
“Chutnifying the Translation: An Act of Drinking New Wine from a New Bottle”

¹Dr. Amit R. Prajapati

Professor, Department of English, Veer Narmad South Gujarat University,
Udhna-Magdalla Road, Surat.

Article Received: 17/11/2025

Article Accepted: 18/12/2025

Published Online: 19/12/2025

DOI:10.47311/IJOES.2025.7.12.264

Abstract:

What is chutnification? Can the word ‘chutnification’ be applied to Translation Studies? This research paper attempts to introduce the term ‘chutnification’, for the very first time introduced by Salman Rushdie in the context of *Midnight’s Children*, to Translation Studies with an intention to examine whether chutnifying the activity of translation results into the benefits or losses, exploring the infusions of the contexts of Indian cultural and linguistic elements into English and vice a versa. Chutnification creates a hybrid mode of translation which highlights the post-colonial identity and localized sense of sensibility. It is argued to suggest how chutnified translation transcends even the code-mixing, operating at a creative level to decolonize the monopoly of some ‘standard’ language, transforming it into Indianized colour and culture. The study of Translation Studies projects that translation gains due to the practice of chutnification. The term ‘chutnification’ aligns with theories like domestication, foreignization etc. The fear that chutnifying translation can chutnify literature can’t be ignored.

Key Words: chutnification, domestication, foreignization, culture, poly-system

Introduction:

Chutnification may perhaps lead one to more towards the study of cultural aspects/concepts where parallels in the target language are nearly impossible, particularly, with reference to the culture of India which is more mythical and therefore mysterious. The unavailability of the presence of the same register of the Source Language Text in the Target Language Text results into thinking otherwise on the part of the translator of a given text. Looking at ‘chutnification’ and ‘Translation Studies’ simultaneously, one cannot deny thinking about the relationship between the two since both the terms belongs to different

registers of use. Chutnification refers to a type of the creation of the compound word with the help of two different languages whereas translation refers to the transfer of the meaning of some statement available in the Source Language Text into the Target Language Text. However, the affinity and assimilation between the two cannot be neglected either directly or indirectly.

Necessity of Chutnification:

One cannot do away with the need and demand of chutnification pressurized by cultural exposure of a Source Language Text. The universality and globalization of English as a language of the colonizers opens up the new horizon of complexity about identity and culture. Especially, Indian writers have always confronted the supremacy and legacy of colonizing language. It has always been a challenge to produce our emotional crises into a foreign language like English. The significant point one has to remember is that most of the theories of translation written are more or less the Western basically in their behaviour, practice and methodology as well, therefore they don't help more in the act of translation of the ancient as well as the modern Indian texts into English. Harish Trivedi rightly notes, "What we don't yet have in India is a theory or theories of translation. This may be because . . . we have been practicing translation for so many years—So many centuries—in fact, that we forgot to stop and theorize" (Trivedi 1999: 36).

During the same phase, the emergence of chutnification as a new type of Indian theory applicable to especially Translation Studies has helped the translators realize and solve their problem to an extent. When one translates an Indian text, one doesn't always feel the need of the Western theories to be followed or applied, and even if one wants to use them, many of such theories are not conducive for Indian culturally and religiously loaded texts to be applied. Hence, the translator requires chutnification.

Sujit Mukherjee, the translator of Tagore, argues Harish Trivedi in his book *Translation as Recovery*, did not approve of the use of any theory while translating practically. As Trivedi noted in the "Introduction" of the book what Mukherjee has said about himself, "He had a strong distaste for arid and superior theory and firmly believed that only those who actually practiced had a right to preach or perhaps even to open their mouths (Trivedi, 2004: 14). Further, in the same book what Mukherjee has noted about his personal experience of translating a text has been noted by Harish Trivedi: "However, I must not prescribe a theory nor labour to formulate one to justify what I have deduced from the practice. Once when I had the opportunity, I pontificated (actually, wrote) 'I have no theory of translation. I leave such theories to those who do not translate'. But even the mere practice of translation does not throw up a variety of issues that a better qualified person than I would surely be able to lodge at theoretical levels" (Trivedi 2004: 39).

The translator is very often likely to fall into the trap of improving the Source Language Text. Any translator always needs to be carefully vigilant not to be misguided by

misrepresenting rather than presenting the Source Language Text into the Target Language Text with fidelity. Yes, cultural boundaries of two different nations may hamper not only the thought process but also the practice in the act of translation. Developing the foundation in Translation Studies established by Catford, Halliday, Nida, Newmark etc. Roger Bell, Mona Baker, Basil Hatim, Hans Veemeer and others have, in words of Susan Bassnett, “done a great deal to break the boundaries between disciplines and to move translation studies on from a position of possible confrontation’ (Bassnett, 2005: 3).

Chutnification: Its Name, Notion and Nature:

Most of the critics of Indian literature in English and those of Translation Studies consider Salman Rushdie as the pioneer who for the very first time used the word ‘chutnification’ in his creative work *Midnight’s Children* (1981). Arti Gupta writes, “Salman Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children*, a post-colonial novel has attracted the attention of many critics for its remarkable use of language and the blending of history and story. The writer’s use of the expression “Chutnification” epitomizes his use of language in the novel. He has created a language of his own that transcends any English that has been spiced with Indian words and expressions. Since then the plethora of writers adopted this in their works contributing in Indianisation of the English language. Besides, this is widely accepted in day to day conversation” (Gupta 2018: 25). The benefit of chutnification, according to Deepa Thomas is more that provides a tasty flavour to the works and words of Salman Rushdie. Deepa Thomas writes, “The process of chutnification of English provides a tasty flavour to Rushdie’s works, which is obviously made possible through the abundant blending of Hindi and Urdu words with English, thereby reflecting India’s hybrid culture” (Thomas 2019: 10).

While using the word ‘chutny’ which is a type of mixture of some eatable ingredients, Rushdie writes in his novel *Midnight’s Children*, “. . . the feasibility of the chutnification of the history; the grand hope of the prickling of time! I, however, have prickled chapters. . . What is required for chutnification? Raw materials, obviously-fruit, vegetables, fish, vinegar, spikes” (Rushdie 1981: 268). After beginning chutnifying English, Salman Rushdie declared in his *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism, 1981-1991*, “The English language ceased to be the sole possession of the English some time ago” (Rushdie 1991: 64). This very statement made by Rushdie in 1991, after ten years after the publication of his novel *Midnight’s Children* in 1981, indirectly establishes the use of the term ‘chutnification’ in Indian English literature at least. While explaining the word ‘chutny’, Sarala Krishnamurthy says, “Chutney” is an Indian dish, which is a side dish and tangy, adding flavour to the main course of any meal. “Chutney” is a noun form and is understood as such in English. By adding “-fication”, Rushdie changes an Indian word into an English one to stand for transformation. Therefore “Chutnification” in the novel means transformation of English having an additional connotation of making the language used in the novel tangy and more flavoursome and exciting” (Krishnamurthy 2010: 366).

The very idea of chutnification has been associated to ‘neologism’ meaning a new word to express a new meaning which is not the regular meaning of the same word or an

invention of a new word. Sarala Krishnamurthy says while quoting Simpson, “Simpson (2007) has drawn attention to the fact that foregrounding devolves around the concept of a norm which is difficult to define” (Krishnamurthy 2010: 366). To quote the view of Simpson about foregrounding from his own text *Stylistics* directly, ““a form of textual patterning which is motivated for literary aesthetic purpose” (Simpson: 2007:50).

(Chutnification: Its Function:

The function of chutnification has been very distinct with reference to Translation Studies. Chutnification not only lends the local colour to the act of creativity or re-creativity or trans-creativity, but it also functions as a type of decolonizing force for dominion of language and constructive force for localization. It enables a writer or a translator to reclaim and to Indianize English to express culturally loaded experiences in such a way as they might appeal to the sensitivity of the readers. The very concept of chutnification focuses largely on inter-lingual translation rather than intra-lingual with a view to Translation Studies.

The function of the translator is, “to fix words in an ideal, unchangeable for and it is the task of the translator to liberate those words from the confines of their source language and allow them to live again in the language into which they are translated. In consequence, the old arguments about the need to be faithful to an original start to dissolve” (Bassnett, 2005: 5). This thinking allows us to look at the Source Language Text and Target Language Text, both as original and translation as equally creative, as Octavio Paz has already focused on the equality between the translator and the creative artist in his essay “Translation: Literature and Letters” (1992) what Susan Bassnett has said about in her *Translation Studies*.

The use of English by Salman Rushdie established the new English, may be an Indian English, perhaps! As an activity of resistance, Rushdie reforms the colonial language to decolonize. In order to capture the spirit of India and Indianness, Rushdie, according to Sisir Kumar Chatterjee, attempts to destroy “the natural rhythms of the English language” (Chatterjee 2004: 253). This very act and intention of Salman Rushdie establishes the significant function of chutnification. Fries clearly mentions as cited by Deepa Thomas, “Rushdie, unlike the novelists who preceded him, uses the hybrid, pan-Indian “Hinglish” to communicate the worldview and emotions of his characters” (Fries, 2005). Comparing, Salman Rushdie with Raja Rao, Tabish Khair writes, “Rushdie is mostly trying to appropriate a kind of Indian English that his characters are supposed to speak while Rao is mostly translating the vernacular spoken by his characters” (Khair 2005: 110). Very briefly to mention Meenakshi Mukherjee, “Rushdie took ‘linguistic risks’ that with utter abandon, defining them as getting away with the use of the mongrel street language of cities, daring to translate idioms and puns mediated by no apology, no footnote, no glossary” (Mukherjee, 2003, p.10).

Thus, it cannot be impossible to conjecture that by chutnifying the English language, Rushdie actually Indianizes the English language as a form of decolonisation. This

chutnification can't only be treated as merely the code-mixing or simply borrowing when necessary but it is an attempt of creating a type of Indianized Hinglish linguistic stratagem. The word 'chutnification' has become so famous in the contemporary time that to quote Rajpal, "The 'chutnification' of English will not be seen through the purist perspective but will be seen through anti-colonial perspective" ("Popular Indian Culture").

Concept of Domestication:

This is the type of the theory advocated by Lawrence Venuti in his book *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (1995; rev. ed. 2008), which is opposite to foreignization, i.e. in the other sense 'chutnification'. Domestication allows the translator to reduce the foreignness of the Source Language Text, therefore, this strategy / theory stands opposite to the very idea of chutnification. This strategy attempts to adapt the Source Language Text to the Target Language Text by linguistic values and cultural values to be equivalent. This theory renders the translator invisible in the result of the Target Language Text. While defining the domestication, Venuti writes, "A translated text, whether prose or poetry, fiction or nonfiction, is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers, and readers when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention" (Venuti 2008: 1). Further, Venuti adds that domestication is "an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home" on the other hand the very act of chutnification, though used in the creative sense by Rushdie but when applied to the act of translation, permits more foreign words to be present in the Target Language Text (Venuti 2008: 15).

Even the very idea to domesticate cannot be more welcome depending on the difficulty level of the type of the cultural text loaded with cultural lexis is being translated. The translation of a literary text involves not only the transaction between two languages, a type of linguistic substitution, but a sort of complex negotiation between the two complex cultures involved. To quote Harish Trivedi, "The unit of translation was no longer a word or a sentence or a paragraph or a page or even a text, but indeed the whole language and culture in which that text was constituted (Trivedi, 2005: 254). The very argument by Harish Trivedi exemplifies the very complex nature of translation activity in relation to the complex nature of the culture involved in the Source Language Text. Domestication may unify the text with the culture of the Target Language Text, however at the cost of the lost of reduced culture of the Source Language Text as Venuti says, "Fluency is a strategy that assimilates the foreign text to dominant cultural values in the target language, rendering the translation immediately intelligible but culturally reductive" (Venuti 1998: 11). Domestication is possible when while translating "the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language" done (Catford 1965: 20)

Concept of Foreignization: Foreignization and / vs Chutnification:

The very concept of foreignization is very close to chutnification and opposite to that of domestication. Foreignization as a translation strategy attempts to deliberately observe,

then reserve and preserve linguistic and cultural differences between the Source Language Text and Target Language Text. This strategy resists the translator to completely integrate the Source Language Text into the Target Language Text. The very element of foreignization does not promote transparency and fluency allowing the reader the explicit knowledge of some of the elements of the Source Language Text. While juxtaposing the theory of foreignization to domestication, Venuti says defining foreignization, “Foreignization entails choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in the target language” (Venuti 2008: 19).

The very root of Venuti’s foreignization theory can be found in the very idea of two methods of translation lectured by Friedrich Schleiermacher’s in his 1813 lecture. As it is believed, Venuti restructures two methods advocated by Friedrich Schleiermacher as domestication vs foreignization. Venuti writes, “Schleiermacher allowed the translator to choose between moving the writer toward the reader or moving the reader toward the writer” (Venuti 2008: 19). Thus, here it can be noticed that ‘foreignization’ responds and corresponds to making the reader move towards the writer. Foreignization allows to retain the cultural boundaries between the two different languages. Fluency opposite to foreignization works at “minimizing the foreignness of the text” (Venuti 2008: 1) whereas “Foreignizing translation signifies the difference of the foreign text, yet only by disrupting the cultural codes that prevail in the target language” (Venuti 2008: 23) resulting into the intentional disruption of the readability. The very method of foreignization to Venuti is “to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text” (Venuti 2008: 20).

The conflict between translator’s visibility and invisibility is that of foreignization and domestication. Domestication renders the translator completely invisible whereas the foreignization renders the translator visible allowing the Source Language Text to overpower over the Target Language Text and thus establishing the supremacy of the decolonized. The invisibility of the translator elevates the Target Language Text to the level equal to Source Language Text. Thus, the very strategy of domestication narrows down the difference between the Source Language Text and the Target Language Text. However, foreignization argues contrastingly that translation must read as translation only and merely. Venuti argues, “Foreignizing translation seeks to make the translator visible, to reveal the translation as a translation” (Venuti 2008: 15).

The binary and contrast between foreignization and domestication can be clearly visible when Venuti has very popularly said, “The translator has the option of choosing between a domesticating method, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, or a foreignizing method, an ethnodeviant pressure on those values” (Venuti 2008: 19-20). This binary leads the discussion of the theory towards Translation Studies. Coming under the influence of the cultural imperialism, the very theory of domestication does not dissolve, cannot dissolve rather creates an illusion of transparency

by eradicating the boundary between the creative text and the translated one. Venuti renders that as a dominant theory, domestication strategy enforces, “the illusion of transparency” (Venuti 2008: 21) and foreignization as a contrast can be seen as a “form of resistance against ethnocentrism and cultural dominance” (Venuti 1998: 12).

The intention of the foreignization strategy has never been hidden rather it obviously allows strangeness and levels of difficulty in the Target Language Text. Venuti says, “Foreignizing translation preserves differences, maintaining a resistance to cultural assimilation” (Venuti 1998: 11). This very thought of Venuti asks the translator to avoid more explanation of the culturally loaded words of the Source Language Text. However, Venuti while acknowledging the limits of foreignization states that entire foreignization is almost impossible and sometimes entire domestication of the Target Language Text is also impossible as foreignization “is a strategic choice, not an essence; it is relative to historical and cultural situations” (Venuti 2008: 18).

Foreignization has its relation to Translation Studies via Cultural Turn in Translation Studies. The very idea of chutnification is related to the creative writing by Salman Rushdie. However, it is attempted here to link it to Translation Studies since foreignization in the Translation Studies does not remain separate and different in either way with chutnification. Foreignization and chutnification both render English readers to face challenges generated by linguistic as well as cultural differences. Similar to foreignization, chutnification disrupts and disturbs the standard English. Of course, domestication is necessary in translation however not completely inevitable. Venuti argues, “Domestication is inevitable in translation, but it need not be unreflective or absolute” (Venuti 2008: 17). Thus, one can say that chutnified translation is an attempt to win over English language. Salman Rushdie writes, along the lines of Venuti, “To conquer English may be to complete the process of making ourselves free” (Rushdie 1991: 17). Owning English through the weapon of chutnification advocated by Salman Rushdie and foreignization by Lawrence Venuti, the translation resists the creative linguistic hybridity and cultural dominance.

The important query that may attract the readers is to how much resistance may be allowed. Foreignization resists smooth readability by resisting “fluency” by “foregrounding the linguistic and cultural differences of the source text” (Venuti 2008: 18) whereas chutnification moving a step forward makes this resistance pleasurable for the readers to read. Thus, Indian creative artists “are carving out large territories for themselves” (Rushdie 1991: 64). The pleasure the reader can derive out of reading the chutnified creative text like a novel “where many languages and cultures meet, collide, and mingle” (Rushdie 1991: 12) perhaps may be lost while reading the foreignized text as, according to Venuti, “The foreignizing translation deliberately breaks target-language conventions, thereby forcing the reader to confront difference.” (Venuti 2008: 23). Foreignizing translation makes the translator visible whereas chutnification renders the creative artist visible, especially a

creative artist like Salman Rushdie who, according to Chatterjee, “uses English as an Indian language” (Chatterjee 2004: 252) and thus Rushdie’s “English is remade by Indian words” (Chatterjee 2004: 253). In a supportive way, Krishnamurthy states about the very idea of the foreign words either in translated or in a creative text that, “The mixing of languages creates new meanings rather than obscuring meaning” (Krishnamurthy 2010: 369).

Foreignization is according to Venuti, “a strategic choice made by the translator” whereas chutnification in relation to culture has been an ongoing process (Venuti 2008: 19). Relatively, as a part of an ongoing cultural process, various “Languages do not remain static; they grow by absorbing other languages” (Krishnamurthy 2010: 370).

Concept of Poly-system Theory of Even-Zohar:

The very concept of poly-system has been developed by Even-Zohar offering definition of the same in his book *Poly-system Theory*. This theory offers literature a multicultural as well multi-systematic product. He says, “Literature is not an isolated activity but a system of systems, a polysystem, in which different kinds of texts occupy different positions” (Even-Zohar 1990: 11). This system, according to Even-Zohar, shifts between the centre and the periphery. There is a scope for innovative steps to be realized when the forms at the margin strive and thrive to enter the centre. “When new literary models enter a system”, says Eve-Zohar, “they often do so from the periphery, gradually moving toward the centre” (Even-Zohar 1990: 14). This leads to the conflict between the centre and the periphery. The centre represents the Source Language Text whereas the periphery presents the Target Language Text. This idea leads towards the understanding of the chutnification. Thus, chutnification can be understood and accepted here as the peripheral text introducing non-standard syntax, non-English (Indian) words into English as an invasion of the non-native on the native.

Even-Zohar argues that the change that takes place within the system cannot and does not take place suddenly, rather it is always systematic. Even-Zohar says while arguing, “Innovatory repertoires tend to emerge when the literary system is young, peripheral, or in a state of crisis” (Even-Zohar 1990: 27). The movement of chutnification from the periphery to the centre is equated with the poly-system theory of Even-Zohar. Moving from the marginal Indian chutnified English to be the globally used Indian English stands to prove the success of the foreignization over the domestication. Applicable to Salman Rushdie’s English, Even-Zohar has rightly said, “Once a peripheral repertoire gains prestige, it may become central and even canonical” (Even-Zohar 1990: 15). The central event is the event that the creative text like *Midnight’s Children* by Slaman Rushdie got the Booker Prize as the best text using chutnification and shifting towards the making of the canonical text.

Code-mixing or language mixing is commonly allowed in the poly-system theory. Even-Zohar says, “A polysystem need not be homogeneous; heterogeneity is a necessary condition for its functioning” (Even-Zohar 1990: 23). This statement by Even-Zohar turns

chutnification to be the example of heterogeneity legitimately. This poly-system theory projects the chutnification as the performer similar to translated literature. Sometimes, the translated text may occupy the central position as to in the words of Even-Zohar, “Translated literature itself constitutes a system which may assume a central position” (Even-Zohar 1990: 46) leading the example of English (or Hinglish?) used by Salman Rushdie to make his English the canonical English. This leads one to think that the process of canonization is not free from the power structure. Even-Zohar rightly states, “Canonization is governed by socio-cultural power relations” (Even-Zohar 1990: 19). We find here the threat generated by chutnification onto the colonial English or standard English. The success of chutnification decentring the standard English is realized when Rushdie says, “The English language ceased to be the sole possession of the English” (Rushdie 1991: 64). One finds the functioning of the theory of chutnification in the poly-system theory itself. When the periphery reshapes the centre by replacing it, the chutnification is successfully realized in the very process.

To conclude, can be emphasized that chutnification has already made a movement towards the centre of English literary poly-system to threaten its monopoly, has rather threatened it. While establishing the relationship between Translation Studies and poly-system theory, which is in a way associated with chutnification, Susan Bassnett argues, “Until the end of the 1980s Translation Studies was dominated by the systemic approach pioneered by Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury” (Bassnett 2005: 7). The advancement of poly-system theory has been hailed by Bassnett as she says, “it shifted the focus of attention away from arid debates about faithfulness and equivalence towards an examination of the role of the translated text in its new context” (Bassnett 2005: 7). The statement made by Bassnett indirectly refers to chutnification since there is not point now to talk about “faithfulness and equivalence” as chutnification allows partial liberty to the translator (Bassnett 2005: 7).

Chutnification: Benefits or Losses?

It may be wrong to talk in terms of benefits or losses of chutnification as there is always a possibility of either to gain or lose in the very act of translation. However, the act of translation results into the benefit solely as something is better than nothing.

While discussing the losses of the chutnification in relation to translation, some translation critics opined differently however agreeing on the losses. Chutnification according to Salman Rushdie may render the Source Language Text “opaque to those unfamiliar with the cultural context” (Rushdie 1991: 67), to Kachru it is, “semantic opacity, where meaning becomes dependent on insider cultural knowledge” (Kachru 1983: 29), to Tejaswini Niranjana, “Hybridized postcolonial English texts generate serious problems of untranslatability” (Niranjana 1992: 173), to Mehrotra, “grammatical consistency and lexical precision are often sacrificed for cultural exuberance” (Mehrotra 1992: 112), to Ashcroft “it also risks dispersing meaning to the point where textual coherence is diminished” (Ashcroft 1989: 62), and to Susan Bassnett, “Culturally dense lexical innovations resist equivalence

and lead to unavoidable losses in translation” (Bassnett 2005: 38). The opinions of the translation critics cited above inevitably prove that it is impossible to translate without suffering the loss/-es. Chutnification may allow the relish to an Indian reader but it may take the joy away from the foreign reader. Arti Gupta very rightly cites in her research paper “The Chutnification of English”, “Besides Salman Rushdie, Arundhati Roy, Vikram Seth, Kiran Desai and many Diaspora writers have contributed significantly to the ‘chutnification’ of language, but unfortunately for the western audience, they could do better by providing a glossary of the ‘chutnified’ words. Though sometimes, this becomes irksome” (Gupta 2018: 27).

While discussing the benefits of the chutnification in relation to translation, some translation critics are happy to be positive about rendering into the target language. To quote a few examples positively, Salman Rushdie defending chutnification focusses on freedom provided to English language from the “possession” of the native speakers emphasizes “the process of making ourselves free” (Rushdie 1991: 64-5). To Kachru, chutnification in the form of nativization “has resulted in creativity, innovation, and the expression of local identities” (Kachru 1983: 20), to Ashcroft, “The use of hybrid language forms is one of the most powerful strategies for cultural resistance” (Ashcroft 1989: 39), to Chatterjee, “Rushdie’s chutnified English revitalizes narrative” (Chatterjee 2004: 87), to Bassnett, the chutnified translation does not “merely transfer meaning but produces new meanings” (Bassnett 2005: 6) and to Homi Bhabha, “Hybridity represents the revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity” (Bhabha 1994: 112). Evidently, it can be said that what Raja Rao says cannot be underestimated. Raja Rao rightly utters, “We cannot write like the English. We should not. We can only write as Indians” (Rao 1938: vii).

To state neutrally on the basis of the opinions cited above, one can conclude that chutnification enriches the target language culture. There are some critics who support chutnification in translation and favour the very process. To Roman Jakobson, “there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units, but messages may serve as adequate interpretations” (Jakobson 1959: 233), to Eugene Nida, “Anything that can be said in one language can be said in another” (Nida 1964: 120), to Newmark, “the attempt to replace a written message in one language by the same message in another language” (Newmark 1988: 7), to Bassnett translation is a “process of rewriting” (Bassnett 2005: 6) and to George Steiner “No translation can be definitive. There can be no finished product” (Steiner 1998: 296).

In the statement made by Venuti, one finds his advocacy for translation. He says, “Translation inevitably entails loss, but it also produces new meanings and values” (Venuti 2008: 14). Walter Benjamin clearly says that one should not expect the Target Language Text aiming at “likeness to the original” (Benjamin 1923: 73). Many scholars from Dryden to Venuti have accepted that though the loss in translation is inevitable, there is some gain as well, not the total loss only. Dryden clarifies translation as an art of loss.

Conclusion: Can Chutnified Translation be Pure?

The phenomenon of chutnification involves very deeply translational in cultural way. The very idea of chutnification raises very significant questions: Can we consider chutnified translation as a pure form of translation? Does chutnified translation not mean a hybrid one? What about the linguistic theory of equivalence? What about the very idea of fidelity on the part of translator? What about the dichotomy of Source Language Text vs Target Language Text? One has to try to explore these questions in the light of Translation Studies. The field of Translation Studies can be reconceptualized which may be more flexible to accommodate hybridity, exchange of cultural barriers, linguistic transformation and may allow to accept something better than nothing.

Alexander Fraser Tytler, in his *Essay on the Principles of Translation*, “Chapter I” advises translators which is related to the very idea of chutnification while entering into the act of translation. When Tytler says, “That the Translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work”, the evidence is clear that in order to give “a complete transcript of the ideas” of the original work, one can without being hesitant, in order to retain the flavor of the original, chutnify the translation. Further, Tytler also mentions “That the style and manner of writing should be of the same character with that of the original”. As all know, different languages may have different sentence pattern and the style of writing. In order to retain “the style and manner of writing . . . of the original”, again in order not to deviate, one can chutnify the necessary sentences while translating. Tytler also comments on the ease of creation and ease of reading of the text when he states, “That the Translation should have all the ease of original composition.” The ease of the Source Language Text in the Target Language Text is possible when somewhere originality of those words which are culturally loaded in the original text are retained in the translated text. (Tytler 1791: 7).

One can always argue to say that like Salman Rushdie’s use of Hinglish, neither completely Hindi nor completely English, if wishes the translator can take liberty especially if s/he translated from any Indian regional language into English, particularly. When the creative artist enters into the coinages and neologism, s/he doesn’t care for the difficulty to be faced by the future readers of the text. Similarly, the translator may chutnify his/her translated text. In the modern globalized world, due to the role of internet and media, most of the languages of the world have been influenced by one another. It has to be noted here that Oxford and Cambridge dictionaries published by Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press respectively in United Kingdom don’t object rather they adds every year many new words from languages all over the world including many Indian regional languages by chutnifying their pure English deconstructing the very idea of pure language now. The Cambridge Dictionary website on November 12, 2025, under the title “How Do New Words Get Added to the Cambridge Dictionary?” announces that, “In August 2025, the Cambridge Dictionary announced that over 6,000 words had been added in the past year, including slang words . . .” (“How Do New Words Get Added). Oxford Dictionary has

recently added many Indian words say for examples, “‘gulab jamun’, ‘vada’, ‘keema’, ‘anna’ (elder brother), ‘abba’ (father), ‘mirsch, masala’, ‘funda’, ‘chamcha’ ‘timepass’, ‘natak’, ‘jugaad’, achha, funda, nagar, nai, namkeen, ganja, nivas, bapu, ghee, gosht, bachcha, bada din, gully, papad, badmash, pukka, bhelpuri, puri, bhindi, haat, bhavan, qila, chup, churidar, jhuggi, ji, chutney, sevak, chacha, sevika, chakka jam, surya namaskar . . .” etc. (Stelieu).

The research paper can be concluded by the advice and criterion given to the translator by Bassnett quoting Dolet. Susan Bassnett says:

“In 1540 Dolet published a short outline of translation principles, entitled *La manière de bien traduire d’une langue en aultre* (How to Translate Well from one Language into Another) and established five principles for the translator:

- (1) The translator must fully understand the sense and meaning of the original author, although he is at liberty to clarify obscurities.
- (2) The translator should have a perfect knowledge of both SL and TL.
- (3) The translator should avoid word-for-word renderings.
- (4) The translator should use forms of speech in common use.
- (5) The translator should choose and order words appropriately to produce the correct tone.” (Bassnett 2005: 61)

Finally, on the basis of the discussion made above, one can say that the very concept of chutnification is not only a mere aspect of literary form but a very strong powerful form of translation in view of culture and language. The very introduction of chutnification in the area of Translation Studies will definitely enrich the field of Translation Studies.

References:

- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back*. Routledge, 1989.
- Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Benjamin, Walter. “The Task of the Translator.” In *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zohn Schocken, 1968.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.
- Catford, J. C. *A linguistic theory of translation*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Chatterjee, Sisir Kumar. “‘Chutnification’: The Dynamics of Language in Midnight’s Children.” In *Salman Rushdie’s Midnight’s Children: A Reader’s Companion*, edited by K. B. Kumar, New Delhi: Asia Book Club, 2004.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. “Polysystem Theory.” *Poetics Today*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1990, Print.
- Fries, 2005, cited in “The Chutnification of English in Salman Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children*.” *International Conference on Multidisciplinary Approaches Special Issue (TRP)*, 2019.

-
- Gupta, Arti. "The Chutnification of English Language." *International Journal of English Language, Literature in Humanities (IJELLH)*, vol. 6, no. 8, Aug. 2018. Cambridge University Press, n.d. Web. 5 Dec. 2025.
- Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In *On Translation*, edited by Reuben A. Brower, Harvard UP, 1959.
- Kachru, Braj B. *The Indianization of English: The English Language in India*. Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Khair, Tabish. 'Language Problems of Dialogue and Mapping' in A.K. Malhotra (Ed.), *Babu Fictions: Alienation in Contemporary Indian English Novels* 110-11. New Delhi: India: Macmillan Publishers, 2005.
- Krishnamurthy, Sarala. "The Chutnification of English: An Examination of the Lexis of Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*." *Language in India*, vol. 10, no. 8, Aug. 2010, Web. (Consulted on September 12, 2025).
- Mehrotra, Arvind Krishna. *Partial Recall: Essays on Literature and Literary History*. Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Mukherjee, Meenakshi. "The Twice Born Fiction". New Delhi, India: Arnold-Heinemann, 2003.
- Mukherjee, Sujit. *Translation As Recovery*. New Delhi: Pencraft International, 2004.
- Newmark, Peter. *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall, 1988.
- Nida, Eugene A. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Brill, 1964.
- Niranjana, Tejaswini. *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. University of California Press, 1992.
- "Popular Indian Culture: Chutnification of Languages." *Communication Today*, 30 Dec. 2015. Web. 15 Oct. 2025.
- Rao, Raja. *Kanthapura*. Foreword. Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Midnight's Children*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1981.
- Salman. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism, 1981-1991*. Viking, 1991.
- Simpson, P. *Stylistics*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Steliou, Andrie. "70 New Indian Words Added to the Oxford English Dictionary." *Cudoo Blog*, Cudoo, n.d. Web. 25 Nov., 2025.
- Thomas, Deepa. "The Chutnification of English in Salman Rushdie's *Midnight Children*: A Stylistic Analysis". *Asian Review of Social Sciences* 8. S1, 2019.
- Trivedi, Harish. "Translating Culture vs Cultural Translation." In *Post-colonial Theory and Practice*, edited by Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, Routledge, 1999.
- Harish. "Introduction", in Sujit Mukherjee. *Translation As Recovery*. Delhi: Pencraft International, 2004.
- Harish. "Translating Culture Vs Cultural Translation", in Paul St. Peiree and Prafulla C. Kar (eds.) *In Translation: Reflections, Refractions, Transformations*. Delhi: Pencraft International, 2005.

Tytler, Alexander Fraser, Essay on the Principles of Translation. London, 1791.

Venuti, Lawrence. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Lawrence. The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference. London: Routledge, 1998.