

REVIEW ARTICLE

Vol. 12. Issue 4. 2025 (Oct-Dec)

ISSN  
INTERNATIONAL  
STANDARD  
SERIAL  
NUMBER  
INDIA  
2395-2628(Print):2349-9451(online)

## Between the 'Trans-Creator' and the 'Creator': A Post-Colonial Approach

Dr. Amit R. Prajapati

Professor, Department of English, Veer Narmad South Gujarat University,  
Surat – 395007, Gujarat, India

[doi: 10.33329/ijelr.12.4.149](https://doi.org/10.33329/ijelr.12.4.149)



Dr. Amit R. Prajapati

### Article information

Article Received:16/11/2025  
Article Accepted:14/12/2025  
Published online:18/12/2025

### Abstract

When a translator translates, the translator always interprets the Source Language Text at his/her own individual level allowing the text most probably the individual experience and circumstance-based interpretation. This renders translation a verbal activity of interpretation. It is not wrong to say that an individual interpretation while translating a text can't be free from prejudices. The activity of translation, being an activity of meaning transfer through words and the words being more powerful, can hardly be individually, politically, culturally or thoughtfully neutral, especially in the colonial and the post-colonial contexts. Since translation has remained for long the key area of study for post-colonial translation critics, it has been looked at with a post-colonial approach in order to break the monopoly of some governing languages and a colonial governance as well. Translation of regional literature always breaks the monopoly of universally accepted languages compared to regional literatures and languages allowing them to get a chance of universally and globally accepted literature. The activity of translation needs to be re-evaluated post-colonially.

**Key-words:** translation, colonial, post-colonial, hegemony, universality, literature.

### 1. Introduction

When a translator translates, the translator always translates making use of his/her own interpretation based on his/her own individual as well as circumstance-based experience which leads to a personal interpretation. It is not wrong to say that personal experience doesn't allow a translator a choice of freedom to be free from prejudices to interpret. The activity of translation, being an activity of meaning transfer through words and the words being more powerful, can hardly be individually, politically, culturally or thoughtfully neutral, especially in the colonial and the post-colonial contexts. The post-colonial approach allows the Translation Studies to break the monopoly of some languages. The translation of a variety of regional literatures always disowns the dominance of universally accepted languages while allowing an opportunity to the regional literature to possibly gain the global

attention of readers. The activity of translation needs to be re-evaluated, re-thought and re-theorized post-colonially.

## 2. Post-colonial Approach:

In order to study the post-colonial approach, it is first necessary to peep into the basic concepts of colonialism and post-colonialism.

### 2. 1. Concept of Colonial(ism):

The term “colonialism” exclusively describes the process of forcible invasion, settlement and political administration by the European powers such as Spain, Portugal, Britain, the Netherlands and France over the rest of the world including America, Australia and parts of Africa and Asia growing from the mercantile capitalism and the ideology of possessive individualism in the 18<sup>th</sup> century Europe. Colonialism legitimizes the exploitation of inhabited lands and natural resources including manpower imposing alien rules by force. The non-West counterpart was forced to follow the agenda set by the powerful West.

*Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (2006) refers to colonialism as “the project of European political domination from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries” dying out with “the national liberation movements of the 1960s” actually dating from the end of the First World War however different in relation to different nations. The seventy years’ struggle between Western liberalism and Eastern communism is the struggle for domination between opposed camps situated on common territory extending the cultural-economic domination of the West. Especially, in this regard, the modern history of the non-Western world is “essentially determined by its relations with the countries which had established themselves in the nineteenth century as the lords of humankind” (Hobsbawm 1995: 200).

Robert Young argues in his book *Post-colonialism: An Historical Introduction* defining colonialism that “Colonialism involved the conquest and control of other people’s land and goods” (Young 2001: 16). This directly connects to the argument that the very process of colonialism may also corrupt an individual mind. Ania Loomba defines colonialism as “not merely a political and economic relationship of domination and subjugation” but also as “the transformation and the reorganization of the colonized society” (Loomba 2005: 8), Michael Doyle defines colonialism as, “a relationship of domination between an imperial center and a periphery, and it entails the extension of sovereignty over distant territories” (Doyle 1986: 45), Bernard Cohn as, “Colonialism can be seen as a form of rule which involves the restructuring of both the political and cultural systems of the colonized.” (Cohn 1996: 4) and Thomas Metcalf as, “Colonial rule required not only the exercise of political authority but also the construction of a set of ideas that justified domination.” (Metcalf 1994, 1),

The desire to rule led the colonialists to monopolize. Using the word ‘power’ in definition, Jurgen Osterhammel defines colonialism as, “a relationship of power in which one people controls another, transforming their identity and institutions.” (Osterhammel 2005: 15), Albert Memmi considers the colonialism as, “the establishment of a relationship in which the colonizer imposes his values, economy, and social structures upon the colonized, who is reduced to a state of dependency and inferiority.” (Memmi 1965: 91), Edward Said in his book *Culture and Imperialism* defines colonialism as, “a practice of political and cultural domination that restructures the identity and history of the colonized.” (Said 1993 :9), and further Edward Said said in another book *Orientalism* about colonialism is, “The relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony.” (Said 1979: 5). To Gayatri Spivak colonialism is, “the histories of the colonized, rendering them voiceless within the structure of imperial power.” (Spivak 1999: 198) and to Ashcroft colonialism is, “the forcible takeover of land and economy accompanied by political domination and the imposition of the colonizer’s culture.” (Ashcroft 1982: 2). Chatterjee defines

colonialism as, "Colonial rule" that "establishes a state of difference, keeping the colonized permanently subordinated within a hierarchical order." (Chatterjee 1993: 19), Anne McClintock defines colonialism as, "a system of power that defines colonized people as inherently inferior and uses this hierarchy to justify domination." (McClintock 1995: 6) and Ngugi defines colonialism as, "the mental universe of the colonized by destroying or undervaluing their languages, cultures, and heritage" (Ngugi 1986: 16).

## 2. 2. Concept of Postcolonial(ism):

What makes a shift from colonial to post-colonial thinking? Achille Mbembe focussing on this shift indirectly argues that "Postcolonial thinking is a critique of colonial reason and its afterlives in modern forms of power" (Mbembe 2015: 11). Along these lines one may argue that coloniality led to post-coloniality. In order to distinguish between the periods, the terms "colonial" and "post-colonial" have been used to denote the "colonial" as 'the colonial period of the British rule' and the "post" (after) time of independence or colonialism in many books of national history and comparative studies. The term "Post-colonial" deconstructs colonialism commencing post-coloniality simultaneously. But difficult it is to argue "When exactly then does the 'post-colonial' begin?" (Shohat 1992: 103).

Investigating the emergence of the term "post-colonial(ism)" designating the period after independence reveals a range of opinions around. The term, though used by a few literary critics by the late 1970s to characterize various cultural effects of colonization, was still not in general currency. In spite of definitional debates over its meaning for some two decades, argues Ashcroft that "seldom used in 1989", the complex and slippery concept of post-colonialism "raises over 10,000 entries" and the debate over the use of this term is "fast and furious" (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 1989: 219).

The hyphen in the term emphasizes the discursive effects of the historical fact of colonialism resisting indiscriminate attention to cultural difference, marginality and practices of reading and writing. As a form of "space-clearing" gesture, the prefix "post" in "post-colonial(ism)" like hyphen, frees the term from the tyranny of chronology. The rubric "postcolonial" without hyphen means "since colonialism began". For post-colonial studies, the ambiguity of the prefix "post" be kept in sight to mean "after" and not "since".

While analysing the problem of chronological definition to which these debates draw attention, the term is haunted by a linear development that it sets out to dismantle. Metaphorically, the term marks history as a series of stages along an epochal road from the precolonial, to rethinking the post-colonial. In this view the "post" in "post-colonialism" is doomed perpetually to compete with the spectre of linearity and the teleological development it wants to contest.

Sahadeva Dasa states that since the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century till "in 1921, 84 per cent of the surface of the earth had been colonized" and there were "as many as 168 colonies" (Dasa 2011: 41). Though by the mid-1960s most colonies were formally independent, the experience of last three decades shows that the ghost of colonization still looms over the post-colonial world because globalization is the evidence of the continuing control of the "West" over the "Rest". Post/neo-colonialism establishes the rebirth of European colonialism because "We live in a post-colonial neo-colonized world" (Spivak 1990: 166) which Kwame Nkrumah also while calling 'neo-colonialism' says, "The essence of neo-colonialism is that the State which is subject to it is, in theory, independent and has all the outward trappings of international sovereignty. In reality, its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from outside" (Nkrumah 1965: ix).

To Gayatri Spivak, "Post-coloniality" is the "continuation of colonialism" as postcolonialism as a term is "just totally bogus" (Spivak 1991: 224) whereas to Stuart Hall, infected by imperialism, "postcolonial is not the end of colonization" but "displacement and rearticulation" (Hall 1999: 230). Thus, colonialism is, even as post-colonialism, the establishment, maintenance and expansion

of colonial culture that continues to resonate. As a neologism, “post-colonialism” takes advantage of new conditions to search for alternatives to the discourses of the colonial era to review the past and the future. It deals with conflicts of identity and cultural belonging. Adopting colonial rules resulted into acceptance of the Western traditions and culture. Having faced the challenge to recall their own culture and traditions, the colonized have resorted to language as a means of writing to review and deconstruct one-sided, worn-out attitudes of colonization. Thus, post-colonial means any kind of resistance.

To Edward Said, “Orientalism is . . . a Western style for dominating, reconstructing and having authority over the Orient” (Said 1978: 3). This leads to a question whether colonialism will also dominate the activity of translation in future as, according to Ashcroft, “the effects of colonization on cultures and society” may deal with the problems of translators in future. (Ashcroft 2006: 1). However, in the light of the argument made by the scholar like Leela Gandhi that postcolonial theory “is a theoretical resistance to the mystifying amnesia of the colonial aftermath” where the translator may stand a scope to be independent in his/her translation activity (Gandhi 1998: 4). Loomba Ania clearly mentions that “Postcolonial is used to signify the transitions and disruptions caused by colonialism and its continuing effects” (Loomba 2015: 7). Of course, Robert Young refers to role of post-colonialism as a resistance as he states, “Postcolonialism is a historical and theoretical resistance to colonialism, its discourses and its legacies” (Young 2001: 57).

Looking as translation to interpret post-colonialism in a selfish way, one has to quote the argument made by Boehmer who says that “Postcolonial literature... is writing that sets out in one way or another to resist colonialist perspectives” (Boehmer 1995: 3). Homi Bhabha looks at postcolonialism having a sort of hybrid identity when he states, “Postcolonial perspectives... intervene in those ideological discourses of modernity that attempt to give a hegemonic ‘normality’ to the uneven development of the Third World” (Bhabha 1994: 171).

When one looks at the translator with reference to or in view of colonialism, does one consider the translator an inferior, not equal to the original author? When Gayatri Spivak defines the postcolonial, she clearly states that “the subaltern cannot speak” (Spivak 1988: 287) as if compared to an original author the translator of it like a subaltern cannot speak, nor defend him/herself. One can say that translating a Source Language Text into the Target Language may be an act of disengaging the Source Language text from the colonial authorial supervision as Helen Tiffin says about post-colonialism, “Post-colonialism is the process of disengagement from the whole colonial syndrome” (Tiffin 1995: 95). The very challenge raised by the post-colonial theories threaten the power of the colonial as rightly said by Walter Mignolo, “Decolonial options mean delinking from the colonial matrix of power” (Mignolo 2011: 11).

Further, post-coloniality is according to Priyamvada Gopal, “the unfinished business of colonialism” (Gopal 2019: 12), to Quayson, “the systematic study of the lingering effects of colonial domination upon contemporary societies” (Quayson 2021: 7), to Lazarus, “the continuing operations of imperialism within the global capitalism” (Lazarus 2011: 6), to Upamanyu Pablo Mukherjee, “the ecological and material histories shaped by empire” (Mukherjee 2010: 9), to Tabish Khair, “the literary and cultural analysis of the social worlds shaped by colonial encounters” (Khair 2016: 3) and to Niblett, “capitalism’s embedded colonial histories” (Niblett 2012: 5). Thus, it is very much evident that it involves a type of engagement with the colonial experience. To quote Quayson, “ . . . postcolonialism designates a critical practice that is highly eclectic and difficult to define. It involves a studied engagement with the experience of colonialism and its past and present effects at the levels of material culture and of representation . . . to the continuing power and authority of the West in the global political, economic and symbolic spheres and the ways in which resistance to, appropriation of and negotiation with the West’s order are prosecuted” (Quayson 1998: online). The march through the history and development of postcolonialism with reference to Translation Studies will better enlighten the term and its relationship with Translation Studies.

---

## 2. 3. History and Development:

The Eurocentric history of the colonial hey-day written by Colonizers legitimizes their rule over the disqualified Colonized. As a story, Leela Gandhi notes, colonialism is “a way of ‘worlding’ the world as Europe” (Gandhi 1998: 171). Therefore, the postcolonial historiography challenges the hegemony of the grand narrative and questions its legitimization. The attempt to review the post-colonial turn in Translation Studies is “to see cultural relations at a global level” in order to understand the continuous complexities of power relations in histories (Simon & St-Pierre 2000: 13-14). The translated texts only into the European languages for European consumption expose the one-way process of translation as a power-game and thereby establish that “colonialism and translation went hand in hand” (Bassnett and Trivedi: 1999: 3). It will be aimed at surveying how and to what effect theoretical frameworks are employed in the discipline. Finally, some roads not taken may possibly be explored to pursue postcolonial studies rigorously.

Post-colonialism has its genesis in the philosophy of Michel Foucault who argues that essentially contextual knowledge involves a play of power and therefore power and knowledge are inseparable. But located in 1978, “Edward Said initiated the discourse of Post-colonialism” systematically with the publication of *Orientalism* (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 1989: 198). Said reveals the close relationship between colonialism and European system of knowledge. His use of the term “Orientalism” constructs the binary division of the world into the Orient and the Occident which are mutually constitutive. The concept of the “East/the Orient” was created by the “West/the Occident” suppressing the ability of “the Other” to express. It has made the Occident superior, progressive and civil by allowing the colonized to have no voice, and therefore, no history.

The seminal text *The Empire Writes Back* (1989) by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin points out the postcolonial studies welcoming “powerfully subversive general accounts” (Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin 1989: 192). Of course, Ashcroft, Gareth and Tiffin had a number of predecessors; from Frantz Fanon to Edward Said who contributed to theory and criticism and from Chinua Achebe to Ngugi wa Thiong’o who contributed to literature and criticism; who, in this decade, paved the ground for the boom. Anyway, the connection of the post-colonial writing to translation has been explored by, among others, G. J. V. Prasad “Writing translation. The Strange Case of the Indian English novel” In Bassnett and Trivedi (eds.) *Post-colonial Translation. Theory and practice*, 1999) for India, Paul Bandia (*On Translating Pidgins and Creoles in African Literature*, 1994) for Africa, Joanne Akai (*Creole... English: West Indian Writing as Translation*, 1997) for the Caribbean and Gayatri Spivak (*Outside in the Teaching Machine*, 1993) and Lawrence Venuti (*The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 1995) for America.

Different translation critics offer different opinions on the origin of the postcolonial Translation Studies. The post-colonial studies emerged as a discipline “in the 1970s” according to Helene Buzelin (Buzelin 2007: 39-40), “in the mid1980s” according to Douglas Robinson (Robinson 1997: 1), and “in 1990” according to Bassnett and Lefevere (Bassnett and Lefevere 1990: 8). Helene Buzelin further states that the first studies relating to translation in a post-colonial setting appeared in the 1990s, only with the works of translation critics like Andre Lefevere, Susan Bassnett, Gayatri Spivak, Lawrence Venuti, Harish Trivedi, Maria Tymoczko, Sherry Simon, Paul St. Pierre and others (Buzelin 2007: 40).

However; the 1950s and the 1960s witnessed the publications of articles to explore the connections between inter-lingual translation and the post-colonial literature. But it is believed that Gayatri Spivak, a Bengali/American academician, introduced post-colonialism in 1993 through her article “The Politics of Translation” which is indicative of how Cultural Studies and especially post-colonialism has over the past decade focused on issues of translation and colonization (Valero-Garcès 1995; Tymoczko 1999/2000; Cronin 2000; Wolf 2007; Polezzi 2001). Along the same lines, *The Location of Culture* (1994) by Homi Bhabha also provides useful theoretical stimulus by contributing to TS

through his views on the key concept of “hybridity” which is “the sign of the productivity of colonial power” without any imposed hierarchy (Bhabha 1994: 112). Though theorized by Bhabha and demonstrated by Salman Rushdie, hybridity as unable to resolve the tension between two cultures cannot be subversive and therefore Sathya Rao proposes the term “non-colonial translation theory” (Rao 2006: 89).

Lawrence Venuti, the most discussed translator scholar, recently recommends that the translation reads fluently if done without the absence of any linguistic or stylistic features. Venuti advocates retaining foreignness which proposes a space where “newness enters” the text (Bhabha 1994: 212). The “text” was earlier viewed in terms of the language, later on as a cultural study and now in the post-colonial context as ideology/identity by Venuti, Berman, Cohen and others. It makes the text a document of “the public domain”, like Barthes’s death of the author, delimiting the translator’s rights to interpret (Venuti 1995: 312). Translation is not “a duplicate of the original” (Gasset 2004: 61) but “the translation of another text” merely as a work with “a different vocabulary” (Paz 1992: 154). Hence, it renders significance to translation activity.

On the other hand, Blanchot, Jianzhong, Roman Jakobson, House and Walter Benjamin accept the concept of the “original”. Translation is “a rewriting of an original text” (Jianzhong 2000: 159). Fettered to words, “to approximate all the dimensions” and the spirit of the original text is almost impossible (Jakobson 2004: 116). Translatability is an essential quality that not only “issues from the original” but also contains the “law governing the translation” (Benjamin 2004: 16). The transparent translation produces the “intended effect [*Intention*]” of the original (Benjamin 2004: 19-20) as a “representation” (House 2002: 247) of namely “what has been said” (Mariano 2006: 438).

Derrida’s deconstruction challenges the copyright to subordinate the TL text. In the post-colonial stance, the translator deconstructs the anti-colonial narratives to show their “complicity with the master of imperialism” (Niranjana 1992: 167). The shift in translation strategy by the post-colonial translator with an inadequate vocabulary conveys “in a language that is not one’s own the spirit that is one’s own” (Rao 1938: vii). To deconstruct a text is therefore to decipher “meaning”, to undo assumptions, to dismantle “the hegemonic West from within” and hierarchical binary oppositions (Niranjana 1992: 171). This meaning cannot exist “outside-the -text” but depends on the absent counterparts (Derrida 1989: 841). The multiplicity of textual interpretations rejects the transfer of stable meaning. For Derrida, translation is inadequate to compensate for that which multiplicity denies us and therefore the translator appears as a creative text-producer who frees history from colonialism. The decolonized translator with a liberty to preserve any element speaks of those voices that have been silenced. The post-colonial translation is viewed as a new literary phenomenon about which “we do not as yet know how to speak directly” (Tymoczko 1999: 19).

The post-colonial translation discourse has invented three main linguistic groups: “monoglossic, diglossic and polyglossic”. Monoglossic is a single-language society, Diglossic is a double-language society and Polyglossic is a multi-lingual society. (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 1989: 198). Thus, the post-colonial Translation Studies is the unequal struggle of various local languages against “the one master-language of our postcolonial world, English”. (Bassnett and Trivedi 1999: 13). Translation is thus seen as the battleground of the postcolonial context. One must move past the traditional concept of translation as “purely linguistic or textual activity” to realize that “translation has always been an indispensable channel of imperial conquest and occupation” (Robinson 1997: 10). Therefore, for Robinson, postcolonial theory is the part of the interdisciplinary field of cultural theory and cultural studies.

Anthropologically, translation has been used not only “to control and ‘educate’” but also to “shape colonized populations in the past” (Robinson 1997: 6). Colonization bore decolonization. Moreover, translation in the present remains concealed in the political and cultural complexities of post-

coloniality. One of the hopes of postcolonial translation is that it might open “new and productive avenues for the future” (Ibid: 6). Notions of “the foreign” and “the domestic”, invite Tarzan as a “translator” who can read and write English. Since he cannot converse with apes for having “impoverished tongue”, he can only “dominate them” (Cheyfitz 1991: I/16). This projects translation as a process not happening in vacuum innocently. Thus, the post-colonial translation makes texts free from colonialism.

The post-colonial studies along with the gender studies, evolved out of power relations operating inside and between cultures, developed “in the wake of the break-up of the great European empires in the 1940’s, 1950’s and 1960’s” (Dimitriu 2005: 183). Asymmetrical power relationships establish a lot in common among authorship, patriarchy and colonialism. These ideologies of the oppressed further subordinate the status of translators to authors whereas of women to men. This partnership in inferiority occupies a “(culturally speaking) female position” (Jouve 1991: 47) who are always delivered at second hand level and therefore are “defective” (Jouve 1991: 47).

Emerged during the 1970s and recognized through the 1980s, the experimental feminist writing has helped women to voice and parallel their stance along with translation to liberate from the language. Within this feminist approach, Flotow sees the role of the translator in “reclaiming some of this derogatory vocabulary and developing new terms” (Flotow 1997: 19). These ideas have been nourished by authors such as Hélène Cixous, Claudine Herrmann, Marina Yaguello, Anni Leclerc in France, Mary Daly, Kate Millett, Adrienne Rich in the United States and Nicole Brossard, Louky Bersianik, France Théoret in Canada (Flotow 1997: 8).

The shift from feminist analysis to empirical research is the most important trend in the current Translation Studies. If such a shift is to take place in postcolonial Translation Studies much should be done in order to effect rewarding interaction between theory and practice. Translation Studies could be practice-driven rather than theory-driven. Since each act of postcolonial translation has such manifold contextual parameters, perhaps a meticulous study of those parameters would benefit not only the object of study and possible comparative theorizing but also lead to a better understanding of the relevant postcolonial situation and its ties with the colonizing and other cultures.

Additionally, some ingrained notions which are evident in the works of post-structuralists are unhelpful. First, the employment of translation as one-dimensional metaphor for interpretation of all kinds. Second, when original does not exist, Lefevere’s notion of translation as “rewriting” is of little help. Third, comparison of postcolonial literature and translation is of some interest and importance but should be combined with more enlightening studies of their dissimilarities. Postcolonial writings and translation go hand in hand so far as the expressions of colonized feelings are concerned.

Despite not being a part of the mainstream translation works, postcolonial scholars in general have made us all more aware of the intricacies and complexities of the relationship between translation and power throughout history and at present. Worth acknowledging that translation has always played a crucial role in colonizing and/or decolonizing processes. From 1950s, each decade has been marked by dominant concepts such as linguistics, culture and post-coloniality. Having developed as a discipline today, the level of sophistication and inventiveness soared and new concepts, methods and research projects have been developed. In short, Translation Studies as a field brings together approaches from a wide language and cultural studies along with the modifications and development of new models specific to its own requirements.

### **(3) Conclusion: Interdependence of ‘Translation’ and ‘De-Colonisation’:**

Truly, most of the post-colonial theories are very closely related to Translation Studies. While exploring post-colonial theories, some critics get attracted to exploration of Translation Studies. Translation has inevitably played a crucial role from post-colonial perspective. This perspective renders

the Source Language text as an inferior to the Target Language text. However, if the text has been translated into English, it gets recognized in the West. Thus, it can be experienced how the post-colonial turn in literature has indirectly contributed to the post-colonial translation. The post-colonial translation may challenge the traditional context of Translation Studies. The term perhaps refers to the translation that mediates the cultural and linguistic difference.

Theories like domestication offer translation another, a political turn known as the post-colonial. The turn from cultural to postcolonial examines a number of directions highlighting historical, ideological and cultural translation. Much of postcolonial translation, with its self-reflexive thoughts on the strategy and aim of translation, can be seen as part of the cultural turn. Thus, the focus of Translation Studies seems to be shifting to the broader area that is encompassed by the rubric of cultural studies and this cultural turn paves the way for meaningful studies of the postcolonial aspects of translation because culture as a form of “hegemony” involves invisible consent on the part of the “subaltern” who according to Gayatri Spivak (1988) could not speak/protest.

Translation was used by the colonialists as a tool for their selfish political authoritative intention. The British, after they had come to India, got many Indian literary books and religious treatises translated into English to know and study the culture of that nation they wanted to colonize. Thus, translation was also used as a tool for colonisation. Therefore, in order to break the monopoly of some language/s or to decolonize the monopoly, it was necessary to decolonize coloniality by the tool of translation.

While establishing the relationship between translation and post-colonialism many critics have registered their views. Claire Chambers and Ipek Demir declare that “The relationship between translation and colonisation is well established” (Chambers 2024: 3). Douglas Robinson considers colonialism at the heart of translation while noting that “translation has always been an indispensable channel of imperial conquest and occupation” (Robinson 1997: 10). Lawrence Venuti establishes the relation between translation and post-colonialism when he writes, “[t]he colonization of the Americas, Asia, and Africa could not have occurred without interpreters, both native and colonial, nor without the translations of effective texts, religious, legal, educational” (Venuti 2002: 158). Tejaswini Niranjana sites in her book, “Translation as a practice shapes, and takes shape within, the asymmetrical relations of power that operate under colonialism” (Niranjana 1990: 2).

Claire Chambers and Ipek Demir declare citing the example of the minutes of Macaulay:

“The British parliamentarian Thomas B. Macaulay had in 1835 made English language instruction and the training of translators in India central, revealing the link between translation, domination, and empire. He notoriously asseverated:

“We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect. To that class we may leave it to refine the vernacular dialects of the country, to enrich those dialects with terms of science borrowed from the Western nomenclature, and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population” (Macaulay, 1995/1835, 428–430; emphasis added).

Here Macaulay blends the literal act of translation or interpretation with the metaphor of moulding Indians into culturally transformed, English-speaking intermediaries” (Chambers 2024: 3).

Claire Chambers and Ipek Demir further comment on the role of translation having its association with de/colonisation. They declare:



"While the role of translation in decolonisation was being uncovered, the study of world literature itself took a 'translation turn', largely in the first decade or so of the twenty-first century. Whereas postcolonial literary studies centre around European languages and, to a lesser extent, the tongues of countries previously ruled over by the British Empire, contemporary world literature scholarship scrutinises works in translation from any language, including non-European and non-colonised ones." (Chambers 2024: 3-4).

The "Introduction" of the book *Translation and Decolonisation: Interdisciplinary Approaches* has been titled as "Translation in the Service of (De)colonisation" by editors Claire Chambers and Ipek Demir which is in itself self-explanatory (Chambers 2024: 1). They write how their book "investigates how translation itself can become a vehicle for intervention and of decolonisation" (Chambers 2024: 2). The same translation critics further add that there is always a relationship between translation and decolonisation. As they rightly write, "By drawing from theories of postcolonialism and decoloniality as well as translation theory, but also considering specific case studies, the book reveals and scrutinises new relationships between decolonisation and translation" (Chambers 2024: 7). In order to support their argument, they summarise very briefly the view of Gayatri Spivak that "translation is both colonialism's engine fuel and a potential path to decolonisation" (Spivak, 2009/1993: 200-225). Thus, to conclude in the words of Claire Chambers and Ipek Demir, it can be said "how translation, having been an instrument of colonisation, can itself become a vehicle for decolonising . . ." (Chambers 2024: 2) and "how translation can be a tool of colonisation but also of decolonisation" (Chambers 2024: xvi).

### Works Cited

- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1989). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2006). *The post-colonial studies reader* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (Eds.). (1990). *Translation, history and culture: A sourcebook*. Routledge.
- Bassnett, S., & Trivedi, H. (1999). Introduction. In S. Bassnett & H. Trivedi (Eds.), *Postcolonial translation: Theory and practice* (pp. 1-18). Routledge.
- Benjamin, W. (2004). The task of the translator. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (2nd ed., pp. 15-25). Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Boehmer, E. (1995). *Colonial and postcolonial literature*. Oxford University Press.
- Buzelin, H. (2007). Translation studies, ethnography and the production of knowledge. In P. St. Pierre & P. C. Kar (Eds.), *In translation: Reflections, refractions, transformations* (pp. 135-154). John Benjamins.
- Chambers, C., & Demir, İ. (Eds.). (2024). *Translation and decolonisation: Interdisciplinary approaches*. Routledge.
- Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The nation and its fragments: Colonial and postcolonial histories*. Princeton University Press.
- Cheyfitz, E. (1991). *The poetics of imperialism: Translation and colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan*. Oxford University Press.
- Cohn, B. S. (1996). *Colonialism and its forms of knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton University Press.
- Cronin, M. (2000). *Across the lines: Travel, language, translation*. Centre for Translation and Textual Studies.

- 
- Dasa, S. (2011). Rise of farcial centralised democracies: Colonial ghost still rules. In S. Dasa (Ed.), *Capitalism, communism and cowism*. Soul Science University Press.
- Derrida, J. (1989). *Limited Inc.* (S. Weber & J. Mehlman, Trans.). Northwestern University Press.
- Dimitriu, R. (2005). *The cultural turn in translation studies*. Editura.
- Doyle, M. W. (1986). *Empires*. Cornell University Press.
- Flotow, L. von. (1997). *Translation and gender: Translation in the era of feminism*. St. Jerome.
- Gandhi, L. (1998). *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction*. Columbia University Press.
- Gasset, J. O. y. (2004). The misery and the splendor of translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (2nd ed., pp. 49–57). Routledge.
- Gopal, P. (2019). *Insurgent empire: Anticolonial resistance and British dissent*. Verso.
- Hall, S. (1999). Cultural composition. In G. A. Olson & L. Worsham (Eds.), *Race, rhetoric, and the postcolonial* (pp. 85–97). SUNY Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1995). *The age of extremes: The short twentieth century, 1914–1991*. Abacus.
- House, J. (2002). Universality versus culture specificity in translation. In A. Riccardi (Ed.), *Translation studies: Perspectives on an emerging discipline* (pp. 92–110). Cambridge University Press.
- Jakobson, R. (2004). On linguistic aspects of translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (2nd ed., pp. 113–118). Routledge.
- Jianzhong, G. (Ed.). (2000). *Contemporary American translation theory*. Hubei Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Jouve, N. W. (1991). *White woman speaks with forked tongue: Criticism as autobiography*. Routledge.
- Khair, T. (2016). *The new xenophobia*. Oxford University Press.
- Kohn, M., & Reddy, K. (2025). Colonialism. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/colonialism/>
- Lazarus, N. (2011). *The postcolonial unconscious*. Cambridge University Press.
- Loomba, A. (2005). *Colonialism/postcolonialism* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Loomba, A. (2015). *Colonialism/postcolonialism* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Mariano, G.-L. (2006). On defining translation. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 51(3), 437–447.
- Mbembe, A. (2015). *On the postcolony* (A. M. Berrett, Trans.). Wits University Press.
- McClintock, A. (1995). *Imperial leather: Race, gender and sexuality in the colonial contest*. Routledge.
- Memmi, A. (1965). *The colonizer and the colonized*. Beacon Press.
- Metcalf, T. R. (1994). *Ideologies of the Raj*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.
- Mukherjee, U. P. (2010). *Postcolonial environments*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Niblett, M. (2012). *The Caribbean novel since 1945*. University Press of Mississippi.
- Niranjana, T. (1992). *Siting translation: History, post-structuralism and the postcolonial context*. University of California Press.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. James Currey.
-

- 
- Nkrumah, K. (1965). *Neo-colonialism: The last stage of imperialism*. Thomas Nelson.
- Osterhammel, J. (2005). *Colonialism: A theoretical overview* (2nd ed.). Markus Wiener.
- Paz, O. (1992). Translations of literature and letters. In R. Schulte & J. Biguenet (Eds.), *Theories of translation from Dryden to Derrida* (pp. 152–162). University of Chicago Press.
- Polezzi, L. (2001). *Travelling languages: Translation and transnational poetics*. Monash University Press.
- Quayson, A. (2021). *Tragedy and postcolonial literature*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rao, R. (1938). *Kanthapura*. New Directions.
- Rao, S. (2006). From a postcolonial to a non-colonial theory of translation. In N. Sakai & J. Solomon (Eds.), *Translation, biopolitics, colonial difference* (pp. 195–210). Hong Kong University Press.
- Robinson, D. (1997). *Translation and empire: Postcolonial theories explained*. St. Jerome.
- Said, E. W. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon.
- Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. Knopf.
- Simon, S., & St-Pierre, P. (Eds.). (2000). *Changing the terms: Translating in the postcolonial era*. University of Ottawa Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1990). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues* (with S. Harasym). Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason*. Harvard University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (2009). *Outside in the teaching machine*. Routledge.
- Tiffin, H. (1995). Post-colonial literatures and counter-discourse. In B. Ashcroft et al. (Eds.), *The post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 95–98). Routledge.
- Tymoczko, M. (1999). Post-colonial writing and literary translation. In S. Bassnett & H. Trivedi (Eds.), *Postcolonial translation: Theory and practice* (pp. 19–40). Routledge.
- Valero-Garcés, C. (1995). *Languages in contact: An introductory textbook on translation*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (2002). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation* (Rev. ed.). Routledge.
- Wolf, M., & Fukari, A. (2007). *Constructing a sociology of translation*. John Benjamins.
- Young, R. J. C. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction*. Blackwell.
- 

### Biodata

Dr. Amit R. Prajapati is a Professor at Department of English, Veer Narmad South Gujarat University, Surat. He possesses the degree of Ph.D. in the area of Translation Studies. His thesis entitled is “Translation of Narmad’s Selected Poems into English and Evaluation of His Literary Art”. He has translated, and keeps on translating various poems from Gujarati into English by eminent poets and poetesses of Gujarat. Many translated poems have been published in various national and international journals. He has also published several articles in the area of Translation Studies, Indian Literature in English as well as English Literature. To his credit, he has successfully guided 04 Ph.D. scholars, specially in the area of Translation Studies, Film Studies and English Language Teaching.