

CHAPTER VI

GITANJALI ONCE AGAIN

When William Radice began to translate the poems of Tagore for his Penguin *Selected Poems* (1985) in the late 1970s, he wanted to forget all about *Gitanjali*, the crowning glory of ‘the English Tagore’ and decided not to include in his selection any poems from this anthology. As a young translator and Tagore scholar from SOAS, Radice has taken a considerable amount of time to come to terms with *Gitanjali*, Tagore’s most famous book which helped him to make “his poetic thought ... a part of the literature of the West” (Tagore. 301). The main reason for his initial rejection of *Gitanjali* poems for his selection was that he wanted to “establish his [Tagore’s] reputation and credibility as [a] great poet in Bengali, with an output far more complex and variegated than one could tell from his own English translations (Radice 279). His selection included only one poem from the English *Gitanjali*, ‘Arrival’ [Agaman], which was the first Tagore poem he translated, though he did not at the time realize it was from *Gitanjali* (No.51), because it comes not from the Bengali book of that name but from *Kheya* [‘The Ferry-Boat’, 1906]. Another reason was his reluctance to include songs in his selection and the majority of the poems of Tagore’s *Gitanjali* are actually songs (*Ibid*). Thirdly, Radice believes that songs are untranslatable, ‘I do not believe you can translate songs, and I have not tried to translate songs in this book’ (Radice28). It was because of the untranslatability of songs that he did not take up any ‘song-poem’ from Tagore’s *Gitanjali* (1912) for inclusion in his *Selected Poems* of Tagore as translation policy. But he was not unaware of the fact that ‘Tagore’s genius showed itself most naturally and faultlessly in his songs’ (*Ibid* 30) and his songs were for him, to quote his own words, his শেষপারাবির কড়ি, the buck for his last journey (Tagore17). But this aspect of Tagore’s genius remained unrepresented in his own translations; for he deliberately kept his songs outside the purview of his selection.

Radice's ever growing engagement with *Rabindrasangit*, Tagore's songs, over the years, drew him nearer to Tagore's *Gitanjali* and he came to realize its importance in Tagore's 'English career'. Although his *Gitanjali* poems vary in 'literary quality', they represent, at their best, "a very considerable creative achievement, an expression of real imagination and inventiveness in a language that was not primarily his own....they can work when read aloud: the sensitive ear of a *mahakabi* is ever active in them, in their rhythms and cadences and word-painting" (Radice 279). Thus Radice came to discover, albeit belatedly, the true importance of Tagore's *Gitanjali* (1912) as the *magnum opus* of a *mahakabi*, a great poet, more than two decades after the publication of his *Selected Poems* (1985) of Rabindranath Tagore. But it is fascinating to distinguish his English version from the Bengali original in order to understand 'the subtle changes or cuts or additions' that have gone into the rendering of *Gitanjali* making it "a miracle of translation" (Bose15).

Radice's belated realization of the importance of Tagore's *Gitanjali* made him aware of the existence of 'two *Gitanjalis*', ---the original Bengali *Gitanjali* (1910) and its English translation entitled *Gitanjali: Song Offerings* (1912) and he came to discover a lot of differences between them; for the Bengali *Gitanjali* (1910) is not the same in its form and content as the English one. The former is an anthology of 157 lyric poems in Bengali, many of which are known as songs whereas the latter is the famous English *Gitanjali* containing 103 prose-poems in translation, with W. B. Yeats's famous and impassioned introduction. With its first publication by India Society in November 1912, the English *Gitanjali* created an unprecedented sensation among the leading English literary persons of the time. Thomas Sturge Moore was so moved by the mesmerizing power of the *Gitanjali* poems that he recommended the name of Tagore to the Swedish Academy and he was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature in 1913.

The poems that Tagore translated on the eve of his 1912 journey to England finally became his English *Gitanjali (Song-Offerings)*. They were translated from 'a motley collection of his poems, not all from the Bengali *Gitanjali* as is the popular notion' (DasGupta 61). He takes 53 poems from the Bengali *Gitanjali*, and the rest from nine other books of his poetry, most of which belong to 'the devotional genre of his lyrics' (Ibid 61). Although Tagore's *Gitanjali*

(1912) has been widely acclaimed in the West as an anthology of ‘mystic’ poems, it actually contains a variety of poems that often remain concealed not only by the random order of the text but also by Tagore’s rendering of the poems into the uniform style of poetic prose. André Gide, the French translator of Tagore, was perhaps the first to identify the ‘diversity’ of *Gitanjali* poems in the Introduction to his translation. Concurring with Gide’s views Radice seems to have classified *Gitanjali* into three types of poems: songs, sonnets and ballads. They are the ‘song-like poems’ of the *Gitanjali* phase proper, the intricate, sensuous and austere sonnets from *Naibedya* (‘Offerings’ 1901) and the lighter ballad-like poems from *Kheya* (‘The Ferry’, 1906), of which *Agaman* is a typical example. According to Radice, any new translator of *Gitanjali* today would have to face two options. Either he or she would have to do a new translation of the Bengali *Gitanjali* (1910) or a retranslation of all the poems from the English *Gitanjali* (1912). The first option has already been adopted by Brother James Talarovic in 1983 and by Joe Winter in 1998. The first poem was published by University Press Limited in Dhaka and republished as *Show Yourself to My Soul: A New Translation of Gitanjali* (Sorin Books, Notre Dame, Indiana, 2002). Radice, as he confesses, has chosen a more ‘audacious’ option than James Talarovic or Joe Winter of translating afresh the poems of the English *Gitanjali* when he was given by Penguin India the assignment of rendering them on the occasion of Tagore’s 150th birth anniversary (Radice p.xvii). His *Gitanjali* (2011), published from Penguin India, is a retranslation of all the poems contained in what is called the Rothenstein manuscript. While translating afresh *Gitanjali* Radice has to grapple with the ‘iconic’ status of Tagore’s *Gitanjali* (1912) in India and an inevitable comparison with his translation invariably comes into our mind as we go through his rendering (2011). Moreover, *Gitanjali* --- being a unique combination of poetry and song--- posed a difficult challenge for Radice and he tackled it confidently with moderate success. In his essay “The Challenge of Translating Tagore” (2012) Radice says, “[...] I tackled this challenge by looking afresh at Tagore’s own translation as well as doing a new one of my own. My book contains *an entirely new text* of Tagore’s English *Gitanjali*, based on his manuscript, and giving, I hope, *a very different impression* from the standard text as introduced and edited in 1912 by W.B. Yeats” (emphasis added) (Radice 458).

Tagore's *Gitanjali* (1912) contains three types of poems representing a uniform style in poetic prose whereas Radice tries his best to reflect the three styles clearly and distinctly in his new translation. Consequently, there is a 'diversity' in style which distinguishes his *Gitanjali* from Tagore's anthology. In his Introduction to *Gitanjali* (2011) Radice dwells on the 'three styles' that he has tried to capture and carry across in his own rendering from Tagore's original *Gitanjali* (1910). While translating poems for his *Selected Poems* (1985) of Tagore, Radice steered clear of such 'poems that are songs', concentrating exclusively on the rendering of non-*Gitanjali* poems only. In his attempt to make a fresh translation of Tagore's *Gitanjali*, Radice adopts a new translation method for the 'song-poems' of the *Gitanjali* phase --- poems that convey the "intimate combinations of words and melody" characteristic of songs (Radice 28). He seems to have learnt with time that "it is through his songs that Tagore speaks, *as a poet*, to his widest audience in Bengal" (Dyson 41) and that it is "in his songs that Tagore is nearest to his people and culture" (Radice 30). There is no denying the fact that Tagore is "great in poetry and equally great in songs" (Mukherji 185). According to Buddhadeva Bose, his songs too can claim a prominent place among his best poems (Bose 248). This is perhaps the reason why Tagore believes that his greatest contribution to his countrymen is his songs. In "The Religion of an Artist" he declares, "I do not hesitate to say that my songs have found their place in the heart of my land...and that the folk of the future, in days of joy or sorrow or festival, will have to sing them" (Das 687). Consequently, his genius *as a poet* would remain incomplete if his songs are not translated in English for the West.

This realization seems to have prepared Radice inwardly for the translation of Tagore's 'song-poems' of *Gitanjali* that he had once deliberately rejected. It was during the 150th birth anniversary of Tagore that Penguin India approached him with the proposal to do a fresh translation of Tagore's *Gitanjali* in the changed scenario of the 21st century. This proposal seems to have inspired him to undertake a poetic quest afresh for *Gitanjali* which culminated in his startling 'discovery' that its published text was in many respects 'a betrayal of what Tagore originally had in mind' (Radice lvii). This 'discovery' seems to have prompted Radice to offer his 'new translation and the original text of Tagore's translation contained in Rothenstein manuscript, as a kind of 'restitution'. According to Radice, W.B. Yeats tampered with the original manuscript while editing it and, to a great extent, influenced the

interpretation and reception of *Gitanjali* with his seminal introduction dwelling on its contents. The published text of *Gitanjali* is not what Tagore had originally conceived it to be and Radice's objective in his new translation is to enable the reader to discover 'the real *Gitanjali*' that Yeats seems to have taken away from him (p. lvi). By the expression 'the real *Gitanjali*' Radice seems to imply the recreation of the boundless 'creative joy' out of which the poems of the original *Gitanjali* were born.

While translating the *Gitanjali* poems Radice faces some complex problems for rendering songs and he addresses them through an innovative translation method. In "The Challenge of Translating Tagore" (2012) he sums up this 'innovative' method very succinctly: "There are also special challenges in translating poems that are songs --- something I was reluctant to do in the past, but which I now approach by repeating lines and indicating the four-part structure of the song with line-breaks" (Chakravarty 458). Again, in "Painting the Dust and the Sunlight: Rabindranath Tagore and the Two *Gitanjalis*" (2011) he gives a practical demonstration of this translation method by translating ^{ধায় যেনো মর সকল ভালোবাসা} *Dhay yeno mor sakal bhalobasa* from Tagore's Bengali *Gitanjali* (1910). The complete song is reproduced below to illustrate the translation method Radice follows for rendering the *Gitanjali* poems, the majority of which are basically songs:

Let all my love rush
 Lord, towards you, towards you, towards you
 Let all my deepest hopes run
 Lord, your ears, to your ears, to your ears
 Let all my love rush
 Lord, towards you, towards you, towards you

Wherever my thoughts are, let them respond to your call
 Wherever my thoughts are, let them respond to your call
 Whatever my fetters let them all snap
 O Lord, at your pull, your pull, your pull
 Let all my love rush
 Lord, towards you, towards you, towards you

This beggar's bag outside me, let it be emptied endlessly
 And let my heart be secretly filled

Lord, by your gifts, your gifts, your gifts
This beggar's bag outside me, let it be emptied endlessly
And let my heart be secretly filled
Lord, by your gifts, your gifts, your gifts

O inmost friend, let all that is lovely in this life
O inmost friend, let all that is lovely in this life
Let it burst out today
Lord, with your songs, your songs, your songs
Let all my love rush
Lord, towards you, towards you, towards you

(Tr. William Radice).(Biswas *et al* 281)

In this well-known song from Bengali *Gitanjali* (1910) Radice preserves, in its four-part structure, the repetition of words and phrases that is indispensable in a song by Tagore. According to Radice, there are three advantages in this method of rendering. In the first place, the reader can immediately know that this is “a song, not a poem”, as repetitions are a universal feature of songs in all languages. Secondly, while reciting the translation, the reader has the right or opportunity to change the ‘tone and ‘space’ and ‘emotional effect of each recurrence’ just as the singer has the freedom to vary such repetitions in his or her interpretation. Thirdly, and most importantly, by introducing the ‘line-breaks’ in the translation, the four sections or *tukkas* of the vast majority of Tagore’s songs – *asthayi*, *antara*, *sanchari* and *abhog* --- can be singled out and differentiated. It is this form, originally derived from *Dhrupad*, that Tagore used successfully again and again, in order to preserve the beauty, mystery and profundity of the songs.(Radice 281-282). But his repetitions of line/lines to indicate their identities as song borders more often than not on monotony. He fails to produce the aesthetic effect that Eliot famously does in his *The Hollow Men* by repeating the following lines at the end of the poem.

This is the way the world ends
This is the way the world ends
This is the way the world ends
Not with a bang but with a whimper.

(Eliot 86).

Had Radice used this technique discreetly the effect would have been much better, as has been the case with Tagore's own rendering of poem no. 7 that begins with the line যাবার দিনে এই কথাটি বলে যেন যাই (*Gitanjali* 2009). In the Bengali original he repeats the line twice like a refrain but in his English rendering he retains part of the line -- *let this be my parting word* --- making an artistic effect on the readers. In poem no. 60 of the published text ('On the seashore of endless worlds children meet') and its original he uses the opening line as a refrain with tremendous effect. Surprisingly, Radice refrains from repeating any such line/lines and his translations of these poems seem to be less effective than those of Tagore's English *Gitanjali*.

Since Radice considers the Rotheinstein manuscript as the authentic version of Tagore's translations, he begins his translation of *Gitanjali* poems following its sequence and order of arrangement of lines. In his translations Tagore discards the metre and rhyme, the associational ideas and the irreplaceable symbols of his Bengali poetry in favour of rhythmic 'prose-poems' in English. Naturally his prose rendering tends to conceal repetitions of words/phrases, if any, traditionally associated with songs and fails to give the non-Bengali and non-Indian readers any idea about their song-like quality and structure. Radice had to face the special challenge of rendering these 'song-poems' and to ensure their appeal and reception as songs to the Western readers. His innovative translation method enables him to translate these 'song-poems' on which he turned his back at the time of rendering his *Selected Poems* of Tagore. In "The Challenge of Translating Tagore"^(২০১২) Radice touches upon the challenges, "There are also special challenges in translating poems that are songs --- something I was reluctant to do in the past, but which I now approach by repeating lines and indicating the four-part structure of the song with line-breaks (Chakravarty 458). It must be admitted that most of Tagore's songs make use of metre, *chanda*, and rhyme, *mil*, in the words and that they remain concealed and overridden by the rhythm and phrasing of the music. Radice believes that this rhythm and phrasing can be "represented in English translation by the use of repetition and line-breaks", though Tagore undoubtedly did his best to "reflect it too in the musicality of his Bible-influenced prose-poetry" (Radice 283). His experiences as a musician and a piano player may have helped him for rendering the 'song-poems' of *Gitanjali*. In a confessional tone Radice seems to have explained:

How could I have found my way into the songs of *Gitanjali* without being something of a musician myself? [Without] Playing the piano --- a pastime that has entered my professional life through my work with opera composers ... I would not be able to approach a poet such as Tagore, for whom poetry and music were always --- in Milton's famous words --- 'Blest pair of Sirens, pledges of Heav'ns joy, Sphear-born harmonious Sisters...'

(Chakravarty 459).

Despite his best efforts to render Tagore songs by repeating lines or phrases and presenting their four-part structure with line-breaks, Radice could only convey the words of the songs rather than their melody. The text of a song on the printed page looks like a poem and does not have its melody unless it is sung. In his review of Radice's translation of *Gitanjali* (2011) Martin Kampchen expresses the same view about the 'song-poems', "There are many which read well as poems; in that case reading the repetitions (of the singer) disturbs. Other song-texts do not really read well, they sound vapid and bland --- they unfold their essence only as songs" (Kampchen 4). In other words, the melody of a song cannot be captured in a translation and a song minus its melody resembles a poem in its printed form. This explains why Tagore expresses his reluctance in his *Reminiscences* to publish books of the words of songs; for without melodies they would seem to be lacking in their soul (Stern 295). They may at best be treated as poems but never as songs. In his essay "The Real Rabindranath Tagore and His Music" Philippe Stern quotes Tagore as saying [speaking of a Baul song in his *Creative Unity*], "*the best part of a song is missed when the tune is absent, for thereby its movement and its colour are lost, and it becomes like a butterfly whose wings have been plucked*" (emphasis added) (*Ibid*). What Tagore seems to emphasize here is that a song is like 'a butterfly' flying around on the 'wings' of its 'tune' or melody and that a poem is like a 'butterfly' stripped of its wings. In the Granthaparichay section of *Sanchayita* Tagore is quoted as having described the songs of his *Gitabitan* as গীতিকাব্য, lyric poems: ("ভাবের অনুষ্ণ রক্ষা করে গানগুলি সাজানো হয়েছে। এই উপায়ে সুরের সহযোগিতা না পেলেও পাঠকেরা গীতিকাব্যরূপে এই গানগুলির অনুসরণ করতে পারবেন") "The songs have been arranged following the associations of their feelings. If they do not have the accompaniment of tune, the readers may accept them as গীতিকাব্য, lyric poems" (translation mine) (Tagore 878). By the same logic the songs of

Gitanjali may be accepted as 'lyric poems'. Translation cannot carry across the 'tune' or melody of a song from one language to another; for the 'tune' or melody is something that transcends the verbal language and is untranslatable. According to Murray Schafer, music comes 'alive in performance, gaining its true freedom and cadence' (Sutton136). Thus translation, however competent, cannot capture the tune or melody of a song that only comes 'alive in performance' simply because the tune or melody is something elusive and unattainable.

It is not always remembered in the West that Tagore is not only a poet, but a musician as well. In fact, poetry and music are so integrally connected in his works that they cannot be separated. Songs form an important part of his creative work and in them, words and melody complete each other (Stern 295).D.P. Mukerji's observation on the nature of Tagore's songs is worth mentioning here: "Certain compositions had a two-fold character, the poetry of the words and the poetry of music" (Mukherjee183). What Mukerji seems to emphasize is that poetry and song are inseparably related in Tagore's creative soul and that there is a subterranean poetic essence in his songs. In another essay entitled "Tagore, The Supreme Composer" Mukerji dwells on the intimate relation between his poems and songs in his creative soul:

His songs are excellent poems And his songs are composed with due regard to the musical value of words and phrases. The texture of his verse, i.e., its assonance and rhythm, its proper arrangements of vowels and consonants, its beginnings, pauses, and ends are all in tune with its music. The poetic value never jars with, in fact, almost invariably supports the musical value. To him words come clothed in music and the two are inseparable (emphasis added)

Chatterjee
(Mukherjee 177)

What distinguishes Tagore's songs from those of other Indian composers is their exuberance of poetry or lyricism. Comparing his songs with the rest of Indian composers Mr.Mukerjee comments: "Tagore's contribution, though not in the same field of orthodox classical tradition, was at least as rich and varied as that of any other Indian composer. His poetry was certainly superior" (emphasis added) (Mukherjee 185). It is because of the 'superiority' or

abundance of his 'poetry' or lyricism that Tagore's songs surpass those of other Indian composers, past and present. His songs are the spontaneous expression of his poetic feelings and Tagore as 'a poet' definitely speaks through them. Nevertheless, Humayun Kabir, the editor of *Poems of Rabindranath Tagore* (1966) left out songs from this centenary anthology for their untranslatability. According to Kabir, "[his] songs are even more difficult to translate than poems. In their case, fusion of words and music is inviolate" (Kabir p.:xxvii). Even though Tagore's poems are, on the whole, translatable, the fusion of 'words and music' in his songs, in Kabir's view, is the cause of despair for the translator of his songs. It needs to be mentioned here that a rigid division between poems and songs cannot be made in Indian social context where an intimate overlap between the two has been taken for granted since time immemorial. The *bhajans* of Mirabai have been considered for ages in India as both poems and songs. The Baishnab lyrics of the medieval Bengali literature have been equally treated as both poems and songs. Tagore is found to have thought of the roles of the poet and the singer / songmaker as 'interchangeable' and this is true of many other cultures as well. Even much of the folk poetry of India and many other countries is essentially folk song, and *vice versa* (Dyson 40). Even when Tagore began to translate his Bengali poems for his English *Gitanjali* or *Song-Offerings* (1912), he considered the songs as essentially poems and reincarnated them in the receptor language as prose poems. In a letter to Ajit Kumar Chakravarty he enunciated his concept of poetry translation from his first-hand experience of translating the songs of *Gitanjali* as basically poems (Chakravarty 145-147). Commenting on the *Gitanjali* poems Buddhadev Bose says that "[...] it has poems which sing [...] I mean they are so musical as poems, and so genuinely poetry, [...] The poems have gained immensely from their being written in the form of songs, but they are much more poetry than music" (Bose 478). It is only for the poetic core of his songs that Radice has characterized the songs of Tagore's *Gitanjali* as 'song-poems' as they are made of words and melodies only to be sung (Radice 281). Since the melody of a song cannot be translated from one language to another, the best option left for a translator of songs is to carry across the poetic feelings and emotions in his rendering of the song-text. Once an unknown female admirer of Tagore sent to him translations of two of his songs done by her for his well-considered views. Tagore gave vent to his views on the rendering of his songs in a letter to her dated 24 Baishakh 1321 (7 May 1921):

“... বাংলা হইতে ইংরেজী তর্জমা ঠিক literal হইলে চলে না। বিশেষত বাংলা গান। কারণ গানের সুরটুকুর তো তর্জমা হয় না, সে অভাব পূরণ করিয়া লইবার জন্য ইংরেজিতে অনেকটা বদল করিয়া লইতে হয় -- নতুবা বড়ই ন্যাড়া দেখিতে হয়। এরূপ তর্জমায় যথেষ্ট স্বাধীনতা লইতে হয়, এই জন্য নিজে ছাড়া কাহারও উপর এ ভার দেওয়া যায় না। ”

One should not translate literally especially when a Bengali song is to be rendered into English; for the melody of the song is untranslatable, and many changes are to be made to make up for this loss, or else the whole exercise would appear to be barren. One needs to take great liberty for such a rendering and this task can be assigned to no one else but myself. (my translation)

(Chowdhury 107)

Thus Tagore’s method of translating songs and poems are virtually identical. Radice also adopts the same method of rendering songs in Tagore’s *Card Country* (2008) which is replete with songs. Interestingly, he does not follow here the process of repeating line or lines as a refrain that he famously does in translating the ‘song-poems’ of *Gitanjali*. It needs to be mentioned here that the translation of the opening song contains a refrain [“Heave-ho / Heave-ho”] simply because there is a similar refrain in the original.

Surprisingly, this method of translation has been adopted by the translators of Tagore’s songs. In *I Won’t Let You Go* (1992) Ketaki Kushari Dyson seems to have adopted this method for translating twenty four songs for her anthology. She has kept the songs together in one section lest the readers forget that the originals have melodies and are meant to be sung. She renders Tagore’s songs in such a way that they look like the translations of poems in their printed forms. Here is a specimen from the translation of one of his famous songs:

I shall not beguile you with my beauty,
I shall beguile you with my love.
I shall not open the door with my hand,
but with my song I shall make it come open.

I shall not load you with the weight of jewels,
nor cover you with chains of flowers.
My tenderness will be the garland
with which I shall swing from your throat. (Dyson227)

The translation of this Tagore song is not basically different from the translation of a poem. One gets the same impression looking at the rendering of another song by Sukanta Chaudhuri. As the General Editor of *O T T* Prof. Chaudhuri takes up the complicated issue of translating songs in the *Preface to Selected Poems: Rabindranath Tagore* (2004), “The songs present a special problem. Even when *they are read on the printed page like any other poem*, closer study brings out a distinctive movement and texture that *resists rendering in another language*” (emphasis added) (Chaudhuri p. vii). In other words, Chaudhuri seems to imply that songs are generally untranslatable and that they look like poems having no melodies of their own in their printed forms. Melodies come alive only when the song is presented in a performance. Chaudhuri’s translation of Tagore’s songs also reads like poems. Here is an extract from the translation of a Tagore song:

I have been called to the joy-feast of this earth:

Blessed, O blessed is my human birth.

My eye surfeited roams

The palace of all forms,

My ear in sweet music is immersed.

I have part in your festival:

I play upon the flute,

Threading my tears and laughter

Upon my music’s note. (Tr. Sukanta Chaudhuri)

(Chaudhuri 199).

A careful study of the translations of Tagore songs quoted above is very likely to lead one to conclude that they can be considered as independent poems on the printed pages. In fact, the translation of a song-text in its printed form is identical to that of a poem and makes no difference unless and until it is taken up for vocal or instrumental rendition. It is against this theoretical background that Radice’s translations of Tagore’s *Gitanjali* (2011) poems are to be evaluated.

II

Radice's *Gitanjali* (2011) begins with the translation of the first poem of the Rothenstein manuscript ["This is my delight, thus to wait and watch"] preserved in Houghton library, Harvard University, and published in facsimile edition from Kolkata in 2009(Dey 1). He follows faithfully the order of arrangement of the poems in the original manuscript as it came from the poet himself. Unlike Tagore Radice does not render the poems of this manuscript in simple and poetic prose; he translates them in verse repeating lines and dividing the text into a four-part structure lest the target readers should forget that this is a song.

Radice's method of translation in this poem is both literal and interpretative. The rendering of the original in the first part of the poem is literal whereas it is interpretative in the remaining three parts of the poem. The first verse deals with the poet watching the road--
আমার এই পথ চাওয়াতেই আনন্দ. Radice is here literal ['I love to watch the road'] whereas Tagore is interpretative ['This is my delight, thus to wait and watch at the wayside']. Radice's fidelity is to the original but Tagore's to the interpretative sense of the original. Again, Radice's interpretation of the second verse is concise and true to the original. Thus the following lines of the original কাঁরা এই সমুখ দিয়ে / আসে যায় খবর নিয়ে, / খুঁসি রই আ পন মনে, /
বাতাস বহে সুমন্দ are rendered as "People pass to and fro bringing news' / I'm happy to live in my thoughts / when the breeze cools, / cools me gently". Tagore is here verbose and digressive in his interpretation of the lines: "Messengers, with tidings from unknown skies, greet me and speed along the road. My heart is glad within and the breath of the passing breeze is sweet". Again, Radice's rendering of শুভখন হঠাৎ এলে তখনি পাবো দেখা of the third verse is apt and conforms to the uncertain note of the original: "If the time comes for you to be suddenly here, / I'll see you". Conversely, Tagore sounds confident in his translation "I know the happy moment will arrive of a sudden when I will surely see"; for his perception is free from any trace of uncertainty. The conflict between the certainty and uncertainty of meeting casts its shadow on the translation of the last verse. Radice's rendering is filled with the 'scent' wafted by the breeze but still the uncertainty of the meeting lingers on whereas Tagore's translation breathes 'the perfume of promise' of a long-awaited meeting.

The poem with which the Macmillan text of *Gitanjali* begins is the third poem in Radice's book. His rendering of the first line of the original 'আমারে তুমি অশেষ করেছো এমনই লীলা তব' as 'You've made me limitless, it amuses you to do so' testifies to his literal-cum-free mode of translation here. In Radice's text the Bengali word অশেষ becomes 'limitless' and the Bengali expression 'এমনি লীলা তব' is turned into 'it amuses you to do so' in English. Words like 'অশেষ' and 'লীলা' seem to have *Upanishadic* overtones that Radice fails to capture in his rendering. Tagore who has his spiritual moorings in the *Upanishad* renders words such as 'অশেষ' and 'লীলা' in their literal senses giving one an impression of 'ভূমা' of the *Upanishad*. The *Upanishadic* associations of the two words give Tagore's translation of the line an edge over Radice's. Tagore's literal rendering of the first line confirms the truth of Nabokov's assertion made in a different context that sometimes 'literal translation is a thousand times more useful than the prettiest paraphrase' (Radice and Reynolds 89).

Unlike Tagore, Radice conveys the sense of the original in the second and fourth lines almost word for word. Tagore renders the second line by using the interpretative phrase 'frail vessel' and the fourth line with the help of the 'little flute of reed'. Radice's fidelity to the original here is simply literal rather than interpretative and he renders 'ছেট এ বাঁশিটিরে' as 'this little flute'. He is, again, literal but true to the spirit of the original in the remaining lines of the first verse except his rendering of the word 'তান' which becomes 'flourishes'. Tagore departs from the original transcreating a new line: ['Thou'] "hast breathed through it melodies eternally new". He misses out on the half-line 'কাহারে কব' and the word তান is transformed into "melodies eternally new". Thus Tagore's translation here becomes truncated because of his dropping of the part of the line whereas Radice's rendering is free from any such lapses. The third part of the poem deals with the effect of His 'অমৃত পরশ' on his soul. Radice's literal rendering acquaints the target readers with the flavour of the original whereas Tagore's imaginative and interpretative translation recreates the original with the vision of a poet. The 'অমৃত পরশ' is translated as the 'nectre-touch of yours' by Radice and 'immortal touch of thy hands' by Tagore respectively. It is under the impact of His 'অমৃত পরশ' that the heart, in Radice's rendering, gives way to boundless 'ecstasy' and 'words gush out' spontaneously. In

Tagore's translation, the heart loses its bound in extreme joy evoking 'utterance ineffable'. Here Radice remains faithful to the original but Tagore recreates, taking liberty with it. Both Radice and Tagore differ from each other in their rendering of the last verse. With the former the gifts come to his 'single cupped hand' and the recipient continues to receive them for many ages together. But in the case of the latter, the 'infinite gifts' of the Supreme One come on the 'small hands' of the recipient and He continues to pour them out for ever: "Ages pass and still thou pourest and still there is room to fill".

Poem no 6 of the Rothenstein manuscript is a representative Tagore poem that deals with 'the joy of finding the infinite in the finite and finite in the infinite', to quote the words of Tagore from *My Reminiscences* (1917), the English translation of *Jibansmriti* (1912) by Surendranath Tagore. Radice's mode of rendering in this 'song-poem' is literal as well as interpretative. The first verse of this poem has been rendered word for word while the second one has been done sense for sense. His renderings of 'পুরানো আবাস' as 'familiar surroundings' and of 'মনে ভেবে মরি কি জানি কি হবে' as *I worry about how it will be* are anything but literal. Tagore's translation of the two lines into a one-liner --- "I am uneasy at heart when I have to leave accustomed shelter" --- is interpretative rather than literal. His rendering of 'নূতনের মাঝে তুমি পুরাতন' as "the changeless old in the changing new" tends to surpass the original. Radice, on the other hand, is faithful to the original --- "[...] *amidst the new you are always there*" and the same is true of the remaining verses of the poem. As a creative writer, Tagore is under no compulsion to follow the original slavishly; he recreates it from time to time at the promptings of his creative imagination. This accounts for his creative interpretation in such lines as "...one companion of my endless life who ever linkest my heart with bonds of joy to the unfamiliar" and "I may never lose the bliss of the touch of the One in the play of the diverse many". The last verse shows Radice's fidelity to the original at its best whereas Tagore is at his creative best in the interpretation of the concluding lines.

In Radice's rendering of poem no 7 of the Rothenstein manuscript one finds an excellent combination of fidelity and freedom. This 'song-poem' which also deals with "the joy of finding the infinite in the finite" and *vice versa* does not have the repetition of lines that one

finds in his translations of Tagore's songs. The original song of Tagore's Bengali *Gitanjali* (1910) contains the repetition of the opening line –‘যাবার দিনে এই কথাটি বলে যেন যাই’---like a refrain. Surprisingly Radice's translation of the ‘song-poem’ is conspicuous by the absence of any such repetition.

Naturally, the first verse of this exquisite song is recreated in a verse-form that is obviously different from that of the original. Instead of using the rhyming couplet of the original Radice evolves a novel verse form in which the first two lines of the original are turned into four, with two brief lines in between the first and the fourth lines. Even though he tries to remain faithful to the original, he seems to have deviated a little in the fourth line in order to ensure its rhyme with the first line. Here is the first verse:

Let me pronounce these words the day I go :

Nothing compares

With what I've seen,

With what I've come to know. (Radice 12)

Radice follows the same rhyming pattern in the rest of the ‘song-poem’. In the fourth line of the first verse, he moves away from the original interpreting it in a different way. This results in a distinct translation shift through which the expression ‘যা পেয়েছি’ is transformed into “what I've come to know”. In Tagore's rendering this expression ‘যা পেয়েছি’ has been dropped making the translation truncated, for the line in the original is ‘যা দেখেছি যা পেয়েছি তুলনা তার নাই’ ---“what I have seen is unsurpassed”. Thus what one finds in Tagore's rendering is translation loss rather than translation shift.

Even though the second and third verses of this ‘song-poem’ in Radice's translation expresses the joy of discovering the infinite in the finite and *vice versa*, his mode of rendering is surprisingly literal. The literal mode of rendering that Radice adopts cannot always capture and convey the poetic and imaginative beauty of the original. His translation of the following lines of this poem deserves special consideration:

বিশ্বরূপের খেলাঘরে কতই গেলেম খেলে,
অপরূপকে দেখে গেলেম দুটি নয়ন মেলে।

This world of forms
In which I've played
Allows what has no form to show
Its Beauty. (*Ibid* 13)

Radice's rendering of the two Bengali lines quoted above is prosaic and unimaginative whereas Tagore's translation of them poetic and imaginative: "In this playhouse of infinite forms I have had my play and here have I caught sight of him that eludes all forms". Thus he recaptures in his rendering something of the 'poetic' essence that Radice fails to convey in his literal representation of the original. The poetic prose used by Tagore in the rendering of *Gitanjali* poems is more poetic and imaginative than Radice's rhymed verse and corresponding verse form.

The poem 9(22)--- 'আজি শ্রাবণ-ঘন গহন-মোহে' ---is 'a perfect lyric', haunting in metre, rhyme and alliteration (Bose17). Radice's mode of rendering here is almost literal. His translation of the first line--- 'আজি শ্রাবণ-ঘন গহন-মোহে'--- as 'In the murky chaos of Shraban' seems to be misleading. The expression 'murky chaos of Shraban' fails to convey the note of 'deep dark enchantment' that is associated with the Bengali expression 'শ্রাবণ-ঘন গহন-মোহে'. Tagore's rendering of the line as 'the deep shadow of the rainy July' seems to have captured something of the original. Radice retains the Bengali term 'শ্রাবণ' in his translation whereas Tagore changes it into 'the rainy July' to convey to the Western readers the exact point of time he has in view. Again, Radice's interpretative translation of 'নিলাজ নীল আকাশ ঢাকি নিবিড় মেঘ কে দিল মেলে' as 'Someone has draped in dense cloud the innocent blue of the sky' succeeds in capturing the sense of 'নিলাজ নীল' whereas Tagore's phrase 'ever wakeful blue sky' seems to have moved away from the original. Radice may have in his mind the innocence of Adam and Eve before their Fall when they did not have the sense of shame that

generally comes to us with experience. His translation of the word নিলাজ as 'innocent' carries with it the biblical sense of the Bengali word.

Radice's fidelity to the original in the last stanza of the poem is literal whereas Tagore's imaginative. For Radice 'কূজনহীন কাননভূমি' becomes 'The woods are empty of birdsong'. With Tagore the line is imaginatively transformed into 'The woodlands have hushed their songs'. He recreates the original here without deviating from its spirit. Radice's almost word for word rendering in the last line stands in sharp contrast to Tagore's free translation. The former renders the last line as 'Do not ignore me, do not fade like a dream' whereas the latter translates it as 'do not pass by like a dream'. Radice is here literal in his rendering whereas Tagore imaginative.

Poem no 10 of the English *Gitanjali* is one of the best poems rendered by the poet himself. This poem has also been translated by William Radice for his *Gitanjali* (2011) and it is one of the best translations of Tagore poems he has ever done. His mode of rendering in this poem is quasi-literal. He succeeds in capturing the essential spirit of the original so faithfully that the English rendering of the poem may be called, in the words of Walter Benzamin, an example of 'transparent translation' (Benzamin 1992).

Radice's line-by-line translation of the first verse stands in sharp contrast to Tagore's free rendering of the original. He retains the five lines of the first verse in his rendering whereas Tagore abridges them into a single line in poetic prose:

Humbler than all and lower than the low
That is the place where your feet reign
 Behind all, beneath all
Among those who have lost all
Humbler than all and lower than the low (Ibid 35)

Here is thy footstall and there rest thy feet where live the poorest and lowliest and lost.
(Tagore 26)

Radice's mode of translation here is at its literal best and he succeeds in carrying over the spirit of the original from the SLT to the TLT. In his attempt to recapture the 'feelings and sentiments' of the original Tagore deviates from the SLT re-creating it in the receptor language. Even though Tagore's phrase 'the poorest and lowliest and lost' may have its special effect in the target language, it fails as an adequate equivalent for 'সবার অধম, দীনের থেকে দীন' and 'সবহারা' of the original. Radice's literal rendering of the verse, repeating the first line 'Humbler than all and lower than the low' as a refrain seems to have captured the spirit of the original. Despite the use of his imaginative phrase 'the poorest and lowliest and lost' Tagore's translation of this verse fails to convey the spirit of the SLT.

The second verse of the poem brings out the pitfalls of literal rendering. In spite of Radice's best efforts his rendering of the first two lines cannot attain the spontaneity and readability that Tagore's translation seems to have achieved:

I bow down before you
but my bending gets stuck somewhere
It doesn't reach down to the place below shame
where your feet reach
Behind all, beneath all
Among those who have lost all
Humbler than all and lower than the low (Ibid 26)

Tagore's translation of the above verse is as follows:

When I try to bow to thee my obeisance cannot reach down to the depth where
thy feet rest among the poorest and lowliest and lost. (Ibid 26)

Radice's rendering of the original lines 'তোমার চরণ যেথায় নামে অপমানের তলে/ সেথায় আমার প্রণাম নামে না যে' into 'It does not reach down to the place below shame / where your feet reach' is literally accurate but lacks fluency. His use of the last three lines of each verse as a refrain makes an aesthetic effect corresponding to that of the original. Tagore achieves a certain measure of spontaneity at the cost of accuracy in the following line: 'When I try to

bow to thee my obeisance cannot reach down to the depth where thy feet rest'. He fails to 'carry across' the expression 'অপমানের তলে' in the TL and his rendering suffers from translation loss. Radice seldom suffers from this type of loss as long as he sticks to literal mode of rendering. But when he deviates from the literal mode, he becomes interpretative at the expense of translation loss. His rendering of the first line of the next verse is interpretative. The original lines are as follows: 'ধনে মানে যেথায় আছো ভরি/ সেথায় তোমার সঙ্গ আশা করি' and Radice interprets them as 'We count on companionship with you / in places of wealth and grandeur'. His rendering of 'ধনে মানে' as 'wealth and grandeur' is an example of translation loss, for the word 'grandeur' cannot convey the sense of 'মানে' of the original. Thus he attempts to interpret the phrase 'ধনে মানে' at the risk of translation loss whereas Tagore drops the two lines altogether making his rendering truncated.

Poem no. 17 beginning with 'When the heart is hard and parched up come upon me with a shower of mercy' is one of the famous poems of *Gitanjali* rendered in poetic prose by Tagore. Radice translates this 'song-poem' in verse form repeating the key lines and dividing it into four parts. His method of translation is, on the whole, literal but it rises, at times, to the interpretative level depending on the context of the poem. His rendering of the first verse of this devotional poem is literal:

When the life in me dries up
Come with a stream of kindness
When the sweetness in me disappears
Come with a song's nectar (Ibid 26)

Radice's rendering of 'গীতসুধারসে এসো' as 'Come with a song's nectar' is very likely to give one an aesthetic jolt. Tagore's translation of this line --- 'come with a burst of song' ---- comes closer to the original producing an aesthetic sense. Tagore's 'come with a burst of song' is more readable and fluent than Radice's 'Come with a song's nectar'.

Radice finds the original verse so imaginative that he cannot render it literally. Accordingly, he translates the verse interpretatively.

When my work becomes menacing
and crowds me all round
with its roaring
Steal into my heart, O quiet Lord,
with noiseless steps. (Ibid 26-27)

He follows the spirit of the original faithfully in the first line of the above verse and interprets the second line creatively. He invokes the 'lord of quiet' to 'steal' into the heart on tiptoe. Compared to Tagore's rendering ['come to me, my lord of silence, with thy peace and rest'] Radice's is more direct and more faithful.

In the third and fourth verses of the poem there are translation shifts and the translator is found to be at his interpretative best here. Radice makes use of the translation shifts not merely to "change" the last two verses but to recreate them as organic whole. His interpretation of 'দীনহীন মন' as 'miserable mind' is intended to show that the poet is a prisoner of a selfish world. Radice's rendering of the line 'আপনারে যবে করিয়া কৃপণ' implies the poet's imprisonment in a selfish world and his prayer for flinging open the door indicates his longing for liberation. This idea seems to have been conveyed by the translator through translation shift. His prayer to the Lord to break open the door is the emancipation the poet is here looking forward to. One needs to have a look at the concluding Bengali verse to grasp the nature and implications of another translation shift that gives it an interpretative twist. Here is the original Bengali verse:

বাসনা যখন বিপুল ধুলায়
অন্ধ করিয়া অবোধে ভুলায়
ওহে পবিত্র, ওহে অনিদ্র,
রুদ্ধ আলোকে এসো।

In his rendering of the last verse Radice's imagination is at its exuberant best. He deviates from the original in translating the following lines – ‘বাসনা যখন বিপুল ধূলায়/ অন্ধ করিয়া অবোধে
ধূলায়/ ওহে পবিত্র, ওহে অনিদ্র,/ রুদ্ধ আলোকে এসো’ – and ends up transcreating them as “When my stupid cravings / blind and entomb me / in mountains of dust’/ Come, O pure and unsleeping Lord, / with explosions of light”. But he fails to carry across the expression ‘অবোধে ধূলায়’ in the target language and there is inevitably a *translation loss* here. Tagore's rendering of the last verse is comparatively more fluent and more faithful than Radice's: “When desire blinds the mind with delusion and dust, O thou holy one, thou wakeful, come with thy light of thunder”.

Poem no 28 is a famous poem of *Gitanjali* that takes the poet-quester to the toiling masses in his quest for God, far from the lonely dark corner of a temple. This is one of the poems successfully rendered by Radice for his *Gitanjali* (2011) following the Rothenstein manuscript. His mode of translation is both literal and creative. One distinguishing mark of this poem is its absence of repetition of lines or words and the four-part structure that characterize a typical ‘song-poem’ of Tagore's *Gitanjali* (1912). His method of rendering in this ‘song-poem’ is in many ways similar to that followed by Radice in his *Selected Poems* (1985) of Tagore.

Radice renders the first verse of the poem following the rhyme pattern – *a a b b a* -- of the original faithfully. His mode of rendering is marked by fidelity and freedom. He interprets the first line in keeping with the spirit of the original and re-creates the fourth line departing from it. Tagore translates the line literally [“Whom dost thou worship in this lonely dark corner of a temple...?”] whereas Radice transcreates the line with a hint at the ‘বর’ (gift) associated with ‘পূজা’ [“What pooja object do you seek?”]. Even the arrangement of the lines of the original has been followed in this poem with utmost fidelity. Let us compare the first verse of the original with its rendering to clarify the point:

ভজন পূজন সাধন আরাধনা

সমস্ত থাক পড়ে।

রুদ্ধদ্বারে দেবালয়ের কোণে

কেন আছিস ওরে

অন্ধকারে লুকিয়ে আপন মনে

কাহারে তুই পূজিস সংগোপনে,

নয়ন মেলে দেখ দেখি তুই চেয়ে

দেবতা নাই যবে।

Prayer and worship and rite ---

cast them aside.

In a nook of the closed temple,

why hide?

Groping in your mind's dark,

What pooja-object do you seek?

Open your eyes and look:

God does not stay inside. (Ibid 40).

Radice has taken liberty with the punctuation of the original in order to re-create the poem drawing on the 'feelings and sentiments' of the original.

In the second and third verses of the poem Radice maintains the same rhyme pattern as in the first[*aa bb a*] and takes liberty at times with the original in order to preserve the rhyme pattern. He is required to render 'রৌদ্রজলে' as 'the flood and the heat' and 'ধূলা' as 'dirt' for maintaining the end rhyme of this couplet. He is compelled to use the English word 'shirt' as the equivalent for 'শ্চিত্রবসন' only to ensure rhyme with 'heat' and 'dirt': "He's there in the flood and the heat; / His hands are plastered with dirt; / Be like him, strip off your shirt to be level with all". Radice also attempts to have far-fetched rhyme in the third and fourth lines of the third verse: "Forget about trances or poojas; / Throw away trays of flowers". The concept of 'মুক্তি' in Indian Culture has got a deeper meaning than the word 'Release'. Tagore's word

'Deliverance' is capable of conveying much of the spiritual nuance of the word 'বুক্তি'. The last line of the poem is marked by a *translation loss*; for there is no equivalent for the word 'কর্মযোগ' in English vocabulary. Tagore strives to convey the sense of the word through 'toil' and 'sweat' whereas Radice tries to carry it across suggestively ['get grimy, get sweaty']. But the expression 'কর্মযোগে তার সাথে এক হয়ে' of the original cannot be carried across in the target language simply because there is no adequate equivalent for the culture –specific word 'কর্মযোগ'.

Poem no.72 (35) is one of the sonnets from *নৈবেদ্য* that Tagore translates for his *Gitanjali* in poetic prose with no paragraph breaks at all. He does not feel the need for retaining the sonnet form in his rendering; for he seems to have shared Nida's view that the translation should lay emphasize on the 'the reproduction of the message rather than the conservation of the form of the utterance' (Nida 12). This poem enjoys such a world-wide popularity that it has no equal among the *Gitanjali* poems transcreated by the poet. Another unique feature of this poem is that a fourteen-line sonnet has been transformed by Tagore into a prose-poem consisting of a long complex sentence. Radice's fresh attempt at rendering the poem may give rise to a strong cavil in some quarters about the rationale of translating the poem again. The original poem is a sonnet in rhymed couplet, having a distinct octave-sestet division and Radice rewrites it after the English or Shakespearean sonnet form following the rhyme scheme of *a b a b, c d c d, e f e f, g g*.

Radice's rendering of the poem is more interpretative than literal. Instead of word-for-word adherence to the original, he interprets the 'place' the sonnet revolves around from an objective point of view. Conversely, Tagore's mode of rendering is literal as well as creative and he gives his interpretation of the place from a subjective point of view. For Radice, the place is a 'fearless' one where everyone is free to move about and share knowledge; Tagore visualizes it as one where 'the mind is without fear and the head is held high'. Radice's rendering of the line 'যেথা বাক্য হৃদয়ের উৎসসুখ হ'তে উচ্ছসিয়া উঠে' as 'Where speech wells from the heart' is marked by *translation loss* whereas Tagore's translation of the line ['where words come out from the depth of truth'] is more interpretative and closer to the original than

Radice's. The next three lines of the original --- 'যেথা নিৰ্ব্বাৰিত শোভে/ দেশে দেশে দিশে দিশে
কৰ্মধারা ধায়/ অজস্র সহস্রবিধ চরিতার্থায়' --- contains an image of the stream of a river. Radice
carries across the image, though his rendering here is verbose and roundabout. Tagore's
translation of the line is marked by a note of spontaneity, even though the image of the
stream is lost and hint of a new image is suggested ['stretches its arms'] in its place.

Radice's literal rendering of the closing couplet of the poem stands in sharp contrast to
Tagore's creative translation. The manuscript of the original *Gitanjali* contained the
rendering of 'ভারতেরে সেই স্বর্গে কর জাগরিত' ['there waken up my country into that heaven of
freedom, my father!'] dropping the penultimate line. The editor of *Gitanjali* here intervenes
and the poet rewrites the last line as 'Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country
awake'. In the manuscript version the poet's prayer was for India, the land of his own birth.
But with the replacement of 'India' by 'my country', the poem became, at once, a hymn of
universal patriotic feelings for 'Everyman' transcending the narrow geographical boundary.
The poet's creative rendering coupled with this editorial intervention have made this poem 'a
miracle of translation' ---- a miracle that seems to have eluded Radice.

Poem no. 60 of the published text [also known as poem no. 12 of the Additional poems] is
one of the great poems that Tagore rendered for his *Gitanjali* before his departure for
England in 1912. This happens to be the title poem from Tagore's *Shishu*, a book of poems
for children and its prose translation by the poet was later included in *The Crescent Moon*.
The translation of this poem from *Gitanjali* ranks as one of the best by Radice. It is a poem of
five stanzas rendered in verse with each stanza following the rhyme scheme of *a b b a a* .
Radice's mode of rendering is both literal and creative. He transforms the Bengali poem into
a new independent poem in English drawing on the 'feelings and sentiments' of the original.

Radice's fidelity to the original is imaginative so far as his re-creation of the first verse is
concerned. In his attempt to rewrite the poem Radice 'manipulates' the original text in order
to adapt his text to its rhyme scheme. In the first line he does not hesitate to take recourse to a
translation shift to ensure its rhyme with the 4th and 5th lines of the original. Let us take a
look at the Bengali original and its rendering by Radice:

জগৎ-পারাবারের তীরে
ছেলেরা করে মেলা ।
অন্তহীন গগনতল
মাথার 'পরে অচঞ্চল,
ফেনিল ওই সুনীল জল
নাচিছে সারা বেলা।
উঠিছে তটে কী কোলাহল –
ছেলেরা করে মেলা।

On the shore of the world-sea,
Children play.
Endless sky stretching
Above their heads unmoving;
Deep blue water foaming ---
Dances all day.
Merrily on the shore
They meet and play (Ibid 131)

Since Tagore renders the poem in poetic prose, he does not feel the need of following any such rhyme scheme. He transcreates the first verse drawing on his intuitive impression of the original. This makes his renderings widely different from Radice's. Radice translates 'জগৎ পারাবার' as 'world-sea' whereas Tagore renders it as 'endless worlds'. The third line 'ফেনিল ওই সুনীল জল নাচিছে সারাবেলা' which has been literally translated ['Deep blue water foaming - - /Dances all day'.] by Radice was transcreated in a truncated form ['the restless water is boisterous'] by Tagore. Consequently, something is definitely lost from his rendering but he succeeded in conveying the inner sense of the original line. In the translation of last line of the first verse, Radice is at his precise best whereas Tagore is at his interpretative best.

In translating *Gitanjali* poems Radice's mode of rendering is mostly literal but he switches over to the interpretative mode from time to time depending on the exigency of the text. The

houses made by the children on the shore with sands have been interpreted by Radice as 'sandcastles'. The rafts and toy-boats made by them with withered leaves are floated on the 'vast blue water' and the interpolated line 'While ocean swells' is added to the verse for the sake of rhyme. The original contains no such lines or expressions as to defend the interpolation in the target text. Again, this line seems to convey an interpretative significance against the background of the swelling ocean. In the last line of the verse Radice alters the refrain of the original --- 'জগত্ পাবারের তীরে ছেলেরা করে খেলা' ---to suit the rhyme scheme of the poem "On the shore of the world –sea, / They join to play". The replacement of the Bengali line 'ছেলেরা করে খেলা' ['Children play'] by the English expression 'They join to play' constitutes a translation shift which is interpretative. Radice makes use of this translation method in the remaining two verses of this poem. Thus he tries to enact the creative joy out of which his songs are born and ends up writing a parallel text.

While evaluating Nirendranath Roy's rendering of Shelley's poem "One Word Too Often Profaned" Tagore sums up the basic concepts of modern translation, "If one attempts to make the translation as comprehensible as possible, it is rather difficult to cast it perfectly in the mould of the original. It [your rendering] has been to some extent analogous rather than identical to the original" (my translation) (DasGupta & Ghose 1962). What Tagore implies here is that translation of a poem can never be the same as the original and that it can at best be 'analogous [^{অনুরূপ}anurup]' rather than identical [^{প্রতিরূপ}pratirup] with it. One also finds confirmation of this view in Octavio Paz's assertion, "the translator must compose a poem analogous to the original" (Paz 159), for what he seeks to achieve in his translation effort is, in the words of Nida, 'equivalence rather than identity' (Nida 120). Radice's translations of *Gitanjali* poems are, therefore, 'analogous' rather than identical with their originals. .

III

In his oft-quoted letter to Indira Devi, Tagore tells her what he proposes to do in his translation of *Gitanjali* poems, "I simply felt an urge to recapture through the medium of another language the feelings and sentiments which had created such a feast of joy within me in the days gone by" (Chakravarty 21). Accordingly, he re-created the 'feelings and

sentiments' of the original *Gitanjali* (1910) in his 'English' renderings and handed over his manuscript to Rothenstein who then sent it to W.B. Yeats for his editorial supervision. Yeats edited the *Gitanjali* poems altering their sequence, paragraphing, punctuation and choice of words wherever he felt it necessary. Above all, he wrote an impassioned introduction to *Gitanjali* so as to influence its appreciation and reception in the West. According to Radice, Yeats is responsible for distorting the 'real *Gitanjali*' that Tagore originally conceived it to be. It is through his fresh rendering of the poems of the Rothenstein manuscript that Radice tries to recover to Tagore 'the real *Gitanjali*' that Yeats allegedly took away from him.

Now the question is how far Radice's charge against Yeats is based on facts and how Tagore would have reacted to this charge even if it were true. Interestingly, Radice cannot put forward any incontrovertible proof in support of his charge. In his Introduction to *Gitanjali* he says, "*I do believe* that the changes that Yeats made --- to the order and selection of the poems, to the paragraphing, to the punctuation, and above all to Tagore's choice of words and phrases ---would have contributed to Tagore's growing feeling over time that in the English *Gitanjali*, as presented and edited by Yeats, he had betrayed his true self" (emphasis added) (Radice p. lvi). He levels this charge against Yeats solely on the basis of his intuitive belief ['I do believe'] rather than any solid arguments. Secondly, he found out altogether 326 changes which were basically of minor nature. Moreover, in certain cases, the changes heighten the effect of the poems, as for example, the sonnet 'Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high'. But how can they alter the 'the real *Gitanjali*' distorting its mood and spirit? Had it been so Tagore would certainly have registered his protest as he did when Robert Bridges made certain alterations in one of Tagore's poems from *Gitanjali* to be included in a proposed anthology to be made by him. He was not at all happy about the Introduction to *Gitanjali* written by Yeats and did not mince words to convey his unhappiness about it in a letter to Jagadananda, 18 September 1912. But nowhere did he utter a single word about the alleged 'twisting' of the original intention and mood of the *Gitanjali* poems. In a letter to Edward Thompson (18 Nov.1913) Tagore expresses his gratitude to Yeats for what he did for the English *Gitanjali* poems, "...I think that the method that Yeats followed while editing my book was the right one in selecting those poems that required least alterations and rejecting others in spite of their merits"(DasGupta 165. In his essay "On the

(Nov. 1977 - April 1978)

Autograph Manuscript”[^] Shyamal Kumar Sarkar makes a detailed examination of the Rothenstein manuscript and the printed text of *Gitanjali* but finds no such distortion as claimed by Radice. He, therefore, concludes his study by referring to Tagore’s acknowledgement of Yeats’s ‘literary comradeship’ for the ‘foreign reincarnation’ of the *Gitanjali* poems in his letter (26 November 1926) to Rothenstein (Sarkar 31).

Radice’s main objective of rendering Tagore’s *Gitanjali* afresh is to give the foreign readers a taste of the ‘real *Gitanjali*’.. As the original writer, even Tagore cannot ‘revive’ or ‘re-enact’ the creative process, let alone the translator. This is as much true of the meaning of a creative work as of its other constituent parts. Though the *Gitanjali* poems have been praised by Buddhadev Bose as a ‘miracle of translation’ (1948), even Tagore could not give us the taste of the original but ended up capturing only the ‘echo of the original’. In an important article ‘Tagore in Translation’ Bose characterized the English *Gitanjali* as ‘a by-product’ (Bose 25) of the original. If the original writer rendering the Source Text (ST) cannot give us the taste of ‘the real *Gitanjali*’, how can a third-person translator hope to do so?

Secondly, from theoretical point of view, Radice’s claim is not at all tenable. A translation can never be identical with the original. According to Nida: “The basic principles of translation mean that no translation in a receptor language can be the exact equivalent of the model in the source language” (Nida 27). He cites three things that all types of translation involves: (1) ‘loss of information’, (2) ‘addition of information’, and (3) ‘skewing of information’ (*Ibid* 27). In other words, the translator cannot carry across everything of the original and loses something during its transfer from the SLT to the TLT. Secondly, in his attempt to interpret the original he needs to add some words or expressions to make the rendering fluent and readable. Lastly, he has to ‘manipulate’ the original to adapt it to his understanding, purpose and vision. Consequently, the translation undergoes a transmutation and deviates from the original. One finds a plethora of translation losses, translation shifts and attempts at domesticating words or ideas of the original in Radice’s rendering of the *Gitanjali* poems. Thus, his translation, however excellent, can never give us the real taste of Tagore’s ‘original *Gitanjali*’ in Bengali. Tagore was well aware of the limitations of translations. “A translation”, he says, [in an interview to Musical America, 27 Nov 1920]

“may be a re-incarnation but it cannot be identical” (Lal 110). Radice’s *Gitanjali* may be the re-incarnation of but cannot be ‘identical’ with the original, however competent the rendering is. Again, Harish Trivedi complimented Radice for creating ‘a third Tagore’ in his Tagore translations. Accepting Trivedi’s compliment Radice says, “As well as the Bengali Rabindranath and the English Tagore, a third Tagore was being revealed by me and other translators” (Radice76). If Radice and his contemporary translators are revealing ‘a third Tagore’ in their translations, how can he hope to give us the taste of the ‘real Tagore’ / (does he mean the first Tagore?] in his rendering of *Gitanjali* ?

Note:

All citations from Tagore’s Bengali and English *Gitanjali* to be found in this article have been taken from *Gitanjali: Song Offerings* – Rabindranath Tagore (bilingual edition) edited by Subhankar Bhattacharyya and Mayukh Chakraborty (Parul) 2007.