũ needed some explanation as they are part of the narrative strategy. Anglo- American International Conglomerate of Insurance (AICI), Agribusiness Co-ordinating International Organisations (ACIO) and Bankers International Union – (BIU) are provided with footnotes as follows:
"* The abbreviations here make the words in the Gĩkũyũ language Aici: thieves; Acio: those; Biu, thorough; hence, 'the real thieves'" (Ngũgĩ: 1987:50).

H. TRANSLATING COLLECTIVE HERITAGE

In addition to the question of the individual translator's authority, a number of other issues arise in relation to translating orature as genre. This includes issues of communal heritage rights and the implication for the translator's rights as creative agents (see Venuti: (1998:66) on copyright: in relation to unequal cross-cultural rights), (see p.137 above). This question is raised by Ngũgĩ's invitation for the reader/listener to do with the narrative as they please. This raises the questions about individual intellectual rights beyond the individual author/ translator and the ethical issues for the rights of 'readers/translators' as creative participants in the story telling where the traditional authorial authority is challenged. I was acutely aware of the potential for departure from the text that the invocation enlisted.

In the axiomatic climate of authorial authority, does the translator really have any such authority including such permission as is granted by this author and text to translate/read the narrative as she would? This is a wider question which proponents such as Levine have addressed in *The Subversive Scribe* which we addressed in the first chapter. In the specific case of *Matigari*, I felt that this invitation is a red herring as the narrative is already so compelling and confined by copyright norms of textual production and in relation to the deconstruction in the source text discussed above. Additionally the fable, in which reality reads as 'stranger than fiction' as Balogun argues and the departure with the genre which is epistemic, demands a faithful listener/reader/narrator/translator relationship with the text (see Cronin above, pgs.95-97) in relation to translating Irish literature above). As Ogude notes, the author prescribes how the text is to be read (96). It is a self conscious aesthetic act, much in

the way of applause intended for an audience on a stage can compell the 'real' audience in the auditorium to participate. It is like a game of parallel mirrors, very similar to Pirandello's *Sei Personaggi in cerca d'autore* (*Six characters in search of an author*). The audience is invited to participate in a play about a play where the characters are unfinished. It is a false dilemma similar to what Venuti calls a pseudo-translation, in this case, pseudo-writing as a self-conscious aesthetic device. In the play, the real audience remains the real audience and the actors are the actors etc. In Ngũgĩ's case, it is a game of mirrors, which fixes the translator to a specific spot from which to beam the ray accurately into the other language for the mirror mirage to work. The task of unravelling the narrative (s) is then left to the audience, just as the decision to applaud or not applaud when the characters do on stage is left to an 'uncomfortable' audience.

In this research, I asked the author whether it was possible or permissible for the translator to read the text and translate it as she would in respect of the invocation of the story by following through the logic of the oral narrative. In the past, the story-tellers were recognised and appreciated through status, through response to their work and most importantly through the response given to their work by other storytellers in a device very similar to adaptation in the written form. In Kĩkũyũ traditional culture such a response would be considered an honour (Bjorkman: 1989). Kamaru and DK, two famous Kĩkũyũ musicians have kept this tradition alive. Through song, they challenge not only concepts expressed in the music, but the aesthetic, through pushing the borders of form, genre, through rhythm, meaning, lyrics and vocabulary in the way that Ngũgĩ has done with orature which is collectively owned (Meehan and Mustapha, 1995:248, Al Amin Mazrui and Mphande, 1995:175). Ngũgĩ s response was that this would not be desirable.

In addition to this point on communal heritage rights, several African narratives have been committed to print in foreign languages by 'foreign' or local 'editors' with no acknowledgement of the informant or the interpreter. Neither they nor the communities who collectively hold the copyright for the narratives receive any recompense or recognition. Most of these narratives have been edited and often do not carry information about the community from which they are drawn. Their artistic form and context has been reduced and anthologised out of context, and the narratives have titles such as 'stories from Africa' etc. which gives no context as to their purpose. This raises important questions for translation ethics and the protection of cultural heritage particularly in traditions which allow multiple 'narrators' or writers belonging to that heritage group to not only to intervene (as narrators) but also as translators. The question of which version is to be selected for translation and who has authority to choose or translate remain areas which need exploring and developing. This has ramifications for copyright, the role of the translator in relation to copyright and that of the author and more importantly that of recompense (Venuti: 1998:62-68). This area of communal heritage copyright still remains to be resolved but has been recognised through UNESCO (Wa Goro, 1999).

This rendering of the form into a foreign language also leads to further questions about intellectual rights in global contexts that Niranjana states to be sites of 'unequal relations of power' (*op.cit*). The question of what authority the translator has to export narrative devices which are collectively owned by the speakers of that language and receive individual recompense for it, requires an answer. These kinds of questions allow dialogue to take place where-as the 'authorised' (Moreduwun, 1998: 170) translation which canonises specific translations also imposes closure on discussing deconstructive communal translational forms and ownership . No matter how much

criticism is written, the authorised translation at the time remains in a position of authority however inadequate it might be (Simon: *op.cit*).

My view is that such a text invites readers to read it, as they will, naturally invites a plural translation exercise. It would enable the writer or writers and oral narrators to intervene in the same story and retell it from their various vantage points of reading/listening. Ngũgĩ has no authority over the oral narrative to this text. It will travel, like Chinese whispers as the story of 'Matigari' has done within this text and beyond (see Ngũgĩ's introduction to second edition: 1998). In the introduction to the translation, Ngũgĩ talks about how the authorities went to arrest Matigari, only to learn that it was a book! This vindicated the faithful rendering of *Matigari* as it is a text that will be read in the way the reader, listener choses, and that in any case, is the truth about all reading (see Fish above on reception theories, p.214)

The possibility of plural translations also exists. Would such texts find a market, how would publishers react if other publishing houses agreed to publish the 'challenging' or alternative text are just some of the questions which arise in relation to canonicity. They have implications for what I have called the re(dis)covery of lost, hidden, forgotten or covered narratives which through the plural translation exercise and through dialogue would enable a collective rather that a solitary excavation.

IV. CHAPTER CONCLUSION

The research has demonstrated the complex juxtaposition of antihectorosexism and hectorosexism in the text and the challenges these present to translation strategies. As von Flotow points out, "A strategy for translating politically 'offensive' texts has not

been theorised" (1998:45). I do not view *Matigari* as an offensive text, but have pointed out some of the challenges that it poses for translation. We also addressed how hectorosexism in this text is asserted through several other complex narrative strategies, some of which are ambivalent owing to the constructionist, deconstructionist approaches adopted by the author at the level of style and narrative. Further, as we noted in chapter 2, identities are constructs, as are narratives of all kinds (Balogun: 154). Thus, the processes of writing and of translating become both part of a simultaneous deconstructionist and constructionist strategy (what Ogude calls a textual counter discourse (66-67) which confirms Arndt's view above. We addressed this through an analysis of metatext, subtext, text and context, and through specific texual devices such as naming and characterisation to demonstrate the complexity of hectorosexism.

CHAPTER FIVE

SYNTHESIS: FINDINGS ON THE CHALLENGE OF HECTOROSEXISM IN THE TRANSLATIONS OF *CAITANI MŨTHARABAINI* AND *MATIGARI* INTO ENGLISH

I. INTRODUCTION

The chapter includes the findings of the study in relation to the research question that:

"The study seeks to ascertain how much is lost or gained through any shifts that may be required on culture and the subject location in relation to the hectorosexism on the part of the translators/texts/ readers.

It seeks to do so through a synthesis of comparative studies and an assessment of the impact of any shifts in the texts and the evaluation arising out of the critique and retranslations. This follows a discussion of the key issues arising out of the translation of themes, content, form, structure and genre, characterisation, meaning and authority within the comparative framework and within the context of hectorosexism.

I address the question of methodology and the research question to assess whether they have served their purpose in relation to exploring the impact of hectorosexism as discourse. This includes an assessment of my assumptions at the inception of the research about culture and subjects as well as the comparative and descriptive methodology adopted. I also assess the issue of auto-research as a mode for research and its usefulness as a comparative tool for another translator. I address the question of the difficulties I had anticipated and provide an assessment of these.

Finally, I conclude the research with some recommendations in relation to hectorosexism in general and the equalities paradigms in particular.

II. FINDINGS ON TRANSLATION ISSUES IN RELATION TO HECTOROSEXISM IN THE TWO TEXTS

A. CASE STUDIES: INSIGHTS FROM COMPARATIVE STUDY

1. Migration of Culture and Subjects in the Context of Hectorosexism

The comparative study set out to establish whether there were any shifts of culture and subject in relation to the translations of the two texts.

I sought to conduct a comparative study of hectorosexism in the two translations. This included a scrutiny of form, the positionality of the author, translator and reader and additionally through other stylistic devices such as genre which Balogun argues is the central 'sign' which produces 'difference' (153). This includes the use of other stylistic devices, including the songs, epithets, formulary expressions etc. I took Massardier-Kenney's view that 'all interrelated issues should be taken into account' as a starting point for determining the effectiveness of ethical translation strategies in respect of addressing hectorosexism. I also assumed that there would be an inevitable shift in cultures and subjects in addressing issues of hectorosexism.

2. Translation Issues: texts and context

A range of issues arose through the cultural context, text and subjects. The context of reception seems an important determining factor of how the text is written and translated, for what purpose and for whom. This confirms the space of translation as a complex metonymic space as Tymoczko has argued.

This includes the strategies adopted by the author and the responses to them by the translators as we noted in the case studies above particularly the domesticating strategies advocated by Cronin through what Robinson calls introversion, as conscious acts as Cronin argues, those seemingly 'fluent' strategies which he suggests may represent their survival (see above).

We noted the impact of the 'farewell to English' stance that Ngũgĩ took, which was also part of the deconstructionist approach in relation to the context of neo-colonialism or postcoloniality in literature. The political environment necessitated by neo-colonialism was a key factor which played an important role in determining the writing, translation and publication strategy for both texts as Chakava's account revealed. The single act of the farewell speech and its consequence of Ngũgĩ's writing in Gĩkũyũ produced the translations. The context for the discourses and scholarship that have ensued, including my own translation work and this research are evidence of this 'epistemological' departure. This answers the research question that indeed culture and subjects have 'relocated' and the presence of the translator's voice as something that can be heard, as a new and conscious presence in African literature is significant. The attitude of the receiving culture within the broad understanding of the Skopos theory also has a significant impact on the strategies adopted. The question remains whether translation of African literature and literature from the formerly colonised worlds should remain

'extroverted' in a context where Africa/Orient as a notion is already exoticised (Said, 1993; Kabbani: 1998). We noted above the ambivalence to the the reception of Tutuola's *Palm wine Drinkard*, and to a large extent texts such as those in the African Writers Series which have had a wide reception outside Africa and primarily in the United Kingdom and the Commonweath.

Further, we noted Nkosi's comments which prompted this research in chapter 1, which invites comparative research into translation. For instance, responses through the criticism, studies and interest provoked by the texts act as an important indicator for gauging the reception culture. We noted the specific studies in response to the texts which prompted English text readers to learn Gĩkũyũ or address the source language which has not been the case with the English language corpus of African literature. It has focussed minds on translation as a central tool of teaching, research and reception. Sicherman's study, Cantaloupo's work, particularly the organisation of the '*Text and Context*' conference on Ngũgĩ's work attests to this. Balogun has conducted a study on the hagiography and Ogude's doctoral thesis was on 'the African postcolonial narrative' which are all issues highlighted not only by the texts, but their new location in the source, target and "inbetween" (Dingwaney and Maier, 1995) cultures. gikandi has conducted a study on the 'epistemology' of translation, which prior to this was not a central theme to scholarship or criticism of Ngũgĩ's writing or of African literature. As noted above, Gititi has conducted a study on the gicaandi in direct response to *Devil on the Cross*.

These are only a small reflection of what can be said to be an 'epistemological' moment in African literature, therefore their reception worldwide by the same token. They owe

this epistemological departure to translation practice in the particularity of Gĩkũyũ which reflects not onlyAfrican literature but other 'postcolonial' literatures in general.

The choice of the orature, deconstruction and ambivalence in the source texts and contexts was a common feature that both texts had to handle in translation and I would argue that these affected the positionality of the subject not only of the author and translator, but also of publishers and readers. I will return to the discussion of the findings on these below.

I would also argue that the fact of the context of the text itself as one authored by a specific, Gĩkũyũ, Kenyan man, in jail or exile etc., is a key feature affecting the reception as we noted. Their impact on the subjectivity and identity of the translators as products of culture and the impact for instance of ideology on what Tymoczko calls metonymics of translation are relevant as we noted particularly through the translation processes and undoubtedly on the translators of the two texts. Translations happen in/on the body, and this I believe is a particular case with African literature which falls within the realm of realism at the present time. We noted the interplay of realism and fiction in the deconstructionist model and the challenges of ambivalence that this produces for translation in the hectorosexist space.

B. THEMES AND CONTENT

1. Translating Realism and Fiction

This thematic drawing together of the "real" and the "fiction" (especially in these texts where the line between these is so thin), is also complex and demonstrates how

literature often mirrors contemporary history, which in turn mirrors fiction etc. This poses a challenge for translation in terms of positionality, in relation to the real and fiction and particularly so for hectorosexism. Ngũgĩ's depiction of a postcolonial state of which some critics suggest is Kenya, and of characters similar to those living in the colonial state is difficult to question in the translation strategies, particularly if this is their reality which the author is questioning. We noted above in chapter 1, the wider concern I raised for authorship as an activity and the freedom that authors have with their creativity and the whole question of using translation as a means of censorship. I believe firmly that translators have a choice not to translate a specific text and if they modify elements that they do not agree with for moral or other reasons, then the resultant text is a different artefact from the original text. As Maier (Maier, 1996) has pointed, I feel that translator's should get 'under the skin' of complex texts such as these two (or unfriendly texts) and find ways of drawing attention to the complexities raised by the text either through thick translation (Appiah: 1993), evaluation Maier,op.cit), through criticism or through paratextual material (Michaela Wolf, 1999), as these texts have already produced this kind of commentary, and this validates the 'faithful' rendition of the texts, which seems to support Tymockzo's and Cronin's point noted above about faithfulness in the postcolonial context.

2. Tools

The study demonstrated the application of a wide range of tools such as those suggested by Douglas Robinson due to the sheer juxtaposition of values including authorship, location, deconstructionist and constructionist strategies, the questioning of hectorosexism as a thematic concern, the use of form (orature) and other stylistic devices in new ways. The study demonstrated the 'hybrid' nature of the temporal and

spatial issues embedded in a posthectorosexist translational context and text as they weave in and out (Vieira, 1997) of hectorosexism in different complex ways which leaves different elements of their translations ambivalent. We noted for instance the implication by the author that the protagonist Matigari was of an undetermined gender, yet the text seems to indicate his masculinity in many ways. Whether this is an authorial/editorial issue, or whether it is a deliberate ploy is hard to tell. The suspense could not be retained in the English owing to its own rules about gender, but also the awkwardness that the revelations of Matigari's gender engender. This would have presented greater challenges in the French language. It signals to the importance of the target language rules of engagement and raises the question of the primary purpose of translating each text. In the case of these texts, I concluded that the primary purpose was to communicate the urgency of the neo-colonial situation and therefore the option for seeming fluent strategies or introversion was determined by this, although it is a fluent strategy which undermines some of the embedded assumptions of the target language. This however raises the ethical question over the location of the hectorosexm, and whether it is admissible to address some issues, while down-playing or undermining others. Boehmer, as we noted above, finds that this is not acceptable in relation to writing and themes. It leaves the challenge of how to deal with both without compromise either.

The presence of stereoytypes that are heavily in favour of the male characters and unfavourable to the female characters is another issue that produces ambivalence owing to the empathy the author seems to have for these oppressed female characters. We noted how critics of the translated text, particularly Boehmer and Ogude respond to these ambivalences as they seem to jar on the sensibilities of the English language reader. Unfortunately, no criticism exists in the Gĩkũyũ language, and this would have

lent useful insights into the perceptions of the Gĩkũyũ critic of the Gĩkũyũ text. What we have are critics of the translated text, apart from Biersteker and Gikandi and even so, the studies really reflect criticism of the target text in the terms of the target culture.

The studies demonstrate that the level of development in feminist awareness in Kenya at the time and the reality of women's lives in Africa in certain quarters would suggest that these texts by a male author were breaking new ground at their time. It is also clear that the term feminism is a fluid term and the Kenyan context and culture cannot be equated to feminism in Europe at that time. This would seem to support Mira's observations on the lack of cultural equivalence of translating British or American camp into Spanish as this has specific cultural and contextual signification which borrows from its own cultures, for instance, drag etc. Boyce Davies has also pointed out the lack of equivalence in Black gay/camp aesthetics as we noted above. We have noted similar difficulties above, in the translation of French feminism into English. In contrast, the awareness of race issues is stronger in the source cultures than in the target language cultures, say of Britain as was noted in relation to the translation of the term 'kaburu'. If the English text were published in Kenya, this issue would not have arisen. On the contrary, the gender issues are better articulated in the target language cultures than in the source language and culture.

These differences in the level of awareness of gender oppression are therefore difficult to translate and demonstrate that writing and translation are bound by time, culture and spaces of the source and target cultures which may or may not have cultural proximity. The present difference in the Anglican Church particularly over the gay issue demonstrates this point clearly. For instance, South Africa which has enshrined gay

rights in its constitution has a positive stance towards the appointment/anointment of a gay Bishop.

Another additional factor that is significant in the study is the question whether indeed hectorsexism is a unifying principle in culture and in the texts owing to its deconstructionist uses in both texts. This is questioned both by the complex stylistic presentation of the texts, the thematic concerns and the new use of new yet familiar aesthetic devices. The use of deconstruction only focuses the mind on the fact that identities and cultures are constructs of ideology and power as we noted above.

For instance, I have demonstrated how the multigenre adopted by Ngũgĩ, through allusions to fiction and realism through allegory and satire complicates the translation of hectorosexism.

> The claim is that these concepts allow for the breaking of the polarizations in translation theory inasmuch as they dramatize the ambivalences inherent in translation, moving translation beyond binary oppositions and diachotomic thought (Vieira, 1998:192).

This ambivalence lies in the deconstruction which is partly embedded in the hectorosexist "past" but which is endemically present in language, form, imagination, expression of the source and target text and the translation, and in the present as I argued in chapter 2. However, Ngũgĩ parodies these as I demonstrated in the example where in the narrative where the thief and his wife are fighting about who should have multiple bodily organs. The parody and realism are too close for this to be a moment of humour. Domestic violence and sexism are very real issues and the potential of

misunderstanding the satire exists world-wide as it does in Africa. In audiences I attended and heard this particular excerpt read, I was surprised to find that a large proportion of the audiences found it very funny. However, I came to realise that the male audiences were laughing for completely different reasons from the female audiences, and the white women were interested in different elements from the black audiences. This is a text which in translation was popular with women particularly in North America. My view is that Gĩkũyũ female readers/audiences would not find such a passage funny at all, but that the male reader/audience is likely to find it funny.

Capturing this complex moment of ambivalence in meaningful ways in translation seems important in the target texts as it is for the source texts, and an awareness of the multiple layers of reception is therefore necessary. What the research has done is problematise the 'inbetween' space by partially accepting Gikandi's criticism of the 'antagonistic' nature of the space of translation of the text. However, I go further by problematising the broader issues of hectorosexism by showing the complexity here.

3. Form and Genre

a.   *Multigenre and Multiple Voice Strategy*

We also found that the translations draw specific attention to devices such as orature (particularly the use of the multigenre and the multiple voice narrative strategy), the metatext and subtext in texts which have been read in English as 'novels'. This extends to specific issues like form, structure, songs, enigmas, riddles, epitets, proverbs, polyphony formulary expressions, framed stories, multiple narratives and multivoiced devices, idiomatic expression, and metaphors. They bring the particularity of the

Gĩkũyũ cultural aesthetics, the oral narrative, orature and translation practices to the target language reader and culture. It also includes specific features such as heteroglossia, and the use of realism/fiction within the narrative style. We also noted that it includes the use of deconstruction and ambivalence.

The deconstructionist writing strategy and the use of orature in the source texts in what Balogun has called a 'reconfiguration of the novel' affected the methodology and strategies of handling hectorosexism through the multigenre and other deconstructionist devices. In addition to the use of context, the use form and content, particularly the use of multiple narrative voices, the engagement of fictional and real 'narrators' including the reader/s listeners seems to break the assumed distance between the reader and author. This had an impact on the translation strategies in both texts. These seemed to answer well to the notion of the 'turn' in translation strategies through converting the translator into a reader/listener/narrator/and translator rather than just a translator.

In addition to the deconstructive device, another key to the success in the source texts was the use of ambivalence where the narrative voice and form and themes were more ambivalent and therefore demanding a more direct and therefore faithful translation.

The claim is that these concepts allow for the breaking of the polarizations in translation theory inasmuch as they dramatize the ambivalences inherent in translation, moving translation theory and practice beyond binary oppositions and diachotommic thought (Vieira, 1998:192).

4. Naming and Characterisation

In addition to the above findings, the device used in relation to the meanings of the names of the characters in both texts are of significant relevance to the translation of theme, content and characterisation. They are significant in the source text which as they are part of the narrative device. In *Matigari*, translations of these have been included underneath the names in the section titles. This is is not the case in *Devil on the cross*. The section titles reflect the symbolic meaning of names of the main characters but also provides the ideological, thematic and philosophical framework for each of the sections. These include the sections "Gũthera", translated as "The Pure", "Mũriũki", translated as "The Resurrected" and "Ngarũro wa Kĩriro", translated as "Wipe Your Tears Away". These translations indicate an awareness of the non-Gĩkũyũ readers of the text. The publication and translation of the text in England may also demonstrate the Skopos in practice.

These meanings could have been availed to the target text reader as they are a significant aspect of the narrative available to the Gĩkũyũ and Gĩkũyũ /English reader. Had their meanings not been provided, as is the case generally with Ngũgĩs texts in English as in the translation of *Devil on the Cross*, the English reader would have 'lost' out through the omission. In this sense, this provision of meaning provides a recovery which would otherwise be lost in translation. The English translation of *Matigari ma Njirũũngi* therefore 'gains' not an equivalent value' by the Gĩkũyũ reader standard, but a significant gain in any case. The lack of translation of the names in *Devil on the Cross* prompted a study such as Ndingirigi's on naming, which therefore acts in the place of interventionist strategies (of thick translation) that Ngũgĩ could have adopted in his translation. His study enhances the target readerships comprehension of the text as

paratexual material. In a sense, Ndigirigi's study is useful because it brings the discerning non-Gĩkũyũ readers and scholars closer to the source language texts. I know from interviews with Sicherman and Biersteker that they relied heavily on paratextual 'readings' through oral and written submissions. Nearly all non-Gĩkũyũ critics have been compelled to conduct research into the elements of Ngũgĩ's work which are untranslated in the texts including the English texts. This is also true of the the translations. We noted, Biersteker's research on the meaning of *Matigari ma Njirũũngi* above in chapter 3, thus moving the reader closer to the source culture and language in ways that Ngũgĩ's texts in European languages have not done previously.

5. Authority

The findings also demonstrate that the deconstructionist devices affected a clear-cut appraisal of authority in the continuum of author/ narrator/ translator/reader etc. using multiple narrative devices particularly in *Devil on the cross*. We also noted a similar approach in *Matigari* through the invitation of the reader/listener to join in the multiple narrative strategy where the author 'usurps' his authority. We noted the ambivalent effect this has in entrenching the authorial authority even further.

This fact also draws attention to the wider theoretical and critical issues of faithfulness, domestication etc., which prior to the Ngũgĩ's writing in Gĩkũyũ and the existence of the translations were not issues that most critics or theorists were concerned about, in the reception of African literature in European languages. This is exemplified in the example given above through naming and characterisation, which is an inherent part of the narratives.

6. Shift in reader/translator positionality

We have also witnessed a trend at 'retranslation' of works previously written in European languages, and of research specifically addressed at the oral/written narratives in order to recover the missing source text. That however, will be the subject of another study. The intertextual space is one that this researcher and others have had to rely on in order to appraise the translated texts. We noted above the unconscious reference to this work as though it belonged to the English language corpus, even by scholars such as Gikandi, Balogun, Ndigirigi and Ogude in particular, who despite their significant work have developed through that tradition. What is striking is that the traditionally, 'non-Gikũyũ', Gĩkũyũ-speaking scholar like Biersteker and Sicherman and to some extent Julian have greater appreciation of the translation element owing to their distance from African literary traditions and practice. This epistemological break is itself a challenge to hectorosexism as is the response to it that the translations have to make in relation to faithful or unfaithful rendition. The presence of Gĩkũyũ /English critics and scholars, at the liminal space also necessitates this and point to a new direction for reading, teaching, researching and evaluating not only African literature, but literature in translation in general or literature in cross-cultural and intercultural contexts (Dingwaney: 1995:3). For instance we noted above through Gikandi's and Sicherman's observations on the level of African words used in the translation as opposed to the levels they are used to in texts written in English by Ngũgĩ, or indeed, Ngũgĩ's translation of *Devil on the cross*. This signals a conscious demarcation of the translation as a conscious process as opposed to what Zabus calls 'reflexification' as noted above.

The nature of the texts through their form, content, themes, characterisation and naming and the shifts necessitated by both hectorosexism and the deconstructive devices the author uses necessitates multi-writing/reading strategies and inherently multi-translation strategies. I would argue that the deconstructionist devices in the writing require deconstructionist translational strategies including, plural translations. The complexity of hectorosexism demands it. They required the relocation of the translating subjects in this case Ngũgĩ and wa Goro, but also the reading public, the publishers, scholarship as well as reception modes not only in the target culture, but also in the source culture in what Msiska has called 'critical hybridity' of reception. This includes critical translation in relation to the translators as 'readers' and writers to use Diaz-Diacaretz' term. This is resultant of the new content, context, themes, location, objects and subjects of culture as we observed through the study of the text and context. For instance, grappling with my own ambivalence and coming to terms with what I considered to be the author's or the publisher's ambivalence was one of the harder challenges. This requires what Deleuze and Guattari (cit.in Venuti: 1998: 11) refer to as the invention of "...specific, unforeseen, autonomous becoming" (1987:106), what Ongudipe's calls a 're-creation' (1994).

They also unearth new material and substance for both source and target cultures to grapple with as we identified in the studies. The new space they occupy calls for a different ethics that guides translators towards what Smidt has called the 'limit' and by drawing out what Venuti calls the 'remainder'. (Although in this context, this terminology is inappropriate as the material being unearthed is the 'core' and the axiomatic material is the 'remainder' according to the deconstructist model of hectorosexism that I have used in this thesis). As pointed out above, I find this term problematic as it continues to assert the notion of an axiomatic centre. As we noted

above in chapter 1 Boyce Davies assertion in chapter 1 that there is a rush to get beyond the 'posts', whereas the findings here is for culture to move to this 'posthectorosexist' location. I also made observations above in relation to potential backlashes above.

Venuti calls this "... cultivating a heterogeneous discourse, opening up the standard dialect and literary canons to what is foreign to themselves, to the substandard and the marginal". As these texts and research demonstrates, there is nothing "substandard" and "marginal", in the findings of the new forms that the deconstructionist model unravels, infact to the contrary, it unearths significant new artefacts both physical and metaphorical for the appreciation of reading translation. This includes the Gicaandi, and the deconstructionist norms for translation and reception that I have demonstrated above, including the multigenre, the multivoiced narrative, repetition, song, epithets, riddles etc. (Balogun, op.cit). His argument and recognition of these new sites is, however, relevant in that he recognises the difference which is the subject of this research. This "minoritizing translation" (Venuti, 1998:11) is what the texts reveal in both cultures. I believe that although critics like Venuti consider this to be marginal, they point to the ge(r)ms of new articulations and to new centres of culture as Ngũgi himself points out, and which is acknowledged by findings of feminist writers like bell hooks in her book *feminist theory, from **margin to centre*** [emphasis mine].
In the context of education, Hills Collins notes that:

...those who control schools, the media and other cultural institutions are generally skilled in establishing their view of reality as superior to alternative interpretations. While an oppressed groups experiences may put them in a position to see things differently, their lack of control over the apparatuses of

societies that sustain ideological hegemony makes the articulation of their self-defined standpoint difficult (Hills Collins: 1989:749).

We also noted the importance of other players on the translation continuum, described in chapter 2 including the author, the publisher and the translators. We noted above the risks that Henry Chakava of Heineman Kenya (later East African Publishing House) took with publishing Ngũgĩ's work in the original and in translation as noted above. The arguments put forward in chapter 2 seem to support a strong case for a contextualised approach to all texts which, as we noted above, reflect their author's and translator's positionality as they 'toll' their time. The texts, for instance, were found to be neither uniformly 'unfriendly' (see Maier above, Simon, 1996:30) nor uniformly 'friendly' for a wide range of issues and a number of contradictions are evident including those that are offered to the reader to resolve. The case studies supported the general theories of deconstruction of the axiomatic paradigm by pointing to the shifting landscape and the conscious engagement advocated by Robinson seemed evident in the willingness to shift on certain elements.

The research established its expected findings that translation can and does play an important role in the re(dis)covery of narratives which may be 'lost', 'hidden' repressed or 'forgotten' and also unearthed 'new', alternative and unexpected narratives. We noted this particularly through unearthing the translation of orature and the artefact of the gicaandi in both source and target cultures. (This includes the artefacts and stylistics devices carried by these tools including epiteths, songs, formulalry expressions, enigma's etc as identified by Balogun in his study. The new departures for these in the written form enrich both source and target cultures.

This finding also confirmed the anticipated outcome of shifts in the subject positionings of the writers, translators, editors/publishers and readers against a backdrop of hectorosexist historicity and of culture both as product and as a wider ideological and philosophical concept in a shifting landscape of both source, and target cultures. but in addition, shifts in the translation space. We referred to the cultural turn and in this specific context, its impact of translating in new and ambivalent, in-formation contexts can be said to be present.

B. RELEVANCE OF FINDINGS

At a theoretical level, I believe this work will contribute to the appreciation of a multifaceted approach through the use of the hectorosexism as paradigm. This departs from the axiomatic and contemporary equalities paradigms which either fail to address the issues in general, or do so from narrower parameters and specificities such as gender, or race and gender, respectively. This testing out of Massardier-Kenney's idea of taking 'all interrelating issues into account' confirms the importance of the strategy and the importance in fact, of translating the interrelated issues. It demonstrates the quantity and quality of hidden material through the 'visibility' or 'invisibility' (Venuti: 1995) of the translator, and the conscious engagement they require in both the source and target cultures (Massardier-Kenney, 1996).

As we noted above, the theoretical question around equalities and hectorosexism and their time, timing and location in history in relation to culture and its subjects is a complex one for a number of reasons. The axiomatic theories under scrutiny have presented a picture of an 'ideal' median position of equilibrium in power relationships when a text is transferred from one culture to another. The research questioned this

stance from the outset and sought to demonstrate how important the specificities and contexts of culture and subjects are in relation to translation as both process and practice. In this context, hectorosexism as a paradigm has demonstrated the unsustainability of the axiomatic paradigm.

I would therefore concur with Tymockso's observation on translation as a tool for geopolitical agendas in contexts of 'critical transformations' (Ongudipe-Leslie:1994) and political engagement for what Venuti calls democratic (1998:12) outcomes. These have been particularly tested in practice against the two texts and the proposals of the equalities theories around the cultural turn.

The thesis has demonstrated that while in theory it was possible to grapple with the need to 'turn' away from oppression, arriving at a suitable methodology and more importantly norms in relation to strategies proved difficult. The equalities paradigms in their singular and often dual positioning demonstrated an increasing intolerance of the axiomatic paradigm and a growing awareness and theorisation against oppression as was evident particularly in contemporary research and theorisation. The emergence of theories based on the totality of their findings provided a useful framework for conceptualising such a framework. What was more difficult to assess was the effectiveness of the theory in practice and in multiple locations such as the one posed by hectorosexism in general. For instance in the area of post-colonial discourses, it is difficult to pin down an emerging practice although the grounding theory exists and is clear about what the issues are for what Sandoval calls a 'pedagogy of the oppressed'.

While I found this formulation, as well as Spivak's question whether the subaltern can speak, a useful philosophical starting point, I also found it problematic in terms of the

time of day it represents for the equalities paradigms. In the West for instance. issues of gender have been on the agenda for some time. Who the subalterns are and what their location in time and place is proved to be a more complex question to address in the specific context of the theory and practice under scrutiny. This was particularly more so in the target culture in such an instance. In Gĩkũyũ culture, these departures by a male author or any author for that matter were also groundbreaking at the time.

In this respect both through an analysis of contemporary theory and practice and through the selected case studies the thesis demonstrated that the moment of culture is indeed a 'turning one', despite the complexities and tensions and that this produces. We noted for instance how the turn produces ambivalence and hesitance in relations of power in terms of authorisation, knowledge to perform transformational translation, will, courage and interest. I argue from the research that there is still a considerable way to go in relation to the emergence of a democratic and egalitarian utopia in relation to hectorosexism. What we can observe as fact, however, is the unmistakable turn of the tide, which has started to shift cultures and subjects which confirms Robinson's view that the revolution (both as turn and transformation) has begun and there is no turning back.

The research also demonstrated that there are several separate movements at various levels of development across the equalities paradigms, as vonFlotow demonstrates in relation to the work around gender in Canada and Tymoczko in the case of the translation of Irish literature. In other instances, the distance for turning is considerably slower particularly in cultures where oppressions are entrenched as power into the institutions and practices of everyday over long periods of time. Venuti talks about the scandals of translation (1998) and makes the case for this seeming intransigence for

instance in translation into hegemonic cultures where he views the issue of ethics as a critical one with respect to the levels of respect accorded to linguistic and cultural difference. Here I would add, in the context of this thesis, that I read this cultural difference to include the concerns around all the hectorosexist issues which at the present have presented real inequalities in the lived and expressed cultures, identities and subjectivities. We identified these around hectorosexism which I defined in the first and second chapters as a necessary formulation which I believe will assist in addressing what Massardier-Kenney called the 'interrelated' issues. The increasing interdependence of societies and an acknowledgement of the existence of imbalance within this interdependence in history and its interpretation in translation theory and practice necessitate such an approach.

Despite this optimistic view however, we noted that arbitrary or conscious factors can cause the tide to turn in seismic or slow formulations towards what Falk calls 'end states'. We also noted that it is difficult to assess the changes when we are part of these in our real lived time and location and may be unable to access how far the wider moral will for change has turned. We also noted the potential for backlashes and their sometimes unexpected and arbitrary sources. This was evident through the challenges encountered in theorising hectorosexism and additionally in locating the discourses which proved particularly slippery in the case studies. This was owing to the complexity posed by the theorisation of the disjunctures and commonalities in the equalities tropes.

However, Robinson's model of dialogue and an expectation and acceptance of pluralism and dialogue as ethical and conscious approaches is useful. This is supported by Tymockzo view of this as a political project It allows the taking of risks and in so doing.

the discovery of the potential beyond the risk (Tadjo: 2001). The work gave me insights into Venuti's view that this is difficult to achieve. I also became aware that for a dialogue to take place there has to be more than one person daring, or willing to play. The players also need to be aware of the rules, pointed out by Bhabha, as the 'rules of recognition'. The work such as that by gay, lesbian, black and feminist translators is demonstrating these possibilities including theorists such as Harvey, von Flotow, Simon, Chamberlain and hooks amongst others.

The outcomes also demonstrated is that it is difficult to theorise in the abstract and in general although it is useful to be aware of the broad range of issues and attendant patterns of hectorosexism as I tried to demonstrate through drawing attention to the commonalities and disjunctures within the theories and their applications..

I conclude that it is therefore not possible or desirable to simplify or generalise issues of subject locations of writers and translators as readers and writers in historical, cultural, economic and political contexts. I argue that it is possible to comment on general trends around known parameters including the evaluation (Venuti, 1998:6, Maier: 1998) of translation such as this thesis or other criticism might attempted to do. Other modes of evaluation could include evaluation of parameters such as the use of wider indicators. These could include the sales of translated texts from the areas of concern for this thesis, (although these are not always reliable), e.g., the number of texts translated into English language over the year (see, Venuti,1995:17) in US and rest of world data of texts published). Equally important would be to find out the number of black, feminist, lesbian or gay texts etc. translated into and out of English. Other parameters could include the levels of knowledge and engagement of publishing houses in the mainstream in the publishing of new material emerging from the new discourses

in quantifiable terms. As I complete this thesis, for instance, I have learnt of the decision by Heinemann Books which has been the leading publisher of African literature, to no longer publish new titles in its series whether in European language writing or in translation. This is a publishing house which has pioneered the publication of translations from Africa and literatures from Asia and the Caribbean and in fact, the texts which have formed this study. From all indications, the other mainstream publishers are no-where near understanding what African literature is about, nor its place in an increasingly globalised world. The evaluation of what such a move could mean therefore might enable an understanding of the location of culture and subjects in relation to African literature and culture in particular and of hegemonic culture in general. Kotsigile's question about the location of these works is relevant here. He posits: "...who is the audience of the contemporary African writer? The bored Euro-American liberal literati searching for literary exotica in the African quarters of their empire? The African elite trained away from themselves in instititutions of African design?" (Cited in Lefevere, 1992: 125). My own assessment is that this does not augur well for the translation and African literature in particular or equalities issues in general and demonstrates an arbitrary act discussed above that could turn the clock back or forward for African literature and its reception globally.

III. THE RESEARCH QUESTION AND ETHICS AS A FOUNDATIONAL FRAMEWORK

A. THE RESEARCH QUESTION

I argue that the theoretical question has been answered through both an exploration and testing of existing theory and practice through the selected case studies and the exploration of the emergent trends across a broad range of critiera and in the retranslations. The research points to the fact that indeed the landscape is shifting as are the subjects and objects, within it. The practical work identified the difficulties as is evident through the theories chapter and in the case studies particularly the articulation of the specific contexts of theoretical commonality and disjunctures within the theories and the axiomatic paradigm's insistence on faithfulness. This includes the challenge of the reassertion of the axiomatic paradigm against the equalities paradigm, posing as 'universalism'.

The research leads to the conclusion that the theoretical and practical bases of axiomatic traditions in literary translation, particularly around ideas of fidelity to some monolithic hectorosexist authority, are unsustainable. This is within the context of the challenges presented by contemporary theories and reality. I would also argue that caution is necessary, given the moment of the 'turn' in translation and cultural history, theory and practice. I would argue that this turn is still, underway and it is premature to determine the outcome of the full revolution.

The difficulties raised by the study also confirms Venuti's view that implementing the new theories will be difficult, while at the same time confirming that this challenge is not a sufficient reason not to continue pursuing new paradigms.

B. METHODOLOGY

1. Reviewing Hectorosexism as Tool

As pointed out in chaper 1, I had reservations about the viability of the conceptual framework for such research, particularly the research tools. I found conceptualising hectorosexism a difficult thing to do in both theory and practice. This is partly because it is a new and untested tool, but also because of the challenges of the two texts under scrutiny which are themselves grappling with hectorosexism as a conceptual issue.

On the other hand, I found the term useful as a conceptual tool but limited in that values and culture in language are time bound, thus new words and concepts arise out of such departures as hectorosexism itself signifies. As observed, "splitting" values, time and place is exceedingly difficult due to the various locations and permutations of hectorosexism and the location of the subject reader and the various impetuses at play at each instance. The 'turning' space and time in culture and history during which the research was conducted was challenging at times, particularly at the inception of the research. However, the equalities paradigms discourses made the work considerable easier towards the end and confirmed the validity of work as the general trend is one moving away from the axiomatic paradigm and looking for new locations. The emergence of translation and discourses on what I call 'hectorosexism' as new discourses also made the conceptual frame easier to handle, because as I pointed out, the equalities paradigms remain locked on the whole on dicotomies and hierarchies enforced by hectorosexism itself. The separate equalities tropes models provided

sufficient insights to enable me to continue working comfortably with hectorosexism as a paradigm particularly through the commonalities and divergences they are yeilding. We noted the significance of the work of particularly black women whose invaluable work has made this work easier to conceptualise. This includes insights of theorists such as Chela Sandoval, Chandra Mohanti, Audre Lorde, June Jordan, Gitayari Spivak, Boyce Davies, Anzaldua, Micere Mugo, Alice Walker, Else Viera, Toni Morrison, Patricia Williams, Ogudipe-Leslie, Abena Busia and several others, in their articulations of migration, pluralism, democracy and agency as tools of negotiating 'border crossings'. This is specifically true through the theorisation of what Sandoval calls 'the mestiza consciousness' and what I view as 'translation-as-liberation'. Else Vieira calls it a 'weaving and fraying', Robinson: a turning, and Appiah: 'thick translation'. Boyce Davies reflects Andaluzia's argument that:

> The new mestiza conciousness is one of "crossing over", "perpetual transition," plural personality which resisits unitary paradigms and dualistic thinking (pp.77-99). Thus, the borders are those places where different cultures, identities, sexualities, classes, geographies, races, genders and so on collide or interchange. For Anzaldua, mestiza politics and poetics allow one to create a new story to explain the world. This formulation is an important one for me to enter the idea of the meaning of culture in multiple contexts and in particular the identification of the dynamics of the experience and writing of Black women/women of colour" (Boyce Davies, 1994:16).

The complexity of the texts and their reliance on several new parameters, particularly the deconstructionist/constructionist methodology, additionally made the study as challenging, as I would argue was the case of the experience of translating *Matigari*. It

is therefore difficult to evaluate the usefulness of such a tool against such a shifting context which is itself attempting to grapple with the same issues. The best example I can give of this, is of a feminist/lesbian translator trying to translate an already feminist/lesbian text using feminist methodology. These strategies would cancel each other out overall, and the translator has to rely on faithful renditions as Tymozcko and Cronin have suggested.

C. REVIEWING SUBJECTIVITY AS A TOOL FOR RESEARCH

As I had anticipated, the use of subjectivity facilitated such methodology as I was able to turn to experience and knowledge and my own locality within the theoretical and practical frames. I was also able to share my own and others' experiences such as literary criticism, interviews, academic papers, conferences etc. to test this subjective knowledge. Du Bois has pointed out that:

> Our methods, as women, as feminists, require seeking things as they are: whole, entire, complex. Our work requires that we see things in context, that we understand and explain our eventful, complex reality with and as a part of its matrix and that experience, reality, can be known. And that experience includes the knower (Du Bois: 1983:105).

While this was approach was useful, there are elements of subjectivity that I found to be limiting as method, more so in relation to developing a comparative study. In the case of this comparative study for instance, I had first hand access to a large amount of data in relation to the translation of *Matigari*, and less on *Caitani Mũtharabaini* as that has not been documented. The verification process of the research is therefore limited for

this purpose and hence, reliance on the texts and literary criticism, interviews with Ngũgĩ in particular and data retrieved from private documents (such as editorial material, translator's notes on drafts, letters, etc.) proved the most useful methodology for verification.

Conducting what is partially auto-research also confirms the theoretical notion of moving cultures and subjects as it has given me a genuine opportunity to see how much involvement is required of a translator. It is useful from a translator's view to turn retrospectively to these issues theoretically and objectively where possible, but that will be the subject for another discussion. What I can state however, is that the lessons learned from the theoretical work and this research enable a critical appraisal of the translation process and yields important information that can be used for future translations. It enables the voicing of a discipline where a big distance still exists between theory and practice. I know through this research that I have gained considerable insights in relation to the translation process in general and specific elements of translation and the relationships, or lack of relationships between these as is evident from the case studies. These insights do not of course mean that I will be a better translator, as each task comes with its own complexities, but I believe that I have the tools to be a more 'self-conscious' translator in relation to hectorosexism, and am more aware of the tools available for addressing it. The insights from documentation of other translators' work has proved useful in this respect, particularly the work of Jill Levine, Carol Maier, Massardier Kenney and Kadish, Spivak, and several others referred to in this research, and others not referred to in this work.

I found, however that conducting 'objective' research was hampered by my proximity to the translator, and the author of the text I have translated and who also happens to be

the translator of the one of the texts under scrutiny in this comparative study. This raised ethical questions about research and confidentiality particularly in how much can be publicly divulged from what was gathered in a process which was not construed as a research exercise at the time. I was aware of ethical codes of research outlined by BERA, and felt that it was inappropriate to bring material from a context that was not a research context for the purposes of research work without permission or agreement. I relied solely on my own documentation of the translation process and on interviews with Ngũgĩ undertaken for this research and other scholars involved in similar work. I also relied on criticism and research by other Ngũgĩ scholars such as Sicherman, Cantalupo, Ogude, Balogun and Biersteker, Gichingiri and Gĩtiti to 'control' the project.

An objective appraisal of my own work was also difficult to do, and I used public seminars, conferences and teaching to air some of the translation issues involved in the translation of *Matigari* and to receive feedback. Katiwawa Muli's paper for instance on the translation of gender in *Matigari*, in response to my account of how this impacted on my practice gave me useful insights for the research. This enabled a certain level of objectivity and produced documentation on which I could rely for the purpose of this research as I was compelled to address specific issues by the audiences, and by the presentations, such as naming and characterisation, discourse ownership, enunciatory positionality of translation etc.

The retrospective appraisal of the translation I had undertaken over twelve years ago also presented difficulties in relation to the appreciation and memory of what actually occurred in relation to authority, intention and meaning, particularly those aspects which were not documented. Most of the process was a genuine translational one at the time, with no thought that it would ever be the subject of academic research by this

researcher. On the other hand, this absence of research motivation at the time has enabled a privileged insight into the workings and relationships between authors and translators, the borders of authority and power and the potential democratic collaboration available through these, and their relationship to hectorosexism. I believe that availing these findings in the public domain in this form also invites a discourse. It also means that a wider engagement with the translation issues around the texts can be enlisted in keeping with Robinson's invitation to 'conversation'.

D. THE COMPARATIVE MODEL

The comparative model for ST and TT, whilst useful, was time-consuming and the comparative model of two texts, considerably complex, as it was necessary to find common parameters for the comparative exercise for all the four texts. For instance in the genre, the use of the gicaandi in *Caitani Mutharabaini* does not have a direct equivalent in *Matigari,* so as a device, this could not be studied for comparative purposes, in that sense. On the other hand, the selection of the comparative material in these texts was not very difficult because of the similarity of the themes, language, style, naming and characterisation etc. This exercise while suited to this oeuvre may be difficult for another set of texts. The scope of the thesis also means that the large amount of material that such a study yields can only be distilled in limited ways and confirms Herman's view of the inevitable generalisation and over-simplification that comparative studies can sometimes produce (Hermans, 1999:68). Jill Levine's work on Cabarera Infante's text demonstrates the level of involvement that even one text requires.

The additional criteria of hectorosexism within the comparative models means that it is considerably more complex to handle within the scope of such a study. The complexity of hectorosexism and its occurrence in a wide range of locations adds to the complexity of the model. I however found the culmination of the various aspects useful in making the key arguments in relation to the location of subjects and culture. The work was well supported by findings from the singular and dual models of equalities such as gender and race.

E. THE VERT SYSTEM

In addition to hectorosexism, Robinson's model for addressing the turn was useful in that it enabled an array of tools through which the subalterneity and ambivalence could be addressed. It enabled the emergence of new locations of heterogenous articulation and dialogue such as the contexts where criticisms, research and scholarship form part of the wider reception strategies and form what he considers to be the ultimate translation strategy, conversation. This is supported by the equalities theories strategies, which as I demonstrated shared several commonalities in the issues they were trying to address, including issues such as marginalisation, stereotype, caricature etc. as we noted in chapter 2.

The divergences also presented a basis for enabling the expression of particularity, which is seen as a sticking point in relation to the theorisation of difference. The complexity is posed by the question whether translators should straddle cultures beyond language by finding 'democratic' middle-points from which to translate colonialism, gender, sexuality, disability, on the one hand, or whether, they should leave the discussions to rage around the polarised singular and binary discourses inherited from

history. This includes binaries such as black/white, north/south, masculinity, feminity, gender/feminism, heterosexual/gay and lesbian, able-bodied and disability? This raised the question of what this would mean for translators in shifting cultures. Here I argue from the findings that the ending of fascism and apartheid has demonstrated, for instance, that it is possible to transcend this state of oppression through courage and through the rejection of brutality and oppression as norms but also setting concrete goals for freedom-as-trope. That it is not sufficient to dismantle the towers of oppression, that it is important to outline, create and use the building blocks for new paradigms. Thus, from the point of view of theory and practice, it seems no longer possible or sustainable in such instances to adopt such median positions, which, as Robinson points out are not neutral or innocent activities in any case (see p. 91 & 238 above). The case studies confirm Simon's rejection of 'universalism' which I argue seeks to assert axiomatic paradigm in order to further entrench it and as a backlash and response against the arguments of the equalities paradigms against hectorosexism.

E. SOURCE LANGUAGE AND RESEARCH SUPPORT

I found researching translation in a relatively new academic discipline and in this new area of Gĩkũyũ/African literature challenging, as there is not much detailed scholarship in these fields. Awareness has been developing over the years since the inception of this research and this has helped to clarify several issues. The African Literature Association conference in 2002 was of particular significance, as it placed the writer, the critic and the translator on equal footing, again confirming the importance of the context of the production and reception of African literature and its translation, which at present is mainly in the academy. The AHRB seminars on *translation theory East and West* at the University of London, and *the Gender in translation conference* in Norwich,

the Sheffield *conference on translation and community,* and the Birkbeck conference on *the Black gaze* were particulalry also useful.

The language and culturally specific support for this specific research was additionally limited in terms of availability and collaboration, partly caused by my exile and partly by the newness of the discipline and the conceptual framework. There are also obvious limitations for conducting this kind of research in the UK where resources for the language and research are scarce. The internet proved a vital resource tool, as did the telephone and conferences. The staff and resources at the British library and at SOAS library were of considerable help.

Most Ngũgĩ scholars based in this country are familiar with his works only in English or in translation. Equally, not many translation theorists are familiar with Ngũgi's work. The paradigm I choose to work in of hectorosexism is also not one that many are familiar with although the presentations I made at seminars and conferences were well received and useful feedback was received.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. ETHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

These issues above raise a number of questions about the question of translators' ethics and accountablility (Mira:1998; Venuti:1995:309 1998) which arise particularly in contexts that are still "bound" (Ward, 1997:114-129) by broader axiomatic rules as to what the 'limits' are and what lattitude they offer. For instance, it is not clear how much leeway the publisher would give the translator to adapt such a text, or subvert it in its entirety through adaptation for instance.

Accountability (Mira: 1998) is also required to the new centres of articulation as I have demonstrated above in this 'reinscription', away from hectorosexism, but these have to be clearly defined and known in order to require or elicit such a response.

The application of the notion of shifting cultures and subjects to the formulation of the critique of the axiomatic paradigm has partially enabled such an insight, through enabling the exploration of the potential of posthectorosexist possibilities. The plurality of Babel and of the complexities of the hectorosexist concerns will make drawing up such rules and developing a consensus difficult, but an awareness and willingness to be self-conscious could be a useful starting point.

On a more general note, as we noted in chapter 1, the question of the writing of African literature has been a subject of great debate and concern to writers and scholars of African literature. This concern is extending to the question of the location of translation theory and practice in the wider context as they begin to realise how much material is hidden in this space, particularly culturally specific material such as the songs, idioms, epiteths, positionality, metatext, textual creation, experimentatation, archival material about culture, ideology etc. The engagement with the translation of contemporary literature in terms of issues, aesthetics, based on older modes such as the novel, orature, the oral tradition, the English language texts, intertextuality make these texts a useful base from which to reassess some of the theories and practice which have been presented. The testing of these through comparing the translations with the existing original texts (including absent originals) provides a new layer of meaning availed by the fact of translation. This has been demonstrated to be the case with with Ngũgĩ's works which were written in English and this study attests to the need to revisit

most of these 'translated' texts. For instance, I noted the use of italics, footnotes, paratextual material and the presence and contexts of the translator/s and their subjectivities and the publishing contexts are undoubted factors, which need to be taken into account. Previously, the cultural issues and the presence of Gĩkũyũ culture could only be conjectured in the texts in English. Here they are unquestionably present, if only through the fact of the presence of the source text/ language, or through the acknowledgement of the existence of the text as a translation (e.g. reference to translator or acknowledgement of translator copyright etc.). In this way, account needs to be taken of all these factors in ways that are meaningful. This requires courage, research and knowledge of theoretical issues at stake (see Bassnett in chapter 1) but also awareness and acknowledgement of translation per se as an important contribution to literary and cultural production than has hitherto been the case.

V. CONCLUSION SHIFTING LANDSCAPE AND NEW CENTRES OF CULTURE?

The posthectorosexist paradigm in translation offers an important, and I would argue necessary launching pad for translation of democratic cultures (see Venuti above). It would act as the lever for a cultural renaissance, for which there seems to be a growing political will at least on the part of the democratic translation community. By so doing, we can open up what I believe are new discourses that would unearth, or is unearthing valuable data for cross cultural democratisation and respect. I believe that that this carries the ge(r)m that will recradle humanity into yet a new quantum leap in our civilisation giving the importance of translation to our contemporary global and plural culture. We can turn hectorosexist oppression into the source of our rebirth, not by

forgiving and forgetting, but by re-membering (both in the sense of looking back, but also of regrouping (the body) for the future. By body here, I mean of the person, the community and additionally the civilisational corpus, which I believe we have only begun to unearth, but also the text. Jo Balmer's work on classical fragmaments is an important case in point (Balmer, 1997, 29-34). By using translation, we can, as it were, piece our collective history back to some limited extent. I believe that Ngũgĩ's work is a good example of this, as he conducts a restorative project of oral literature, history and contemporary writing, and this has made it a pleasure to research. His availability as a contemporary writer, and his availability as an engaged writer has also been useful for the restorative project, just as his willingness to dialogue around the processes of his work, their themes, content and context.

What the research reveals is the importance of the need to be aware of the importance of agency and responsibility as an ethical norm in pursuit of justice (Falk: 2000) on the part of all those on the translation continuum as process. We noted that this responsibility should be linked to some ethical norms, agency and accountability. This accountability includes knowledge and a willingness to 'move' from fixed locations of theory and practice that hold us to the past, and limit us from future possibilities. This includes research and practice and as Robinson advocates, dialogue. It would also require self-consciousness (Venuti, *op.cit.*:309).

Most importantly, is the importance of the quest for relevance as moral and ethical considerations. This has to do with discernment and judgement that authorisation discussed above by Mudimbe (p.19), and Bassnett (80), but can also arise out of research and dialogue, but also towards goals and outcomes, such as those required by the equalities movements, of justice, inclusion, an end to oppression, equality, and

representation. It requires moving the posthectorosexist paradigm from 'margins to centre' (hooks: 1984). This has to be accompanied by the courage, to be 'brave' alluded to in chapter 1 which was voiced by Hull, Scott and Smith but it also requires persistence and creativity, what Robinson calls 'playfulness'.

The thesis concludes by making suggestions in accordance with Massardier-Kenney's view of the importance of 'taking all inter-related issues into account' and further that this is necessary and desirable as society is rapidly transforming and is faced by more complex challenges through changes such as globalisation, science and technology.

The synthesis argues that a shift away from the hectorosexist paradigm will continue to lay the foundations not only for a democratic translation theory and practice, but of societal development and transformation which is critical. The role of literary translations and translation in general is one which is pivotal to this development owing is role as the communication hub through which humanity can hear itself (Bhabha, 1994).

The work also demonstrates through both theory and practice that these shifts are already happening, but are yet to gain centre ground. I would argue in conclusion, that it does this in manifold ways, including recovery of lost narratives, but also the discovery of hidden and new narratives through covering the repressions imposed by the hectorosexist paradigm and allowing the narratives to exist in their own right, rather than as remainder. We observed this through the various strategies explained through the vert system, which places translator decision making into a process of conciousness, a process of choice and a position of agency. Such an approach, it argues, enables a wider picture, in addition to the distorted hectorosexist one which has so far existed and

brings into relief and view new and interesting paradigms through which humanity can relate to as new civilisational orders unfold and transform knowledge and self-definition. I would therefore reiterate as recommendation, the importance of making this posthectorosexist project a political one, as Tymockzo advocates above. I argue that this requires a conscious ownership of discourse in translation, which requires translators to not only be conscious, but self-conscious as seen above.

In response to Spivak's rhetorical question, "can the subultern speak?" I would argue that the findings here adequetely demonstrate that posthectorosexist translators are moving from the subaltern location, and that the margins are moving to new centres of articulation. In translation as in other discourses they refuse to be fixed in an axiomatic past, while through 'the turn', have not yet properly found their feet in the posthectorosexist present/future.

In this way, it becomes possible to recover in an archaeological sense, the heritages which collect dust or are encased in the masters' museums both literally and metaphorically, through this 'polyphonous' 'playfulness'. Through the willingness to collaborate, to learn, the willingness to extend the boundaries from the foreign to the domestic and vice-versa in an ever changing world as we saw with the vert system (particularly with conversation as noted above). This however requires that more people on the translation continuum of a specific text including the readers and critics at the receiving end of the product be players in this new game. In this way it seems possible to heal the wounds of hectorosexist violence through this shifting/ transposing of the enunciatory authority to the significant centre of articulation which affirms the 'subalterns'' right to articulate, but also to be heard. In this way, the texts, language, the cultural space and subjects become the custodians of the new aesthetics and values

through new words, new metaphors, new frames of reference, new forms of texts, new practices such as translating black, translating camp, feminist translation etc. in a new posthectorosexist paradigm.

In this way, the translating space between languages thus becomes the translated space beyond languages and cultures in their axiomatic hectorosexist bedrock. They provide for a rebirth of language, through a shedding of the old, which though recognisable has served its purpose in its time – a relocation of culture and its subjects. I believe strongly that the mould is set to change. Thus, it seems appropriate to end the thesis with Robinson's powerful insight which best sums up what this thesis has helped us glean, that:

> Translation is already and can be more, as we free ourselves from the reptile claws of idealized mainstream theory, a humanizing process. Through its insistence that we immerse ourselves in cross-cultural conversation, in the felt connections between people who speak different languages, translation can restore us to ourselves – to our full humanity. It is the translator's turn to not only be alive, be a real person with deeply felt experiences, but to become more alive, feel experience more deeply and to channel feeling and experiencing through translating, into both better translations and richer, more playful living (258).

References and Bibliography

Primary Sources

Balogun, F. O. (1997) *Ngũgĩ and African Postcolonial Narrative: The Novel as Oral Narrative in Multigenre.* Quebec: World Heritage Press.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1980) *Caitaani Mũtharabaini,* Nairobi: Heinemann.
— (1980) *Devil on the Cross*, (*Trans.* Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o), London: Heinemann.
—1987) *Matigari ma Njirũũng,* Nairobi: Heinemann.
— (1989) *Matigari, Trans.* Wangũi wa Goro Oxford: Heinemann.

Ndingiri Gichingiri (1991) 'Charcter Names and Types in Ngũgĩ's *Devil on the Cross*', *UFAHAMU,* XIX, II & III: 96-109.

Ogude, James (1999) *Ngũgĩ's Novels and African History: Narrating the Nation,* London, Sterling, Virginia: Pluto Press.

Biersteker, Anne (1993) '*Matigari* ma Njirũũngi: What Grows from the Leftover Seeds of "Chat Trees?"' *Paintbrush,* Vol. XX, Nos. 39 & 40, Spring and Autumn.

Secondary Sources

Achebe, Chinua (1975) *Morning yet on creation day,* Garden City: Double Day.

Adebola, A.S. (1983) "The London Connections: A factor of survival of the Kikuyu independent schools movement", *Journal of African Studies,* 10: 14-24.

Adejunmobi, Moradewun (1998) "Translating and Postcolonial Identity: African Writing and European languages", *The Translator,* Vol. 4, No. 2, November 1998, St Jerome Publishing: Manchester.

Aidoo, Ama Ata (1991) "Conference Presentation," in Philomena Mariani, (Ed.), *Critical Fictions: The politics of imaginative writing,* Bay Press: Seattle: Washington.

Ali, M. Mazrui and Alamin, A. Mazrui (1998) 'A Tale of Two Englishes,' in Ali, A. Mazrui and Alamin, M. Mazrui (Eds.) *The Power of Babel: Language & Governance in the African Experience,* Oxford: James Currey; Nairobi: E.A.P.H; Kampala: Fountain Books; Cape Town: David Philip, and Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ali, S. (2000) 'Introduction' trying to connect you', in Ali, S. Coate, K. and Goro, W. (Eds.) *Global Feminist Politics, Identities in a changing world,* Routledge: London and New York.

Amadiume, Ifi (1987) *Male Sons, Female Daughters: Gender and Sex in an African society,* Zed Press: London.

Amos, Valerie & Parmar, Pratibha (1984) 'Challenging Imperial Feminism,' *Feminist Review,* No. 17, autumn. Feminist Review: London.

Andrade, S. (1990) 'Rewriting History, Motherhood and Rebellion: Naming and African women's literary tradition' in *RAL.* Vol.21: No.1 (1990) pp: 91-110.

Anzaldua, Gloria (1981) 'Speaking in Tongues. A letter to Third World women Writers.' In Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldua, (eds). *This bridge called my back, Writings by radical women of colour.* Watertown, Mass., Persephone Press.
—(1991) 'Too Queer the Writer — Loca escritora y chicana,' in Betsy Warland (Ed.) *Inversions. Writings by Dykes, Queers and Lesbian,* Vancouver Press Gang Publishers.

Appiah, K. (1993) 'Thick Translation', *Callaloo* 16, (4), pp: 808-19.

Arndt, S. (1998) *African Women's Literature,* Bayreuth African Studies. Bayreuth.

Ash, Ranjana S. (2000) 'The African Epic's Reception Today,' (Unpublished Conference Paper Presented at *The Black Gaze: International Perspective on African-World Literary and Visual Culture Conference,* the University of London.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H. (1990) *The Empire Writes Back,* Routledge: London and New York.

Bakhtin, Mikhail (1985) 'Discourse on the Novel," in Louis Gates. Jnr. Henry. (Ed.) *"Race", Writing and Difference*, Chicago University Press: Chicago.

Balmer, Josephine (1997) 'The possibilities of silence, translating Classical women poets' in *In Other Words,.* Winter, Spring, 1997, no.8/9, Translator's Association: London.

Balogun, F.O. (1997) *Ngũgĩ and African Postcolonial Narrative: The Novel as Oral Narrative in Multigenre*, World Heritage Press: Quebec.

Bandia, Paul (2002) 'African European Language Writing and the Ethics of translation' at the *Translations and Translation Theories East and West Conference,* SOAS, June, 2002.

Bannet, E.T. (1993) *Postcultural Theory: Critical theory after the Marxist paradigm*, McMillan: Basingstoke and London.

Bardolf, Jacqueline (1986) 'La litterature du Kenya: Resistance, Conscience et litterature' in *Littérature Nationales: Histoire et Identité.* No 85 Octobre- December 1986).

Bassnett, Susan (1991) *Translation Studies,* (Revised edition), Routledge: London.

Bassnett, S. & Lefevere, André (1992) Preface in Venuti, L. *The Translator's Invisibility,* Routledge: London & New York.

Bassnett, S. (1998) 'Researching Translation Studies: The Case for Doctoral Research,' in Bush, Peter & Malmkjær, Kirsten, (Eds.) *Rimbaud's Rainbow: Literary Translation in Higher Education,* John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
— Bassnett, Susan & Lefevere, André (Eds.) (1998) *Translation, History, Culture,* London: Pinter Publishers.
— Basnett, Susan & Trivedi, Harish (1999) *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practice,* London and New York: Routledge.

Belitt, B. (1978) *Adams Dream,* Grove Press, Inc, New York

Benjamin, Walter (1992) 'The task of the translator, in Schulte and Biguinet, (Eds.) *Theories of Translation, Trans.* Harry Zohn, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, London.

Berman, Antione (1984) *L'Epreuve de l'Etranger: Culture et Traduction dans L'Allemagne Romantique,* Gallimard: Paris.

Bhabha, Homi (1994) *The Location of Culture,* Routledge: London and New York.
— (1997) 'Reinventing Britain: A manifesto' in *Reinventing Britain: Identity, Transnationalism and the Arts,* April 1997 Issue, British Council, London.

Biersteker, Anne (1993) '*Matigari ma Njirũũngi*: What Grows from the Leftover Seeds of "Chat Trees?"'*Paintbrush,* Vol. XX, Nos. 39 & 40, Spring and Autumn.
— (1994) "Mũtaratara wa Mabuku Maria Maandĩkitwo Kana Gũtaruwo na Gĩgĩkũyũ," *Mũtiiri,* Maja 1, Iruta 3, Nov-Dithemba.

Bjorkman, I. (1989) *Mother Sing for Me*, Zed Press: London.

Boehmer, Elleke (circa 1991) paper presented at a postgraduate seminar at the Institute of Commonwealth studies: 'The Master's Dance to the master's voice: Revolutionary Nationalism and the representation of women in the writing of Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o'.
— (1992) 'Motherlands, Mothers and Nationalist Songs: Representation of Nationalism and Women in African Literature' in Rutherford, (Ed.) *From Commonwealth to Postcolonial*. Sydney, New South Wales, Mundelstrup and Coventry: Dangaroo Press

Boyce Davies, Carol (1994) *Black Women Writing: Migrations of the Subject,* London and New York: Routledge.

Boyce Davies, C. and Graves, A. (1981) Ngambika: *Studies of women in African Literature,* Trenton, New Jersey: African World Press.

Brah, A. (1996) *Cartographies of Diaspora, Contesting Identities*, London: Routledge.

Brennan, Tim (1995) 'The Price of Happiness: CLR James in New York, 1950.'in Dingwaney, A. and Maier C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross Cultural Texts* Pittsburgh and London: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Brenzinger et al. (1991) 'Language Death in Africa' in Robins, R. H. and Uhlenbeck, E.M. (Eds.), *Endangered Languages,* Oxford: Berg.

Brewer, M. (1993) 'Theorising Race, Class and Gender: The New Scholarship of Black Feminist Intellectuals and Black Women's Labour,' in James, S.M. and Busia, A. P. A. (Eds.) *Theorising Black Feminisms: The visionary pragmatism of black women*, London and New York: Routledge.

Brisset, A. (2000) 'The Search for a native language: Translation and Cultural Identity', *Trans*. Gill Rosalind and Gannon, Roger, reprinted in Venuti, Lawerence (Ed.) *The Translation Studies Reader,* London and New York: Routledge.

Busia, A.P.A. (1993) 'Performing, transcription and the languages of the self: Interrogating identity as a "post-colonial poet"', in James, S. M. and Busia, A. P. A. (Eds.) *Theorising Black Feminisms: The visionary pragmatism of black women,* London and New York: Routledge.

Cameron, Deborah (1985) *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*. Houndsmill, Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press.

Cancel, R. (1993) 'African-Language Literatures,' in Owomoyela, O. (Ed.), *Perspectives on Culture an Identity: A history of Twentieth Century African Literatures,* Lincoln and London: University of Nabraska Press.

Carby, Hazel V. (1985) '"On the Threshold of Women's Era": Lynching, Empire, and Sexuality in Black Feminist Theory,' in Louis Gates, Jr. Henry. (Ed.) *"Race", Writing and Difference*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Cavici, E. (1977) *Problems of change in Kikyu tribal society,* Bologna: Pontifical Institute of Foreign Mission.

Chakava, Henry (1988) 'A Decade of Publishing in Kenya: 1977-1987: One Man's Involvement,' *African Publishing Record*, 14.4.
— (1995) 'Publishing Ngũgĩ: The Challenge, the Risk, the reward' in Canteloupo, C. (Ed.), Ngũgĩ *wa Thiong'o: Texts and Contexts*, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

Chamberlaine, L. (1992) 'Gender and the Metaphorics of Translation,' in Venuti, L. (Ed.), *Rethinking Translation – Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, New York and London: Routledge.

Checole, Kassahun (2002) 'Publishing and distribution of Africa's 100 best Books'. Unpublished paper, Sabdet Panel on Africa's 100 best books organised at the London Bookfair: London.

Cheyfitz, Eric (1991) *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan*, Oxford University Press, New York and Oxford.

Chrehan, Stewart (1993) 'Review of "Justice for the Oppressed"…The political Dimension in the Language Use in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o by Herta Meyer', *Research in African Literature*, Vol.24, No.1.
Cixous, Hélène (1980) 'Laugh of the Medusa,' in Marks E. and de Courtivron, I. (Eds.) *New French Feminisms: an Anthology*, The University of Massachusetts Press: Amherst.

Collins, Hill. P. (1989) *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*, Routledge: London & New York.— (1989a) 'The Social Construction of Black Feminist Thought' *Sign*, Summer, p.: 875-884.

Cortés, David Carbonel (2002) Conference paper abstract for AHRB conference: Translation and translation theories, East and West, June 19-20, Univerisity of London.
Crisafulli, Eduardo (1999) 'The Translator as Textual Critric, and the Potential of Transparent Discourse' in *The Translator*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp.83-107.

Cronin M. (1995) Altered States: Translation and Minority Languages: *TTR* 8 (1): 85-103.
—(1998) The Cracked Looking Glass of Servants: Translation and Minority in a Global Age: The Translator: Vol.4, No. 2, November.

Crystal, D. (1999) 'The death of language', in *Prospect*, November, 1999.

Curtin, P.D. (Ed.) (1971) *Imperialism, London*: Mcmillan

Davis, Angela, (1981) *Gender, Race and Class*, New York: Random House.

DeJulio, Maryanne (1994) 'Translating Olympe de Gouge' in Kadish, D. and Massardier-Kenney, (Eds.) *Translating Slavery: Gender and Race in French Women's Writing 1783-1823*. Kent, Ohio: Kent University Press.

De Lotboitinière-Harwood (1981) *Re-belle et infidèle. La traduction comme pratique de ré-écriture au féminine/the Body Bilingual: Translation as Rewriting in the Feminine*, Montreal and Toronto: Les Éditions du remue-ménage and Women's press.

Delagado, Celeste (1997) 'MotherTongues and childless women: the construction of Kenyan "womanhood" in Nneameka Obioma (Ed.), *The Politics of Mothering: Womanhood, Identity, and Resistance in African Literature,* London and New York: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1986) *'But beyond... (Open letter to Anne McClintock and Rob Nixon),'* Trans. Kamuf, P., in Louis Gates, Jrr, Henry. (Ed.) *"Race", Writing and Difference,* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Diaz-Diacoretz, Maria (1985) *Translating Poetic Discourse: Questions on Feminist Strategies in Adrienne Rich,* Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dingwaney, A. (1995) Introduction: Translating "Third World" Cultures" in Dingwaney, A. and Maier, C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Crosss- Cultural Texts,* University of Pittsburgh Press: Pittsburgh.

Diop, Samba (2000) 'The African Epic and its Paradigms,' (Unpublished paper presented at the Biennial Conference of the African Studies Association in the UK (ASAUK) 11-13 September 2000.

Du Bois, B. (1983) 'Passionate scholarship: notes on values, knowing and method in feminist social science', in Bowles, G. and Klein, D. (Eds.) *Themes of Women's Studies,* London: Routledge and Kogan Page.

Eagleton, Terry (1996) *Literary Theory, an Introduction,* Oxford and Massachussettes: Blackwell.

Editorial Advisory Body (1985) Preface in Likimani, Muthoni Passbook No.F.47927: *Women and Mau Mau in Kenya,* Basingstoke and London, Mcmillan.

Ellis, Steve (1998) 'Decanonising the Canon: The Role of the Translator?' in Bush, P. and Malkmjær (Eds.) *Rimbaud's Rainbow,* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Elseworth, B. (1999) 'Foreignising Translation: An ethics of translation', in Papoutsaki. P, Procter, A.H. Serzin, S. Spiropoulou. N. (Eds.) *Papers in European Languages and Cultures: Literary translation theory and Practice, Norwich papers,* September 1999, Vol. III, UEA, Norwich: p.1-6.

Evans, Jennifer (1987) 'Women and Resistence in Ngũgĩ's Devil on the Cross', in Jones, Eldred, Palmer Eustace and Jones Marjorie (Eds.) *Women in African Literature Today,* London and New Jersey: James Currey & African World Press.

Evan-Zohar, Itamar (1971) "The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem," *Poetics Today:* 11 (1990): reprinted in Venuti, L. (2000) *The Translation Reader,* London and New York: Routledge.

Falk, Richard (1992) *Explorations at the Edge of Time: The Prospects for World Order,* Philadelphia: Temple University Press
— (2000) *Human Rights Horizons: The Pursuit of Justice in a Globalizing World,* London and New York: Routledge.

Fanon, Franz (1967) *The wretched of the Earth*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
— (1986) Black skin white masks, Trans. C. Farrington, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Finnegan, Ruth (1970) *Oral Literature in Africa*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Fish, Stanley (1980) *Is there a text in this class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*, Cambridge, Massachuettes.
Foucault, M. (1978) *The History of Sexuality*, Harmonsworth, Allen Lane Penguin Books.

Fryer, P. (1984) *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain*, London, Pluto Press.

Gadda, C.E. (1974) *Meditazione Milanese.*, Turin: Einudi.

Gasset, Y. Ortega (1992) 'The Miseries and splendours of translation' in Schulte and Binguinet (Eds.) *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Gates Jr., Henry. L. (1990) 'Censorship and Justice: On Rushdie and Soyinka, *RAL*, Vol.21, No. 1.
— (1999) (Ed.) *"Race", Writing, and Difference*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Gentzler, E. (1998) *Contemporary Translation Theories*, Clevedon: Buffalo, Toronto, Sydney.

Gĩkandi, Simon (1987) Reading the African Novel, Heinemann, Nairobi, Portsmouth, London.
— (1991) 'The Epistemology of Translation: Ngũgĩ and the Politics of Language,' *Review of African Literature*, Winter, Vol. 22, No.4.

Gilman, Sander L. (1986) Black Bodies, White Bodies: Toward an Iconography of Female Sexuality in the Late Nineteenth Century Art, Medicine and Literature', in Gates Jr., Henry Louis (Ed.) *Race, Writing and Difference*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Gĩtĩtĩ, Githahi (1993) 'Recuperating a Disapearing Art Form: Resonances of "Gĩcaandi" in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's *Devil on the Cross'*, *Paintbrush*, 1993 Spring and Autumn.
— (1995) 'Ferocious Comedies: Henri Lopes' *The Laughing Cry* and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's *Matigari* as 'Dictator novels' in Cantalupo Charles (ed.) *Ngũgi wa Thiong'o: Texts & Contexts*, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

Godard, B. (1982 Preface in Brossard, *Lovhers,* Trans. Godard B., Montreal:Guernica Press.

Graddol, David (1996) 'Global English, Global Culture?' in Goodman, S. (Ed.) *Redesigning English: New Texts, New Identities*. Routledge, London and New York.

Greenfield, Kathleen (1993) 'Murdering the Sleep of Dictators: Corruption, Betrayal, and the Call to Revolution in the World of Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o" *Paintbrush*. Vol. XX, Nos 39 & 40, Spring and Autumn: 1993.

Gunner, Elizabeth (1984) 'African Language Conference: New Beginnings.' *New African*. Dec. 1984.

Gyasi, Kwaku Addae (1998) Maintaining and African Poetics: Translation in/and African Literature in *Translation Review.*, The University of Texas, Dallas, No. 6, pp.10-21.

.

Hall, Stuart (1991) 'The Question of Cultural Identity,' in S. Hall, D. Held and A. McGrew (Eds.) *Modernity and Its Futures,* Cambridge: Polity Press.
— (1997) 'The spectacle of the "other" in Hall, S. (Ed.) *Representation: Cultural representation and signifying practices,* London and California: Sage Publications,

Hammond, Dorothy and Jablow, Alta (1970) *The Africa that never was: Four Centuries of British writing about Africa,* New York, 1970.

Harding, Sandra (1987) *Feminism and Methodology,* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Harlow, Barbara (1987) *Resistence Literature,* New York: Metheun

Hartman, Heidi (1993) 'The unhappy Marriage of socialism and feminism' in Kourany, Janet, A., Sterba, James, P. and Tong, Rosemary (Eds.) *Feminist Philosophies,* New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Harvey, K. (1998) 'Translating Camp Talk: Gay Identities and Cultural Transfer' in Venuti, L. (Ed.) *Translation and Minority. The Translator,* Vol. 4, No. 2, Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Hatim, Basil and Mason, Ian (1990) *Discourse and the Translator,* London and New York: Longman.

Hermans, T. (Ed.) (1985) *The Manipulation of Literature,* New York: St Martin's Press.
— (1999) *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System Oriented Approaches Explained,* Manchester: St Jerome publishing.

Hill, P. Collins (1996) "Black Women and the Sex/Gender Hierarchy," in

Holmes, J. (1988) *Translated! Papers on literary translation and translation studies,* Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodophi.
— (2000) 'The Name and nature of translation Studies,' in Venuti, Lawrence (Ed.) *Translation Studies Reader.* New York and London: Routledge

Holmstrom, Lakshmi (1999) 'Where race intersects with gender: Translating cultural differences in Ambai and Baama', at the Norwich Symposium on *Gender in Translation* University of East Anglia.

Hong Kingston, M. (1981) The woman warrior: *memories of girlhood among ghosts,* London: Picador.

hooks, bell (1981) *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

— (1984) *Feminist Theory, from margin to center,* Boston: South End Press.

—(1989) *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black.* London: Sheba.

'—1993) 'Sisterhoood: Political Solidarity Between women' in Kourany, Janet. A., Sterba, James, P. and Tong, Rosemary (Eds.) *Feminist Philosophies,* New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

— (1995) "This is the oppressor's language/yet I need it to talk to you": Language, place and struggle in Dingwaney, A. and Maier, C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Culture: Translation and Cross Cultural Texts,* Pittsburgh and London: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Hull. G.T., Bell Scott, P. & Smith, B. (Eds.) (1982) *All women are white, all men are black, but some of us are brave,* New York: The Feminist Press.

Irele, Abiola (1963) 'African Literature and the Language Question,' *Présence Africaine,* Paris: Présence Africaine.

The Bible Society in East Africa (1965) *Ibuku ria Ngai,* London.

Irigaray, L. (1993) 'Questions' in Kourany, Janet, A., Sterba, James, P. and Tong Rosemary (Eds.) *Feminist Philosophies,* New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Jackson, H. Thomas (1991) 'Orality, orature and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o' in *Research in African Literature,* Indiana University Press and Ohio State University. Spring 1991, Vol.22, No.1.

Jackson, S. and Scott, S. (Eds.) (1996) *Feminism and Sexuality - A Reader,* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Jacobs, Harriet (1861) Jacobs' *Incidents in the life of a slave girl, written by herself* in McKay, Nellie Y. and Foster, Frances Smith (Eds.) *Incidents in the life of a slave girl.* New York, London: Norton Company.

Jewell, K.S. (1993) *From Mammy to Miss America and Beyond,* London and New York: Routledge.

Jordan, June (1989) 'White English/Black English: The Politics of Translation, 1972,' in *Collected Writings,* London: Virago.

Julien, Eileen (1992) *African Novels and the question of Orality,* Bloomington: Indiana, Indiana University Press.

Kadish, Doris & Massardier-Kenney, Françoise (1994) *Translating Slavery: Gender and Race in French Women's Writing,* 1783-1823, Kent: Kent State University Press.

Kanneh, Kadiatu (1998) 'History, "Africa", and Modernity,' *Interventions,* Vol. 1(1) 30-40, London & New York: Routledge.

Karega, Mutahi (1980) 'Language and Politics in Kenya (1900-1989)'. (Paper delivered at *The East Africa History Conference on Language and Culture in Eastern*

Africa, sponsored by the Kenya Ministry of Culture and Social Services and Goethe Institute). Nyeri, 17-20 September, 1980, Typescript: 1-19.

Kaplan, Caren (1987) 'Deterritorialisations: The Rewriting of Home and Exile in Western Feminist Discourse', *Cultural Critique,* No.6, Spring, 1987.

Kaplan, Gisela (1992) *Contemporary Western European Feminism,* London: UCL Press; Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Kabbani, Rana (1988) *Europe's Myths of Orient: Devise and Order,* London, Pandora Press.

Kamenju, Grant (1985) '"Petals of Blood" as a Mirror of the African Revolution,' in Gugelberger, Gerorg, M. (Ed.) *Marxism and African Literature,* London: James Currey.

Keenaghan, Eric (1998) 'Jack Spicer's Pricks and Cocksuckers: Translating Homosexuality into Visibility', (1998) in *The Transaltor.* Vol.4, No. 2.

Kiarie, Ngina wa (1994) 'Mukengeria' in *Mutiiri,* Jan-Eipuru, Manja 1, Iruta 1.

Kinyatti, Maina (1980) *Thunder from the Mountains,* London and New Jersey: Zed Books.
— (1987) Kenya's *Freedom Struggles, The Kimaathi's papers,* Zed Books, London and New Jersey.

Knight, V.W. (1974) *Between Negritude and marvellous realism,* Black Images: Toronto.

Kolb, W. (1999) 'Language choices variation in Cross cultural Context: African and Caribbean Literature in German Translation' conference paper presented at the *Sheffield conference on Translating Communities,* Third ITI Colloquium.

Kollontai, Alexandra (1977) *Love of Worker Bees,* Trans. Kathy Porter, London: Virago.

Kolodney, Annette (1993) 'Dancing through the Minefield: Some Observations on the Theory, Practice, and Politics of a Feminist Literary Criticism', in Kourany, Janet, A., Sterba, James, P. and Tong, Rosemary (Eds.) *Feminist Philosophies,* New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Korsak, Mary Phil (1999) '"Adam and Eve' or 'on translating Genesis 13.6'", paper presented at the *Norwich Symposium on Gender in Translation.* 1999.

Kristeva, Julia (1989) *Language, The unknown: An initiation into linguistics.* Trans. Menke, Anne, M., London, Sydney, Tokyo: Harvester, Wheatsheaf.

Kwieciński, Piotr (1998) 'Translation strategis in a rapidly transforming culture: A central European perspective,' in *The Translator,* Vol.4, No. 2, 183-206.

Langen, U. (1992) "Constraints on Non-sexist Translation," *Babel.* No.38: 130-138.

Lefevere, André (1992) (Cf. Nam Fung Chang) 'Politics and Poetics in Translation,' in *The Translator.* Vol 4, No 1:1997.
— (1999) 'Composing the Other,' in Bassnett, S. and Trivedi, H. *Post-colonial Translation,* London: Routledge.

Leonard, Diana and Delphy, Christine (1992) *Familiar Exploitation,* Cambridge: Polity.

Levine, Suzanne J. (1991) *The subversive scribe: Translating Latin American Fiction,* Minneapolis. Minnesota: GreyWoolf Press.
— (1983/1992) 'Translation as Subversion: On Translating Infante Infereno's Substance,' (Reprinted in Venuti, L. (Ed.), *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology,* London and New York: Routledge.

Likimani, Muthoni (1985) Passbook no.F.47927: *Women and Mau Mau in Kenya,* Basingstoke and London, Mcmillan

Lorde, Audre (1996) *Zami, a new spelling of my name,* California: Freedom Press.

Lovesy, Oliver (1992) 'Accommodation and Revolt: Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's Devil on the Cross' in Rutherford, A. (ed.) *From Commonwealth to Postcolonial,* Sydney, New South Wales, Mundelstrup and Coventry: Dangaroo Press.

Lygate, Madgdalene A. (1994) 'Women Who Move - Experiences of the Diaspora,' Paper delivered at the *Women's Studies conference* in Glamorgan, 1994.

Maake, Nhanla (1982) 'A survey of Trends in the Development of African language literatures in South Africa: With Specific Reference To Written Sotho Literature: c1900-1970 in *African Languages and Culture,* (1992) Volume 5, No. 2: 157-188.

Maier, C.S. (1995) "Toward a Theoretical Practice in Cross Cultural Translation in Dinawaney, A. and Maier. C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross Cultural Texts,* Pittsburgh and London: Pittsburgh University Press.

Maier, C.S. (1996) Question of Review: Beyond the Boundaries of Translation Spectrum, in *Translation Perspectives,* Binghampton, Centre for Research in Translation IX Translation.

Maier, Carol & Massardier-Kenney Francoise (1996) 'Gender in/and Literary Translation,' *Translation Perspectives,* Binghamton: State University of New York.

Mama, Amina (1995) *Beyond the Mask: Race, Gender and Subjectivity,* London: Routledge.

Massardier-Kenney, F. (1994) 'Translation Theory and Practice,' in Kadish. D. and Massardier-Kenney, (Eds.) *Translating Slavery: Gender and Race in French Women's Writing 1783-182,* Kent, Ohio: Kent University Press.

Matteru, Falisidya L.M. (1982), "The images of women in Tanzanian oral literature: a survey", in *KISWAHILI.* No. 49/2: 1-31.

Maughan-Brown, David (1991) "*Matigari* and the rehabilitation of Religion", *Research in African Literature*, 22, iv, (1991):173 –180.

Mayor, Frederick (2001) The World Ahead – our Future in the Making, London: Zed Press.

Mboughuni, P. (1982) The Image of Woman in Kiswahili Prose Fiction *KISWAHILI.* No. 49/1:15-24.

McClintock, A. (1995) *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in Colonial Contest,* London and New York: Routledge.

McClintock, A. and Rob Nixon (1986) 'No Names Apart: The Separation of Workd and History in Derrida's "Le dernier Mot du Racisme" in Gates, Jr. *"Race", Writing and Difference,* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

McKay, Nellie Y. and Foster, Frances Smith (Eds.) *Incidents in the life of a slave girl.* New York, London: Norton Company.

Meehan, Kevin and Karim, Abdul Mustapha (1995) 'Decolonising spaces: Uses of Storytelling in African-American Slave Narratives and Ngũgĩ's' in Canteloupo Charles (Ed.), Ngũgĩ *wa Thiong'o, Texts and Contexts,* New Jersey: Africa World Press.

Mehrez, S. (1992) Translating and the postcolonial experience: The Francophone North African Text in Venuti, L. (Ed.) *Rethinking translation: Discourse, Subjectivity. Identity,* London and New York: Routledge.

Mies, Maria (1986) *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour,* London: Zed Press.

Miller, N. (1986) "Changing the Subject," in de Lauretus, T. (Ed.) *Feminist Studies/Citical Studies*, The Macmillan Press: Basingstoke.

Min-Ha, Trinh T. (1987) 'Difference' *A Special Third World Women Issue Feminist Review,* No. 25, March.

Mira, Alberto (1996) 'Gender in translation 'Issues of translating gay fiction,' Seminar presented at Middlesex University Centre for Translation Studies.

Moi, T. (1985) *Sexual Textual Politics: Feminist literary theory,* London and New York: Metheun.

Mohanty, Chandra (1988) 'Under Western Eyes' *Feminist Review*, 1988, No.30.

Morrison, T. (1992) 'Black Matters' in *Playing in the Dark*, London: Picador.

Mojola, A.O. (2002) 'Ngũgĩ's epistemological break' & sacred scripture translation in African languages: two sides of the same coin', Conference paper presented at the African literature conference in San Diego, 2002.

Msiska, H.M. (2000) 'Living and Reading: Towards a Phenomenology of the Reader of the African text,' (Unpublished paper delivered at the *Black Gaze Conference*) Birkbeck College: University of London.

Mudimbe, V.Y. (1988) *The Invention of Africa, Gnosis, Philosophy and the order of knowledge*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press; London: James Currey.
— (2000) Review Article: Race, Identity, Politics and History, in *The Journal of African History*, 41, pp.291-294.

Muir, W. (1959) 'Translating from the German,' in R. Brower (Ed.) *On Translation*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Mukherjee, S. (1994) Translation as discovery and other essays on Indian Literature in English translation, Sangam Books, Delhi.

Needham, Lawrence (1995) '"Goody Two-shoes" / "Goosee Shoo-shoo"; Translated Tales of Resistance in Mathew Lewis' *Journal of a West India Proprietor,*' in Dinawaney, A. and Maier. C. *Between Languages and Cultures: Transltion and Cross Cultural Texts,* Pittsburgh and London: Pittsburgh University Press.

Ngũgĩ, wa Thiong'o (1965) *The River Between*, London, Heinemann.
— (1977) Petals of Blood, London, Heinemann.
— (1980) *Caitaani Mutharabaini*, Nairobi: Heinemann
— (1980) *Devil on the Cross*, (Trans. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o), London: Heinemann.
— (1986) *Decolonising the Mind*: The politics of language in African literature, London: James Currey, Nairobi: Heinemann, and Portsmouth: Heinemann.
— (1987) *Matigari ma Njirũũngi*, Nairobi: Heinemann.
— (1988) 'Literature in African Languages,' in (Ed.), Owusu, K. *Storms of the Heart*, London: Camden Press.
— (1989) *Matigari*, Trans. Wangũi wa Goro Oxford: Heinemann.
— (1990) 'Preface' in Sicherman C., Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o: *The making of a rebel*, London, Munich New York: Hans Zell.
— (1998) *Gunpoints and Penpoints and Dreams: Towards a Critical Theory of the Arts and the State in Africa*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Ndingirigi, Gichingiri (1991) 'Charcter Names and Types in Ngũgĩ's *Devil on the Cross*', *UFAHAMU*, XIX, II & III: 96-109.

Nida, E. (1996) 'Translation: Possible and Impossible' in Translation Horizons, Beyond the Boundaries of Translation Spectrum, *Translation Perspectives*, IX, State University of New York.

Nida, E. (1964) Principles of Correspondence reprinted in Venuti. L. (Ed.) (2000) *The Translation Reader*, London and New York: Routledge.

Nida, Eugene A. and De Waard, J. (1986) *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Niranjana, Tejaswini (1992) *Siting Translation, History Post-structuralism and the Colonial Contex*, Berkeley: University of California Press

Nkosi, Lewis (1993) 'Reading *Matigari*: The New Novel of Post Independence'. (Ed.) Canteloupo, C. *Paintbrush*, XX, Nos.39 & 40, Spring and Autumn: Missouri.

Nneameka, Obioma (1997) The Politics of (M)othering: *Womanhood, Identity, and Resistance in African literature*, London, New York: Routledge.

OAU (1975) *Cultural Charter for Africa*, Addis Ababa: OAU.

Obiechina, Emmanuel (1967) 'Transition from Oral to Literary Tradition,' *Présence Africaine*, 63: 140-161.

Ogude, James (1999) *Ngũgĩ's Novels and African History: narrating the Nation*, London, Sterling, Virginia: Pluto Press.

Ogundele, Wole (1995) Natio, Nation and postcoloniality: The example of Ngũgĩ in Charles Cantalupo (Ed.) Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o: *Text & Contexts*, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

Ogundipe-Leslie, M. (1994) *Recreating Ourselves: African Women and Critical Transformations*, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

Okpewho, Isidore (1977) 'Does the Epic exist in Africa? Some formal considerations,' in: *RAL*, 8.2: 171-200.
— (1979) *The Epic in Africa: Towards a Poetics of the Oral Performance*, New York: Columbia Univeristy Press.
— (1990) 'The Oral Performer and His Audience: A Case Study of the Ozidi Saga,', (Ed.) Ibadan: Spectrum Books: 160-184.

Owusu, Kwesi (1988) *Storms of the heart*, London: Camden Press.

Paniker, Ayyappa K. (1986) 'The Anxiety of Authenticity: Reflections on literary translation', in Singh, Avadhesh, K. (Ed.) *Translation: its theory and practice*, Creative Books. New Delhi.

Parrinder, Geoffrey (1982) *African Mythology*, London, New York, Sydney & Toronto: Hamlyn.

Pen American Center (1991) *A Handbook for Literary Translators*, 2nd edition, New York: Pen American Center.

Penrod, L.K. (1993) 'Translating Helene Cixous: French Feminism(s) and Anglo-American Feminist Theory,' in *TTR* (Traduction, Trminologie, Redaction), 6, 2: 39-54.

Pirandello, L. (1954) *Six Characters in Search of an Author, Trans.* May, Frederick, Heinemann Educational Books, London.

Presley, Cora Anne (1992) *Kikuyu Women, the Mau Mau Rebellion, and Social Change in Kenya*, Colarado: Westview Press.

Procter, Annemarie H. (1999) 'Is an "Ethics of Difference" Ethical? A consideration of the rights and responsibilities of the translator, with specific reference to feminist translation,' in Papoutsaki, P., Procter, A., Serzin, H. and Spiropoulou, N. (Eds.) *Papers*

in European Languages and Cultures: Literary translation theory and Practice.
Norwich papers, University of East Anglia. September 1999, Vol. 111, pp 7-18.

Pugliese, C. (1995) Author, Publisher and Gĩkũyũ Nationalist: *The Life and Writings of Gakaara wa Wanjau,* Bayreuth African Studies 37, Bayreuth & IFRA, Nairobi.

Rafael, Vincent L. (1993) *Contracting Colonialism-Tranaltion and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule,* Cornell University Press: Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Ricard, A. & Swanepoel, C. (1997) "Towards a new Philology?" in *RAL,* Vol.28, No.1, Spring, Indiana: Indiana University Press & Ohio State University.

Rich, Adrienne (1984) 'Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence,'in Snitow, Anne, Stansell, Christine, and Thompson, Sharon (Eds.), *Desire and Politics of Sexuality,* London: Virago Press.
— (1987) *Blood, Bread and Poetry: Selected prose 1979 –1985,* London: Virago Press.

Robinson, Douglas (1991) *The Translator's Turn,* Baltimore: John Hopkins University.
— (1997) *Translating and Empire: Postcolonial theories,* Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Ross, Stephen D. (1996) 'Translation as Transgression: The good for translation in Translation Horizons: Beyond the Boundaries of Transltion Spectrum, Binghambpton, Centre for Research in Translation,' *Translation Perspectives,* Binghamton: State University of New York.

Rutherford, A. (1991) *From Commonwealth to Postcolonial,* Sydney, New South Wales, Mundelstrup and Coventry: Dangaroo Press.

Said, E. (1991) Introduction in Rutherford, A. *From Commonwealth to Postcolonial,* Sydney, New South Wales, Mundelstrup and Coventry: Dangaroo Press.
— (1995) 'Embargoed Literature,' in Dingwaney, A. & Maier, C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-cultural texts,* London and Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Sandoval, Chela (1991) 'U.S. Third World Feminism: The Theory and Method of Oppostional Consciousness in the Post Modern World," *Genders,* 10, Spring, 1991, pp.1-24.

Sanneh, Lamin (1991) *Translating the message: The Missionary Impact on culture,* New York: Maryknoll, Orbis Books.

Sapir, Edward (1929) 'The Status of Linguistics as a Science,' in *Language,* No.5.

Sarayevo-Susam, Sebnam (2002) 'Multilingual' and 'International' Translation Studies?' in Hermans, T. (Ed.) *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Studies in Translation Studies II, Historical and Ideological Issues,* Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Scott, Howard (1999) 'Interventionism in society and translation: Changing sexist language' at the *Norwich Symposium on Gender in Translation* (1999). University of East Anglia: Norwich.

Schipper, Mineker (1993) 'Culture, Identity and Inderdiscursivity', in *RAL*, 1993. Vol 24, No.4, Indiana University Press, Indiana.

Schäffner, Christina (1994) Editorial. *Current Issues in Language and Society* 3, p. 193-200.
— (1995) in Schäffner, Christina and Helen Kelly-Holmes (Eds.) *Cultural functions of translation*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
— (1999) in *Translating Norms*, Clevedon, Philadelphia, Toronto. Multilingual Matters.

Schopenhauer, A. (1992) 'On language and Words,' in Schulte, R. and Biguenet, J. (Eds), Trans. Mollenhauer, P., *Theories of Translation: an Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

Selvon, S. (1956) *The Lonely Londoners*, Longman, Kingston, San Juan, Ontario and New York

Sen, G. & Grown, C. (1985) *Development, Crisis and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspectives*, New Delhi: DAWN .

Sengupta, M. (1995) "Translation as Manipulation: The Power of Images and The Images of Power," in Dingwaney, A. & Maier, C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Cultures: Trans-cultural Texts*. London and Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Shaw, Carolyn Martin (1995) *Colonial Inscriptions: Race, Sex and Class in Kenya*, Minneapolis; London: University of Minnesota Press.

Shuttleworth, Mark (1998) 'Polysystem theory' in Mona Baker (Ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, Routledge: London, New York.

Sicherman, Carol (1990) *Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o: The Making of a Rebel. Source Book in Kenyan Literature and Resistance*, London, Munich & New York: Hans Zell Publishers.
— (1992) 'Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o as mythologiser and mythologized' in Rutherford, A. (Ed.) *From Commonwealth to Postcolonial*, Sydney, New South Wales, Mundelstrup and Coventry: Dangaroo Press.

Simala, Iyanyi (1998) Sexist Overtones in Kiswahili Female Metaphores: a Critical Analysis in *Gender Issues Research Report Series*, No. 7, (OSSREA) Moi University, Eldoret.

Simon, S. (1992) "The Language of Cultural Difference: Figures of Alterity in Canadian Translation", in L. Venuti, (Ed.) *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, London and New York: Routledge.
— (1996) *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity, and the Politics of Transmission*, London and New York: Routledge.

Singh, Avadhesh K. (1996) Translation: *Its theory and practice.* Creative Books: New Delhi.

Smidt, J. (1990) 'Hermeneutics and the Poetic Motion in Translation', *Perspectives,* V, 1990, Binghamton: State University of New York at Binghamton.

Smidt, Siegfried (1982) *Foundations for the Empirical Study of Literature,* Robert De Beaugrande (Trans): Hamburg.

Snell-Hornby (1995) *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Snyder, W. (1996) 'Context: An essential element of language meaning Translation Horizons: Beyond the Boundaries of Translation Spectrum', in *Translation Perspectives,* IX Binghampton, Center for Research in Translation

Spender, Dale (1980) *Man Made Language*, London and New York: Pandora.

Spivak, Gitayari C. (1992) 'Politics of Translation,' in Michele Barrett and Anne Phillips, (Eds.) *Destabilising Theory*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Steiner, George (1975) *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sturge, Kate (1997) "Translation Strategies in Ethnography", *The Translator*, Vol. 3 Number 1.

Tadjo, Veronique (2001) *As the Crow flies. Trans*, Wangui wa Goro, Oxford, Heinemann.

Tharu, Susi and Lalita, K. (Eds.) (1993) *Women Writing in India.* Vols.1 and II, New York: The Feminist Press at the City University of New York.

Todorov, Tzvetan. (1986) '"Race" Writing and Culture' in Louis Gates, Jr. Henry. (Ed.) *"Race" Writing and Culture,* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Toury, Gideon (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond,* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Trivedi, H. (1996) The Politics of Postcolonial translation' in Singh, A. K (Ed.) *Translation: its theory and practice,* Creative Books, New Delhi.

Tutuola, Amos (1952/1995) *The Palm-wine Drinkard and his dead Palm: Wine Tapster in the Deads Town,* London: Faber.

Tymoczko, M. (1999) *Translation in a Postcolonial Context: Early Irish Literature in English Translation, Manchester*: St Jerome Publishing.

Ukoyen, Joseph (1999) 'La litterature Africaine moderne en traduction: problemes, perspectives et contribution a la culture nationale et universelle' in *Babel*: 45, No.2, 149-161.

Umoja (1987) Unpublished papers of the Umoja Conference in 1987: Learning from our past, London: Umoja.

United Nations (1948) *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, (1948) New York: The United Nations.

Van Sertima, Ivan (Ed.) (1988) *Black Women in Antiquity*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Books.

Vemeer, Hans (1992) 'Is translation a cultural or linguistic or cultural process?' in Malcolm Coulthard (Ed.) *Studies in translation / Estudios in Tradução Ilha do Desterro* 28: 37-49.
(1996 A Skopos Theory of Translation, Heidelberg, TextconText Verlag.

Venuti, Lawrence (Ed.) (1992) *Rethinking translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology,* London and New York: Routledge.
— (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility: A history of Translation,* London and New York: Routledge.

Van Dis, A. (1999) 'Stolen Languages' in Leopard, I.V. (Ed.) *Bearing Witness,* London: Harvill Press.

Vieira, Else R.P. (1997) "New Registers in Latin America," in Bush, P. and Malmkjær, K. (Eds.) *Rimbaud's Rainbow: Literary Translation in Higher Education,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Volosinov, V.N. (1986) *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language,* Trans. L. Matejka and I.R. Titunik, Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press.

Vossler, K. (1932) *The Spirit of Language in Civilization*, Trans. O. Oeser, London: Kegan Paul.

Von Flotow, Luise (1991) 'Feminist Translation: Contexts, Practices, Theories.' *TTR* 4(2): 69-84.
— (1997) *Gender in Translation,* Manchester: St Jerome's Publishing.
— (1998) 'Dis-unity and Diversity: Feminist Approaches to Translation Studies', in Bowker, Cronin, Kenny and Pearson (Eds.) *Unity and Diversity?* Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

Wa Goro, W. (1996) 'Determined Women Who Move – African Women and Sexuality', (*unpublished* MA dissertation), London: Institute of Education.

Weiner, G. (1993) 'Educational evaluation and Social Justice' in Jill Blackmore and Jane Kenway (Eds.) *Gender Matters in Educational Administration and Policy,* London and Washington DC, The Falmer Press.

Wali, Obiajunwa (1963) 'The Dead End of African Literature', *Transition:* 3.10.

Williams, Patricia J. (1991) *The Alchemy of Race and Rights: Diary of a law Proffesor,* Cambridge, Massachusetts and London (UK): Harvard University Press.

Williams, R. (1976) Keywords: *A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. London: Fontana.

Wolf, Michaela (2000) 'Feminist Thick Translation: A challenge to the formation of feminist cultural identity?' Paper presented at the *Norwich Symposium on Gender in Translation (2000),* University of East Anglia. Norwich.

Wood, James (2001) "James Wood weighs the genius of Joseph Brodsky against the perils of translation,' *The Guardian.* November 17, 2001, London and Manchester.

Zabus, Chantal (1991) *The African Palimpsest: Indigenization of Language in the West African Europhone Novel,* Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.

End notes, Chapter One

[1] Robinson, Douglas (1991) *The Translator's Turn*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University.

[2] Morrison, T. (1992: 12) Morrison, T. (1992) 'Black Matters' in *Playing in the Dark*, London: Picador.

[3] Aidoo, Ama, Ata (1991) "Conference Presentation," in Philomena Mariani, (Ed.), Critical Fictions: *The politics of imaginative writing*, Bay Press: Seattle: Washington.

[4] Louis Gates, Jr., Henry (1995) *"Race", Writing and Difference* (reprinted, 1999) Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

[5] Boyce Davies, Carol (1994) *Black Women Writing: Migrations of the Subject*, London and New York: Routledge.

[6] Eric Keenaghan (1998) *Jack Spicer's Pricks and Cocksuckers: Translating Homosexuality into Visibility*, in *The Translator*, Vol.4: No.2, p.273-294.

[7] Raymond Williams, (1976) *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, London: Fontana.

[8] Derrida, J. (1986) 'But beyond... (Open letter to Anne McClintok and Rob Nixon),' Trans. Kamuf, P., in Louis Gates, Henry, Jnr. (Ed.) *"Race", Writing and Difference*, The University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

[9] Gadda, C.E. (1974) *Meditazione Milanese*, Turin Einudi.

[10] Lygate, Madgdalene A. (1994) 'Women Who Move Experiences of the Diaspora,' Paper delivered at the *Women's Studies conference* in Glamorgan, 1994.

[11] Bhabha, Homi (1994) *The Location of Culture*, Routledge: London and New York.

[12] *Op.cit.*

[13] Msiska, H.M. (2000) 'Living and Reading: Towards a Phenomenology of the Reader of the African text,' (Unpublished paper delivered at the Black Gaze Conference), Birkbeck College: University of London.

[14] Bhabha, Homi (1994) *The Location of Culture*, Routledge: London and New York.

[15] Lewis, Nkosi (1993) 'Reading Matigari: The New Novel of Post Independence', (Ed.) Canteloupo, C. *Paintbrush*, XX, Nos.39 & 40, Spring and Autumn, Missouri.

[16] 'Oralation' is a term I coined for the texts which are rendered directly into translation without a source language text.

[17] Robinson, Douglas (1991) *The Translator's Turn*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University.

[18] *Op.cit.*

[19] (1991) A Handbook for Literary Translators, 2nd edition, New York: Pen American Center.

[20] Lefèvere, André. (1999) "Composing the Other," in Bassnett, S. and Trivedi, H. *Post-colonial Translation*, London: Routledge.

[21] Brennan, Tim. (1995) 'The Price of Happiness: CLR James in New York, 1950,' in Dingwaney, A. and Maier C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross Cultural Texts*, Pittsburgh and London: University of Pittsburgh Press.

[22] Tagore seemed to have had the same kind of experience. See Sengupta Mahasweta (1998) Dingwaney, A, & Maier, C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Cultures: Trans-cultural Texts*, London and Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

[23] Smidt, J. (1990) "Hermeneutics and the Poetic Motion in *Translation, Perspectives*, V, 1990, Binghamton: State University of New York at Binghamton.

[24] Ross, Stephen D. (1990) 'Translation as Transgression: The good for translation in Translation Horizons: Beyond the Boundaries of Transaltion Spectrum, Binghambpton, Centre for Research in Translation,' *Translation Perspectives*, Binghamton: State University of New York.

[25] Edward (1995) "Embargoed Literature," in Dingwaney, A. & Maier, C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Cultures: Trans-cultural Texts*. London and Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

[26] Sturge, Kate (1997) "Translation Strategies in Ethnography," *The Translator*, Vol.3, No.1.

[27] hooks, b. (1993) Sisters of the Yam: Black women and self-representation. South End Press.

[28] Mama, Amina (1995) *Beyond the Mask: Race, Gender and Subjectivity*, London: Routledge.

[29] Andrade, S. (1990) 'Rewriting History, Motherhood and Rebellion: Naming and African women's literary tradition,' in *RAL*. Vol.21: No.1 (1990) pp: 91-110.

[30] Mama A, (1995) *Beyond the Mask: Race, Gender and Subjectivity*, London: Routledge.

[31] Massardier-Kenny, F. (1994) 'Translation Theory and Practice,' in Kadish, D. and Massardier-Kenny, (Eds.) *Translating Slavery: Gender and Race in French Women's Writing, 1783-1823*, Kent, Ohio: Kent University Press.

[32] Von Flotow, Luise (1997) *Gender in Translation*. Manchester: St Jerome's Publishing.

[33] Spivak, Gitayari. C. (1992) 'Politics of Translation,' in Michele Barrett and Anne Phillips, (Eds.) *Destabilising Theory*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

[34] Kanneh, Kadiatu (1998) 'History, "Africa", and Modernity,' *Interventions*, Vol. 1(1) 30-40, London & New York: Routledge.

[35] Vieira, Else R.P. (1997) 'New Registers in Latin America,' in Bush, P. and Malmkjær, K. (Eds.) Rimbaud's Rainbow: *Literary Translation in Higher Education*,' Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[36] Sengupta, M. (1995) 'Translation as Manipulation: The Power of Images and the Images of Power,' in Dingwaney. A. & Maier C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Cultures: Trans-cultural Texts*, London and Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

[37] Min-Ha, Trinh T. (1987) 'Difference' *A Special Third World Women Issue Feminist Review*, No. 25, March.

[38] Hong, Maxine.K. (1981) The woman warrior: *memories of girlhood among ghosts*, London: Picador.

[39] Knight, V. W. (1974) *Between Negritude and marvellous realism*, Toronto: Black Images.

[40] Chefitz, Eric (1991) *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[41] Busia, Abena P.A. (1993) 'Performing, transcription and the languages of the self: Interrogating identity as a "post-colonial poet"', in James, S. M. and Busia, A.P.A. (Eds.) *Theorising Black Feminisms: The visionary pragmatism of black women*, London and New York: Routledge.

[42] Cameron, Deborah (1985) *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*, Houndsmill, Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press.

[43] Maier, C. "Toward a Theoretical Practice in Cross Cultural Translation (1995) in Dingwaney, A. and Maier, C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Cultures: Transalation and Cross-Cultural Texts*, Pittsburgh and London: Pittsburgh University Press.

[44] Brenzinger et al. (1991) 'Language Death in Africa' in Robins, R. H. and Uhlenbeck, E.M. (Eds.), *Endangered Languages*, Berg. Oxford.

[45] Maake, Nhanla (1982) 'A survey of Trends in the Developmetn of African language literatures in South Africa: With Specific Reference to Written Sotho Literature: c1900-1970 in *African Languages and Cultures*, (1992) Vol.5, No.2: 157-188.

[46] *Ibid*: 161.

[47] Mofolo wrote *Shaka Zulu* in Zulu at the turn of the nineteenth Century.
[48] Ibid.

[49] Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1998) Gunpoints and Penpoints and Dreams: Towards a Critical Theory of the Arts and the State in Africa. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

[50] *Ibid*.

[51] Owusu, Kwesi (1988) *Storms of the Heart*, London: Camden Press.

[52] Wali, Obiajunwa (1963) 'The Dead End of African Literature,' *Transition*, No.3, Vol.10.

[53] Zabus, Chantal (1991) *The African Palimpsest: Indigenization of Language in the West African Europhone Novel*. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.

[54] Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1979) *The Guardian*, June, (cited in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, (1981:43).

[55] Finnegan, Ruth (1970) *Oral Literature in Africa,* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[56] Irele, Abiola (1963) 'African Literature and the Language Question,' *Présence Africaine*, Paris: Présence Africaine.

[57] Fanon, F. cit. in A, Mazrui, and Al Amin Mazrui (1998) *The Wretched of the Earth*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

[58] Venuti, L. (1998) cited in Venuti 1995.

[59] Ngũgĩ, wa Thiong'o. (1986) *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*, London: James Currey, Nairobi: Heinemann, and Portsmouth: Heinemann.

[60] Achebe, Chinua (1975) *Morning yet on creation day*, Garden City: Double Day.
[61] Ibid.

[62] Gĩkandi, Simon (1987) 'Reading the African Novel'. Heinemann, Nairobi, Portsmouth, London.

[63] Backcover, *Devil on the Cross* (1980). (Trans. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o), London: Heinemann.

[64] Ngũgĩ, wa Thiong'o (1990) 'Preface' in Sicherman C., *Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o: The making of a rebel,* London, Munich New York: Hans Zell.

Endnotes chapter two

[1] Nida, E. (1964) Principles Of Correspondence, Reprinted In Venuti. L. (Ed.) (2000) *The Translation Reader*, London And New York: Routledge.

[2] Ngũgĩ, Wa Thiong'o (1986) *Decolonising The Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*, London: James Currey, Nairobi: Heinemann, And Portsmouth: Heinemann.

[3] Toury, Gideon (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[4] Bannet, E.T. (1993) *Postcultural Theory: Critical Theory After The Marxist Paradigm*, Macmillan: Basingstoke and London.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] Bhabha, H. (1987) 'Reinventing Britain: A Manifesto' in, *Reinventing Britain: Identity, Transnationalism and the Arts*, April 1997, Issue British Council, London.

[7] Robinson, Douglas (1991) *The Translator's Turn*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University.

[8] Bhabha, *Ibid.*

[9] Niranjana, Tejaswini (1992) *Siting Translation, History Post-Structuralism And The Colonial Context*, Berkeley: University Of California Press.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] Mehrez, S. (1992) Translating and the postcolonial experience: The Francophone North African Text in Venuti, L. (Ed.) *Rethinking translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Identity*, London and New York: Routledge.

[12] Smidt, J. (1990) 'Hermeneutics and the Poetic Motion', *Translation Perspectives*, V, 1990, Binghamton: State University of New York at Binghamton.

[13] Simon, S. (1992) '*The Language of Cultural Difference: Figures of Alterity in Canadian Translation*,' in L. Venuti, (Ed.) Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology, London and New York: Routledge.

[14] Williams, Patricia (1991) *The Alchemy of Race and Rights: Diary of a law Proffesor*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London (England): Harvard University Press.

[15] Simon, S. (1992) "The Language of Cultural Difference: Figures of Alterity in Canadian Translation", in L. Venuti, (Ed.) *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, London and New York: Routledge.

[16] *Op.cit.*

[17] *Op.cit.*

[18] Bhabha, *op. cit.*

[19] Traducture – a word coined by this researcher to reflect the practice such as écriture in translation practice.

[20] *Ibid.*

[21] Volosinov, (1929) 'Multi-accentuality and the sign' (reprinted in 2000 in the Routledge reader), Burke, L, Crowley, T. and Girvin, A. (Eds.) *The Routledge Language and Cultural Reader*, London and New York: Routledge.

[22] Kolodney, (1993:223) 'Dancing through the Minefield: Some Observations on the Theory, Practice, and Politics of a Feminist Literary Criticism', in Kourany, Janet, A., Sterba, James, P. and Tong Rosemary (Eds.) *Feminist Philosophies*, New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

[23] Michael Cronin (1998) The Cracked Glass of the servants: in Lawrence Venuti (Ed.) *Translation and Minority in a Global Age*, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing.

[24] Chefitz, Eric. (1991) The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[25] Von Flotow, Luise (1997) *Translation and Gender: Translating in the Era of Feminisim*, Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

[26] Jewel, K.S. (1993) *From Mammy to Miss America and Beyond*, London and New York: Routledge.

[27] *Op.cit.*

[28] Kwieciński, Piotr (1998) 'Translation Strategis in a rapidly Transforming Culture: A central European perspective,' in *The Translator*, Vol.4, No. 2, 183-206.

[29] Smidt, J. (1990) 'Hermeneutics and the Poetic Motion in Translation,' Perspectives, V, 1990, Binghamton: State University of New York at Binghamton.

[30] JanMohamed, Abdul R. (1985) The economy of the Manichean Allegory: The function of racial difference in Colonialist Literature in Louis Gates Jnr., Henry (ed.) *"Race", writing and Difference*, The University of Chicago Press, London and Chicago.

[31] Bhabha cit. in Niranjana (*Op.cit*).

[32] Hill Collins, Patricia, (1993) Mammies, Matriarchs and other Controlling images in Kouronay Sterba, and Tong , (Eds.) *Feminist Philosophies*, Wheatsheaf, New York, London, Toronto, Syndey, Tokyo, Singapore.

[33] Spivak, Gitayari C. (1992) 'Politics of Translation,' in Michele Barrett and Anne Phillips, (Eds.) *Destabilising Theory*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

[34] Keenaghan, Eric (1998) 'Jack Spicer's Pricks and Cocksuckers: Translating Homosexuality into Invisibility' (1998) in *The Transaltor*, Vol.4, No. 2.

[35] Mira, Alberto (1996) 'Gender in translation 'Issues of translating gay fiction'. Seminar presented at Middlesex University Centre for Translation Studies.

[36] Stuart Jeffries, *Observer*, November. 2000.

[37] *Ibid*.

[38] *Op.cit.*

[39] Massardier-Kenny, (1994) *Translating Slavery: Gender and Race in French Women's writing*, Kent, Ohio and London, England: The Kent University Press.

[40] *Ibid*.

[41] *Op.cit.*

[42] I have already problematised the use of the terms them, us, theirs and ours as they do not necessarily explain the positionality of the speaker and ought to be questioned.

[43] Gitayari Chakravorty Spivak (1999) *A critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachussettes, London, England.

[44] bell hooks (1993) 'Sisterhood: Political Solidarity between women' in Kourany, Streba and Tong (Eds.) Feminist Philosophies, Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York, London, Toronto, Tokyo, Singapore. See also Masingale-Bell 1995:52-74.

[45] Collins Hill, (1989a) 'The Social Construction of Black Feminist Thought' *Sign*, Summer, pp. 875-884.

[46] Jordan, June (1972), *Selected writings*, London: Virago Books.

[47] Gates, Henry. L. Jr. (Ed.) (1999) *"Race", Writing, and Difference,* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

[48] Elseworth, B. (1999) 'Foreignising Translation: An ethics of translation', in Papoutsaki. P, Procter, A.H. Serzin, S. Spiropoulou. N. (Eds.) *Papers in European Languages and Cultures: Literary translation theory and Practice, Norwich papers,* September 1999, Vol. 111, UEA, Norwich. pp.1-6.

[49] Kolodney, (1993:223) 'Dancing through the Minefield: Some Observations on the Theory, Practice, and Politics of a Feminist Literary Criticism', in Kourany, Janet, A., Sterba, James, P. and Tong Rosemary (Eds.) *Feminist Philosophies,* New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

[50] Muir, W. (1959) 'Translating from the German,' in R. Brower (ed.) *On Translation,* New York: Oxford University Press.

[51] Needham, Lawrence, (1995) '"Goody Two-shoes" / "Goosee Shoo-shoo"; Translated Tales of Resistance in Mathew Lewis' Journal of a West India Proprietor,' in Dinawaney, A. and Maier. C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Cultures: Transaltion and Cross Cultural Texts,* Pittsburgh and London: Pittsburgh University Press.

[52] *Ibid.*

[53] Moi, T. (1985) *Sexual Textual Politics: Feminist literary theory,* London and New York: Methuen.

[54] Woolfgang Iser, cit. in Msiska, 2000:19, Msiska, H. M. (2000) 'Living and Reading: Towards a Phenomenology of the Reader of the African text,' (Unpublished paper delivered at the Black Gaze Conference) Birkbeck College: University of London.

[55] Robinson, Douglas (1991) *The Translator's Turn,* Baltimore: John Hopkins University.

[56] (1996) *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity, and the Politics of Transmission.* London and New York: Routledge.

[57] Weiner, G. (1993) 'Educational evaluation and Social Justice' in Jill Blackmore and Jane Kenway (Eds.) *Gender Matters in Educational Administration and Policy,* London and Washington DC: The Falmer Press.

[58] Falk, Richard. (1992) *Explorations at the Edge of Time: The Prospects for World Order,* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

[59] Bannet, E.T. (1993) Postcultural Theory: Critical theory after the Marxist paradigm, McMillan: Basingstoke and London.

[60] Irigaray L. (1993) in Kourany, Janet, A., Sterba, James, P. and Tong Rosemary (Eds.) *Feminist Philosophies,* New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

[61] Kourany, Janet, A., Sterba, James, P. and Tong Rosemary (1993) Introduction' in Kourany, Janet, A., Sterba, James, P. and Tong Rosemary (Eds.) Feminist Philosophies, New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

[62] Kolodney, (1993) in Kourany, Janet, A., Sterba, James, P. and Tong Rosemary (Eds.) *Feminist Philosophies,* New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

[63] Simon, S. (1996) Gender in Translation (1996) *Cultural Identity, and the Politics of Transmission,* London and New York: Routledge.

[64] Sarayevo-Susam, Sebnam. (2002) 'Multilingual and International' Translation Studies? Hermans. T. (Ed.) *Crosscultural transgressions: research models in Translation Studies II: historical and ideological issues.* Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

[65] *Op.cit.*

[66] *Ibid.*

[67] Maryann DeJulio. (1994) 'On translating Olympe de Gouges' in Doris Y. Kaddish and Massardier Kenny (Eds.) *Translating Slavery: Gender and Race in French Women's writing*, Kent, Ohio and London, England: The Kent University Press.

[68] Op.cit.

[69] Diaz-Diacoretz, Maria. (1985) *Translating Poetic Discourse: Questions on Feminist Strategies in Adrienne Rich*, Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[70] hooks, b. (1995) "this is the oppressor's language/yet I need it to talk to you": Language, place and struggle in Dingwaney, A. and Maier, C. (Eds.) *Between Languages and Culture: Translation and Cross Cultural Texts*, Pittsburgh and London: University of Pittburh Press.

[71] *Op.cit.*

[72] Kolb, W. (1999) 'Language choice and Language variation in the Cross Cultural Context: African and Caribbean Literature in German Translation', conference paper presented at the Sheffield conference on Translating Communities.

[73] *Op.cit.*

[74] *Ibid.*

[75] *Ibid.*

[76] *Ibid.*

[77] *Op.cit.*

[78] Levine, Suzanne J. (1991) *The subversive scribe: Translating Latin American Fiction*, Minneapolis, Minnesota: GreyWoolf Press.

Endnotes chapter three

[1] Evans, Jennifer. (1987) 'Women and Resistence in Ngũgĩ's Devil on the Cross', in Jones, Eldred, Palmer Eustace and Jones Marjorie (Eds.) *Women in African Literature Today*, London and New Jersey: James Currey & African World Press. (pp. 131-140).

[2] Bardolf, Jacqueline. (1986) 'La litterature du Kenya: Resistance, Conscience et litterature' in *Littérature Nationales: Histoire et Identité*, No 85 Octobre-December 1986).

[3] *Op.cit.*

[4] Evans, Jennifer (1987) 'Women and Resistence in Ngũgĩ's Devil on the Cross', in Jones, Eldred, Palmer.

[5] Venuti, L. (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility: A history of Translation*, London and New York: Routledge.

[6] Balogun, F. O. (1997) Ngũgĩ and African Postcolonial Narrative: The Novel as Oral Narrative in Multigenre. Quebec: World Heritage Press.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] Moi, (1985). Moi, T. (1985) *Sexual Textual Politics: Feminist literary theory*, London and New York: Metheun.

[9] Kiarie, Ngina wa (1994) 'Mukengeria' in *Mutiiri*. Jan-Eipuru, Manja 1. Iruta 1) [My translation]

[10] Queendom. This is a term I have used consciously in my recent translation of Tadjo's work, see *As the crow flies* .

[11] Cavicchi (1977) *Problems of change in Kikyu tribal society.* Bologna: Pontifical Institute of Foreign Mission.

[12] Presley, Cora Anne. (1992) Gikuyu women, the Mau Mau Rebellion, and Social change in Kenya. Boulder, San Fransico, Oxford: Westview Press, p.35-36.Harry Thuku was one of the leaders of the Trade Union Movement jailed by the British in for the general strike in 1927. The people went to the Nairobi Police Station where he was being held, planning to storm the police station and bring him out. They were faced by a large number of armed policemen.

[13] *Ibid*

[14] *Op.cit.*

[15] *Op.cit*, 79

[16] Boehmer, Elleke (circa 1991) paper presented at a postgraduate seminar at the Institute of Commonwealth studies: 'The Master's Dance to the master's voice: Revolutionary Nationalism and the representation of women in the writing of Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o'.

[17] Ndingirigi, Gichingiri (1991) 'Charcter Names and Types in Ngũgĩ's *Devil on the Cross'*, *UFAHAMU*. XIX, II & III: 96-109.

[18] Nazareth Peter (1978) The Third World writer: his social responsibility, Nairobi : Kenya Literature Bureau.

Endnotes Chapter four

[1] Balogun, F. O. (1997) *Ngũgĩ and African Postcolonial Narrative: The Novel as Oral Narrative in Multigenre*, Quebec: World Heritage Press.

[2] Kanneh, Kadiatu. (1998) 'History, "Africa", and Modernity,' Interventions, Vol. 1(1) 30-40, London & New York: Routledge.

[3] Biersteker, Anne. (1993) 'Matigari ma Njirũũngi: What Grows from the Leftover Seeds of "Chat Trees?", Paintbrush, Vol. XX, Nos. 39 & 40, Spring and Autumn.

[4] Steiner, George. (1975) *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[5] Gĩkandi, S. (1991) 'The Epistemology of Translation: Ngũgĩ and the politics of Language,' *RAL*, Winter, Vol. 22, No.4: 161-167.

[6] Chakava, H. (1995) Publishing Ngũgĩ, the challenge, the risk, the reward in Cantalupo, Charles (Ed.) *Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o: Texts and context,* New Jersey, Africa World Press.

[7] Ngũgi, wa Thiong'o. (1987) *Matigari*, see foreword.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o , *N. (1999) Preface.*

[10] *Op.cit.*

[11] Njogu, K. (1995) Living Secretly and Spinning Tales: Ngũgĩ's Secret Livs and Other Stories,' in Cantalupo Charles (Ed.) *Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o: Texts and contexts,* New Jersey, Africa World Press.

[12] Ngũgi wa Thiong'o. (1987) *Matigari ma Njirũũngi*, Nairobi: Heinemann.

[13] Op.cit.

[14] Julien, Eileen. (1992) African Novels and the question of Orality. Bloomington. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

[15] Msiska, H. M. (2000) 'Living and Reading: Towards a Phenomenology of the Reader of the African text,' (Unpublished paper delivered at the Black Gaze Conference) Birkbeck College: University of London.

[16] Balogun, F.O. (1997) *Ngũgĩ and African Postcolonial Narrative: The Novel as Oral Narrative in Multigenre*, Quebec: World Heritage Press.

[17] Gitahi, G. (1995) 'Ferocious Comedies: Henri Lopes' The Lauging Cry and *Ngũgĩ* wa Thiong'o's *Matigari* as 'Dictator novels' in Cantalupo Charles (ed.) *Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o: Texts & Contexts*, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

[18] *Op.cit.*

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] *Op.cit.*

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] Arndt, S. (1998) *African Women's Literature*, Bayreuth African Studies: Bayreuth.

[23] Kinyatti, M (1987) *Kenya's Freedom Struggles, The Kimaathi's papers*, Zed Books, London and New Jersey.

[24] Balogun, F.O. (1997) *Ngũgĩ and African Postcolonial Narrative: The Novel as Oral Narrative in Multigenre*,Quebec: World Heritage Press.

[25] Presley, Cora, Anne. (1992) Kikuyu Women, the Mau Mau Rebellion, and Social Change in Kenya, Colorado: Westview Press.

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] Ngũgĩ, wa Thiong'o and Ngũgĩ wa Mirii (1982) *I will marry when I want*, London, Heinemann

[28] *Op. cit.*

[29] *Op.cit.*

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] Wagoro, W. (1987) Seminar on Translating in postcolonial contexts at Middlesex University.

[32] The descriptions of Wariinga and Gũthera are very similar in the two texts.

[33] *Op.cit.*

[34] 'Motherlands, Mothers and Nationalist Songs: representation of Nationalism and women in African Literature' in Rutherford, (ed.) *From Commonwealth to Postcolonial* (Sydney, New South Wales. Mundelstrup and Coventry: Dangaroo Press, 1992).

[35] *Op. cit*: 80.

[36] Wa Goro (1997) - as 31 above.

[37] Her name might be a translation of the Christian name (Purity) from English.

[38] *Op.cit.*

[39] Meehan Kevin and Karim,Abdul Mustapha (1995) 'Decolonising spaces: Uses of Storytelling in African-American Slave Narratives and Ngũgĩ's'*Matigari* in Canteloupo Charles (Ed.), Ngũgi wa Thiong'o, Texts and Contexts, New Jersey: Africa World Press.

[40] Editorial Advisory Body in Likimani, Muthoni (1985) *Passbook No.F.47927: Women and Mau Mau in Kenya*, Basingstoke and London, Macmillan.

[41] Tadjo, Veronique (2001) *As the Crow flies, trans,* Wangui wa Goro, Oxford, Heineman.