

CUJHSS, 2018; 12/1-2 (double issue): 99-111
Submitted: July 1, 2018
Accepted: December 18, 2018
ORCID#: 0000-0001-6356-8814; 0000-0003-4953-2393

Language in the War-Zone: The Power of Translation in Rajiv Joseph's *Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo*

Savaş Alanında Dil: Rajiv Joseph'un *Bağdat Hayvanat Bahçesindeki Bengal Kaplanı* adlı Oyununda Çevirinin Gücü

Qurratulaen Liaqat
Forman Christian College, Pakistan

Asia Mukhtar
Kinnaird College for Women, Pakistan

Abstract

In the backdrop of 9/11, the two subsequent invasions in Afghanistan and Iraq sparked the imagination of British and American playwrights for creating political plays which protest the futility of wars and conflicts. *Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo* (2009) by Rajiv Joseph is one of those plays which depict the plight of an invaded country and its inhabitants. The play revolves around the character of an Iraqi translator, Musa. The role of an interpreter in conflict zones is very significant because linguistic capability bequeaths palpable forms of leverages. Additionally, the very act of translation becomes more considerable and culturally evocative in the backdrop of war. There are many studies conducted on the powerlessness of translators and the exploitation of interpreters at the hands of invaders; however, this paper will conduct a hermeneutic descriptive analysis of the growing empowerment of Musa's character—both as a translator and as an individual. This study is significant as it initiates the debate into the potential power which the act of translation entails and the need to train interpreters to utilize this power to create a better world for themselves, their country and the world at large.

Keywords: Rajiv Joseph, language, translation, power, conflict.

Öz

11 Eylül saldırısının ardından Afganistan'ın ve Irak'ın işgali, İngiliz ve Amerikan oyun yazarlarına savaşın ve çatışmaların anlamsızlığını protesto eden politik oyunlar yazmaya konusunda ilham vermiştir. Rajiv Joseph tarafından yazılmış olan *Bağdat Hayvanat Bahçesindeki Bengal Kaplanı* (2009) adlı eser, işgal altındaki bir ülkenin ve vatandaşlarının durumunu anlatan oyunlardan biridir. Oyun, Iraklı tercüman Musa karakterinin etrafında döner. Savaş bağlamında çevirmen çok önemli bir role sahiptir çünkü dilsel beceriler somut bir güç kazanır. İşgalcilerin elinde bulunan çevirmenlerin güçsüz durumları ve onların istismarı üzerine yapılan birçok çalışma bulunmaktadır. Bu çalışmada ise Musa karakterinin çevirmen ve birey olarak güçlenmesinin hermenötik bir analizi yapılmaktadır. Bu çalışma, iki bakımdan önem taşımaktadır; ilki, çevirinin gerektirdiği potansiyel güce ilişkin tartışmalara öncülük etmesi; diğeri ise bu gücü kendileri, ülkeleri ve büyük ölçekte genel olarak daha iyi bir dünya

yaratmak için kullanmaları amacıyla ihtiyaç duydukları eğitime dikkat çekmesidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Rajiv Joseph, dil, çeviri, güç, çatışma.

Wars, conflicts and invasions always lead to rampant destruction of the invaded land. Invaders exhibit their power through the weapons and artillery they have. Nevertheless, the exercise of power generates certain forms of power in the conquered land which invaders might not be aware of. *Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo* by Rajiv Joseph is one such play which highlights the amount of power that the translation ability can bestow to a translator. The main character, Musa, hired by the Americans as a translator, is both indispensable and fearsome for them. They mistreat him and exploit him, yet at the same time, they are afraid that he might deceive them any time. This paper hypothesizes that translation is used in this play to show the power of the native which can force the invader to be subjugated at the expense of the knowledge of the languages of both the colonizer and the colonized. This study also argues that the art of translation empowers Musa politically, ethically, emotionally and morally.

Every kind of knowledge certainly stimulates more forms and types of power. *Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo* is about the American invasion of Iraq in 2003. The American invasion created a need to arrange English to Iraqi translators. Thus, the current study contends that invasion produces new objects of knowledge and accumulates new bodies of information like translation capabilities in this play. The play narrates the development of the character of Musa and his journey of self-realization through his translation capabilities. Therefore, the American invasion and dominance give rise to another form of power, which is translation. Translation capability gives individuals a linguistic power that they can exploit every now and then on their own will. The paper aims at studying translation as a form of social and economic power in *Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo* from the perspective of Cultural Studies and of Post-colonial approach to translation. This paper is an exploration of various kinds and dimensions of the influence which Musa (the translator) gains through his translation ability.

Rajiv Joseph has gained an eminent reputation as a playwright in a very short span of time. His plays like *Animals out of Paper* (2008), *The Leopard and the Fox* (2007), *Gruesome Playground Injuries* (2009), *The Monster at the Door* (2011), *The North Pool* (2012), *Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo* (2009) and *Guards at Taj* (2015) narrate very pertinent global issues like racism, wars and world politics. His play *Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo* narrates the impact of the American invasion on the societal life in general in Iraq. The play won the Pulitzer Prize for its relevance to the contemporary era's pertinent issues, and it received its due praise for its

original and thought-provoking content from many critics (Rooney, 2011; Isherwood, 2011; Marks, 2012; Lowry, 2013; Howey, 2015; Hobson, 2016; Neutz 2017) while some harshly criticized the play for being ambiguous and over-ambitious (McCall, 2010; Lahr, 2011; Jones, 2013; Osborne, 2017). The 9/11 tragedy and the subsequent wars on terrorism waged in its backdrop have contributed significantly to a “renewed focus on translation in film, fiction, academic research, and the media” (Apter 69). Many plays like *My Trip to Al-Qaeda* (2007) by Lawrence Wright, *Stuff Happens* (2005) by David Hare, *Fallujah* (2007) by Jonathan Holmes, *Guantanamo* (2004) by Gillian Salvo and Victoria Brittain, and *The Trial of Tony Blair* (2007) by Alistair Beaton highlight the guilt associated with the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan. These plays belong to the political and protest theatre (Spencer 1) which shows rampant effects of war to the audience at home. Joseph’s play is an example of the genre of political theatre which illustrates the scars and wounds left on the psyche of Iraqi people and Americans who lost their lives in the Iraq war (Basile 152). Thus, the paper studies how learning a foreign language builds or rather rebuilds Musa’s personality.

Joseph took the inspiration of this play from a real life incident which actually happened in 2003.¹ The writer starts his play with two young American marines on the stage, Tom and Kev, standing guard at Baghdad Zoo near a tiger’s cage. The contemporary history has been depicted in a surrealist way (Chaudhuri 137). Interestingly, the tiger is depicted as a shabbily dressed old man by the author. The tiger eats up Tom’s hand while feeding it. Kev freaks out and shoots the tiger. Consequently, the tiger dies at the spot and its ghost keeps on roaming in the Iraq city. Later on, the play introduces Musa who is a translator hired by the American army for military purposes. During the course of action, the audience gets to know that Musa worked as a gardener in Uday Hussein’s (Saddam Hussein’s son) palace. Musa’s sister, Hadia, was assaulted by Uday Hussein in the garden tended by Musa. Musa has a traumatic past, and Uday Hussein’s ghost keeps on haunting him throughout the play. Before the American invasion, he was exploited by Uday Hussein. After the invasion, the American marines used him for their own unlawful activities. At the beginning of the play, Musa is an innocent translator, but gradually his capacity to translate endows him with futile economic, social, ethical and pragmatic powers.

Literary theorists and critics like Fanon (1952), Bourdieu (1991) and Craith (2007) have hypothesized that notions of language and power are essentially interrelated. Linguistic ability has been termed as the “linguistic capital” which entails a huge variety of linguistic capabilities. The linguistic capital can be defined

¹ “Iraq; U. S. Soldier Kills Tiger in Baghdad Zoo.” *The New York Times*, September 21, 2003, <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/21/world/the-struggle-for-iraq-us-soldier-kills-tiger-in-baghdad-zoo.html>

as “fluency in, and comfort with, a high-status, worldwide language which is used by groups who possess economic, social, cultural and political power and status in local and global society” (Morrison 471). Bourdieu is of the view that the more a person has linguistic ability, the more he can exploit the “profit of distinction” (18). These profits might be both material and non-material like prestige, honour, or educational credentials. Speaking the “right” language becomes “a form of capital or investment which can consolidate or enhance one’s credibility in the non-material sector” (Craith 2). Similarly, translation is “a political act” which cohorts with power structures and “the most representative paradigms of the clash between two cultures,” and it is also an outstanding medium for studying the typically Foucauldian “binary essence of the opposition power/knowledge” (Álvarez and Vidal 1-5). Michel Foucault’s theoretical spectrum on the workings and evolution of power as well as Frantz Fanon’s assertion on the linguistic necessity and empowerment of the colonized with the colonizer’s power provide a very apt framework to analyse the power of translation as illustrated in Joseph’s play. Mark Poster reiterates that knowledge or reason is no longer a repressing or denying force but a creating, shaping, or forming force (122). For Foucault, whenever there is power, it gives form and produces new forms of power as the audience observes throughout Joseph’s play.

Basile claims that many theorists like Bhabha, Friedman and Glissant consider translation as a “key trope” for articulating the problems like questions of power, and the ethico-political need to redress the historical violations” (152). He suggests that “translation constitutes for many contemporary writers the poetic tool [...] capable of articulating the wound, the scar, and its itch in ways that prefigure new cultural formations” (152). The Arabic passages in the play, as well as Musa’s and Kev’s translations, are used by Joseph to express the scars and wounds left on the psyche of the Iraqi people and the Americans who lost their lives in the war. Many studies have been conducted on the helplessness and betrayal (by the invaders) of interpreters in conflict zones (Packer 2007; Baker 2010; Baigorri-Salon 2010; Aaltonen 2011; Ghena 2016; Rosenda and Prasaud 2016). Nonetheless, this paper highlights the forms of power which a translator can achieve by being in this role, such as the power of language.

From the postcolonial perspective, it was inevitable for Musa to come face to face with the language of the colonizer and attain the characteristics of the colonizer. Power was one of those characteristics which Musa attained unavoidably because “mastery of language affords remarkable power” (Fanon 9). Musa is a hybrid who can talk two languages and is at the border that can be identified as a hybrid character. That he is accepted neither by the natives and the non-natives places him at the “Third Space” (Bhabha 53). The colonized translator mainly plays the role of “bridging cultures” by “taking from one, stealing, and putting into another” (Ngugi 118-119). The motif of translation in the play has been analyzed in some

studies. Critics like Al Basuony are of the view that Joseph is interested in how language functions as a form of power as well as how it is used for political and social control (328). Thus, his translation abilities empower him in his dealings with the colonizer and disable him to function as a native. In this play, translation is a necessity for the colonizer which empowers the colonized translator Musa till he becomes dominant in terms of knowledge about both the colonizer's language and insecurities.

Many major studies conducted on the play have identified three major purposes or uses of translation (Al Basuony and Ibrahim 2016; Muneroni 2013; Proudfit 2017). Firstly, translation is portrayed as "the privileged tool to unpack the theological arguments of the play and to both encode and decode the in-between nature of its characters" (Muneroni 3). Secondly, translation has been used as the "hammer which destroys the barriers among different cultures" (Al Basuony and Ibrahim 328). Thirdly, it "illuminates Joseph's desire in stirring a process of cultural negotiation" (Al Basuony and Ibrahim 329). *Bengal Tiger* exhibits "the experience of encountering and communicating with a different culture" (Gerard n.p.). Musa as a translator has multiple qualities and characteristics. In his 2011 interview Joseph states that Musa's role as a translator is a very important one (Gerard n.p.). Musa is an "artist" (Suellau 3), "Moral Compass" (Muneroni 4), "hybrid" (Al Basuony and Ibrahim 328; Myatt 36), "a bridge" (Al Basuony and Ibrahim 328; Myatt 36), "a traitor" (Muneroni 5) and "approximates God" (Muneroni 8) because of his translation capacity. Evaluating the step by step evolution of Musa into an ethically, culturally, religiously and materialistically powerful person, this paper contends that for Musa translation is a form of empowerment which makes him stronger in multiple ways.

Joseph's choice of location is the first hint at the motif of power of language. His characters are geographically located in the city of Baghdad, which is said to be the location of the ancient Tower of Babel (Cruikshank, 2014). The ancient city of Babel was "the mystical city of the Apocalypse" and the story of Babylon is "a microcosm of human history" (Maruzi 2016). Baghdad, the current possible location of the ancient city of Babel is also a microcosmic representation of the deplorable condition of humanity (Liaqat 234). There is a tradition of referring to the biblical Tower of Babel in English literature (Hirst 444; Westbrook 406). It has been proved that the biblical story of the Tower of Babel actually happened in ancient times (Talley 36; Hodge 245). In Genesis, it is identified as the place where all different languages were created. The story tells how God confounded the people and He gave them different languages and exerted His dominance over the people by dividing them into languages. Once, in the course of human history, human beings became so proud that they started building a tower which they planned to build as high as the heavens. God became angry and punished them by snatching away the privilege of a common language and dividing them by giving

distinctive languages to human beings. The biblical story narrates that once upon a time all human beings had one common language but they were punished with the multiple languages (11:1-9). The Bible says, "That is why it was called Babel – because there the Lord confused the language of the whole world. From there the Lord scattered them over the face of the whole earth" (11:9). In the narrative of the play, the similar demonstration of the power of language can be observed.

According to Hodge, "The past is the key to present" (245). The Tower of Babel story is the key used by Joseph to refer to the present situation of the humanity. The differences of languages have provided immense power to the translator Musa, who is already compared to God by Muneroni (7). The Babel of language can be experienced by the audience in Act 1, Scene 3 and Act 2, Scene 2. In fact, the myth of the Tower of Babylon is applicable to the whole play. The tiger's language is not understandable for Tom and Kev. Later on, Iraqis and Americans cannot convey their messages to each other. The most interesting thing is that even God is unable to communicate to the humanity, and the humanity is equally incapable of calling God. The rampant absurdity and incongruity of linguistic communication is visible in Kev's prayer in Arabic and English. In Act 1, Scene 2, Musa seems unable to understand the meaning of the American expression "bitch," and he says, "I know the word. It is derogatory, meaning the female of the dog. But I do not always understand its context" (157). Moreover, Musa is shown exerting power over the Americans in the play because of his ability to speak to both the Iraqi and the Americans. The biblical story establishes the power of language, showing that presence of different languages can either make or break unity among human beings. Spivak asserts, "Languages have a very interesting ability to trick the people with the verbosity. It is a simple miming of the responsibility to the trace of the other in the self" (397). Similarly, Musa's ability to speak both languages provides him with palpable forms of power, which is a reiteration and repetition of the biblical story that illustrates the power of languages.

The first signs of Musa's possible gain of power through translation emerge in Act 1, Scene 2 where Musa is trying to learn the meaning of a slander word which seems to be anthropomorphism where Musa and Kev both are abusing each other. The following excerpt illustrates the subtle slandering of the colonizer and the colonized:

Musa: What is "bitch"?

Kev: What?

Musa: "Bitch," what is "bitch"?

Kev: Are you calling me a bitch?

Musa: No, I am asking you what "bitch" means? (156)

The word "bitch" means "rough situation" (Clarke 9). Language becomes more indecent, more vulgar, more explicit, and more abusive in the war zone as portrayed in the play. Colonized people try to empower themselves "through

language use: in attempting to reclaim abusive terminology [...] and ‘taking power back’” (Andersen 224). This interaction shows the hidden and concealed slander. Musa’s subconscious desire to use abusive words for the colonizer, who have wrecked the overall life in his country, is unconsciously making him say such words. It is true that he is trying to learn the meaning of this abusive expression, but at one point it seems that Musa is actually calling Kev as “Bitch”. It can be easily interpreted as the use of abusive language without Kev actually realising what Musa is doing. The excerpt quoted above is an example of a subtle abusive exchange between Musa (the colonized) and Kev (the colonizer), which is the very first indication of the potential power of translation skills.

The second instance which gives a glimpse of the subtle empowerment of translation is visible in the house-raid scene in Act 1, Scene 3. Kev is evidently apprehended by Musa’s translation ability and secret knowledge of the Iraqi language as he understands that translation can be used either in favour of him or against him. Kev’s apprehension and powerlessness is evident in the excerpt below:

Musa: She says there are ... (To Woman) Shgil-tee (What did you say?)

Kev: Wait what?

Woman: Makoo shee hnak! bess Buttaniat, makoo ghair shee! (There’s nothing in there! Blankets and nothing else!)

Musa: Nothing! There’s nothing.

Kev: That’s bullshit. She said a lot more than “nothing”. I don’t speak Iraqi, but she said a lot more than “nothing”. (166)

The exchange quoted above manifests the fear of Kev –the colonizer of the linguistic and social knowledge of the colonized land. The lady is telling Musa that there is nothing there but just blankets. However, Musa skips unnecessary information and briefs Kev that there is nothing else. Kev does not believe him because he thinks that Musa can betray him. Musa is a translating traitor in this situation. He is not translating the entire content for Kev. At the same time, he is being a traitor to his native people and his employer, the colonizer. He is helping the colonizers by giving them a very valuable service that is putting them at an advantageous position. If he did not offer his translation abilities, the colonizers would not be able to exploit him and his country to a greater extent. However, Musa is also trying to shield his people by his translation abilities. Thus, he is a perpetrator of violence as well as a savior of his native people.

Moreover, young marines like Tom and Kev are not relying on Musa for military purposes only. Tom manipulates Musa’s translation skills for his personal reasons as well. In Act 2, scene 2, Tom needs Musa to translate what kind of “hand job” he exactly wants from a teenage Iraqi call-girl. Tom’s emotional vulnerability is visible as he had to give very sensitive personal information to Musa which places Musa in an upper-hand position. Musa has got control over Tom as he is the only

one who can translate his needs to the teen-age Iraqi prostitute. Tom's annoyance is clearly noticeable in the following exchange:

Tom: What are you guys babbling about?

Tom: (Angry) You know that's very rude!

I'm standing right here and you guys are fucking talking on and on like that! Especially, since I just kind of revealed some personal stuff and everything. (203)

Tom is afraid that his personal information can be misused by the translator, and he is at a very vulnerable position in the hands of Musa. Yet, he does not have any other way out. Thus, he has to rely on Musa for translation, which gives Musa strength and power as a character.

Gradually Musa starts confronting Tom as his mature ethical sensibility is depicted in Act 2, Scene 1, where he talks about the exploitation of the Iraqi Women (201-210). Musa gathers the courage to tell Tom four times that "she [is] too young for [him]" (216). Being an employee of the American Army, Musa is supposed to be a quiet observer of everything his masters perpetrate. Since Musa knows that he has the power to translate, and his masters are in need of his translation abilities for fulfilling even their basic needs, he has the guts to say it in front of Tom that whatever he is doing is not right. He was serving as a gardener for Uday Hussein but his gardening skills just gave him power over plants. However, his translation abilities endowed him with certain forms of power over his colonizers.

Additionally, Musa also gains the guts to tell the truth. As mentioned earlier, the tiger eats Tom's hand at the very beginning of the play. After that, Tom is patched up with a bionic hand. He tells Musa that he lost his hand while fighting in the war. Meanwhile, Kev already tells Musa that his friend Tom's hand got eaten by a tiger. For a while Musa lets him tell lies, but ultimately he makes Tom realize that he knows the true story about his hand being eaten by a tiger at the Baghdad Zoo and not during a heroic fight. With the passing of time, Musa develops truth-telling power and also points out to Tom that his hand was not lost in the battle but eaten by the tiger (217). Tom lies to Musa to hide his insecurities and shows himself as a hero. Nevertheless, Musa, after being more powerful, tells the truth in his face.

During the course of the play, Musa also attains worldly wisdom. He realizes that the American marines are more interested in looting the Iraqi people than anything else. At the time of Kev's mental breakdown, Musa is present with him for translation purposes. After Kev's hospitalization, the gold-plated gun of Uday Hussein ultimately falls into Musa's hands. When Tom sees the gun in Musa's hands, he wants it back. However, Musa does not want to hand over it to Tom because he thinks that the gun belongs to Iraqi people but Tom wants it just for its material value. Musa says to Tom, "You have no investment in this gun, it does not mean anything to you outside of the fact that it is gold. You're looting so you have

something, something to take home. I don't care about what you have to take home" (220). This statement is a very direct attack on Tom's looting intentions, and Musa feels powerful enough to tell this fact to Tom because he is no more afraid of the colonizers. Ultimately, Musa tells Tom very blatantly that he is a "thief" (220).

Moreover, Musa retorts back by calling his American colonizers with their stereotypical names. From the very beginning of the play, Tom and Kev both keep on calling Musa as "Habib" –a stereotypical expression for the Middle Eastern people. Rehman asserts that in the aftermath of 9/11, "words, concepts and old stereotypes were reinvigorated to humiliate Muslim communities" (212). Kev and Tom also keep on humiliating Musa by calling him "Habib". By the end of the play, Musa becomes so much adept in his linguistic ability that he calls Tom "Jhonny" in a vengeful way to exact his revenge on the fact that Tom has been calling Musa "Habib" since the beginning of the play. The excerpt below is an exchange between two persons who have equal power, and Musa has got this power because of his linguistic ability:

Musa: What the fuck? What the fuck are *you* talking about, Johnny?

Tom: My name's not Johnny!

Musa: My name's not Habib. (219)

In the dialogue above, Musa uses the word "fuck" twice which is a popular American curse word. He has not only learnt the grammatical structures of English language, but also used the common cursing words and cultural references. Musa is using the title "Johnny" for Tom which is a stereotypical title for Americans. Moreover, he is trying to counter "the Orientalist stereotypes of space, history, identity" (Wahab 220). As Musa becomes better in his translation skills, he starts to realize his power. As the below conversation between Tom and Musa shows, Musa's fearlessness and Tom's helplessness indicate that he needs Musa's translation:

Tom: You work for us! I could have you fired, how would you like that?

Musa: And what would you say anyhow? That I stole your gold gun pilfered from the Hussein brothers' stash? There are rules for you. For me there are not rules. No rules, nothing. Anarchy, yes. Rules? No. So go fuck yourself Johnny. My English is getting better every day. Maybe I go get a job at CNN. (219)

In the dialogue between the two, it is seen that Musa has become really good at English, and he even knows that he can get a good job at CNN. He has explored his options, and he knows how to find a way out for himself. Musa does not only acquire the language of his American colonizers, he also becomes immersed in their economic systems. By the end of the play, Tom wants Musa to translate for him so that he can retrieve a gold toilet seat he has hidden in the desert after stealing it from Uday Hussein's palace. However, Musa wants weapons in return:

Tom: I'm not going to get you a bunch of fucking weapons, okay!?

Musa: Then you are not getting the gold gun! This is not complicated!
Capitalism! Thank you! (220)

Musa very clearly makes Tom realize that he is following the system of his colonizers, so if he wants a favour, he will have to pay back in terms of weapons. Musa becomes so convincing that Tom becomes willing to negotiate at the end. His linguistic ability has provided him with a linguistic capital he can exchange for a better life and a better job.

By the end of the play, Tom and Musa go to the desert in order to retrieve the golden toilet seat Tom has hidden there. Musa becomes willing to go to the desert and translate for Tom in return of weapons. Tom lies to Musa that there are hidden weapons in the desert, and he will give these weapons to Musa. But when Tom tells Musa that he has been telling him lies from the very beginning, Musa gets very angry and feels betrayed. Musa never realizes the reason behind his shooting Tom but he is primarily angry with Tom because he deceived him by bringing him to the desert. Secondly, he ruined his country's peace; and finally because he exploited the teen-age Iraqi girl. At the end of the play, Musa is in so powerful a situation because of his translation abilities that he has control over Tom's life, he fully acquires the traits of the colonizer and shoots Tom (228). Musa brings Tom to his knees (237) and Tom "begs" Musa to come back (235) for his life, but Musa does not come back. Thus, Musa does not only acquire the language, he also acquires the multiple, economic, cultural and linguistic habits of his colonizers. By the end of the play, it seems that Musa is suffering psychologically and emotionally because of all the pain and betrayal he faced at the hands of his employers.

In conclusion, translators are most of the times portrayed in research studies and literary works as victimized beings who have been betrayed by their employers in the war zone. The current study has highlighted the potential power of translation ability in Rajiv Joseph's play. Musa as a translator demonstrates the power of translation in the context of war. Translators like Musa emerge because of the perpetration of violence and betrayal. Musa's translation skills endowed him with the subtle power to slander the colonizer, truth-telling, ethical, cultural and capitalist power. Moreover, Musa also acquires power over the emotional and physical needs of the colonizer. Furthermore, the apex of Musa's translation power occurs when he gets power over the life of the colonizer. Musa does not only learn the language of the colonizer, he also becomes like them. He kills ruthlessly like his colonizers whose language he has adopted. Translators and interpreters are very significant in the conflict-ridden areas as they exude multiple forms of power. Hence, the act of translation gives multiple economic, cultural and linguistic forms of powers to the colonized interpreters with which they can strike back.

Works Cited

- Al Basuony, and Gihan Samy Ibrahim. "Representation of Iraqi War between Fantasy and Reality in Rajiv Joseph's *Bengal Tiger at Baghdad Zoo: A New Historicist Reading*." *European Scientific Journal*, vol.12, no.29, 2016, pp. 323-36.
- Aaltonen, Sirkku. "Translator, Transtraitor, Bare Life-Conflicting Ethics in War Situations in George Packer's *Betrayed*." *Käännösteoria, ammattikielet ja monikielisyys, VAKKI julkaisut*, no. 38. 2011, pp.12-23.
- Alvarez, Román and M. Carmen-África Vidal, editors, *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Multilingual Matters Limited, 1996.
- Andersen, Roger. *The Power and the Word*. Paladin, 1988.
- Apter, Emily. "Translation-9/11: Terrorism, Immigration, and the World of Global Language Politics." *The Global South*, vol. 1, no. 2, Globalization and the Future of Comparative Literature, pp. 69-80.
- Baigorri-Jalon, Jesus. *Wars, Languages and the Role(s) of Interpreters*. Les liaisons dangereuses: langues, traduction, interprétation, December 2010, 2011, pp. 173-204.
- Baker, Mona. "Interpreters and Translators in the War Zone: Narrated and Narrators." *The Translator*, vol. 16, no.2, 2010, pp. 197-222.
- Basile, Elena. "Scars of Language in Translation: The 'Itchy' Poetics of Jam Ismail." *Literature for Our Times Postcolonial Studies in the Twenty-First Century* edited by Bill Ashcroft et al., Rodopi, 2012, pp. 151-164.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.
- "The Tower of Babel." *The Bible*, New International Version, Biblica Inc., 2011, www.biblegateway.com
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Polity Press, 1991.
- Chaudhuri, Una. "Embattled Animals in a Theatre of Species." *Performing Animality: Animals in Performance Practices*, edited by Lourdes Orozco and Jennifer Parker-Starbuck, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015, pp. 135-149.
- Clarke, Virginia Nicholas. *American Slang and Sayings: Especially for Businessmen and Tourists*. Red Lead Press, 2011.
- Craith, Máiréad Nic. "Languages and Power: Accommodation and Resistance." *Language, Power and Identity Politics*, edited by Máiréad Nic Craith, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 1-20.
- Cruikshank, Dan. "The Lost Palaces of Iraq." *BBC Recent History-Iraq: Conflict in Context*, 18 September 2014, www.bbc.co.uk/history/recent/iraq/
- Fanon, Frantz. "The Negro and Language." *Black Skin, White Masks*, Pluto Press, 1952, pp. 8-27.
- Gerard, Raymond. "Lost and Found in Translation: an Interview with Rajiv Joseph." *Theatre Interviews*, 3 April 2011, www.slantmagazine.com/house/article/lost-and-found-in-translation-an-interview-with-playwright-rajiv-joseph.
- Ghena, Hana Khlaif. "Translating the Maladies Iraq through the Eyes of its Translators in George Packer's *Betrayed*." *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)* vol. 4, no. 4, 2016, pp. 50-59.
- Hirst, Wolf Z. "George Gordon Byron." *The Blackwell Companion to the Bible in English Literature*, edited by Rebecca Lemon et al., Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, pp. 438-450.

- Hobson, Louis B. "Review: *Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo* Savagely Funny." *Calgary Herald*, 17 June 2016, calgaryherald.com/entertainment/theatre/review-bengal-tiger-at-the-baghdad-zoo-savagely-funny.
- Hodge, Bodie. *Tower of Babel: The Cultural History of Our Ancestors*. Master Books, 2013.
- Howey, Christine. "War Puzzles in 'Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo' From Ensemble Theatre." *Clever Scene*, 5 May 2015, www.clevescene.com/scene-and-heard/archives/2015/05/05/review-war-puzzles-in-bengal-tiger-at-the-baghdad-zoo-from-ensemble-theatre.
- Isherwood, Charles. "Ghostly Beast Burning Bright in Iraq *Bengal Tiger at The Baghdad Zoo*." *NY Times*, 31 March 2011, www.nytimes.com/2011/04/01/theater/reviews/bengal-tiger-with-robin-williams-review.html.
- Jones, Chris. "At Looking Glass, a Tiger Tale Set in Iraq." *Theater Review: "Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo," Chicago Tribune*, 12 February 2013, articles.chicagotribune.com/2013-02-12/entertainment/chi-bengal-tiger-theater-review-20130212_1_bengal-tiger-baghdad-zoo-tiger-tale.
- Joseph, Rajiv. *Three Plays: Gruesome Playground Injuries, Animals Out Of Paper and Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo*. Soft Skull Press, 2010.
- Lahr, John. "Tooth and Claw." *Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo* and How to Succeed in Business without Really Trying, *New Yorker*, 11 April 2011, pp. 76-77, johnlahr.com/articlePDF/2011_04_11_076-077CriticsLahrTheatre-web.pdf.
- Liaqat, Qurratulaen. "An Expose of Absurd Contemporary Conflicts: Rajiv Joseph's *Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo*." *B/Orders Unbound: Marginality, Ethnicity and Identity in Literatures*, edited by Sule Okuoglu and Mustafa Kirca, Peter Lang, 2017, pp. 219-234.
- Lowry, Mark. "Between Iraq and a Hard Place." *Theatre Jones*, 24 January 2013, www.theaterjones.com/ntx/reviews/20130113053653/2013-01-24/Theatre-Three/Bengal-Tiger-at-the-Baghdad-Zoo
- Marks, Peter. "Review: 'Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo,' Burning Bright at Round House." *The Washington Post*, 16 September 2012, washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/review-bengal-tiger-at-the-baghdad-zoo-burning-bright-at-round-house.
- Maruzi, Justin. "Lost Cities #1: Babylon –How War Almost Erased 'Mankind's Greatest Heritage Site.'" *The Guardian*, 8 August 2016, www.theguardian.com/cities/2016/aug/08/lost-cities-1-babylon-iraq-war-history-mankind-greatest-heritage-site.
- Mccall, Tulis. "*Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo*." *New York Theatre Guide*, 1 April 2010, www.newyorktheatreguide.com/reviews/bengal-tiger-at-the-baghdad-zoo.
- Morrison, Keith, and Icy Lui. "Ideology, Linguistic Capital and the Medium of Instruction in Hong Kong." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 21, No. 6, 2000, pp. 471-86.
- Muneroni, Stefano. "Translational Eschatology, Death, and the Absence of God in Rajiv Joseph's *Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo*." *International Journal of Comparative Literature and Translation Studies*, vol.1, no. 2, 2013, pp. 1-10.

- Neutz, Ben. "Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo Theatre Review (Old Fitz, Sydney)." *Daily Review*, 17 April 2017, dailyreview.com.au/bengal-tiger-baghdad-zoo-review-old-fitz-theatre-sydney/58579
- Osborne, Bert. "Theater Review: 'Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo' Roams 7 Stages." *Atlanta Journals Constitution*, 19 September 2017, www.myajc.com/entertainment/arts--theater/theater-review-bengal-tiger-the-baghdad-zoo-roams-stages/o3WcqXGaeQZy4A53h2HIWJ/.
- Packer, George. "Betrayed-The Iraqis who trusted America the most". *The New Yorker*, 26 March 2007, www.newyorker.com/magazine/2007/03/26/betrayed-2
- Poster, Mark. "Foucault and History." *Social Research*, vol. 49, no. 1, 1982, pp. 116-142.
- Proudfit, Scott. "Reunion, Complication, Refraction, and Translation: How Postcolonialism and Post-Structuralism Mark Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo." *Theatre and Performance Studies*, vol. 60, no. 4, 2017, pp. 480-494.
- Rehman, Javaid. "9/11 and the War on Terrorism: The Clash of 'Words,' 'Cultures' and 'Civilisations': Myth or Reality." *Language, Power and Identity Politics*, edited by Máiréad Nic Craith, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, pp. 198-215.
- Rooney, David. "'Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo': Theater Review." *Hollywood Reporter*, 31 March 2011, www.hollywoodreporter.com/review/bengal-tiger-at-baghdad-zoo-173552.
- Rosenda, Lucia Ruiz, and Clementina Persaud. "Interpreters and Interpreting in Conflict Zones and Scenarios: A Historical Perspective." *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series-Themes in Translation Studies*, vol. 15, 2016, pp.1-35.
- Spencer, Jenny, editor, *Political and Protest Theatre after 9/11: Patriotic Dissent*. Routledge, 2012.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "The Politics of Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 397-416.
- Suellau, Rebekah. "Bengal Tiger at the Baghdad Zoo Discussion Guide." *Syllabus THEBENGALTIGER Perspectives on the American-Iraqi Conflict*, edited by Suello in Freund, Jake and Marti Lyons, *Looking Glass*. 25th Anniversary Season, 1-13.
- Talley, Michael. *The Tower of Babel: Confirmed*. BWM, 2016.
- Wahab, Ahmed Gamal Abdel. "Counter-Orientalism: Retranslating the 'Invisible Arab' Leila Aboulela's *The Translator* and *Lyrics Alley*." *Arab Studies Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 3, 2014, pp. 220-241.
- Westbrook, Deeanne. "William Wordsworth." *The Blackwell Companion to the Bible in English Literature*, edited by Rebecca Lemon et al., Wiley-Blackwell, 2009, pp. 397-412.