TRANSLATION STUDIES

18KP1EELE1

UNIT-1

TRANSLATION:

In everyday language, translation is thought of as a text which is a "representation" or "reproduction" of an original one produced in another language. It is written or spoken rendering of a word, speech, book or other text in another language.

Authors like Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997), have found the phenomenon of translation explained as follows:

incredibly broad notion which can be understood in many different ways. For example, one may talk of translation as a process or product, and identify such sub-types as literary traslation, technical translation, subtitling and machine translation; moreover, while more typically it just refer to the transfer of written texts, the term sometimes also includes interpreting.

Bell starts with an informal definition of translation, which runs as follows:

The transformation of a text originally in one language into an equivalent text in a different language retaining, as far as possible, the content of the message and the formal features and functional roles of the original text (Bell 1991).

The more detailed definition of translation raises at least four separate issues:

(1) Translation as a Process and/or Product;

(2) Sub- types of translation;

(3) Concern with written texts;

(4) Translation vs. Non-translation.

What is generally understood is that the translation involves the rendering of a source language (SL) text into the target language (TL) so as to ensure that

- The surface meaning of the two will be approximately similar.
- The structures of the SL will be preserved as closely as possible but not so closely that the TL structures will be seriously distorted.

Define translation

It is necessary to be clear about what is meant by translation as the term is rather loosely applied to many different things such as i) translation within the same language, (ii) translation across two languages, and (iii) translation of a message conveyed by symbols Into a verbal message or vice versa. Jakobson (1959: 233.) calls the first type "intralingual translation the second type: "Interlingual translation" and the last one "intersemiotic translation Intralingual translation consists essentially in rephrasing something within the same language. A passage of greater complexity being rewarded in a simpler manner in the same language can be cited as an example of intralingual translation. Another example would be paraphrasing in prose what is available in poetry.

The second type of interlingual translation may be called "translation proper". Here there is a transfer across two languages. We can notice that something said or written in one language is transferred as an equivalent message in another language. This course is concerned only with this interlingual translation.

The third type of translation is called Intersemiotic translation. Here the message is transferred from one kind of symbolic system to another. For instance, a verbal order issued by the Navy may be transmuted into a flag message by hoisting up the proper flags in a particular sequence. Or a news bulletin read slowly by the newsreader on television is converted by another new person into visual movements and gestures in a way intelligible to the hearing impaired. A cricket umpire's various signals are interpreted verbally by the cricket commentator into a sixer, a four, a wide a no-ball, out etc. Here the visual symbols are translated into words

Though the activity of translation is thousands of years old attempts to define translation is fairly recent. Moreover, any definition translation is governed by the larger theoretical framework of which it is a part. Thus **Catford** and **Peter Newmark** look up to: translation as a branch of applied linguistics; **Eugene A.Nida** situates translation within sociolinguistics; **Susan Bassnett** prefer to treat translation as an independent discipline. Study the following four definitions of translation.

Catford (1965:25)

"The replacement of textual material in one language (Source Language) by equivalent textual material in another language (Target Language)".

Peter Newmark (1981: 7)

"Translation is a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language."

Eugene A. Nida (1969: 12)

"Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style".

Susan Bassnette - McGuire (1980: 12)

"Translating involves the rendering of a source language (SL) text into the target language (T13) so as to ensure that (1) the surface meaning of the two will be approximately similar and (2) the structures of the SL will be preserved as closely as possible but not so closely that the TL structures will be seriously distorted".

The common factor in all these definitions is the concept of equivalence or similarity of the message in the original and the translated versions.

HISTORY OF TRANSLATION

A study of translation history undoubtedly requires a period classification. **George Steiner** (1975) believes that the whole history of translation theory could be divided into **four periods**.

The first period, started with Cicero's and Horace's staternents on translation and finished with Alexander Fraser Tytler's Essay on the Principles of Translation. All the analyses and beliefs during that period stemmed from the practical work of translating. Thus the central characteristic of the period is that of 'immediate empirical focus.' The 18th century finished with a relatively coherent body of theory, whose rationalistic character and empiricism was its downfall in the Romantic climate. Tytler advocated that translation should have the ease of original composition and respect English literary decorum and therefore praised Pope's expurgation of Homer. By the end of the 18th century the preference in translation theory was clearly given to fluent translation.

According to Steiner, **the second period** of the history of translation theory began with Schleiermacher's lecture. Schleiermacher advocated the method of 'moving the reader to the author', preserving the peculiarities of the foreign text. Schlegel and Humboldt saw different languages as immeasurable in their individuality. They continued Schleiermacher's approach of interlingual transfer as a problem of understanding speech acts and emphasizing with the source text. If during the first period translation was seen as a means to appropriate texts, Romantics saw it as a way to enrich the readers by enabling them to appreciate the difference of other cultures.

The third period started in 1940s with the publication of papers on machine translation as well as the application of structural linguistics and statistics to translation. There was little understanding of one group of theorists or translators by another. Different translation theories

were developed in response to specific situations. Americans, like **Nida** developed translation theory in the context of anthropological research and Christian missionary activity. The English people developed translation theory to fit the needs of colonial administration. It is hardly a coincidence that towards the end of the period Savory concluded that the experts in translation theory had bequeathed to us a welter of confused thought'. Unlike during the first two periods, the emphasis was not on translating literary texts but on transmitting information from one language into another. So the most important issue was how to make this information clear to the target reader.

Steiner's **fourth stage** is a consolidation of theory. It is a combined interdisciplinary effort to understand the process of life between languages. This period started in the beginning of the 1960s with the works of **Mounin, Nida and Catford**. The arguments began that anything could be translated into any language and Humboldt's ideas about the uniqueness of every language were "rediscovered". Therefore preserving this uniqueness was seen important once again. During this period "classical philology and comparative literature, lexical statistics and ethnography, the sociology of class-speech, formal rhetoric, poetics, and the study of grammar are combined in an attempt to clarify the act of translation and the process of life between languages"

THE ROMANS

Eric Jacobsen claims that **translation is a Roman invention**. This may be considered as an exaggerated saying.

But it serves as a starting point from which to focus attention on the role and status of translation for the Romans. The views of both Cicero and Horace on translation have great influence on successive generations of translators. They discuss translation within **the two main functions of the poet.**

1. The universal human duty of acquiring and disseminating wisdom

2. The special art of making and shaping a poem.

Roman translation may be perceived as unique. It arises from a vision of literary production that follows an established canon of excellence across linguistic boundaries. With the extension of the Roman Empire, bilingualism and trilingualism became increasingly commonplace, and the gulf between oral and literary Latin widened. The apparent license of Roman translators, much quoted in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, must therefore be seen in the context of the overall system in which that approach to translation was applied.

BIBLE TRANSLATION

With the spread of Christianity, translation came to acquire another role. It had to disseminate the word of God. Christianity is a text-based religion. It presented the translator a

mission to encompass both aesthetic and evangelistic criteria. The history of Bible translation is a history of western culture. Translations of the New Testament were made very early. **St Jerome's** version had great influence on succeeding generations of translators. It was commissioned by Pope Damasus in AD 384. Following Cicero, St Jerome declared he had translated sense for sense rather than word for word, but the problem of the fine line between what constituted stylistic license and what constituted heretical interpretation was to remain a major stumbling block for centuries.

Bible translation remained a key issue in the seventeenth century. The problems intensified with the growth of concepts of national cultures and with the coming of the Reformation. Translation came to be used as a weapon in both dogmatic and political conflicts as nation states began to emerge and the centralization of the church started to weaken, evidenced in linguistic terms by the decline of Latin as a universal language.

The first translation of the complete Bible into English was the Wycliffite Bible produced between 1380 and 1384. It marked the start of a great flowering of English Bible translations. It linked to changing attitudes to the role of the written text in the church. It formed part of the developing Reformation.

THE RENAISSANCE

Edmond Cary, stresses the importance of translation in the sixteenth century:

The translation battle raged throughout Dolet's age. The Reformation, was primarily a dispute between translators. Translation became an affair of State and a matter of Religion. The Sorbonne and the king were equally concerned with it. Poets and prose writers debated the matter. In such an atmosphere, where a translator could be executed as a result of a particular rendering of a sentence or phrase in text. It is hardly surprising that battle lines were drawn with vehemence. The quality of aggressive assertiveness that can be discerned in Chapman's Epistle or Dolet's pamphlet can be seen through the work and statements of a number of translators of the time. One major characteristic of the period is an affirmation of the present through the use of contemporary idiom and style. Matthiesson's study of Elizabethan translators gives a number of examples of the way in which the affirmation of the individual in his own time manifests itself. He notes the frequent replacement of indirect discourse by direct discourse in North's translation of Plutarch, a device that adds immediacy and vitality to the text, and quotes examples of North's use of lively contemporary idiom.

In poetry, the adjustments made to the SL text by such major translators as Wyatt and Surrey have led critics to describe their translations at times as 'adaptations'. Such a distinction is misleading.

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

By the mid-seventeenth century the effects of the Counter Reformation, the conflict between absolute monarchy and the developing Parliamentary system, and the widening of the gap between traditional Christian Humanism and science had all led to radical changes in the theory of literature and hence to the role of translation. Descartes' (1596-1650) attempts to formulate a method of inductive reasoning were mirrored in the preoccupation of literary critics to formulate rules of aesthetic production. In their attempt to find models, writers turned to ancient masters, seeing in imitation a means of instruction. Translation of the classics increased considerably in France between 1625 and 1660, the great age of French classicism and of the flowering of French theatre based on the Aristotelian unities.

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Dryden's and Pope's concept of translation is another element, beyond the problem of the debate between over faithfulness and looseness.

The impulse to clarify and make plain the essential spirit of a text led to large-scale rewritings of earlier texts to fit them to contemporary standards of language and taste. Hence the famous re-structuring of Shakespearian texts, and the translations/ reworking of Racine. Dr Johnson in his Life of Pope discussing the question of additions to a text through translation, comments that if elegance is gained, surely it is desirable, provided nothing is taken away, and goes on to state that 'the purpose of a writer is to be read', claiming that Pope wrote for his own time and his own nation. The right of the individual to be addressed in his own terms, on his own ground is an **important element in eighteenth century translation** and is linked to changing concepts of 'originality'.

ROMANTICISM

Goethe's distinctions between types of translation and stages in a hierarchy of aesthetic evaluation is indicative of a change in attitude to translation resulting from a revaluation of the role of poetry and creativity. In England, Coleridge in his ***Biographia Literaria*** outlined his theory of the distinction between Fancy and Imagination. He asserts that Imagination is the supreme creative and organic power, as opposed to the lifeless mechanism of Fancy. This theory has affinities with the theory of the opposition of mechanical and organic form outlined by the German theorist and translator, August Wilhelm Schlegel. Both the English and German theories raise the question of how to define translation-as a creative or as a mechanical enterprise. In the Romantic debate on the nature of the translation the ambiguous attitude of a number of major writers and translators can be seen.

TWENTIETH CENTURY

The steady growth of valuable works on translation in English since 1950s has been noted. But it would be wrong to see the first half of the twentieth century as the Waste Land of English translation theory, with here and there the fortresses of great individual translators approaching the issues pragmatically. The work of Ezra Pound is of immense importance in the history of translation, and Pound's skill as a translator was matched by his perceptiveness as critic and theorist. **Hilaire Belloc's Taylorian** lecture On Translation, given in 1931, is a brief but highly intelligent and systematic approach to the practical problems of translating and to the whole question of the status of the translated text.

THE RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSLATION

Translation in the early Period

The word 'translation' comes from a Latin term which means "to bring or carry across". Another relevant term comes from the Ancient Greek word of 'metaphrasis' which means "to speak across" and from this, the term 'metaphrase' was born, which means a "word-for-word translation". These terms have been at the heart of theories relating to translation throughout history and have given insight into when and where translation have been used throughout the ages.

It is known that translation was carried out as early as the Mesopotamian era when the Sumerian poem, Gilgamesh, was translated into Asian languages. This dates back to around the second millennium BC. Other ancient translated works include those carried out by Buddhist monks who translated Indian documents into Chinese. In later periods, Ancient Greek texts were also translated by Roman poets and were adapted to create developed literary works for entertainment. It is known that translation services were utilised in Rome by Cicero and Horace and that these uses were continued through to the 17th century, where newer practices were developed.

It is argued that the knowledge and findings of Greek academics was developed and understood so widely thanks to the translation work of Arabic scholars. When the Greeks were conquered, their works were taken in by Arabic scholars who translated them and created their own versions of the scientific, entertainment and philosophical understandings.

These Arabic versions were later translated into Latin, during the Middle Ages, mostly throughout Spain and the resulting works provided the foundations of Renaissance academics.

Religious Translation and Texts

The need for translation became greater with the development of religious texts and spiritual theories. As religion developed, the desire to spread the word and encourage faith means that religious texts needed to be available in multiple languages. One of the first translated religious texts is known to have been that of the Old Testament which was translated into Greek in the 3rd century BC. This translation refers to the "Septuagint', which was a translation of the Hebrew bible into Greek, with Septuagint coming from the Latin word 'Septuaginta', which means seventy. This text is therefore often referred to the Greek Old Testament". Without the use of our modern practices and tools, this translation was carried out by no less than 70 scholars who painstakingly converted the text into Greek and this became the basis for future translations of the bible in multiple languages.

Religion played such a critical role in translation development that the church even names Saint Jerome as the patron saint of translation. Saint Jerome created a Latin bible in 4th century AD. This bible became the predominant text used by the Roman Catholic Church. With the introduction of Protestantism, the need to translate the bible and other religious texts into European languages heightened. Through the rapid translation and distribution of the bible during the Protestant Reformation, Christianity had two clear paths - Roman Catholicism or Protestantism. One of the most clear differences between these two forms of the religion was the disparity in texts and the differences between crucial words and passages of the bible.

Famous translators throughout time

Translators have often been hidden characters, unnamed people who have paved the way for some of the greatest contributions to the dissemination of ideas, knowledge and theories throughout the ages. In some cases, working as a translator was incredibly dangerous and some even lost their lives because of their work. This included famous translators such as William Tyndale, who was executed Holland in 1536 because worked on translating the bible into English. Other famous translators include:

Chinese monk **Xuanzang** who in 645 AD was credited with having translated 74 volumes on Indian Buddhist scripts into Chinese.

Constance Garnett was a British translator who translated Russian classics including Tolstoy, Chekhov, Turgenev and Gogol into English towards the end of the 19th Century.

Gregory Rabassa was an American literary translator who translated numerous Latin documents into English throughout the 20th Century.

Modern Translation Practices and Understanding

Following on from the Industrial Revolution, the economy developed rapidly and evolved into a machine with the potential for global success. New machinery allowed for swifter production of texts and business related materials and this means that more time could be invested in evolving a company and translating material to enter foreign markets. Since 18th century. Businesses have benefitted from formalized translation services but the dawn of modern practice came with the widespread introduction of the internet.

The internet has revolutionized the ability to access, translate and understand texts and documents from all over the world, whether they be contemporary or historical pieces. Crucially, the need to understand the culture of the original country and that of the target audience is further enhanced by modern tools and practices. Although some instant translation services are capable only of metaphase translation (literal word-for-word translation), specialist firms, platforms and translators are able to translate texts and spoken word into multiple languages whilst observing the relevance and culture of the target receiver.

JOB OF TRANSLATORS

Step 1: Scope out the text to be translated

The first step is to get a feel for the text you're going to translate. That is, the subject matter and content, how long it is, the writing style, if it's technical, the various sections, etc.

The translator will typically read or skim read parts of the text to get an overview of the content.

They may note key concepts or terminology they'll need to research, and will decide if any preliminary background reading is needed.

Sometimes they'll research and resolve how they'll translate key terms before beginning the translation.

Step 2: Initial translation

Now they systematically translate the document, typically in chunks of 5 – 10 words at a time.

Choosing the appropriate length of individual text chunks to deal with is important. Ideally each chunk will be a discrete and complete unit of meaning.

Each chunk also has to be short enough to retain in short term memory. Anything over about 10 words can be a struggle.

Sentences are frequently longer than this, so will typically need to be split up into shorter units.

Working with chunks that are too short or not discrete meaning units tends to produce an unnatural and potentially unclear translation.

On the other hand, working with chunks that are too long to easily remember runs the risk of some meaning being missed in the translation.

Step 3: Review the accuracy of the translation

After the first draft is completed, the translator will then methodically work through the translation comparing each chunk of text with the original (source) text.

The primary goal here is to confirm they haven't missed any content or misinterpreted any meaning.

Most translators will also identify and improve any slightly unnatural or inelegant wording in this step.

Step 4: Take a break

The next step is very simple – put the translation aside and take a break.

Ideally this should be for a few hours or overnight.

The idea is purely to clear the mind to ensure a more effective fifth and final step.

Step 5: Refine translation wording

In the final step the translator re-reads the translation, this time without reference to the source document, looking solely at quality of expression.

They'll make final edits to further refine and "polish" the translated text.

Short answer questions:

1. What is translation according to Bell.?

2. What type of translation is this if a verbal order by Navy is transmuted into flage message?
3. Who looked up translation as a branch of applied linguistics?
4. Where did Eugene A.Nida situate translation?
5. How does Susan Bossnett treat translation?
6. Write Catford's definition of translation.
7. To what method Schleiermacher advocate in translation.
8. When did machine translation start?
9. Whose version of bible had great influence?
10. When was the Bible completely translated into English?
11. Which translation remained a key issue in the seventeenth century?
12. What is the meaning of metaphrase?
13. Who translated 74 volumes of Indian Buddhist scripts into Chinese?
14. Who translated Latin documents into English throughout 20th century?
15. What is the first step of the translation job?

UNIT II

PARAPHRASE

Definition

Express the meaning of something written or spoken using different words, especially to achieve greater clarity.**OR** A rewording of something written or spoken

DESCRIPTION

Paraphrasing is presenting ideas and information in one's own words and acknowledging where they come form. By using own words, one can demonstrate his/her understanding and ability to convey any kind of information.While paraphrasing, one must use his/her words to express something that was written or said by another person could clarify the message, make it more relevant to the audience or give it greater impact.

STEPS TO EFFECTIVE PARAPHRASING

Read the material that you plan to paraphrase. Read it several times so that you understand it well.Set the original aside and write your paraphrase on a note card.

Jot down a few words below your paraphrase to remind you later how you envision using this material. At the top of the note card, write a key word or phrase to indicate the subject of your paraphrase.Compare the length of what is written in the original text. they should be the same length. It is more important that a paraphrase should not condense material.

EXAMPLE

Original text:

..there are two ways to become healthy:to create wealth or to take wealth away from others. The former adds to society. The latter typically subtracts from it., for in the process of taking it away, wealth gets destroyed.A monopolist who overcharges for his products takes away money from those whom he is overcharging and at the same time destroys value. To get his monopoly price, he has to restrict production.

Paraphrase:

Creating wealth adds to society,whereas taking away the wealth of others detracts from it and destroys wealth in the process. For example a monopolist overcharging for a product takes money away from the customer but also destroys value because in order to get the monopoly price, production has to be restricted.

TRANSLITERATION

A **translation** tells you the meaning of words in another language. A **transliteration** doesn't tell you the meaning of the words, but it helps you pronounce them. **Transliteration** changes the letters from one alphabet or language into the corresponding, similar-sounding characters of another alphabet.

Meaning of the word transliteration

Transliteration is the process of transferring a **word** from the alphabet of one language to another. Unlike a translation, which tells you the **meaning** of a **word** that is written in another language, a **transliteration** only gives you an idea of how the **word** is pronounced, by putting it in a familiar alphabet.

When **using** a **transliteration**, type the word phonetically in Latin characters. As you type, you'll see a list of word candidates that map to the phonetic spelling.

Angle brackets may be used to set off transliteration, as opposed to slashes and square brackets for phonetic transcription. Angle brackets may also be used to set off characters in the original script. Conventions and author preferences may vary.

SOME TRANSLITERATED/ROMANISED BIBLE WORDS-

There are a number of words in the English Bible are not at all translations but have been transliterated, sometimes called **Romanized.** The Bible translators took the original word and came up with an English word that sounds similar to the **pronunciation** of the original word.

Examples:

1. **Bethel**- It is the name that Jacob gave to the place where he had a dream in which he saw angels going up and down on a ladder. It is a combination of two **Hebrew** words, **Beth**(House) and **El** (God) and it literally means "house of God."

2. **Manna**-When the children of **Israel** journeyed in the wilderness between Egypt and Canaan, God rained bread from heaven-bread that the Bible calls Manna. When the Israelites first saw that food, which was **small, white andround,** they said, **what is it?** The **Hebrew** word which is translated as "What is it"is the same word that is written in English as "manna" simply means "what is it?"

3. **Angel** - This word is not a translation. It comes from the Greek word **anggelov/aggelos**"-when two **g** sounds are back to back, it is an **n** sound in Greek.

4.**Apostle** - From His disciples, Jesus chose twelve whom He also named apostles. The word Apostle is from the Greek word **alpostolov/apostolos** and it simply means one who is sent or commissioned to do something.

Uses of Transliteration

It is particularly used by **libraries** or for the processing of **textual data**. When a user performs a search or **indexes** content, the transliteration process can find the information written in a different alphabet and returns it into the user's script.

INTER-CULTURAL TRANSFERENCE

Cultural transference

In the process of **transfer** and the migration from one **cultural** situation to another, any object falls into a new context and takes on a new meaning. Each **cultural** zone is also the result of the mixing of different **cultural** elements.

Meaning of intercultural

Occurring between or involving two or more cultures. I**ntercultural** differences an **intercultural** gathering occurring during the growing period between sowing and harvesting **intercultural** operations including weeding, pruning, and fertilizing.

Transference in translation

Transference is the process of transferring an SL word to a TL text. It includes transliteration and is as same as transcription or Naturalization. The latter one adapts the SL word first to the normal pronunciation then to the normal morphology of the TL.

Role of culture in translation

Culture gives language different contexts. The same words passed from one **culture** to another obtain slightly or radically different meanings. Sometimes those meanings represent slight or intense value differences that could be critical in translations.

Translation and Culture

For every translated sentence, the translator must be able to decide on the importance of its cultural context, what the phrase really means. Not necessarily what it literally means and convey that meaning in a way which makes sense not only in the target language but also in the context of the target culture

There are many institutions and practices that exist in one culture and don't exist in other cultures. Deeply believed that commitments to truth vary from culture to culture. Each of these unique culturally based psychological entities is associated with words that have meaning in one language that is distinct to that language and not duplicated in other languages. Translating those unique features of culture can be possible only by someone who steeped in the cultures of both source language and target language.

Taboos and Value Differences

Deeply held taboos in one culture can be completely neutral in another culture. Translation must be sensitive to the moral, spiritual values associations of the words and symbols in the language to find meaning equivalents.The values dimension is where some of the worst translations confounding takes place.

For instance,When president Carter went to Poland in 1977, the state department hired a **Russian interpreter** who was not used to translating into **Polish**. Through that interpreter,

Carter ended up saying things in Polish like **When I abandoned the United States** instead of **when I left the United States** and saying things like y**our lusts for the future** instead of **your desires for the future**. the mistakes became a media field, the day became much embarrassed to the president.

Culture gives language different contexts. The same words passed from one culture to another obtain slightly or radically different meanings. Sometimes those meaning differences represent slight or intense value differences that could be critical in translations.

Use quotation marks to identify any unique term or phraseology that have been borrowed exactly from the source.Once it is decided to incorporate the material into the paper, the source must be recorded (including the page) on **t**he note card. If the paraphrase does not make any sense, it must be revised.

EQUIVALENCE

The idea is that a source text (ST) and target text (TT) should be 'the same' in some sense. One of the most prominent theories regarding equivalence has been proposed by Eugene Nida in his work 'Toward the Science of Translating' introducing the concepts of 'formal equivalence' and 'dynamic equivalence' to which the latter involves 'the principle of equivalent effect'. His theory is often seen as being able to offer a 'scientific' or systematic approach to the analysis and transfer of meaning from one linguistic system to another. It has made huge contributions to the development of translation studies as a field.

Formal equivalence focuses on both the form and content of the message itself where 'nothing' outside of the ST should be added to or removed from the translation, i.e. it should be as similar to the ST as possible in terms of all the different elements of the source language used. By staying within the ST structure, such translations will often use scholarly footnotes. Thus, translations in academic and legal environments will often follow formal equivalence, where readers will be able to get a 'genuine' sense of the language and customs of the source culture. Formal equivalence plays a central role in determining accuracy and correctness of a translation.

Dynamic equivalence is based on 'the principle of equivalent effect': a concept by Nida focusing on equivalence of the relationship between the original receptor and message, and the

target receptor and message. In other words, the goal is to find "theclosest <u>natural</u> equivalent to the source-language message" or to convey the meaning of the ST in the TT as naturally as possible. The aim is so that the resulting TT should not feel 'foreign' and translation of the meaning of the message should take priority over maintaining the structure and phrasing of the ST. This allows for and will sometimes require changes in the lexicon, grammar/syntactic structure and cultural references of the source language i.e. sacrifices in 'faithfulness' to achieve a more natural translation.

Advantages and LimitationsNida's theory focused on putting the target audience at the focus. Instead of just looking at comparing features of and within the source and target texts he emphasised the need to look at the relationship between the reader and the text for both source and target languages.

Nida's Dynamic Equivalence Theory -

Nida discarded traditional approach placing too many demands upon the reader to become informed about the original culture, approached translation from a scientific point of view and shifted the focus to the receptor's response. Nida asserts that the **process o**f translating is to reproduce the message rather than to conserve the form of the utterance, because the content of message is considered to be of prime importance, especially for Bible translating. To preserve the content of the message, grammatical and lexical adjustments are inevitable and the form of the utterance must be altered . Secondly 'the closest natural equivalent' is the ideal product of translating, which requires the translator to avoid awkwardness in order to produce a translation which does not sound like a translation in the target language culture. Based on the discussion of definition of translating, Nida established four sets of priorities to guide real translating practice. **Nida'sthree-stage system of translation** In the first place, the analysis procedure in which the surface structure of the source text is analyzed, comprises three major steps: '(1) determining the meaningful relationships between the words and combinations of words on a grammatical level (2) the referential meaning and (3) the connotative meaning' . Second, a transfer of the message at the kernel level from the source language to the receptor language must take place in translator's brain. the translator then must make any necessary adjustment to produce the target text linguistic and stylistic appropriate. Lastly, the translator must test the translation from the point of view of the amount of dynamic equivalence.The two have been understood basically,

with **dynamic equivalence** as sense-for-sense **translation** (**translating** the meanings of phrases or whole sentences) with readability in mind, and with **formal equivalence** as word-for-word **translation** (**translating** the meanings of words and phrases in a more literal way)

The Importance of Equivalence

The factors that affect human **translation** are mostly the ones that are cultural or linguistic in nature. If these so-called parameters are as effective and accurate as expected, they will help streamline the **translation** process in a convincing and correct manner.

Eugene Nida distinguishes between five types of **equivalence**:

Denotative equivalence

It is the case where the ST and the TT have the same denotations, that is, conveying the same extra linguistic facts;

'connotative equivalence,'

It is also referred to as '**stylistic equivalence**,' is related to the lexical choices.

Paradigmatic equivalence:

It refers to the similarity in the grammatical structures between the two texts. André Lefevere has emphasized on preserving the structures of the SL text as closely as possible but not so closely that the TL structures are distorted.

Pragmatic Equivalence

It refers to words in both languages having the same effect on the readers. While cohesion concerns the surface relations that organize and create a text, coherence is the network of conceptual relations which underlie the surface text as perceived by the language users.

Textual equivalence

when referring to the **equivalence** between a SL text and a TL text in terms of information and cohesion. It is up to the translator to decide whether or not to maintain the cohesive ties as well as the coherence of the SL text.

Problems in Equivalence

The principle that a translation should have an equivalence relation with the source language text is problematic. There are **three** main reasons why an exact equivalence or effect is difficult to achieve.

Firstly, it is **impossible** for a text to have **constant interpretations** even for the same person on two occasions.

Secondly, translation is a matter of **subjective interpretation** of translators of the source language text.

Thirdly, it **maynot be possible** for translators to **determine** how audiences responded to the source text when it was first produced.

If an original was written centuries ago and the language of the original is difficult to comprehend for modern readers, then a simplified translation may well have greater impact on its readers that the original had on the readers in the source culture. No translator would hinder the reader's comprehension by using absolute expressions in order to achieve equivalent effect.Because the target text can never be equivalent to the source text at all levels, researchers have distinguished different types of equivalence. Nida suggests formal and dynamic or functional equivalence. Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. It requires that the message in the target language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language . Dynamic equivalence is based on the principle of equivalent effect, where the relationship between the receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message. Newmark makes a distinction between communicative and semantic translation. Like Nida's dynamic equivalence, communicative translation also tries to create the effect on the target text reader which is the same as that received by readers of the source language text.

As has been mentioned above, problems of equivalence occur at various levels, ranging from word to textual level. The equivalence problems emerge due to **semantic, socio-cultural,** and **grammatical** differences between the source language and the target language. These three areas of equivalence problems are intertwined with one another. The meanings that a word refers to are

culturally bound, and in most cases the meanings of a word can only be understood through its context of use.

Due to **semantic**, **socio-cultural, grammatical** differences between the source language and the target language, loss and addition of information in translation cannot be avoided. According to Nida, all types of translation involve 1) **loss of information**, 2) **addition of informationorskewing of information**. To conform to the stylistic demands and grammatical conventions of the target language, 3)**structural adjustment** in translation is inevitably needed.

1 Addition of information

Information which is not present in the source language text may be **added** to the target language text. According to Newmark information added to the translation is normally **cultural**-accounting for the differences between SL and TL culture,**technical**- relating to the topic, or **linguistic**- explaining wayward use of words. The additional information may be put in the text i.e. by putting it in brackets or out of the text i.e. by using a footnote or annotation. Such additional information is regarded as an extra explanation of culture-specific concepts and is obligatory specification for comprehension purposes.

For example-

1. Native speakers of **Batak Tapanuli language** (the native language of Batak community in North Sumatra), for example, have the word **marhusip** which literally means **to whisper**. If the word marhusip is used in the context of discussing marriage within the community in question, its meaning is more than 'to whisper'. It refers specifically to a situation where family members of the bride meet family members of the groom to talk about the dowry. In the meeting, family members of the bride whisper with one another while deciding the amount of dowry they ask from the groom. Family members of the groom also do they same thing while deciding whether to accept or reject it. In this context, the word marhusip may be translated into 'to whisper', but additional information to clarify the meaning of marhusip is needed to help target readers understand its underlying concept.

2. It would be misleading, for example, if the word men in **Tannen** is an apologist for men is translated into para pria in Indonesian. The reason is that it does not actually refer to men in

general but to American men in particular, who became the focus of Tannen's study on male-female interactions. It can be argued that translators should add the word Amerika to the Indonesian version to avoid ambiguity or to avoid a misleading interpretation of the outcomes of the study by Indonesian readers.

2.**Deletion of information**

Baker refers to deletion as **omission** of a lexical item due to grammatical or semantic patterns of the receptor language. She states further thatthis strategy may sound rather drastic but in fact it does no harm to omit translating a word or expression in some contexts. If the meaning conveyed by a particular item or expression is not vital enough to the development of the text to justify distracting the reader with lengthy explanations, translators can and often do simply omit translating the word or expression in question.Omission is required to **avoid redundancy and awkwardness** and this strategy is particularly applied if the source language tends be a redundant language. The category of plural in English is both **morpho**logically conditioned - e.g. **child/children,** mouse/mice and **phono**logically conditioned - e.g. **book/books**, box/boxes, pen/pens. In some circumstances, a plural noun is also preceded by a **determiner** showing plurality - **some** books, three pens. If the 'double' expression of such category is reflected in Indonesian, redundancy will occur. It is by convention that the category of plural in Indonesian is **lexica**lly formed by repetition of the noun buku-buku (book-book) or by adding a noun **quantifier** such as beberapa (some) or tiga (three). Once a given noun is in the plural form, the quantifier has to be deleted. On the other hand, once there exists a quantifier denoting plurality, the noun in question should be in the singular form or the repetition of the noun should be avoided.

3. Structural adjustment

Structural adjustment is another important strategy for achieving equivalence. Structural adjustment which is also called **shift or transposition or alteration** refers to a **change** in the grammar from SL to TL . To shift from one language to another is, by definition, to alter the forms. The alteration of form may mean changes of categories, word classes, and word orders. Structural adjustment, according to Nida has various purposes, including:

1) to permit adjustment of the form of the message to the requirements of structure of the receptor language

2) to produce semantically equivalent structures

3) to provide equivalent stylistic appropriateness and

4) to carry an equivalent communication load.

SHORT QUESTIONS-

1. Define Paraphrase.
2. What do you mean by Transliteration?
3. Name two popular theorists for translation?
4. Define Equivalence.
5. What are the five types of equivalence?
6. Give an example for transliteration.
7. Differentiate Formal equivalence from Dynamic equivalence.
8. Mention any two equivalence problems.
9. What is cultural transference?
10. What is the role of culture in translation?

UNIT-III

Problems in Translation- Different Level of Translation- Transcreation- Excepts from Bama's **Karukku**

PROBLEMS IN TRANSLATION:

Translation is one of the language skills, which is very crucial to be learned by translators and students in the relevant field of study who are eager to be a professional translator in the future. According to Malkjaer (2011), translation is a sort of activity which is done by a translator at conveying meaning in a text from one language to another language. Both researchers stated that the result of translated-work is not supposed to be like what has been written in the source language (SL) text; however, the purpose of the source language should be conveyed when it comes to the target text (TL).

Waldorf (2013) states that translation is a process of mobilizing the meaning of a particular text from one language to the close equivalent of the target language (TL). Hence, based on the explanations that have been revealed by Malkjaer and Waldorf, translation can be concluded as the process of transferring ideas from one language to another language. Therefore, the translators are only transferring the ideas without changing the purposes of a source text (SL). The purpose of the text in the translation work means the precise meaning of the source text should be conveyed in the target text.

 Mathieu (2003) elucidates the five common issues that appear in the translation world;

They are

Lexical Semantic Problems

 Grammatical Problems

 Rhetorical Problems

 Pragmatic Problem

Cultural Issues Word-choice problems

Lexical Semantic Problem

Mathieu (2003) reveals that in the translation world, the lexical choices which are used by translators affect the meaning of the target text. Additionally, every single word that is available

in the dictionaries will have obvious meaning when they are involved in the context. On the other hand, the word itself can be understood if it has been written in the sentences because one word has thousands of meanings. Thus, the context of the text will elucidate the apparent meaning of the word itself. Moreover, word-choice issues can be resolved by consulting the proper dictionaries for figuring out the particular meaning of every single word, translating collocations and idioms that have meaning by themselves, and finding out the synonym or the antonym of every word. Hence in this way, the translation will not be read monotonously by the readers. For example, in the Indonesian language primarily, learners might say "do not be like people difficult," which means "jangan jadi kaya orang susah,". It should be translated as "do not be such a poor." Additionally, a learner who translates that phrase above is translating the words without knowing the precise meaning of every single word that she/he puts in a sentence.

Grammatical problem:

The translators cannot deny the issue of grammatical aspect in translation. Further, Mathieu (2003) explains that what becomes problematic in translating a text from the source language to the target language is the issue of grammatical aspect, which is different between the source language and the target language. Most translators attempt to adjust the grammatical structure of the target text in translating the source text without altering the meaning or the purpose of the source text. In this way, the text will be read as if the readers enjoy the original text even though the text has been translated into their first languages.

Example: In the source language English "the one whom I saw with him last night was his little brother" in the target language Indonesia becomes: "orang yang aku lihat dengannya itu adalah adiknya". Further, the translator does not translate the precise time of the event occurs. Whereas the word saw and last night indicate that the event occurs in the past time, hence the target readers do not precisely know when the event occurs.

Rhetorical problems:

Rhetorical problems on translation deal with the translator's inability to understanding the figurative language in the source-language text. It results in the reckless translation of the figurative words and figurative sentences. As a result, the figurative words and sentences cannot be understood when they get translated into the target language.

For instance, "my brother was boiling mad," it is a sort of metaphor that cannot be translated literally. Additionally, the precise meaning of that phrase is that my brother is too angry at something. The literal meaning will not show the purpose of that phrase.

Pragmatic problems:

Pragmatics in the translation deals with the process of how the translators interpret the meaning of the source language text before they translate the text itself into the target language. Additionally, pragmatic problems occur when the translators fail at addressing the intended meaning of the source language text into the target language.

Cultural issues:

The cultural issues are the problems which deal with the distinctions of cultural background between two countries, values, and ideological views. Also, Mathieu (2003) states that cultural references such as foods, festival cultural connotations might be hard to translate into the target language. Therefore, the translators have to find out the way in adjusting the meaning or the purpose of the source text into target text by considering the method in translating a text having several cultural terms that need to be adequately translated. For instance, translating a sentence "as white as snow" might be difficult for countries which never have snow. Hence, instead of giving them that sentence "as white as snow" as the postulation, translators should change "as white as cotton" if the countries have cotton as the object to postulate the snow.

Therefore translators have full responsibility in translating a text from the source language into the target language. Translators' competence is needed in order to make a good translation product. Therefore, translators have to update themselves in the movement of translation science.

Thus the translators have to be fully aware of choosing words in the dictionary selectively because most problems stated above always deal with lexical ambiguity where the words have more than one meaning. In addition, the words will be fully understood if they are involved in a certain context of discourse.

Furthermore, the translators supposed to have many references about the world's insight in order to translate the cultural terms appropriately, because most translators are struggling in translating cultural references such as values, ideological views, foods, and other cultural terms of the target text.

TRANSCREATION:

Translation is always a creative process. To a greater or lesser extent professional translation aims to produce a text that expresses everything in the original. Including meaning, style, tone and register. But it isn't the translator's job to introduce meaning that wasn't there before, or take meaning out. This is a line that marks the difference between translation and transcreation.

What is Transcreation?

Transcreation is the process of adapting content from one language to another while maintaining the existing tone, intent and style.While creative translation will generally include some of our original content, just a reworking of specific ideas, transcreation will often be a complete reimagining of our content so that it better resonates with a different culture.

How is Transcreation Different from Translation?

<u>While translation focuses on replacing the words in one language with corresponding words in a new language</u>, transcreation services are focused on conveying the same message and concept in a new language.Transcreation enables translators to inject their own creativity and cultural knowledge to create content that resonates with a new audience.

There are six ways to distinguish between the two:

1. Transcreation specialists are writers.

Usually, people who provide transcreation services are copywriters in other languages instead of translators.Some translators also happen to offer copywriting services in other languages, but in general, these are two different services, and the people who provide the services are not always part of the same professional associations and networking groups.

2. Transcreation starts with a creative brief

Unlike translation, which starts with a source text, transcreation starts with a creative brief, just like our other creative projects do in your source language.Instead of simply providing text to the

transcreation provider, we have to provide them with clearer ideas of the creative concept and the desired action we are hoping to trigger with the copy.

3. Transcreation can be costly

Translation is typically billed by the word, whereas transcreation is billed by the hour, or sometimes by the project billing per word is not an accurate reflection of all the work A transcreator does to recapture and recreate our brand's messaging, since the idea isn't just to translate with equal language.This is because transcreation is a creative services, more like copywriting, graphic design, or video production.

4. Transcreation results in new messaging

Usually, messaging that was written for one target segment or audience will not resonate with a completely different group.With transcreation, the result is brand new messaging that is targeted and localized, while with translation, the result is new words in another language, but with the same messaging.A good translator will translate website or app content "in the spirit" of the source text without being too literal, but even so, the message can lose impact in the process of straight translation.

5. Transcreation is for creative, marketing-focused copy

Translation is perfectly fine for informative text, but when text is designed to trigger an action from the reader, as marketing text usually is, transcreation is simply a better fit.

6. Transcreation involves advising on look and feel as well

Often, providers of transcreation services will also advise customers on the look and feel of a creative asset or campaign, to ensure acceptance and resonance in the local market.Transcreation is about creating new content that captures the brand voice and message in an entirely new language. This isn't a simple translation, but a recreation tailored to a specific culture.

Transcreation in the unique challenge when we set out on our *Move the World with Words* campaign. And this was a challenge solved by transcreation. When we translate a phrase like "move the world with words," there's a lot of

meaning and context to capture. There's a lot of nuance in the language that can lead to confusion.For example, does "move the world" physically mean move the Earth to a new location? In our intentions, the phrase is more around "impacting communities, brands and cultures."So,transcreatio*n* is used specifically for the creative translation of advertising and branding materials, whereas *translation* is a general term.

Threesimilarities between translation and transcreation

1. **Professional translation skills**.
   Absolutely essential for both.
2. **Professional writing skills in the native language**.
   Absolutely essential for both.

3. Inability to be put in a box

Neither the translator nor the transcreator does the same job
every time. The same professional can have the skills to do
both jobs. They then adapt to what the customer needs and
draw from both skill sets asnecessary.

DIFFERENT LEVELS OF TRANSLATION:

Newmark asserts that the process of translation operates in 4 levels:

Source text level: The source text itself and its immediate impression on the translator.

Referential level: The level of content of the text

Cohesive level: The level where you aim at making a cohesive target text.

Level of naturalness: The level of constructing a natural target text in an appropriate language.

The Textual Level: At this level the translator translate or transpose, the syntactic structures of the source text into corresponding structures in the target text. Often the translator will find that, for a variety of reasons, he will have to change the structure into something quiet different target language.

The Referential Level: This is the level of content, the translators operate primarily with the message or semantics of the text. This is where he decode the meaning of the source text and build the conceptual representation. Once the translators have decoded the word or expression in question he encodes it into an appropriate target language expression. Note that there will be a cases, like idioms and metaphors, in which he will have to use literal expression in the target language, because it does not have any corresponding idioms or metaphors. The Referential level and the textual level are, of course, closely intertwined, as the nature and the texture of source text convey the message, and of course he will also encode the message, using language into the target text.

The Cohesive Level:

The Cohesive Level links the textual and referential levels in that it deals with the structure/ format of the text and information as well as with what Newmark calls the mood of the text. At the structural sub level, the translator investigates how various connectors, such as conjunctions, enumerations, reputations or reiterations, definite articles and determiners, general category labels, synonyms, punctuation marks, simple or complex conjuncts, link sentences and structure the text and what Newmark calls its train of thought, which is basically its underlying information structure. All of this will have to be somehow transferred into the target language so the translator achieves maximal equivalence at this level.

The Level of Naturalness:

This level is target text oriented, focusing exclusively on the construction of the target text. Random, unpredictable things that just seem unnatural in the target language makes things more complicated as naturalness often depends on the situation, such that something might seem natural in one context but unnatural in another. Perhaps, the only way, to ensure naturalness is to

read through translation and spot unnaturally sounding parts and change them into something that sounds more natural. This is something that most people skip when they do translations.

References:

Kim Ebensgaard Jensen, Basics of Translation, The process of translating– spring 09. Newmark, Peter,1988,A textbook of translation. Prentice-Hall International (New York). Nord, C. (1991). Text analysis in translation: Theory, methodology and didactic application of a model for translation-oriented text analysis.

EXCERPTS FROM BAMA'S "KARUKKU"

Introduction to the author:

Bama was born in 1958 as Faustina Mary Fatima Rani in a Roman Catholic family at Pudhupatti,Madras. She is also known as Bama Faustina Soosairaj. Bama's ancestors were Hindu Dalit Community. They were agricultural labourers. Her father served in Indian Army.Bama had her early education in her villege. On graduation, she served as a nun for seven years. She is feminist and novelist.Her autobiographical novel 'Karukku'(1992) brought her fame and name. The novel chronicles the joys and sorrows experienced by Dalit Christian women in Tamilnadu. Then she wrote two more novels , Sangati(1994)and Vanmam(2002). She also wrote two collections of short stories: Kusumbukkaran(1996) and Oru Tattvum Erumaiyum(2003).

Introduction to 'Karukku'

After serving as a nun for seven years, Bama left the convent and began writing. With the encouragement of a friend, she wrote on her childhood experiences. These experience formed the basis for her first novel, Karukku. Karukku was critically acclaimed and won the crossword Book Award in 2000. Bama got a loan and set up a school foe Dalit children in Uttiramerur. Bama's Karukku has been translated to English by Lakshmi Holmstorm. The title 'Karukku' means palmyra leaves that with their sharp edges on both sides, are like double –edged swords.

By a felicitous pun,the Tamil word Karukku, containing the word karu, embryo or seed, also means freshness and newness.

Essay on Karukku

Karukku is both fiction and autobiography in a couple of ways. The first way is that Karukku is a recreation of much of the life that Bama lived in her villege. When she left the seminary, Bama was struggling to find her own identity: "I had losteverything. I was a stranger to society. I kept lemanting about her life and harked back to my happy childhood days in the village". This recollection back to her life in "the village" ended up forming the basis for what would be Karukku. The work is a "semi-fictional account of the growing awareness of a Dalit".It contains the elements of autobiography because Bama recalls her own background of life in the village.

The language used is realistic, syntax that is reflective of how she and others spoke in her village. The narratives that are explored in the village where ones that she experienced. Bama's work is autobiographical because it speaks to the predicament of the Dalit, of the untouchable, and how caste marginalization in the village setting serves to silence wise. Karukku is an elegy to the community Bama grew up in. She writes of life there in all its vibrancy and colour, never making it seem like a place defined by a singular cast identity, yet a place that never forgets, and is never allowed to forget its caste identity. She writes simultaneously of humourous incidents he remembers from her childhood, the games she used to play with her friends, good meals with her family and the appression of her community by the police, upper – castes and the convent. In this manner, she presents the pervasiveness of caste appression – how it not only punctuates everyday life, but it is an integral part of it, even in the memory of a community.

Problems in Translating Karukku:

Translation means the conversion of something from one medium into another. English language draws a terminological distinction between translating and interpreting. A competent translator is not only bilingual but bicultural. The translator's role in relation to a text has been compared to that of an artist.Every translator job is very different and hard. He faces many problems in translation. Language structure is difficult to deal with,when we are moving from one origin to a different, target language, it can be difficult to not just translate words. The next problem relates

to the suitability of words being translated. Majority of languages will have words and phrases for most things. But there are always certain words and phrases that are just either totally different or missing entirely from target languages. Words in languages may often have a double meaning. In some dialects, the written language may not be confusing, but cultural differences may come into the mix to make things just that little bit harder for the translator to deal with.

Lakshmi Holmstorm is one the most successful Indian translator. She has received the Crossword Award for translation twice (2001-2007) and the loyal award from the Tamil Literary garden,Canada(2008). She is one of the founder of the Soth Asian Diaspora Literature and Arts Archive.

A close look at the translation of Bama's Karukku may help to understand this issue pertaining to translation. This novel has become a canonical text in the history of Tamil Dalit Writings. It stands as the first of its kind in Tamil especially for its language, its narration of events and for its brilliant useof certain caste codes and signs with an aim to revealing the deep-rooted caste system in Tamil society. Bama has used a local Tamil dialect in her work which is oral in nature. This Tamil,as Lakshmi Holmstorm says that "Dalit style of language" which aims at subverting the given/ built "decorum and aesthetics of received upper class, upper caste Tamil" which Bama also approves. Since caste has its material and geographical existence in India, especially in Tamil societies use of this dialect has become a tool of strengthening the content of Karukku. It also helps the readers to situate the issues in the culture proper and get the region specificity. Inability to capture the dialectical variation may not be as serious an issue compared to the failure to catch such cultural codes, especially in the context of Dalit Literature.

One who reads Bama's Karukku in Tamil can obviously feel the rhythm, the orality and the implied caste – cultural markers of the narrative. But by completing the broken sentences of the dialect, wherein lies the orality of the text, Holmstorm seems to have missed something in the English translation. By pointing out the inability of Christianity to do away with caste, Bama in fact shows the casteised vision of Christianity in Tamil societies. Depressed over the caste

discrimination inside the Christian institutions, Bama comes out of the convent.This double edged critique of Karukku as suggested in the title gives the uniqueness to the text. But the translation seems to have fore grounded only casting Christianity and silenced the larger level

critic of caste in Tamil society represented in the Tamil text to accomplish this task, caste codes and signs are simplified and blunted in the translation. Karukku in translation though tried its best to capture locale of the source text unfortunately fails to capture the rhythm of the narrative and its implications.

UNIT IV

INDIAN THEORY OF TRANSLATION - INDRANATH CHOUDHURI

Indian books are just like the ideas and the concept that makes the laws about tradition, culture, diversity, religion, ethics value and many more things. To convey the same level of understanding around the globe, majority of publisher seek assistant of reliable literature translation to keep up the value of the writing assets accurately.

The majority of the authors shared their opinion on this-translation helps on knitting India with the rest of the World. By removing the linguistic barriers, authors and publishers have an opportunity to expose their imagination, perception and insights in a more prominent manner.

In the past, there were numerous children's books that got translated and became a global sensation. One can learn loads of thing one can learn from this finest example. It easily helps in enhancing the scope and making the work reaches to countless of interested people. Besides through the help of linguistic experts, one can express much better in foreign countries.

An Indian theory of translation stresses rather more the context of translation activities. The unique intersection of culture and politics forms the basis of an Indian theory of translation. It sets it apart from other theories with a cultural bias and become the focus of the challenge to western theories.

Bh.Krishnamurti points out that India is a linguistic area and based on the same analogy one can say India is also a translation area. Being polygots, we use more than one language while speaking or even thinking. But the big question is why isn't there a single critical text specifying the art or science of translation parallel to Panini's Ashtadhyagi or Tolkapier's Tolkapium or Bharata's Natyashastra. It is presumed that in Indian context the exclusive attitude of the speakers of the master narrative is responsible for this kind of a dismal situation. It is true to a greater extent and the reason for this sort of an attitude as traced by Suniti Kumar Chatterjee is very interesting.Polyglotism in ancient India was responsible in the development of translating consciousnesses among the indians. Vatsyayan's phrase Lokopichanuvada which means 'translatibility' explains the historical length of existence of India's translating consciousness.Dr.

S.K.Chatterjee in his book Indo-Aryanand Hindi has proved that much of the literature of Sanskrit, particularly the Mahabharata and the Puranas is based nonetheless on a translation.

If we trace the history of idea of translation in pre-colonial India, we can find translation was popularly practiced as 'retelling' in different Indian languages. Mainly the texts like the Ramayana, the Mahabharata, the Purana and many more Sanskrit texts were used to be translated into different Indian languages. And the stories of those source texts were re-told, recreated again in the specific Indian language to make it more acceptable to the target audience. Such precolonial translation has immense importance in the formation of **Bhasha** or modern Indian languages. Through these translations **Loka, Desha**and **Bhasha** were imagined. So translation

involved not only the local language but it helps people to imagine **Desha** through telling of their local stories or making the characters of deshi from Sanskrit which is known as Debabhasha. According to K.Satchidanandan, original has never been specially privileged and the translator's position has never been secondary in India. Such kind of retelling of classics or epics is also known as recreation or creative departure which was very common practice or prevalent norm of translating. Pre-colonial translation in India was also very much Intertextual, Sujit Mukherjee noted that a variety of terms such as **anuvad** or **vivartanam** from Sanskrit and **tarjuma** from Arabic were prevalent in that period. Mukherjee says that it is the very lack of a single equivalent Indian word for the modern term translation that demonstrates the plurality of practices informing translation activities in pre-colonial India.

Indranath Choudhury mentions that India is a translation area. He says that the Polyglottism in ancient India was responsible for developing translation consciousness among Indians. Vatsyayan's phrase lokopichanuvada which means 'translatability' explains the historical length of existence of India's translating consciousness. While piecing together what has been said about translation in different texts one can realize that in Indian context the term for translation is anuvada i.e. repetition of what is enjoined by a vedic text with a different wording. But repetition is not understood as a literal word-by-word rendering of the original from source to target. In the Indian context the reader is never a passive receiver of a text in which its truth is enshrined. Choudhury also mentions that besides the notion of repetition, Gopatha Brahmana reflects on the doctrine of purposefulness of translation. This is how Choudhury points out that the problem of translation is not cultural or linguistic problem purely but aesthetic problem too. And the word

'prayojanam' is to mention the aesthetic necessity of translation. Ancient Indian translation theorists were very much concern about the aesthetic of translated text. Jaiminiya Nyaya says that the revelation of meaning is translation. Kayyat and Tolkapier talks about '*Pramanaantar*, the contextual meaning which means, when transferred, translation becomes a reality. Choudhury refers, AyyappaPanikar has pieced together some very useful concepts in the context of medieval Indian translation of Sanskrit classics which, in fact, reveal all that is said about translation by the Sanskrit theoreticians, but in a new dimension. They are -

i) anukriti, ii) arthakriya, iii) vyaktivivekam and iv) ullurai.

i) Anukriti is imitation of the original. One can imitate only what one is not. The product of imitation is not the same text, but a similar text; ii) Arthakriya is putting emphasis on the manifold ways in which meanings are enacted in different texts. It emphasizes the creation of meaning or addition, omission, displacement and expansion; iii)Vyaktivivekam is rendering of the meaning inferred by the reader or invoking interpretation based on anumana or inference potential of a given passage; iv) Ullurai is a Dravidian term primarily means the inner speech, not the heard melody but the one unheard or the speech within. In a literary text this is the vital layer. During colonial era, we find translation is being used for very political purpose. One side it helps to build contacts between the East and the West through the translations of the orientalists and the other side it shows how cultural hierarchy and imperial rule was paced with the hegemony of translation done by the British institution in India. Ganesh Devy says, translation as a political weapon is not always and necessarily employed towards reducing the gap between the divine and the profane, the high and the low. In recent years translation theorists like Sujit Mukherjee, Ganesh Devy, Harish Trivedi, Uday Narayan Singh, Tejaswini Niranjana produced masterpieces on Indian translation of colonial and post-colonial era.

Every day new definitions, new methodologies, new ideas and new practices of translation occurs. They are introducing more complex issues involved in the work of translation. The cultural turn and post-colonial approaches in Translation Studies is not only opening new concepts and ideas of Western translation but Indian theoretical practice has also been adapted all these theories to explore verity of Indian translations.

A.K. RAMANUJAN'S THEORY AND PRACTICE-

His output as a translator is distinguished not only by its quantity, quality and variety, but also by the body of prefaces, textual and interpretive notes and scholarly commentary that frame it, reflecting on particular materials and cultures as well as the general process of translation. For Ramanujan, the translator's task is defined by this peculiar set of freedoms and constraints, several of which are particularly important. The translator is expected to render textual meanings and qualities literally, to successfully transpose the syntax, design, structure or form of the original from one language to another and to achieve a communicative intersection between the two sets of languages and discourses. At the same time, the translation has to attempt to strike a balance between the interests of the original author and those of the translator to fulfil the multiple expectations of its imagined readers and to construct parallels between the two cultures and the two histories or traditions that it brings together.

While struggling with the minute particulars of individual poems, the words at the level of metaphrase, the translator also has to try and render into the second language the syntax, structure or design of the original text. Syntax, which Ramanujan treats as a synecdoche for structure, represents the site of textual organization where individual constitutive elements such as words, images, symbols and figures combine with each other to produce a larger unit, an ensemble of effects or a whole. In dealing with the original text's construction as a composite entity, Ramanujan sought to carry over not only its metaphrasable or at least paraphrasal meaning but also equally importantly, its formal principles, its modulations of voice and tone and its combination of effects on the reader. Thus, at the level of syntax, he attempted to translate a text phrase by phrase as each phrase articulates the total poem.
 So when he broke up the lines and arranged them in little blocks and paragraphs, or arranged them step-wise, he used the spacing on the page to suggest the distance or the closeness of elements in the original syntax Moreover , in his overall strategy of translation at the level of combination, he sought to make explicit typographical approximations to what he thought was the inner form of the poem. That is, in moving from the level of literal signification to that of structural significance, Ramanujan attempted to translate not just the words, lines, sentences, images and explicit themes but also the shaping principle of the source-text, its elusive poetic core.

PREPARED BY DR S.KRISHNA PRIYA

Ramanujan developed his conceptions of outer and inner poetic form from two culturally incommensurate sources. On the one hand, he owed the distinction in part to Noam Chomsky's analysis of surface and deep structurein discourse, and to Roman Jakobson's rather different structuralist analysis of the grammar of poetry, especially the latter's distinction between verse instance and verse design.To a remarkable extent Ramanujan's differentiation between outer and inner form, which he formulated in the late 1960s or early 1970s, parallels the distinction between **phenotext** and **genotext**which Julia Kristeva developed around the same time from the same structural-linguistic sources but which she deployed in a post-structuralist psychoanalytical theory of signifying practices. On the other hand, Ramanujan owed the classical Tamil distinction between two genres of poetic discourse, the *akam*-interior, heart, household and the *puram-* exterior, public. For much of his career, Ramanujan treated the interior and the exterior as aspects, divisions or characteristics not only of textual and poetic organization but also of social organization and cultural formation as such, specifically in the domains that Rabindranath Tagore, working in a different Indian tradition early in this century, had independently designated in his novel *Ghare bhaire*as the home and 'the world.Also applied the distinction between outer and inner form to his own practice as a scholar and poet when in a rare and therefore frequently quoted comment, he said that English and his disciplines (linguistics, anthropology) give him his outer forms – linguistic, metrical, logical and other such ways of shaping experience; and his first thirty years in India, his frequent visits and fieldtrips, his personal and professional preoccupations with Kannada, Tamil, the classics, and folklore give him substance - inner forms, images and symbols. Ramanujan felt that the systemic differences between two languages ensure that Benjamin's norm of a literal rendering of the syntax of one is impossible in the other and that a compensatory focus on individual words in such a situation - at the expense of structure or design conflicts with the translator's obligations to render the poem's inner and outer forms faithfully. As he put it, in the case of tenth-century *bhakti* poetry- When two languages are as startlingly different from each other as modern English and medieval Tamil, one despairs. For instance, the 'left-branching' syntax of Tamil is most often a reverse mirror image of the possible English. Medieval Tamil is written with no punctuation and no spaces between words.It has neither articles nor prepositions and the words are agglutinative and layered with suffixes. Moreover, the syntax is a dense embedding of clause within clause.

PREPARED BY DR S.KRISHNA PRIYA

In Ramanujan's view, the relationship between translator and author is subject to two pairs of contradictory desires, with the pairs contradicting each other in turn. One coupling consists of the translator's desire to make a poem out of the translation and the negation of this desire by the reader's conventionalized demand for metaphrase or absolute literal fidelity to the original. The other coupling, which conflicts with the first, consists of the translator's desire to make out of the poetry of the original a poem of his or her own and the negation of this desire by the obligation, conventionally enforced by readers, faithfully to make out of the intertextual encounter with someone else's poem.

No matter what else the translator does, he or she has to be true to the reader of the translation. A translator works in a relatively well-defined and predictable rhetorical situation, since his or her work is addressed to a reader who makes multiple demands on the translator and the translation. This reader, both real and imagined expects the translator to be faithful to the source-text, at the level of metaphrase and at that of outer and inner form. This reader also expects the translator to produce a version that is at once true to the original poem and a poem in its own right. The reader further expects the poem, as translated, to be a reliable representation of the original text, its language, its poetics and tradition, its historical and cultural contexts and so on. That is, in order to fulfil the reader's expectations, a translator has to submit to three concomitant, conflicting norms. They are textual fidelity, aesthetic satisfaction and pedagogic utility. While the translator can satisfy the demands of verbal faithfulness and poetic pleasure when he or she negotiates the difficulties of metaphrase, the search for inner and outer forms and the intrusions of poetic desire and subjectivity that create a tension between representation and appropriation, he or she can fulfil the norm of pedagogic utility only by stepping beyond the immediate constraints of textual transmission, and invoking his or her allegiances to a phenomenon that stands outside the text and beyond its reader in translation.

Ramanujan's strategy in the face of this version of the hermeneuticcircle was to create an opening or aperture with the help of the reader.He argued, therefore, that even as a translator carries over a particular text from one culture into another, he has to translate the reader from the second culture into the first one. This complementary process of imaginative transposition or intertextual acculturation can be initiated and possibly accomplished by framing the poetic translations with prefaces, introductions, afterwords, notes, glossaries and

indices. As Ramanujan says in the Translator's Note to **Samskara**, A translator hopes not only to translate a text, but hopes to translate a non native reader into a native one.

Even as he attempts to initiate the foreign reader's movement towards the native culture of the translated text, however, Ramanujan invokes a different allegiance. This is the translator's fidelity to the original poem's historical situation and tradition – the framework, material and process of transmission over time and across generations, within a culture and even between different cultures – which make possible the survival of texts, ideas and practices in the first place. In giving the reader a sense of the translated poem's native tradition ,the translator, together with his or her reader, enters an immense network of intertextual relations, transactions and confluences spanning both time and space. Ramanujan gives us a **metonymic** glimpse of such a network when referring to his versions of classical Tamil poems.

But the traditions that become the sites of such multiple transpositions are not ready-made or already available. Echoing T.S. Eliot's argument that a tradition has to be acquired with great labour.Ramanujan acknowledges that even one's own tradition is not one's birth right but it has to be earned or repossessed. The old bards earned it by apprenticing themselves to the masters. One chooses and translates a part of one's past to make it present to oneself and maybe to others. One comes face to face with it sometimes in faraway places. At the most general level of effort, then, the translator is engaged in carrying over not only texts but also readers, cultures, traditions and himself or herself in radically metamorphic ways. Translation – which, in its most elementary form, appears to be a matter of metaphrasing, say, a single 'adjective-packed, participle-crowded Tamil poem of four lines thus no longer hinges upon a product, or even a bundle of relations. It evolves instead into an open-ended, multi-track process, in which translator, author, poem and reader move back and forth between two different sets of languages, cultures, historical situations and traditions. In the process of intertextuality, the translations that succeed best are those capable of making the most imaginative connections between widely separated people, places and times. The poems and stories Ramanujan himself chose to translate over four decades had the power to make precisely such connections, and they continue to energize his readers' **heterotopic** worlds.

LITERARY HISTORY AND TRANSLATION: AN INDIAN VIEW

GANESH N. DEVY

Literary history has always treated literary translations as a branch of non-canonical or Para-literature. In the Indian literary tradition, translation has had a place of crucial importance since most literary traditions in modern Indian languages originate in some pioneering work of translation. Therefore, in order to understand the significance of translation in Indian culture, it becomes necessary to discuss at some length the notions of "Para" and "tradition", as well as the phenomenology of the self and the other.

PARA-LITERATURE

"In every literary epoch there are," according to Russian Formalism, "not one but several literary schools. They exist in literature simultaneously, but one of them represents the canonized crest. The others are not canonized and exist obscurely..." Formalistic historiography allows for an element of arbitrariness in canon formation, which it describes by the expression automatization-perceptibility". Once allowance is made for the mysterious arbitrariness in how some literary trends get to become the canonized crest and others exist obscurely, the creation, existence and decline of the non-canonized other trends becomes a foreclosed question. However, the question of obscure traditions, marginal styles and non-canonized texts is of utmost importance to literatures with multilingual historical contexts. The question has a great political urgency in societies that have experienced colonial domination and gender discrimination.

Let us try to conceptualize the other, obscure, suppressed or sub cultural literary phenomena by using the epithet "Para". This prefix has travelled from its Greek origin through Latin, and Middle French to Middle English, retaining most of its original sense, and it now means "by the side of, beside, alongside of, past and beyond." Para-literature would, therefore, include all such activities as are normally considered socially parallel. Linguistically parasitical, psychologically paranoid and historically parenthetical. What is common to all forms of Para-literature is that they are literature without interlocutors; a taboo as far as literary history is concerned.

Para-literature occupies the middle space between literature and non-literature. It is not literature, because it is not accepted in literary canons. It is also not non-literature, because it has the formal attributes of literature. Para-literature is, thus, the literature of the middle space.

The middle space is densely populated. It contains a bewildering range of forms of linguistic creativity, such as science and crime fiction, magazine stories, film and television scripts, street-plays, biographies, autobiographies, memoirs, travelogues, philosophic writings,

religious discourses, popular and folk songs, folklore, proverbs, mantra, tantra and liturgical verses, lullabies, oral narratives, archaic literature, slang and dialect works, children's literature, performed poetry (as in mushairas), pornography, graffitti, comics, advertisements, jokes, cartoons, translations and adaptations. Of course this is a random list of middle-space literary forms.

Middle-space literature can be differentiated from non-literature by virtue of its context, style and performance. In other words, middle-space literature is not without aesthetic form, unlike non-literature. All forms of middle-space literature involve a certain linguistic skill and aesthetic sensibility. They have their own distinctive discourses and conventions, standards of excellence and criteria of achievement. They all have their cultural uses. Any language would be much the poorer without these or similar forms of linguistic creativity.

When new literary traditions emerge, or branch off from an established literary tradition, the new literatures are initially treated as taboo/Para-literatures. The history of literature in modern Indian languages tells us that in the initial period of development of these new traditions, the period of transition from Sanskrit to these new languages was seen as a gradual vulgarization. A similar attitude was displayed in Europe towards the literatures and languages branching out of Latin in medieval Europe. In the early phases of English literary writing outside England and Scotland, in countries like Ireland, the United States and Australia, the British attitude to such literature was invariably patronizing. On the other hand, when a literary tradition acquires substance, the preceding literary trends or traditions lose their acquired status. Though it is true that all obsolete literature does not get relegated to the category of Para-literature, literary history does keep agitating against literary obsolescence.

However, not all Para-literature is a product of literary history's amnesia, nor is all of it the result of hesitation on the part of literary criticism to assimilate new modes of writing. Much of Para-literature is downgraded to that status due to contemporary repressions guided by hierarchic stratification within a community. In most communities a lower "aesthetic" value is attached to literature produced by and for children and women in literary criticism and history controlled by the males and adults of those communities. Children and women form two major repressed segments of most communities. Their literary requirements and aesthetic sensibilities are taken less seriously than they deserve. Para-literature therefore accurately reflects the patterns of social repression. In addition to these, there is one more conventional method of repression in India. The sub continental and poly-linguistic country has always had a common mainstream literary tradition, whether in Sanskrit, Pali, Persian. Hindi or English. The regional literary traditions in India have to encounter the imperialism of the mainstream traditions. At present this is the condition of about eighty-five tribal and minority languages, and literary forms in them. These are languages spoken by more than 100,000 speakers each but not listed as languages of administration in the Eighth Schedule of India's constitution. The literary aesthetics of these languages is never given even the minimum passing consideration in Indian literary discourse. Their situation is like that of literatures in Indian languages in relation to the

contemporary world canon of literature. Para-literature is thus the literature of linguistic communities on the periphery of political orders. The psychological desire to castrate one's adversary often takes linguistic expression.

The linguistic creativity of politically subjugated sections is then made a victim of this desire by the dominating language groups. During the nineteenth century, European anthropologists turned perfectly normal literary activity in Africa into para-literature. Orientalism did the same for the Asian nations. Para-literature, in which it is a usual practice to include oral narratives and folk forms, is perceived to be closer to the region of the unconscious.

The primitive in society, the unconscious in the psyche, and the "para" in literature may have intrinsic attributes in a given period, but these are not absolute categories. Their attributes in a given period are gradually determined over a preceding long period through processes of repression. Therefore, what is civilized can come to be considered primitive, what belongs to accessible areas of consciousness can be relegated to the territory and terror of the unconscious, and what is literature can invite description as para literature. Movements in the opposite directions too are possible. These movements are of crucial formative importance in the history of literature, both as system of totems and taboos, and as dynamic cultural practices.

Since there is essentially no difference between literature and para-literature, the boundaries between the two are not permanently sealed. There is a constant mutual exchange between the two. This exchange proceeds along certain established lines. To articulate the nature of this exchange should be one of the primary objectives of literary history. As in the history of language. so too in the history of literature, the trends and styles initially developed on the margins tend to gravitate towards the centre. Removed from the original context, sometimes the para styles change their intended performance in the changed literary context. Conventions of comic literature often originate in the not so comic dialects of the socially less-privileged classes. Conventions of the tragic, epic and canonical originate in the well-formed registers of the socially privileged classes. Once formulated, these languages and literatures become socially-usuable systems. Thus, the marginal (or, desi: regional) and the dominant (or, marga: mainstream) literary traditions keep alternating their positions. This continuous and inevitable mobility of literary con ventions is what the term "evolution" of literature should rightly imply. Literature, as a social and cultural activity, is a continuous re-ordering of the total field of meaning avail. able to a society through language, a continuous re-structuring of various levels of received language. Literature, in order to be socially meaningful, has to re-appropriate the sources of language so as to invest the language system with new possibilities of consciousness. Hence, the linguistic activity on the margins of a language community, the para-literary activity, has an important role to play in the literary enrichment of that language. For this reason it deserves attention by literary history.

It may be said that the distinction between literature and para-literature is not a distinction between two different fields, but a distinction within a single field, as the one between totems and taboos within a single culture, or as between the self and the non-self within a single field of consciousness. The political dispossession of linguistic and social margins is the root cause of the creation of the category. The relationship between literature and para-literature is closely comparable to that between the psychologically masculine, and the psychologically feminine other. It is a relationship in which the female other is seen as being closer to the unconscious, the primitive, the marginal, and yet indispensable. Ultimately, it is the need for this dialectics of self-cognition for literature that creates the category of para-literature.

If the dialectical relationship between the dominant trends and marginal trends is considered a process forming the backbone of the history of literature, it would still be necessary to specify the nature of this dialectics in a given culture, for it may vary from culture to culture. In other words, canon formation may be a common experience for all literatures in the world, but the processes through which canons are formed in a given literary culture are likely to be peculiar to that particular literary tradition. It is not enough for literary history to describe the canon; it is also necessary, and even more important, to explain the culture-specific processes of canon formation so as to make literature a socially integrated sub-system of culture. Therefore, if the relationship between literature and para-literature is of vital importance to the self-cognition of literary canons, it would be essential for any perspicuous literary history to consider the nature of a society's narcissistic structure.

SWA AND PARA: SELF AND THE OTHER

It is at this stage that we have to introduce another term to help us conceptualize the narcissistic structure of Indian society, as understood in Indian traditions. The term we can use is para, which is accepted by a large majority of modern Indian languages as the term for "other". The original Sanskrit term, replete with meanings, indicates: "distant, further, enemy, afterwards, beyond, other, far off, etc." Its superlative form. param, how ever, moves onto a more idealistic plane by generating sacred terms such as parameswar, parabrahman, terms related to the discourse of the other world. The term is shared by Dravidian languages too, with revealing deviations. Tamil uses parai as the term for drums played by outcaste drummers of the paraiyan community, which incidentally, is also the origin of a similar English term, "pariah". One is not sure if the Greek para and the Sanskrit para have a forgotten common source, but it is possible to deduce from the linguistic evidence we have that in all languages in which the Greek and the Sanskrit term para has been assimilated, it is used to indicate "otherness" as a psychological phenomenon as well as a spatial term, as if the psychological space is revealed through this term as a geographical metaphor. Thus the modern English has "parish" and "parochial" indicating restricted psychological and geographical spaces. In Indian languages the term paradesh is used to indicate foreign or alien land. Such peculiar use of the term for describing space as well as otherness, indicating the unarticulated wisdom inherent in human languages, is properly theorized in the following formulation by Jacques Lacan:

The notion of the role of spatial symmetry in man's narcissistic structure is essential in the establishment of the basis of a psychological analysis of space [...] Let us consider that animal psychology has shown us that the individual's relation to a particular spatial field is, in certain species, mapped socially, in a way that raises it to the category of subjective member ship. I would say that it is the subjective possibility of the mirror projection of such a field into the field of the other that gives human space its originally 'geometric' structure, a structure that I would be happy to call kaleidoscopic [...] Such, at least, is the space in which the imagery of the ego develops, and which rejoins the objective space of reality.

Indian epistemology too admits the kaleidoscopic structure within the ego-space. But the kaleidoscoping it visualizes is not between the field of the self and the field of the non self. It is rather between the field of the self and the field of the greater-self. It is a theology bound epistemology. The Katha Upanishad is eloquent on this issue: The tree of eternity has its roots in heaven above and its branches reach down to earth. It is Brahman [...] Brahman is seen in a pure soul as in a mirror clear, and also in the Creator's heaven as clear as light, but in the land of shades as reflections in trembling water. When the wise man knows that the material senses come not from Spirit, and their waking and sleeping belong to their own nature, then he grieves no more. Beyond the senses is the Spirit of man, and beyond this is the Spirit of the universe, and evolver of all. And beyond is Purusha, all pervading, beyond definitions."

Here too, as in Lacan, the key terms are mirror and reflection, which complete the grand hoop of human consciousness by inductive leaps. But the mapping of the narcissistic structure is different. Indian texts, whether emerging from the Vedas, the Upanishads, or secular literature, see the self and the non-self as reflections of Purusha, the greater-self. as mere passing images of a reality beyond human perception. In that sense the dichotomy between the self and non-self has not been conceptualized in radical terms, Buddhist psychology too did not visualize any such opposition between the self and the non-self. In fact, the entire spectrum of human existence is seen in Indian thought in terms of a com plex continuum. To introduce concepts of polarities in it is considered by Indian thought as tantamount to a profoundly ignorant act of consciousness. How can one reconcile this concept of the ego-space with the rational experience of the senses, which form the physi cal basis for the recognition of the non-self? Traditional Indian epistemology circumvents this difficulty by introducing a taxonomy of knowledge. Indian tradition divided know ledge into false knowledge, avidya, and authentic knowledge, vidya. The two are not radi cally different, but they can be recognized as such in terms of a polarity in the spectrum of knowledge. Avidya is the knowledge flowing from the senses to the soul. Vidya, on the contrary, is the knowledge flowing from the soul to the senses. The knower of vidya is a guru, a spiritual guide. These categories were neatly separated from those related to system atized perception of material phenomena, for which the terms gnana and vignana (approximately corresponding to modern humanities and science, respectively) were employed. The knower of the latter was acarya, a teacher, a scholar. An experience of para, the foreign or alien, thus brings

in to play the knowledge of the other, which, when it is guided by vidya (spiritual knowledge) obscures the duality between the self and the non-self, leading to a recognition of the self within the non-self. Sudhir Kakar, who has presented highly-engaging theses on Indian psychoanalysis, comments at length on the sense of the self in Hindu tradition in his study The Inner World. His observations as a professional scholar of psychology would be of immense use to us in defining the priorities of Indian literary history. Discussing the concepts of I. Ego and Self, he writes:

The distinctions between vidya and avidya - true and false consciousness - between reality and maya, illustrate a fundamental difference between Hindu and Western world images, as well as a discrepancy in the modes of thought and apperception, which even the best intentioned movements of cultural ecumenism cannot hope to bridge satisfactorily. The maintenance of ego boundaries, between inside and outside', and between 'l' and 'others' and the sensory experiences and social relations based on these separations, is the stuff of reality in Western thought and yet maya to the Hindus. The optimal discrimination of this reality of separ news, express: in terms of heightened ego functions such as reality sense, reality testing and adaptation to reality, is the stated goal of most Western psychotherapies, but of paltry importance in the Hindu ways of liberation. A good reality sense, according to psycho-analysis, shows itself in the absence of a conscious feeling of the self or the various selves. This, however, is precisely the situation which the Hindu ways of liberation would seek to reverse. And if in the course of development the child learns to differentiate between himself and what is not a part of him, between 'me" and 'not-me' - a process in which the individual's sense of space, time, causality and individuality are formed, and ego boundaries are constituted, then in a certain sense the Hindu ways of liberation (...) seek to undo this process of ego development.

If, as modern psychoanalysis tells us, the tendency of the dominant Indian psycho logical type is towards establishing the non-duality of self and non-self in the narcissistic field, the tendency in the altruistic field must, therefore, be that of allowing a free interplay between the central and para cultural elements.

It would, however, be inaccurate to think that the Aryan epistemology of the self other relationship remained unchanged in the long history of India. Hinduism has been an amorphous mass of ideas and practices, within which an amazing variety of dissenting viewpoints emerged and eventually merged. Besides, for about a thousand years India has produced a powerful and complex tradition of Indian Islam, and for two centuries created hybrid cultural practices out of the encounter with the modern West. Yet, the amazing capacity to assimilate alien cultural, linguistic, and literary elements is a unique and essential feature of Indian history. Though the Western countries too have been exposed to a very large number of alien cultures during the last two hundred years, their assimilation of alien cultural traits has been relatively restricted, corresponding to their relationship of otherness with the foreign cultures.

It is of course not true that metaphysics of non-duality between the self and the non-self did not create social stratification in India. All the plethora of evidence in Indian history goes directly against such an assumption. No other society in the world is, and was, perhaps, more fragmented, stratified and torn with strife than Indian society. It is divided linguistically, regionally, in terms of caste, income, faith, and profession. What is true, perhaps, is that the tendency towards dissension is counterbalanced by a political and social organization based on consensus. It is for this reason that a careful study of the exchanges between literature and para-literature becomes all the more vital to a proper understanding of India's literary past, and thereby the literary present.

TRADITION AND TRANSACTION

European literary historiography uses the paradigm of a single dominant literary tradition. There is very little debate about the central canon of British literature. Occasional debates about particular preferences of styles and periods do take place, as the one created by T. S. Eliot's preference for the Metaphysical over the Romantics; but the overall range of the canon has never been in doubt. At stage in the traditions of English literary criticism was there allowance made for a non-British writer to be included in the British canon, even when some very good works were produced in the language of the British Isles outside, on other continents. On the other hand, in India, a writer with Greek ancestry as Asvaghosa, with Irish nationality as Nivedita, with Caribbean back ground as Naipaul, with Arabic training as Ibn Battuta, have been accepted as Indian writers. Languages such as Persian, Arabic, English, French and Portuguese have been accepted in India as languages of Indian literature. The English canon has never thought of any translation as a great work of literature, the emphasis of Anglo-poetics being on the original (though perhaps the aesthetically most intricate work in English is the King James Version of the Bible, a translation). In India some of the most respected literary classics have originated in attempts to translate: the Jnaneswari in Marathi, Kamban's Ramayana in Kannada, Tulsi's Ramayana in Hindi, Tagore's Gitanjali in English are some examples. Again. Indian literature has in it the peculiar phenomenon of bilingual writers. The number of bilingual writers in India is so large, and the longevity of this practice so substantial, that bilingual literature is more a norm than an exception in India. Considering these major differences in literary practices in India and Western countries, it is obvious that the concept of a single dominant literary tradition, a single and fairly well defined literary canon and historical criticism couched in a unidirectional philology will not prove adequate to interpret the literary history of India. The particular problem for literary historiography can get a useful lead from developments in general historiography in India in recent years. In this respect, specifically useful is Ramila Thapar's important essay on tradition in Cultural Transaction and Early India: Tradition and Patronage. In this essay Thapar discusses the Indian concept of tradition, and more particularly the historical reconstruction of tradition. Through several convincing examples, she makes it clear that at any given time there might be a normative code of tradition, but at the same time there exist numerous deviations from the norm. It is therefore possible, as Thapar argues, to project a variety of traditions as

dominant in Indian history and culture, none of which are more or less authentic that the rest. One of the striking examples she selects to put her view across is that of the Mahabharata. The story of Shakuntala used by Kalidasa existed in the Mahabharata previous to his rendering, The two versions have different philosophic and ideological orientations. After Kalidasa's use of the story, the two versions co-existed in Indian culture. Thaparasks, which of the two is authentic? Her answer is that authenticity of tradition arises out of subjective reading by historians:

For such a diverse community to create a uniform cultural tradition for itself can become an exercise in juggling with history. Traditions are not self-created: they are consciously chosen. and the choice from the past is enormous [...] If we are to understand the role of religion in the Indian society of earlier times we may have to move away from the paradigm of Hinduism and the other religions in India as projected in the colonial period (...) Complex societies have competing value systems and attempts are made by the more established to delete ideologies of protest or of divergent values...

What is true of the national history of India is also, and far more pertinently, true of its literary history, given the multilingual literary context. Western historiography of liter ature is based on literary histories which do not have traditions fragmented in terms of multiple parallel traditions. The term 'parallel' can be applied to popular or folk traditions in European contexts. In India, the parallel traditions are really alternative traditions rather than "lower" traditions. This point can be made clearer through some examples. When Panini wrote his grammar in pre-Christian centuries, he spoke of two discourses of Sanskrit, one used by the common people and another that was grammatically correct. When Bharata composed his treatise on drama, he spoke of two types of theatre, one catering to the public and other based on dramatic conventions. Both Panini and Bharata speak about the popular and the doctrinaire as insiders, not in terms of the self and the other. Dandin, a seventh century Sanskrit theoretician, describes several competing literary styles from different regions of India. They were all styles of Sanskrit poetry: in describing these, Dandin does not arrange them in an aesthetic or sociological hierarchy. In the eleventh century, Rajasekhara could write plays in Maharashtri as well as Sanskrit. Jayadeva, in the twelfth century, wrote poetry in Bengali as well as Sanskrit. Hemacandra, in the thirteenth century, wrote in Gujurati and Sanskrit. Namadeva wrote poems in Hindi and Punjabi too, in addition to writing in Marathi. Thyagaraja of Telugu had no hesitation in learning diction and metre of Gujarati poetry. Eknath prepared a scholarly edition of Jnaneswara's Bhavarthadipika, using the written medium, and 'published' most of his own poems using the oral medium of singing. There are innumerable writers who write in Urdu and Hindi. Hindi and Punjabi, Oriya and Bangla, Gujarati and Marathi, English and some Indian language. None of them shows signs of any unusual anxiety about being torn or split between traditions. An average Indian reader, if he is reasonably well educated, reads works in his own language, in one or two other Indian languages, in English trans lation from other languages, and yet does not feel anxiety or guilt for the loss of his linguistic, literary or cultural identity. The Indian tradition has given to every sensitive Indian the capacity to internalize a multiplicity of traditions. In India, the folk traditions

can be as erudite as the dominant lexical traditions; and apparently outmoded styles and diction can find unexpected revivals. Thus it would be improper to distribute the tradition either in clearly demarcated periods, or according to clearly demarcated class origins of literature. It would be inappropriate even to speak of literary tradition in terms of a tradition of texts in a single given language. A better approach would be to think of the literary history of India in terms of a constant exclusion of para-literatures from the cultural centers and a constant assimilation of para literatures into the centers of culture, and a complex pattern of conflict and collaboration of many minor traditions.

The idea of a pure state of authentic existence at the point of origin is not appropriate to view Indian literary history: probably it is not appropriate to view any literary history at all, except that of literature in proto-Indo-European, if it existed at all, for at that point of history we have with us nothing but a sense of mystery and myth. So far, Western literary historiography has not come to terms with the basic fact about literary history, that all traditions of literature originate in the act of translation. An act of translation holds two or sometimes more different traditions momentarily together for cross fertilization, and in that sense all translations are sahitya (literature).

TRANSLATION AS ORIGIN

"Translation is the wandering existence in a perpetual exile," says J. Hillis Miller. This statement obviously alludes to the Christian myth of the Fall, exile and wandering. In western metaphysics translation is an exile, a fall from the origin: and the mythical Exile is a metaphoric translation, a post-Babel crisis. Given this metaphysical precondition of western aesthetics, it is not surprising that literary translations are not accorded the same status as original works. Western literary criticism provides for the guilt of translations for coming into being after the original; the temporal subsequentiality is held as a proof of diminution of their literary authenticity. The strong sense of being an individual, given to Western individuals through systematic philosophy and the logic of social history, makes them view translation as an intrusion (a sometimes pleasurable intrusion) of the other". This intrusion is desirable to the extent that it helps define one's own identity: but not beyond that point. It is of course natural for monolingual European cultures to be acutely conscious of the act of translation. The philosophy of individualism and the meta physics of guilt, however, render European literary historiography incapable of grasping origins of literary traditions. One of the most revolutionary events in the history of English style was the authorized translated version of the Bible. It was also the literary expression of Protestant Christianity. The recovery of the original spirit of Christianity was thus sought by Protestant England through an act of translation. It is well known that Chaucer was translating the style of Boccacio into English when he created his Canterbury Tales. When Dryden and Pope wanted to recover a sense of order, they used the tool of translation. Similar attempts were made in other European languages such as German and French.

During the last two centuries the role of translation in communicating literary movements across linguistic borders has become very important. The tradition that has given us writers like Shaw, Yeats, Joyce, Beckett, and Heaney in a single country - the tradition of Anglo-Irish literature branched out of the practice of translating Irish works into English initiated by Macpherson towards the end of the eighteenth century. The body of literature called Indian-English Literature too has gathered its conventions of writing from the Indological activity of translation during the late eighteenth century and the nineteenth century. Many of the Anglo-Irish and Indian-English writers have been able translators themselves. Similarly, the settler colonies such as Australia, Canada, and New Zealand have impressive modern traditions of literature, which have resulted from the "translation" of the settlers from their homeland to alien locations. Post-colonial writing in the former Spanish colonies in South America, in the former colonies in Africa, and in other parts of the world has experienced the importance of translation as one of the crucial conditions for creativity. Origins of literary movements and literary traditions inhabit various acts of translations.

Considering the fact that most literary traditions originate in translation, and gain substance through repeated acts of translation, it would be useful for a theory of literary history if a supporting theory of literary translation were available. However, since translations are popularly perceived as unoriginal, not much thought has been devoted to the aesthetics of translation. Most of the primary issues too have not been settled in relation to translation: issues related to the "form" and "meaning" of translation. No critic has taken any well-defined positions about the exact placement of translations literary history. Do they belong to the history of target languages, or do they belong to the history of source languages? Or do they form an independent tradition all by themselves? This ontological uncertainty which haunts translations has rendered translation studies a hap hazard activity which devotes too much energy to the discussion of problems of the original meaning in the altered structure.

Unfortunately for translation, the various developments about the interdependence between meaning and structure in the field of linguistics have been based on monolingual data and situations. Even the sophisticated and revolutionary theoretical formulations proposed by structural linguistics are not sufficiently adequate to unravel the intricacies of translation activity.

Roman Jakobson is an important name in the history of structural linguistics. In his essay on the linguistics of translation he proposes a three-fold classification of translations: a) those from one verbal order to another verbal order within the same language system: b) those from one language system to another language system; c) those from a verbal order to another system of signs. As he considers, theoretically, complete semantic equivalence as the final objective of a translation act - which is not possible he asserts that poetry is untranslatable. He maintains that only "creative translation" is possible. This view finds further support in Formalistic poetics, which considers every act of creation as a completely unique event. It is, however, necessary to recognize that synonymy within one language system cannot be conceptually identical with synonymy between two different languages. Historical linguistics has some useful premises in

this regard. In order to explain linguistic change, historical linguistics employs the concept of semantic differentiation as well as that of phonetic glides. While the linguistic changes within a single language occur more predominantly due to semantic differentiation, they also show marked phonetic glides. However, the degree of such glides is more pronounced when a new language comes into existence. In other words, linguistic changes within a single language are predominantly semantic in nature, whereas the linguistic differences between two closely related languages are predominantly phonetic. Technically speaking, then, if syn onymy within one language is a near impossibility, it is not so when we consider two related languages together.

Structural linguistics considers language a system of signs, arbitrarily developed, that tries to cover the entire range of significance available to the culture of that language. The signs do not mean anything by or in themselves, they acquire significance by virtue of their relation to the entire system to which they belong. This theory naturally looks offensively at translation, which is an attempt to rescue /abstract significance from one system of signs and to wed it with another such system. But language is an open system. It keeps admitting new signs as well as new significance in its fold. It is also open in the socio-linguistics sense that it allows an individual speaker or writer to use as much of it as he can or likes to do. If this is the case, then how "open" is a particular system of verbal signs when a bilingual user, such as a translator, rends it open? Assuming that, for an individual, language resides within his consciousness, we can ask whether the two systems within his consciousness can be shown to be materially different, whether they retain their individual identities within the sphere of his consciousness? Or do such systems become a single open and extended system? If translation is defined as some kind of communication of significance, and if we accept the structuralist principle that communi cation becomes possible because of the nature of signs and their entire system, it follows that translation is a merger of sign systems. Such a merger is possible because systems of signs are open and vulnerable. The translating consciousness exploits the potential open ness of language systems; and as it shifts significance from a given verbal form to a corres ponding but different verbal form it also brings closer the materially different sign systems. If we take a lead from phenomenology and conceptualize a whole community of "translating consciousness", it should be possible to develop a theory of interlingual synonymy as well as a more perceptive literary historiography.

The concept of "translating consciousness", and of communities of people possessing it, are not mere notions. In most third-world countries, where a dominating colonial language has acquired a privileged place, such communities do exist. In India several languages are simultaneously used by language communities as if these languages formed a continuous spectrum of signs of significance. The use of two or more different languages in translation activity cannot be understood properly through studies of foreign language acquisition. Such theories work round the premise that there inevitably is a chronological gap, an order or a priority scale in language-learning situations. The field is stratified in terms of value-based indicators L1 and L2, though in reality language-learning activity may seem very natural in a

country like India. In Chomsky's linguistics the concept of semantic universals plays an important role. However, his level of abstraction marks the farthest limits to which the monolingual Saussurean linguistic materialism can be stretched. In actual practice, even in Europe, the translating consciousness treats the source language and the target language as parts of a larger and continuous spectrum of various intersecting systems of verbal signs.

Owing to the structuralist unwillingness to acknowledge the existence of any non systemic or extra-systemic core of significance, the concept of synonymy in the West has remained inadequate to explain translation activity. And in the absence of a linguistic theory based on a multilingual perspective or on translation practice, translation studies in the West overstate the validity of the concept of synonymy. J. C. Catford presents a comprehensive theoretical formulation about the linguistics of translation in his work A Linguistic Theory of Translation (1964), in which he seeks to isolate various linguistic levels of translation. His basic premise is that since translation is a linguistic act any theory of translation must emerge from linguistics:Translation is an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another. Clearly, then, any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language – a general linguistic theory.

The privileged discourse of general linguistics today is closely interlinked with developments in anthropology, particularly after Durkheim and Levi-Strauss. As noted previously, colonial Europe had distributed various fields of humanistic knowledge into a three-fold hierarchy: comparative studies for Europe, orientalism for the Orient, and anthro pology for the rest of the world. In its various phases of development modern western lin guistics has connections with all of these. After the discovery of Sanskrit by Sir William Jones, historical linguistics in Europe depended heavily on Orientalism. For along time afterwards linguistics followed the path of comparative philology. And after Saussure and Levi-Strauss, linguistics started treating language with an anthropological curiosity. When linguistics branched off to its monolingual structuralist path, comparative literature still persisted in its faith in the translatability of literary texts.

Comparative literature implies that between two related languages there are areas of significance that are shared just as there may be areas of significance that can never be shared. Translation can be seen as an attempt to bring a given language system in its entirety as close as possible to the areas of significance that it shares with another given language or languages. All translations operate within this shared area of significance. Such a notion may help us distinguish synonymy within one language and the shared significance between two related languages.

The translation problem is not just a linguistic problem. It is an aesthetic and ideological problem with important bearing on the question of literary history. Literary translation is not just a replication of a text in another verbal system of signs; it is a replication of an ordered sub-system of signs within a related language. Translation is not a transposition of significance or signs. After the act of translation is over, the original work still remains in its original position.

PREPARED BY DR S.MERCY LOURDES LATITIA

Translation is rather an attempted revitalization of the original in another verbal and temporal space. Like literary texts that continue belong to their original periods and styles and also continue to exist through successive chronological periods, translation at once approximates the original and transcends it. The problems in translation studies are, therefore, very much like those in literary history. They are the problems or relationship between origins and subsequentiality. And as in translation studies, so too in literary history the problem of origin has been tackled satisfactorily. The point that needs to be made is that probably the question of the origins of literary traditions will have to be viewed differently by literary communities with "translating consciousness". The fact that Indian literary communities do possess this translating con sciousness can be brought home effectively by reminding ourselves that the very foundation of modern Indian literatures is laid through acts of translation, whether by Jayadeva, Hemcandra, or Michael Madhusudan Dutta, H. N. Apte, or Bankim Chandra Chatterjee.

We began our discussion in this section by alluding to the Christian metaphysics that conditions the reception of translation in the Western world. Let us allude to Indian metaphysics in conclusion. Indian metaphysics believes in an unhindered migration of the soul from one body to another. Repeated births is the very substance of the fate of all animate creations. When the soul passes from one body to another, it does not lose any of its essential significance. Indian philosophies of the relationship between form and essence. structure and significance are guided by this metaphysics. The soul, significance, is not subject to the laws of temporality; and therefore, significance, even literary significance, is a historical in the Indian view. Elements of plot, stories, characters, can be used again and again by a new generation of writers, because Indian literary theory does not lay undue emphasis on originality. If originality were made a criterion of literary excellence, a majority of Indian classics would fail the test. The true test is the writer's capacity to transform, to translate, to restate, to revitalize the original. An sense Indian literary traditions are essentially traditions of translation.

SHORT ANSWER QUESTIONS

1. What does the epithet 'para' mean ?

2. What is common to all forms of para literature as far as literary history is concerned ?

3. Mention any two forms of middle space literary.

4: What is evolution in the literature according to G.N Devy?

5. What are The three fold classification of translation according to Roman Jakobson?

6.What is the statement of J.Hillis Miller on translation? To what does this statement allude ?

7. What is the difference between avidya and Vidya?

8.How does structral linguistics Consider language

UNIT V Translation Practice

Translated the following sentences from Tamil to English:

1.அகத்தின்அழகுமுகத்தில்தெரியும்

Face is the mirror of heart.

2.பறவைகள்கூடிலிருந்துஇறைதேடபறந்துசென்றது

The birds flew in search of prey

3.இயற்கைவளமேஒருநாட்டின்பெரியசொத்தாகும்

Natural beauty is the greatest asset of a country

4.சிறுதுளிபெருவெள்ளம்

pennies make pound.

5.அளவுக்குமிஞ்சினால்அமிர்தமும்நஞ்சு

Amritam is also poisonous in excess

6.ஆற்றில்ஒருகால்சேற்றில்ஒருகால்

A foot in the river and a foot in the mud.

7.உதட்டில்உறவுஉள்ளத்தில்பகை

Enmity in the heart of the lip relationship.

8. ஒருகைதட்டினால்ஒசைஎழும்புமா

A whispering bone with one hand.

9.ஒன்றுபட்டால்உண்டுவாழ்வு

If one has life.

10.சின்னமீனைபோட்டுபெரியமீனைபிடி

Put the small fish and catch the big fish.

Translate the following proverbs from English to Tamil:

1.A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush

கையில்ஒருபறவைபுதரில்இரண்டுமதிப்புடையது.

2.A friend in need is a friend indeed.

தேவைஒருநண்பர்உண்மையில்ஒருநண்பர்ஆகிறது.

3.A good man is hard to find.

ஒருநல்லமனிதனைக்கண்டுபிடிப்பதுகடினம்

4.Birds of a feather flock together

ஒருஇறகுபறவைகள்ஒன்றாகச்செல்கின்றன

5.Charity begins at home.

அறம்வீட்டில்தொடங்குகிறது.

6. Don't count the chicken before they hatched.

அவர்கள்குஞ்சுபொரிப்பதற்குமுன்புகோழியையெண்ணவேண்டாம்.

7.Every man has his price.

ஒவ்வொருமனிதனுக்கும்அவனுடையவிலைஇருக்கிறது.

8.First come, first served.

முதலில்வருபவர்முதலில்கவனிக்கபடுவர்.

9.Good fences made good neighbours.

நல்லவேலிகள்நல்லஅயலவர்களைஉருவாக்கியது.

10.He who hesitates is lost.

தயங்குபவர்தொலைந்துபோகிறார்.

Dr.S.Krishna Priya