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2.0
This chapter deals with the review of related literature. The theories on translation that the researcher studies in order to strengthen the research work are discussed here. It attempts to present a critical review of the history and various theoretical perspectives of translation. The history and the theoretical issues are very important to the present study to compare and to contextualize them with the issues of the present study. It also looks at the tradition of translation in Gujarati literature and the problems of translating Gujarati fiction. It also presents a brief review on research in translation.

2.1 Introduction
Translation studies are rich in inventions and theories. Each era is characterized by the appearance of new theorists and fields of research in translation. A history of world culture from the perspective of translation reveals a constant movement of ideas and forms, of cultures constantly absorbing new influences because of the work of translators. It dispels the assumption that everything starts in the West and undermines the idea of rigid boundaries between the East and the West. It is true that the western history of translation is larger and rich in proportion to that of the Indian, but we should not deny that the translation history of the latter has also started developing year by year. Over the centuries the translators have made important contribution in dissemination of ideas and information to a larger audience, in shaping of cultures and in a sense helped unite the world. The impact of translation on literary traditions and the sociological
elements contributes to the shift of the canon. The effort of translation to enlarge and enrich a literary system makes it a powerful tool for the introduction of new aesthetics and trends as well as the ideology implied in them.

2.2 Historical Perspectives on Translation Studies

The need for translation has existed since time immemorial and translating important literary works from one language into others had contributed significantly to the development of world culture. The study of history of translation helps those who are interested in translation, literature and cultural studies for their better understanding of the contribution of translation to civilisation and to the development of intellectual and cultural life. The developments within the discipline of translation studies lead to incorporate historical perspectives on translation studies. Translation introduces nations to various perspectives on their paths to modernization and intellectual advancement. Diverse perspectives and approaches to translation give birth to translation theories and theoretical reflections. Historically, translation theories began with the Romans. George Steiner in *After Babel* (1975: 346-40) divides the literature on the theory, practice and history of translation into four periods which extend from Cicero to the present.

The first period begins with the Romans. Eric Jacobsen (1958) states that translation is a Roman invention though translation is as old as language itself. Translated documents were discovered in the 3rd and 2nd millennium B.C., in ancient Egypt and Iraq. The period concludes by Tytler’s definition of good translation as, “That in which the merit of the original work is so completely transfused into another language, as to be
as distinctly apprehended, and as strongly felt, by a native of the country to which that language belongs as it is by those who speak the language of the original work.” (in Bell, 1991, p.11)

The second period, according to Steiner (1975), runs up to the forties of the 20th century. It is characterized as a period of theory and methodology of approaching translation. The eminent theorists in this period are Etienne Dolet, George Chapman and John Dryden who tackled the problems of translation by formulating three basic types: metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation.

The third period starts with the publication of the first papers on machine translation in the 1940s, and is characterized by the introduction of structural and applied linguistics; contrastive studies in morphology and syntax among others which help the translator identify similarities and differences between NL and FL and communication theory into the study of translation.

The contemporary period has witnessed the emergence of many new theories such as ‘Poly system theory’, Skopos theory’, ‘Linguistic theory’ and so on. ‘Poly system theory’ has first arisen from the work of a group of Russian literary theorists. It has received considerable attention in the work of certain groups of translation scholars since the mid-1970s. This theory proposes a general model for understanding, analyzing and describing the functions and evolution of literary systems, its specific application to the study of translated literature.

‘Skopos theory’ was developed in Germany in the late 1970s. It offers a shift from formal theories to more functionally and socio-
culturally oriented concept of translation. According to this theory, the contextual factors surrounding the translation should not be ignored.

Different communities render translations mandatory for their interaction. Hence, to justify translation as an independent discipline, it is necessary to bring to light how the cultural and intellectual interactions between people and civilization took place throughout the history. History is not simply a necessary ingredient in the education of future translators. Historical perspective is necessary and has been incorporated into translation scholarship in general. As mentioned in Routledge Translation Encyclopaedia the word history has two meanings: the enquiry conducted by the historian and the series of actual events in the past which are the subject of his/her enquiry. Focusing on the history of translation is both necessary and inevitable because of the continuous developments occurring in the discipline of translation studies. New conceptual means provided by scholars working from a variety of theoretical perspectives have made it possible to write the history of translation. The history of translation focuses on the practice or theory of translation or both.

A history of the practice of translation deals with the following questions (Baker, 1998):

(a) What has been translated?
(b) By whom has it been translated?
(c) Under what circumstances has it been translated?
(d) In what social or political context has it been translated?
History of theory or discourse of translation raises the following kinds of questions:

(a) What have translators had to say about their art?
(b) How have translators been evaluated at different periods?
(c) What kinds of recommendations have translators made?
(d) How is this discourse related to other discourses of the same period?

The answers of some or all these questions are being investigated for ages. Adequate models have been formulated, highlighting specific genres in combination with spatial and temporal restrictions. When we talk about the history of translation, we should think of the theories and names that emerged at its different periods. In fact, each era is characterised by specific changes in translation history, but these changes differ from one place to another. For instance, the developments of translation in the western world are not the same as those in the eastern world as every country knew that particular incidents led to the birth of particular theories. Translation history, like translation theory, has tended to place particular emphasis on literary translation. One of the ways of looking at the history of literary translation is to study the successive translations and reception of great authors, such as Homer or Shakespeare or central texts such as *The Arabian Nights*.

*The Bible* is one more example of this kind. It is a class in itself. The story of its translation, from Greco-Roman period through the Reformation and up to the modern era, has been told in many ways. The history of the translation of other sacred texts, such as the *Quran* and the *Bhagvad Gita*, has also been documented, though not to a great extent.
Thus, literary and religious translation has received much attention compared to scientific and technical translation.

European literary culture, in the Middle Ages, was a mixture of English and Latin cultures, which was later added to by the Anglo-Norman culture. The situation becomes more complicated when there are versions in Middle English, Latin and Anglo-Norman to reckon with: texts like the anonymous *Ancrene Wisse* (*Guide for Anchoresses*) (early 13th c.) and St. Edmund of Abingdon’s *Speculum Ecclesiae* (*Mirror of the Church*) (c. 1230) survive in English, French and Latin versions.

One of the most revolutionary events in the history of English style has been the authorized version of the *Bible* by King James. 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 Boccaccio into English when he created his *Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer was acknowledged from the beginning as a translator of note.

Translation in 15th c. broke new ground due to a greater professionalism which characterizes literary production in 15th c. and this growing professionalism paved the way of Caxton’s printing press. Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Book II and IV translated by Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (1517-1547) the greatest of the pre-Elizabethan poetic translators along with Thomas Wyatt (1503-1542) offers a major literary source.

During Renaissance the Elizabethan and Jacobean translators such as Thomas Hoby (1530-66), Thomas North (1535-1601), John Florio (1553-1625), George Chapman (1559-1634), Philemon Holland (1552-1637), Thomas Shelton (1612), Christopher Marlowe (1564-93), John
Harington (1560-1612), and Josuah Sylvester (1563-1618) had more felicity in their works than in the translations of any period into any language.

Translation contributed greatly to the development of the major literary forms in the period of Neoclassicism. Satire, novel and drama were all cross-fertilized by translations of European writing, classical and contemporary. This period produced the translation strategy of taking liberty required by fluency for rendering foreign poetry and prose. One of the best examples of this is Abraham Cowley’s *Pindarique Odes* (1656) which came to rank among the most widely circulated of translations. He described, ‘libertine way of rendering foreign Authors’ as purely a matter of personal taste: “I have taken, left out and added what I please.”

This age also introduced theories of translation. The English translators were theorizing the aesthetic autonomy of the translated text. John Dryden’s (1680) ‘*Preface to Translation of Homer’s Iliad*’ is one of the greatest examples of this kind. Dryden exercised a decisive influence on Alexander Pope whose versions of Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are the most accomplished examples of literary translation during this period.

Translations provided a potent impetus for the growth of the novel and also had a significant impact on English drama during the late 17th and 18th century. In the middle of the 18th century the attitude towards translation as the exploitation of the original source-language text underwent a dramatic change. Respect for the foreign text in the original source-language text emerges as a guiding principle, and with that change of perspective, a desire to adjust and adapt to the foreign culture.
This sense of responsibility toward the foreign in the original text continues as a strong undercurrent of 19th and 20th century theoretical outlooks on the art and craft of translation. At the beginning of the 19th century the situation of English was that of ‘a less frequently spoken language’. The reason behind this is limited amount of translation of English prose and poetry into European languages other than French. But at the end of the 19th century the scenario got changed. The translators were likely to be original authors and their work was subject to criticism similar to those of other literary texts. During the last two centuries the role of translation in communicating literary movements has become very important. The tradition of Anglo-Irish literature (writers like Shaw, Yeats, Joyce, Beckett and Heaney) branched out of the practice of translating Irish works into English initiated by Macpherson towards the end of the 18th century. Many of the Anglo-Irish and Indian English writers have been able translators. Origins of literary movements and literary traditions inhabit various acts of translation.

In short, much of the history has experienced the importance of translation as one of the crucial conditions for creativity.

2.3 Traditions of Translation

Translation is one of the oldest activities of humankind. Translation is a natural activity in a multilingual society. It emerges as a confluence of human social instinct and cultural impulse. Although most men and women may be using any one language as their mother tongue (or a major language), cultural development is made possible through opportunities to interact with the cultural traditions of other languages. In any language and literature, for the expansion of horizon of literary
traditions, one needs to explore the other western and regional languages and literatures. This looks ideal but enough difficult practically to study the other literature. The obvious way to source out other language and literary traditions is translations. In this modern era, translation activity has become the universal vehicle to enter into the world of other languages and literatures. It is inevitable to understand how literary traditions shape the translation scenario.

2.3.1 European Tradition

The transfer of knowledge and culture in Europe – particularly since the emergence of national languages as the languages of literature and scholarship – is inconceivable without translations and the activity of translators. This concerns all aspects of society and culture. The spread of printing technology throughout Europe at the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century did not only lead to a rapid increase in the number of translations but also paved the way for the Reformation movement, which played a vital part in shaping European society right up to the present day. For centuries the age-old dichotomy of word vs. sense has dominated the history of translation – eventually leading to the independent discipline of Translation Studies.

The tradition of translation in Western literature is long and varied. It was brought about by the arrival during the 5th century of invaders from what we are now the Netherlands, Denmark and Germany, who settled in the central parts of the island and drove the Celtic inhabitants to its western and northern fringes. Invasion and colonization have characterized the linguistic and cultural situation of these islands almost from the beginning, and translation has played an active role throughout.
An early pioneer achievement of translation in Europe can be found in Classical Antiquity, when a former Greek slave called Livius Andronicus (ca. 285–204 BC) made a Latin version of the *Odyssey* of Homer (ca. 8th century BC), thus giving the Romans access to the treasures of Greek literature. In the Roman Empire, translation began to flourish. Some of the translators were themselves poets, such as Horace (65–8 BC) and Virgil (70–19 BC), or other outstanding personalities, in particular Marcus Tullius Cicero (106–43 BC). It was he who formulated one of the earliest maxims of translation theory: In his discussion of translation *De optimo genere oratorum*, he ranks translating according to sense higher than a word-for-word rendering, unleashing a discussion that was to dominate translation theory for nearly two thousand years. This approach emerges especially clearly in the work of Eusebius Sophronicus Hieronymus (345–420), the patron saint of translators and the author of the *Vulgate*. In a letter (No. 57) to the Roman senator Pammachius, he freely admitted his strategy of expressing not one word by means of another, but translating sense for sense ("non verbum de verbo sed sensum exprimere de sensu"), with the exception however of the Holy Scriptures, where "even the word order is a mystery". In later centuries, an attitude such as this, especially in the field of Bible translation, was to prove disastrous for many a translator in Europe.

During the 9th and 10th centuries a constellation of a completely different kind emerged in Baghdad in the form of a translation chamber under the direction of the Christian physician and scholar Hunayn ibn Ishaq (809–873), known in the West as Johannitius. Here scholars worked in teams to translate scientific works from ancient Greek into
Arabica. In the 12th century, these texts were themselves translated into Latin by scholars in the Spanish city of Toledo, the main focus being on the philosophical and scientific achievements of the Greek and Arab world, especially in the fields of medicine, mathematics, astronomy and astrology. In the 13th century, translations were then made from Arabic into the Spanish vernacular. Through the constant exchange of ideas and experiences these translators were able to create a treasure trove of knowledge which was to enrich Western culture across language barriers. The "School of Toledo" stands for a peak period of translation in Spain and for cultural and scientific interaction in the 12th and 13th centuries in Europe.

In the Middle Ages the Catholic church played a central role in the generation and authorization of medieval translation, especially into and from Latin. For much of the Middle English period two vernaculars were available, Anglo-Norman and English, and translations could be undertaken into either, or from one to the other. Anglo-Norman was the prestige during the 13th century. It was still being used, in the 15th century at court. In such a linguistic situation the choice of vernacular for a translation inevitably reflected complex social and political pressures.

The transition from the Middle Ages to modern times was marked by a decisive event that was also to revolutionize translation: the invention of printing with movable type in the mid-15th century by the German printer Johannes Gutenberg (ca. 1397–1468) from Mainz. In medieval times it had been the privilege of scholars to write down and discuss the results of their scholarship, but in the Age of the Renaissance with all its new ideas and discoveries and the revival of interest in Classical
Antiquity, such knowledge was made accessible to all those who were able to read. Texts were not only in Latin as the lingua franca of the elite, but the use of the vernaculars was also increased. Thus arose a new golden age of translation, which on the European continent had its origins in Italy.

Translation on the increase from the late 14th century was increasingly marked by the professionalism associated with the commercial scriptorium. Two writers represent the new professionalism clearly. The first was Geoffrey Chaucer, the court poet who called himself, ‘a grant translateur’. The quantity and range of his translated work are striking. He contributed powerfully to the establishment of English by publishing only in English. The second was the Wycliffe Bible. The work possibly begun in the 1370s, survives in approximately 250 manuscripts. The Authorized Version was made during Elizabethan age.

In the view of many historians translations played a decisive part in the development and impact of the Reformation. Of central importance was the translation of the Bible and the faithfulness to the "sacred word" of God. Particularly tragic was the fate of the English Bible translator William Tyndale (1494–1536). After his translations had been banned in England, he was forced to flee to the European Continent (his English version of the New Testament was published in Cologne and Worms). He was eventually arrested in Antwerp, tortured and burned at the stake. Only much later did his significance and that of his works gain recognition, and nowadays he is not only known as the "father of the English Bible", but even as the "patriarch of English language and
literature". He, too, did not translate into the written language of the learned, but into the spoken language of the people and thus made an invaluable contribution to the development and enrichment of the English language. His influence is even noticeable in the *King James Bible* of 1611, also known as the "Authorized Version": it is said that up to eighty per cent of this monumental work, renowned for its superb poetic language and for nearly four hundred years the standard Bible of the English-speaking world, goes back to the work of William Tyndale.

The founder and main figure of the Reformation was undoubtedly Martin Luther (1483–1546), who was to share the problems of his contemporary translators. His life, his work as translator of the Bible (his September Testament was the first direct translation from the original languages Greek and Hebrew into a modern language) and his importance for the development of the German standard language are very well-known. Luther's parallels to Tyndale in this regard are however so striking that we must briefly mention his writings, particularly the words he addressed to the conservative ecclesiastics of the time, defending his translation strategies to refute accusations that he had falsified the Holy Scriptures. With his translations, Luther was to provide a model for rendering the Bible in other vernaculars such as Dutch, Danish, Slovene and Finnish as well as the Swedish Gustav Vasa Bible. Like no other translator in the history of Europe, Martin Luther must be given the credit of having helped to develop a standard language through his translations, as scholars have emphasized even outside the German-speaking countries. Through his translation of the Bible, Luther helped bring about the enrichment and standardization of the German lexicon, the
development of a balanced syntax using formal means such as verb positions and conjunctions, as well as the capitalization of nouns. His main contribution, however, is in the field of stylistics. Clarity, general comprehensibility, simplicity and vividness were the most important stylistic features of his translation of the Bible, which even today serves as a model for good writing.

Not only vernaculars and standard languages were influenced in their development by translation, the same goes for the emergence of national literatures. An outstanding example is Joost van den Vondel (1587–1679), the major poet, playwright and translator of the Dutch Golden Age, who can be regarded as a typical vernacular writer of the later Renaissance. Using the languages and models of Classical Antiquity, he created works and texts of a new literary culture. He was immensely productive both as a creative writer and as a translator, with impressive knowledge of various languages and cultures: He translated from Latin and Greek as well as from French and Italian. He also made two complete versions of Virgil, first in prose (1646) and then in verse (1660), encouraging others to do the same: Between 1650 and 1670, a number of Dutch versions of the Aeneid were published by other translators.

The dominant country in European politics, scholarship and art of the 17th century was, however, France, and this also applied to translation. With the self-assertiveness typical of those in a position of power, French people thought that translations should conform to the rules, conventions and even the morals of their own literature. And so there arose the "belles infidèles", the free (infidèles or "unfaithful") translations that were pleasant to read (belles or "elegant"), and were
hence target-oriented texts, which were dominant in France into the 18th century. The most important representative of this trend was Nicholas Perrot d'Ablancourt (1606–1664), who mainly translated historical texts, among others works by Cornelius Tacitus (ca. 55–116) and Cicero, which he "improved" as he saw fit. Top priority was given to elegance of expression and ease of style in the French target text, according to contemporary tastes.

This period gave rise to the epics of Spenser and John Milton; the epyllia of Ovid influenced Marlowe, Chapman and Shakespeare; translations from Greek and Roman poetry contributed powerfully to the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre.

This period of translation activity was dominated at the end of the 17th century by two figures, Dryden and Pope, and in the late 18th century, by the more complex figure of Alexander Tytler. The distinctive emphases of Dryden and Pope can be seen earlier in the prefaces to Chapman’s *Iliad*. Chapman viewed more sophisticated discussions of a poetic art of translation.

The Restoration brought about major changes in literary attitudes. Dryden in his preface to *Ovid’s Epistles By Several Hanas* (1680), ‘for freeing translation from servility’ created new model which would shape theory and practice for the following century, ‘the earlier exhaustive division of translation’ under the three heads of Metaphrase, Paraphrase and Imitation.

The century ends with a major work of theory: Tytler’s *Essay on the Principles of Translation* (1791). Tytler’s *Essay*, reacts against Dryden’s concept of Paraphrase and the loose translations that resulted from it.
One of the outstanding themes in the history of translation is the translation of the plays of Shakespeare. This truly European phenomenon spans the time from Classical Antiquity to the Elizabethan Renaissance and on to the German Romantics, thereby highlighting problems of language, literature and culture that arise when texts are rendered in different national languages. Shakespeare must have been one of the readers of Thomas North's *Plutarch's Lives*, since he owes to them the material for his dramas *Julius Caesar, Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*. It is also interesting that a key role in the reception of Shakespeare's dramas on the European continent was played by France. There, drama was rediscovered during the 18th century as a literary and transcultural theatrical art form; and it was from France that the interest was to spread further. In this period translation aimed, generally, at advance eloquence. Original writing reflects the clear influence of newly discovered or newly valued forms. Thus Italian sonnet is a vital element in the literary projects of the 16th century, translated and imitated by Thomas Wyatt and the Earl of Surrey, and ‘naturalized’ by Shakespeare; the pastoral, by way of Greek (Theocritus), Latin (Mantuan and Virgil) and Italian (Tasso and Guarini), takes root with Sir Philip Sidney and Edmund Spenser; classical epics, especially those of Virgil and Homer-known to the Middle Ages but not translated in their own right until the 16th century. One of the best known of these translators was Voltaire (Francois-Marie Arouet, 1694–1778), who translated *Hamlet* – but also vilified it as a play – and was instrumental in spreading English philosophy and literature in France, which led on to the infatuation with the Gothic novel at the end of the century.
However the predominance of French culture in the age of Enlightenment even, the focus in the field of translation shifted from France to Germany. The great names connected with the early translations of Shakespeare in Germany are Johann Joachim Eschenburg and Christopher Martin Wieland (1733–1813), who produced prose translations of twenty-two plays between 1762 and 1766. By far, the best known translations of Shakespeare are those made by A.W. Schlegel, who, along with Ludwig Tieck (1773–1853), his daughter Dorothea Tieck (1799–1841) and Wolf Heinrich von Baudissin (1789–1878), translated all 36 plays into German: all in all, the "SchlegelTieck" translation was for a long time thought to be the "German Shakespeare" par excellence. Schlegel himself translated seventeen plays from 1797; the remaining nineteen were done between 1825 and 1833 with the collaboration of Ludwig Tieck, who worked as a dramaturge at the theatre in Dresden until 1842, Dorothea Tieck and Baudissin, who moved to Dresden in 1827.

Romanticism distinguished itself sharply from the preceding age in several ways. Romantic writers cut their teeth on translations from the German: Sir Walter Scott on Goethe’s Goetz von Berlichingen (1799), S T Coleridge on Schiller’s Wallenstein (1800), Shelley on parts of Goethe’s completed Faust. Within three years of Goethe’s completed Faust (1832) there were five complete translations.

The ideas of German Romantics were crucial in shaping a new self-understanding for the translator. From the Renaissance to the 18th century translators had generally ‘domesticated’ their work.
At the same time the Romantics were also rediscovering the literature of the Italian Renaissance, especially Dante, whose *Divine Commedia* was as important for nineteenth century readers as *Faust*. Here we should not forget Henry Francis Cary’s translation of 1814, one of the most successful translations of the century.

Goethe's most famous statement on translation theory is found in the Notes written in 1819 on his *West-Ostlicher Diwan*. There he defines three "epochs" of translation:

For the first epoch of "prosaic" translating, Goethe suggests Luther's Bible translation as an example; for the second, "parodistic" epoch, Wieland's translations or the French tradition; for the third – Schleiermacher's ideal of foreignizing – he names the translations of Homer by Voss. Goethe and the German Romantics did trigger a vigorous exchange of translations in Europe – the Scottish historian Thomas Carlyle (1795–1881), for example, translated Goethe's *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* (1824) and *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre* (1827) and wrote a *Life of Schiller* in 1823–1824, which appeared in German in 1830 with a preface by Goethe; the poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772–1843) translated Schiller's *Wallenstein* (1800), and conversely Lord Byron (George Gordon Byron, 1788–1824), Charles Dickens (1812–1870) and Walter Scott (1771–1832) were translated into German.

Entering into 19th century, how can we forget Arnold’s *On Translating Homer* which criticized several translations of Homer including those of Wright (1859-65) and Newman (1856), the latter already under attack for a translation of Horace? For Arnold, since Homer is a classic, the translation should adopt the language of that undoubted classic.
The 19th century, however, was also the heyday of colonialism, and the fascination for the "Orient" and hence translation in Europe was permeated by increasing arrogance towards the "foreign". It is not surprising that striking examples of translations of this kind came from the motherland of the British Empire. Especially well known is the Englishman Edward Fitzgerald (1809–1883) for his free translation from Persian of the *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* (1859).

Also well known for his translations, as well as for his expeditions round the world, is the orientalist Richard Francis Burton (1821–1890), at first for his 16-volume edition of the *Arabian Nights*, but above all for Oriental erotic texts like the *Kama Sutra* (1883), which he published privately to avoid the risk of prosecution.

An empire does not, however, live on literature alone, and it is remarkable that hardly any research has been carried out on non-literary translations by representatives of the colonial powers. In this field, the orientalist and jurist Sir William Jones (1746–1794) was extremely active, and from 1783 he utilized the translation of legal texts in India to domesticate the Orient and thereby turn it into a province of European learning.

In the course of the 19th and especially in the 20th century, colonial or imperial arrogance towards anything foreign developed into open xenophobia, accompanied by an increase in anti-Semitism. Of course translations were still produced in all fields, but the heyday was now over. However, there were occasional translatorial milestones, such as the new translation of the Bible by Martin Buber (1878–1865) and Franz Rosenzweig or the translation of Charles Baudelaire's (1821–1867)
Tableaux parisiens (1923) by Walter Benjamin, whose preface "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers" ("The Task of the Translator") takes Goethe's highest epoch of translation as its ideal and is still acclaimed world-wide in modern Translation Studies.

The 19th century ‘foreignizing’ translations by professional poets have their equivalents in the 20th century, above all, in the translations of the American-born Ezra Pound. In this period the economic role of translation can be seen in the Index Translationum, which has been kept by the UNESCO since 1932. After the Second World War, translation was to experience an unprecedented revival, with a central role being played by technology. What the invention of printing was for translation during the Renaissance was information technology (IT) in the second half of the 20th century. First attempts at machine translation (FAHQT: fully automatic high quality translation) in the USA may have been dismissed by the 1966 ALPAC Report as illusory, but the ensuing rapid progress in computer and information technologies as well as in telecommunication has changed the work of technical translators (LSP) for good; in particular through terminological data-banks and computer-aided translation (CAT). The development of audio-visual media led to new forms and techniques of translation, above all dubbing and subtitling for the screen.

Nevertheless, literary translation too has increased world-wide, at least in quantity, and here again English (in diverse – (post)colonial – varieties, above all American English) is the dominant source or relay language. "Peripheral" or "smaller" languages like Slovene, Romanian, Czech, Finnish, Modern Greek or Polish usually function as target
languages and even have to secure their identity and further existence partly through translation, so that in these language communities translation cultures are especially vibrant.

With this wealth of translation activity it is only natural that professional organizations have been founded on national and international levels, above all the Fédération Internationale des Traducteurs (FIT), which was founded in 1953 in Paris by Pierre-Francois Caillé (1907–1979). With the increasing importance of LSP (Language for Specific Purposes) translation, university training schools for translators and interpreters were established, first mainly in the German- and French-speaking countries, but also in Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Italy, the UK and – at first with particular success – in Finland. With the increasing intensity of the critical and theoretical debates, especially during the 1980s, there emerged an independent discipline of translating and interpreting (Translation Studies), and the European Society for Translation Studies (EST) was founded in Vienna in 1992.

Translation is now more professionally organized than ever before. Translation agencies have sprung up in large numbers; academic and professional courses and qualifications are becoming the order of the day in Britain, especially at post graduate level. In the light of these developments, recent years have witnessed an upsurge of interest in translation studies in Britain: new periodicals, new series and new courses on translations in all its aspects.

**2.3.2 Indian Tradition**

India offers a unique problem when it comes to literature and literary language. It is difficult to trace the origin of something like Indian
Literature because of the multiplicity of traditions that we have in India. There is no specific root where we can go back and the longer we go back into the past, the more difficult it becomes to figure out the life and times of authors. Furthermore, each part of India has a different history than that of other parts of India. Hence, it is least possible to give a comprehensive history of the literature of India. Obviously that makes it difficult to trace the history of translations also in India. Though we do not have authoritative information about dates of composition or identity of authors, we do know that numerous works on various disciplines were produced in ancient India. The earliest texts that we know of are the Vedas which are believed to have been composed around 1500 BC. The Ramayana and the Mahabharata are believed to have been composed by Valmiki and Vyasa respectively, were orally passed on from one generation to another till they were recorded in writing, but it is still difficult to mark out the actual dates of their composition. The language used for all these works was Sanskrit which was the language of the educated upper class. But this was not the only language used on stage. A play was usually composed in a variety of dialects – uppercaste men and ascetics spoke Sanskrit. Women spoke Prakrit and other inferior characters spoke a variety of dialects like Magadhi, Pali and Sauraseni. Hence, while watching a play one had to do simultaneous translation in some sense. But there is little written evidence of translation as an ongoing activity in those days. And this makes us believe that Indian tradition has nothing to say about translation as there is hardly any theorizing anywhere in literary tradition about translation of the texts. We can only infer from the works of those days. For instance, there are many
similarities between Bharata’s *Natyashashtra* and Aristotle’s *Poetics*. Was it just a coincidence or could they have influenced each other? If it is a mutual influence, there must have been a translation: how else they could understand each other?

Hence we can claim that since early time translation has been an essential activity in India. The Chinese came to India, took Buddhist texts back and translated them. Many Pali and Prakrit texts of Buddhists were translated into Sanskrit. The great epics like *the Ramayana* and *the Mahabharata*, along with other popular Sanskrit works (religious and didactic) were also translated into regional languages. For instance, in Orissa the *Bhagvata Mahapurana* was translated into Oriya around 15\(^{th}\)-16\(^{th}\) A.D. by the eminent poet Jagannatha Dasa.

Indian tradition has seen translation as an unconscious activity – something which happened effortlessly. The certain fundamental components like ‘the original text’, ‘the author’, ‘cultural transmission’ were not troubling in the ancient Indian context, and hence, have received a little critical attention. As a result, we rarely find any theories about it. As we have seen that in European tradition also the theories on traditions of translations are fairly recent although translation is as old as language is.

As there is a little critical text in Indian tradition which directly deals with translation, the obvious question that strikes us is: ‘Is there anything distinctive that we can say about translation in Indian context?’ However, one can learn from examples and from the references that different art forms in our culture have evolved. Translations amongst Indian languages taken place before colonization are some such examples.
The spread of Islam, Buddhism and Christianity as well as British colonization gave rise to the translation activity in India. In fact, Indian literary history is a maze of meandering texts which reincarnate themselves in several versions and forms of retellings. In pre-colonial India, liberal and liberating practice of translation has led to innumerable inventive reworking of the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*, the great Indian epics, in Sanskrit as well as in other languages, with appreciable thematic and ideological shifts from changing the storyline to swapping the roles of the characters. It might sound irreverent to a European ear but every retelling of the great epics are heard, read and enjoyed by its audience with the same sense of appreciation and reverence with which a western would approach an original. Hence, to G. N. Devy (2000), Indian literary translations are essentially traditions of translation because they do not lay undue stress on originality but put the writer’s capacity to transform, translate, restate and revitalize the original to test. For instance, Valmiki’s *Ramayana*, even at a very early stage it was translated into almost all existing Indian languages. In fact, its influence is not only confines to just India but all of Southeast Asia. Valmiki’s *Ramayana*, though authentic one, is believed to be one of many *Ramayanas* which deal with the same storyline. So the translations of the epic are also like free retellings. Hence, the concept of fidelity to the original was absent in India. Since literature was mainly orally transmitted, the idea of accuracy in conveying the literary work to another language could not be sustained. Tulsidas’ reworking of the *Ramayana* and Jnaneshwara’s Marathi translation of the *Bhagvad-Gita* are embodiments of the characteristic Indian tradition of translation marked
by ideological shifts and radical subversions. For instance, Tulsidas’ creative retelling of Valmiki’s *Ramayana* was essentially a subversive act aiming to liberate the scripture from monopolist control of Sanskrit scholars and priests. In fact, the whole medieval Bhakti movement was sanctified to an enormous democratization of literary language, morphing the cultural forms of caste hegemony in favour of artisans and peasants. These retellings were often influenced by the world view of the group that was doing the translation/adaptation. The Indian historian Romila Thapar notes: “*The appropriation of the story by a multiplicity of groups that meant a multiplicity of versions through which the social aspirations and ideological concerns of each group were articulated. The story in these versions included significant variations which changed the conceptualization of character, event and meaning.*” (in Richman, p.4). The *Ramayana* translations had the effect of enriching and standardizing regional languages that were still in formative stage. Some of them are Tulsidas’ *Ramcharitmanas* in Hindi, Kamban’s *Ramavataram* in Tamil, Ezhuthachchan’s *Adhyatma Ramayanam* in Malayalam and Krittivasa’s *Ramayana* in Bengali. The language of these regional variations is the common man’s language as opposed to Sanskrit which could be understood only by a few.

The power and prestige of Sanskrit declined in the medieval times. Numerous foreign invasions also brought with them different cultural and linguistic influences. Persian had an important place as a courtly language and the language of scholarship under the Mughal rulers. The Mughal courts had scholars who were also translators. *Babarnama*, an autobiography of Babar written in chagatay, was translated into Persian by
Humayun’s minister Bairam Khan. But it was Akbar the Great’s rule that marked the high point of culture. He commissioned translations of Sanskrit works into Persian. The *Mahabharata* was translated into Persian during Akbar’s time. His great-grandson Dara Shikoh continued the efforts. Dara translated the *Upanishads* and the *Bhagvad-Gita* into Persian. Friedrich Max Muller (1823:1900), German-born philologist and Orientalist also began to translate the *Upanishads*. He published his first book, a German translation of the *Hitopadesa*, a collection of Indian fables. Muller’s Sanskrit studies came at a time when scholars had started to see language development in relation to cultural development. The Vedic culture of India was thought to have been the ancestor of European Classical cultures. The Vedic language, Sanskrit, was thought to be the oldest of the Indo-European languages. Muller became one of the major Sanskrit scholars of his day and sought to understand the most ancient of Vedic scripture, the *Rig-Veda*. For Muller, the study of language had to relate to the study of culture in which it had been used. The significant result of such cultural mixing was that most people bilingual or skilled in two languages or even more. It also gave rise to new languages – for instance, Persian interacted with the local language gave rise to Urdu. There were many writers who were fluent enough to be able to write in two languages. Mirza Ghalib, the famous writer of ghazals, is one such example.

Another shade of subversion, though in a different context, can be seen in the way Shakespeare’s plays were translated into regional languages in late 19th and early 20th century. These translations were essentially transcreation in as much as they radically Indianized Shakespeare’s in terms of plot, characters, place and time and even genre. Bharatendu
Harishchandra’s translation of *The Merchant of Venice* is one such case. Not only does he change the names of the central characters but also the binary of racial animosity from Christian-Jew to Hindu-Jain. Moreover, translation Shakespearean tragedy had to undergo conceptual overhaul in addition to the linguistic and cultural one. The genre of tragedy being unknown to Indian mind had to be given a happy ending by the translator. Thus, translations from the other works had the effect of introducing new genres to India. For example, translations from Persian brought in new genres like masnavi, qasida and importantly the ghazal. They were Indianised to suit the local readers’ tastes. Many Indian texts reached west through Persian translations. As is the case with most texts there are no accurate records about these which makes tracing them down difficult.

Like that of the Mughals, the advent of the British marks a significant turning point in India’s cultural history as well. This became all the more apparent when the British Government took over the complete administration of India in 19th century. The British tried to colonise India intellectually and politically. This was a slow process which went on for many years in different phases. They initially attempted to establish that English language and literature were superior to all Indian languages and literature. Many European texts were translated into local Indian languages. But it was also important for the British to know the local language as matters of administration had to be in Indian languages. They had to know India well to govern it better. So there was also a reverse movement of translation from India to England. However, what got translated were ancient Sanskrit works. They claimed that they had discovered the priceless Sanskrit literature for the entire
world to enjoy. The discovery of Sanskrit not only signals the onset of an ‘Oriental Renaissance’ in Europe, but also marks Europe’s colonization of the world and its languages and cultures (Krishnaswamy, 2013). Sir William Jones – a judge of the Supreme Court in Calcutta and the founder of the Asiatic society, translated Abhijnanasakuntalam (apart from legal texts) into English in 1789. Charles Wilkins, official translator of Persian and Bengali to the Commissioner of Revenue, was the first to translate the Bhagvad-Gita into English in 1784. These translations had official blessings as they were undertaken with the specific purpose of helping the British to know India better. The period after the First War of Indian Independence in 1857 marks another phase in the cultural conquest because it is at this time that the Queen took over power of Indian administration. This also brought in specific language policies. English became the language of administration and it was promoted among the Indians. In this respect, Macaulay’s Minute on Indian Education of 1837 is very important. It called for the cultivation of a class of people. ‘Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinion, in morals and in intellect.’ This resulted in educated Indians acquiring English proficiency. There were large scale efforts to translate English books into Indian languages and promote English literature. Many obscure 18th and 19th century English novels were translated into Indian languages. Another aim of the British empire was the spread of Christianity. The Bible was translated into Indian languages with this aim. The Serampore Mission Press (1800) enlisted Indian experts in different languages to translate the Bible. The translations of the Bible radically changed the concept of translation in India. It first brought in the
concept of printing to what was predominantly an oral tradition till then. The Indian tradition of translation was a free adaptation of source material and was really retelling rather than accurate translations. But the Bible changed all of that. It emphasized the need for accurate ‘word-for-word’ translation; fidelity in translation became a concern for the first time, because it was felt that the word of God had to be conveyed accurately. The Bible translations enriched the vernacular languages by bringing in idioms and imagery to illustrate its concepts. Translations from English to Indian languages and vice versa began to increase. Numerous translations introduced the genre of novel in India although there are people who say that India had the novel (they point to Banabhatta’s Kadambari as evidence) before the British. The first Indian novels in the 19th century were inspired by English novels, but were Indian spirit as they discussed socio-political problems relevant to India. They were also motivated by English education to remove social evils and fostered nationalistic spirit. Very often these novels got translated in other Indian languages and created a bonding among the far-flung regions of India. Bankim Chandra Chatterjee’s Anandamath was translated into English and many other Indian languages in a few years after its publication in 1882. This novel contained our national song Vande Mataram and inspired nationalists all over the country. Sometimes the indigenous novel got promoted by British officers. Some of the early novels were written by British women with a view to promoting Christian way of life. These novels had purpose of educating the native women about Christianity. They were also the first novels to speak about the marginalized sections of Indian society.
Some translations were done by Indians to undermine colonial power. The translation of *Ananadamath* by Aurobindo is one such example. His motive behind this translation was to inspire the militant nationalists of Bengal in the first decade of 20th century. Like Aurobindo, Ganesh Shankar Vidyarthi (1830-1931) translated Victor Hugo’s *Ninety-three* into Hindi as *Balidaan* with a view to instilling patriotism in his countrymen. Like Vidyarthi, Premchand (1880-1936) the famous Urdu-Hindi writer, translated Anatole France’s *Thais* with a view to conveying the same ideological reasons. Translations like these, with the specific purpose of introducing revolutionary ideas to Indian readers, were being undertaken in different parts of India. They were more like free adaptations with no thought for fidelity to the original. They played an essential role in enhancing patriotism among Indians. Translations had the moral responsibility to foster this unity. Satpal’s translation of Aurobindo’s *Savitri* into Urdu is one such instance.

This scenario changed when India became a free nation. As the need changed, so did the finished product. Diversity of the free nation emphasised on the unity which would overlook linguistic and religious differences. To bridge the gap among different regional languages, interlingual translations were promoted. The Sahitya Akademi established in 1954, publishes translations from regional languages into English and other regional languages. The National Book Trust founded in 1957 had the *Adan Pradan* series in which Indian classics were translated into English and other Indian languages. These have definitely helped bring literatures of different Indian languages together. Efforts by individual translators must also be counted. The eminent postcolonial critic and
translator Gayatri Chakravorti Spivak has been instrumental in bringing the prominent Bengali writer Mahasweta Devi to international notice through her translations. Likewise, the noted Kannada poet A. K. Ramanujan through his translations rediscovered the pleasure of ancient Sangam literature for the world at large. These translations are known as promotional translations as they led the world to pay attention to native classical literature or a particular writer. Hence, the translation tradition is very strong in India at present.

To understand the growth of translation in India, the scholars have made attempts to periodize the Indian literature in translation. Susan Bassnett divides it into four phases: (i) History of Translation, (ii) Translation in the TL culture, (iii) Translation and Linguistics, (iv) Translation and Poetics (Bassnett, 2005, pp.16-17). G. N. Devy divides the history of translation into four categories: (i) the colonial phase (1776-1910), (ii) the revivalist phase (1876-1950), (iii) the nationalist phase (1902-1920) and (iv) the formalist phase (1912 onwards) (Devy, 1993, pp.120). Harish Trivedi, an Indian theorist provides four divisions of the Indian literature in translation: (i) Indic and Indological works, (ii) the translations of late ancient and medieval works of Bhakti traditions, (iv) fictional works depicting realistic aspects of modern India and (iv) modernist writers translated into English (Trivedi, 1996, pp. 51-52).

Bassnett’s first two divisions emphasise on the functional aspects of translations and the remaining two emphasise on the process of translation. Devy is interested in the historical context of translation activities with reference to colonialism whereas Trivedi focuses more on cultural context stating that how translations were marked by aspiration and desire than achievement and performance.
More recently, many Indian scholars have engaged themselves with the theoretical concerns of the discipline. Among such pioneers are Sujit Mukherjee, A.K. Ramanujan, Dilip Chitre, Bhalchandra Nemade and Ganesh Devy. Rita Kothari has contributed considerably in the theory, particularly with her book on the politics of English in translations in India, *Translating India: The Cultural Politics of English* (2003). Her observation regarding the use of English in the present time is that English is the language of the new generation. Translation for her becomes a daily act in the language of the cosmopolitan youth. The use of English in e-mails and short messages has changed the linguistic conventions and has given a new shape to translation activity. Although many would find this argument in favour of code switching rather than in favour of the translation, it has a great support from the life style. Sujit Mukherjee’s pioneer and influential book of somewhat theoretical nature considered the translations in the twentieth century. Mukherjee never considered himself to be a “professional” translator but as a translator who translated for himself and for pleasure.

Meenakshi Mukherjee played a leading role by editing *Vagartha* that gave prominence to translations. G.N. Devy is regarded as a scholar in the field of translation. His views on translation are unique and in line with the Indian literary tradition. His essays in *In Another Tongue* are remarkable in this respect.

Another major characteristic of this last phase is the translations of the foreign works into the regional languages. Considered to be “world classics”, most of the works of English literature have been translated into many of the Indian languages. For example, one would find all the major
figures of English literature in Gujarati – From Shakespeare and Dickens to Marquez. The translations of the works from the regional languages into English have found many channels. In recent decades, Indian periodicals have invariably provided space for translations. Vagartha edited by Meenakshi Mukherjee gave prominence to translations. Setu edited by Suresh Joshi was entirely devoted to translation of Indian literature. Kavayabharti and Bombay Literary Review carried translations regularly; other journals like The Commonwealth Quarterly, Indian Literary Review and New Quest too are hospitable to translation. Mimamsaa has contributed particularly in carrying translations from Gujarati. The journal of the Sahitya Akademi, Indian Literature warmly welcomes translations. CIIL provides a large platform for translations in English through the medium of its journal Translation Today. With the remarkable development of translation practices, the centres of translation studies are blooming like anything in the present time. And Gujarati literary tradition has certainly benefited considerably from its translation activity.

2.4 Tradition of Translation from Gujarati into English

Translation is used not only to unify cultures but also to separate cultural identities. And this is equally true in case of translation into English from Gujarati-the state language, in Gujarat, India.

Gujarati language has its roots in Prakrit and Sanskrit languages. During the development of language – ancient, middle and modern stages – Nepali, Bengali, Punjabi, Sindhi, Marathi, Rajasthani along with Gujarati we are growing parallel. Hence, literature of these languages got encountered, influenced received by each other. Sanskrit is the oldest and richest in its influences and receptivity in Gujarati language and
literature. The ancient Gujarati literature was folk-lore and folk-literature. During the middle period in Gujarati literature, \textit{Bhakti} was the main theme prevailing in almost all forms of literature. \textit{Bhakti} poets were trying out different types of poetry like \textit{Pad}, \textit{Muktaka}, \textit{Aakhyaan}, \textit{Fagu}, \textit{Raas} etc. Each of these types of poetry has its roots in spiritual and meditative Sanskrit literature. And apart from this, Sanskrit stories also provided source for Gujarati stories during this period. Such influences continued to innovate Gujarati literature directly or indirectly in modern period as well. Translations from Sanskrit into Gujarati started in middle period and continued in the modern period. As a result, many Sanskrit classics are available in Gujarati. Bhalan (1500-1550?) has translated Bana’s \textit{Kadambari} and \textit{Dashamskandha}. This is not a word-to-word translation. This is a poetic translation of Sanskrit prose. This was a major contribution of Bhalan to Gujarati literature as far as translation is concerned. From latter part of 19\textsuperscript{th} century to latter part of 20\textsuperscript{th} century, many Sanskrit dramas were translated into Gujarati. During this period, a dozen of translations of Kalidasa’s \textit{Shakuntal} is available in Gujarati. Later on, \textit{Geet-Govind}, \textit{Hitopdesh} and \textit{Panchtantra} were translated into Gujarati.

During 19\textsuperscript{th} century, Gujarati literature moved out of its narrow religious outlook. Social awareness of the evils of caste and women’s oppression were articulated in translations. The British rule and English education widened the scope of translation in Gujarati. Due to this, a new generation of Gujarati writers translated Ramayan, Mahabhrata and Puranas in Gujarati poetic language. Premanand (1636-1734), Narmad (1833-1886), Manilal Dwivedi (1858-1898), Mansukhlal Zaveri (1907-
1981), Umashankar Joshi (1911-1988), Sundram (1908-1991) enriched Gujarati literature with their unique style and diction. Hence, Gujarati became more refined and gained depth. Some of the Gujarati poets used idioms of every day spoken language in their translated works. During this period, most of the translations were from English. Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Keats and Byron were translated into Gujarati. Kant (1867-1923), B. K. Thakor (1869-1952), Kalapi (1874-1900), Zaverchand Meghani (1896-1947), Niranjan Bhagat (b. 1926), Nagindas Parekh (1903-1993), Dhumketu (1892-1965) contributed greatly in the translations of English classics and poems. Gujarati sonnets, a new form for Gujarati poetry has been derived after translations of Shakespearean sonnets. Dhumketu translated Khalil Jibran’s The Prophet and Tagore’s Gitanjali. Ever since its appearance in English, Gitanjali has been translated repeatedly into Gujarati. From 1918 to 2010, there have been twelve translations of Gitanjali in Gujarati.

In fact, Gujarati literary circle came into contact with Bengali literature before 1889, when Narayan Hemchandra (1855-1909) translated around fifty Bengali texts into Gujarati. For the purpose of social reforms, the works of Devendranath Thakur (1814-1883), Ashwinkumar, Bankimchandra (1838-1894), Ramkrishna Paramhans, Viveknanad, Raja Rammohan Roy (1774-1833) etc. were translated into Gujarati during late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Saratchandra (1876-1938), one of the well-known novelists of Bengal, was acclaimed throughout India. He has influenced the fiction of almost all regional literatures of India. Gujarat knew of the highly artistic beauty of the fiction of Saratchandra in 1923 when, at the instance of Mahatma
Gandhi, his personal secretary Mahadev Desai (1892-1942) translated three of his novelettes into Gujarati: Ramer Sumati, Bindur Chhele and Mejdidi. In 1924, he translated Biraj Bau. Though the first book of Saratchandra to appear in Gujarati was Datta translated by Ratneswar Vakil, under the title Bijayd, it did not attract the Gujarati readers. Fiction reading public was first attracted to Saratchandra only by the translations of Mahadev Desai. As such, Gujarati people also value sentiments like the people of Bengal, and they were enchanted especially when they came into contact with Bindu of Bindur Chhele, Hemangini of Mejdidi, who showered their affection on children who were not their own, and who came into conflict with members of their family for such behaviour, and ultimately won their battle. Mahadevbhai Desai’s translation which also retained the beauty of the original was also responsible for capturing the hearts of Gujarati readers. When Kaka Kalelker (1885-1981), who was a teacher in Santiniketan, came to Gujarat and joined Gujarat Vidyapith established by Gandhiji, he brought with him his deep knowledge of Bengali literature. Because of his efforts, arrangements were made for the teaching of Bengali in Gujarat Vidyapith, and he himself undertook to impart instructions in Bengali. Those who learnt Bengali from him were sent to Santiniketan for higher studies in Bengali. They, after having mastered Bengali, returned to Gujarat, and began translating the works of Gurudeb and Saratchandra. Most of the translators of Saratchandra are from Gujarat Vidyapith. Mahadev Desai, through his translations, popularized some of the best songs of Gurudeb. Thus, Saratchandra opened new horizons before the fiction writers of Gujarat. He also showed our writers that there was enough of raw
material for fiction in the day-to-day happenings in the family, and even trifling and insignificant happenings have immense potentialities for a fiction writer.

Sharadchandra, Bankimchandra, Jarasandh, Budhdev Basu, Mahashweta Devi, Maitrayi Devi, Humayun Kabir and Tarashankar Bandopadhyay are widely received and translated into Gujarati. Bengali novel and drama influenced Gujarati literature in matters of style and subject. All the novels of Bankimchandra, Sharatchandra and Rabindranath are translated in Gujarati. Some novels are translated more than once. Nagindas Parekh has translated Ghare Bahir and Chaturrang and Two Sisters. Ramanlal Soni translated Gora and Chokher Bali. There are volumes of the complete works of Tagore and Saratchandra published as translation in Gujarati literature. Today, in Gujarati literature there are translations from Sanskrit, Hindi, Urdu, Marathi, Bengali, Tamil, and Kannada. It is estimated that there are five thousand translated works in Gujarati. Translation has gained visibility and status in Gujarati.

We may examine three major words used in this context anuvād, bhāshāntar, tarjumo. Umashankar Joshi, a prominent poet and literary figure, defines anuvad as “following the original statement step by step in saying something”, while he explains the concept of bhāshāntar by saying that there the focus is on transporting the work from one language to another. Thus every anuvād has to be bhāshāntar; however, we cannot say that all bhāshāntar becomes anuvād.

Navalram Pandya has categorized various types of translations into four major classes:
According to him, when one tries to translate every word, the literal translation is *shabdānusāri anuvād*. When the focus is on meaning rather than words, we get *arthānusāri anuvād*. Comparatively free translation, which aims at creating the *bhāva* of the original, can be called *bhāvānusāri anuvād*; whereas certain translations are categorized as *rasānusāri anuvād* or *deshkālānusāri anuvād*, *chhāyānusāri anuvād* or *sārānusād*.

*Deshkālānusāri anuvād* can be known as *rupānt*, e.g. A French drama of Molier *Mock Doctor* translated by Navalrām into Gujarati, titled *Bhatnu Bhopālu*. One more example of this kind is Manilal Nathubhāi Dwivedis *Dulāsinh*, the translation of *Zenoni*. When a translation aims at creating the *bhāva* of the original is known as *anusārjan* (transcreation). Zaverchand Meghani’s *Ravindra Veena* is one such transcreation of Tagore’s works.

Sanskrit and Prakrit works have contributed a lot in the origin and development of Gujarati language of the middle age (since 12th century A.D.). Translations from Jain literature and other works like the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata* are available. The tales of *Bālāvbdh*, as Dr. Harivallabh Bhayani says, are instances of creative translation.

During the Middle Age we got a large number of works derived from the *Ramayana*, the *Mahabharata*, *Shivpurana*, *Kadambari*, *Shivmahimn Stotra* etc. in Gujarati language. Above all, one must note the contribution of the poet, Bhālan for his poetic translation of
‘Kadambari’ written by the great Sanskrit poet Banabhatt. Another poet and story teller Shamal Bhatt has written a series of stories in ‘Sinhasan Batrisi’, ‘Suda Bahoteri’ etc. which are free translations from Sanskrit literature. During this period, translations from Brij, Hindi and Persian languages also appeared. In these works, the translators have tried to cater to the interest of the people. Contact with Islamic community has also led to a few Gujarati translations of Arabic and Persian texts.

The source of inspiration for Modern Gujarati literature has been Western Education. As textbooks and the complementary books were prepared under the guidance and support of education ministry, poets and authors like Dalpatram, Narmadashankar, Mahipatram Nilkanth, Navalram Pandya contributed many translations of literary texts. Magazines like Buddhiprakash, and Gujarat Shalapatra also supported this activity of translations. During this period, translations, mainly from Sanskrit, and then from English, Hindi, and Marathi were also made available. The translations of great Sanskrit classics are worth studying in terms of the art of translation. For example, multiple translations of Kalidas’s Shakuntal and Meghdut are available from Harikrishna Bhatt and Manhar Mehta to Kilabhai Ghanshyam. The genius of Umashankar Joshi is reflected in his translation of Shakuntal. In the Most of these translations are from Sanskrit and English. These translations brought new forms from many parts of the world, in Gujarati. Moreover, direct translations from German, Russian, and Scandinavian etc. are also available: e.g. Narsinhbhai Patel’s direct translation of William Tell written by Shiller- a great German writer, Russian plays translated by Hasmukh Baradi. Similarly Nagindas Parekh, with the help of father Isudas, has translated the Bible from original Hibru.
Moreover, a large amount of translated literature from several Indian languages (particularly from Hindi and Bengali) is now available. Almost all literary works of Bankimchandra, Rabindranath, and Sharadababu are now available in Gujarati. Likewise, Navneet Madrasi made available more than fifty books directly translated from the four South Indian languages. Comparatively translations from Marathi into Gujarati like Gyaneshwari, Geeta Rahasya, Shyam ni Maa, Vyas Parva, Yugant, Thank you Mr. Glad and the whole of V. S. Khandekar are also available.

Umashankar Joshi donated the total sum of the award, Bhartiya Gyanpeeth to publish a series of poems written by seven modern Marathi poets under Gangotri Trust. Also noteworthy are the translations from Bengali done by Mahadev Desai, Jayanti Acharya, Jugatram Dave, Suresh Joshi, Niranjan Bhagat, Shrikant Trivedi, Ramnik Meghani, Bholabhai Patel, Anil Mehta, Jashwant Dave, Suresh Dalal, and Jagdish Joshi.

During post independence period, literary journals have made a remarkable contribution in this direction. Magazines like Sanskriti, Manisha, Kshitiji, Etad, Setu, Kaumudi, Prasthan, Rekha and Vidyanagar ought to be mentioned in this regard. The contribution of Gujarat Vidyapeeth and Navjeevan Prakashan Mandir is equally important. The literary figures like Rasiklal Parikh, Maganbhai P Desai, Sundaram, Umashankar Joshi have contributed to the translations of literary texts. Similarly, Mulshankar M. Bhatt and Ramanlal Soni have provided translations of children’s literature. Gujarat Granth Nirman Board, Gujarati Sahitya Parisad, and Gujarat Sahitya Academy have supported this activity. Hence, Gujarati language and literature have benefited considerably from translations of world literature.
2.5 Issues in Translating Fiction

The biggest challenge a translator faces is the challenge of translating a literary text. Because of the quite different way in which authors use language, the person who sets out to translate fiction is faced by a much more complex problem. More time has been devoted to investigating the problems of translating poetry and fiction than any other literary mode. It is an inherent idea that the translation of poetry is very problematic, yet we have to agree that the translators also have to face a lot of difficulties when it comes to translating prose.

Criticism divides literature into three different genres: poetry, drama and prose fiction. Fiction, in the inclusive sense, is any narrative which is feigned or invented rather than historically or factually true. In most present-day discussion, however, the term ‘fiction’ is applied primarily to prose narratives (the novel and the short story), and is sometimes used simply as a synonym for the novel. And it is to be read rather than acted or performed, and the events described are told us by a narrator, not enacted or dramatized. Some of the important features of prose fiction are narrative technique, characterization, theme, plot and style.

Now talking about nature of fiction translation, it is much more complicated than the translation of other genres, as it deals not only with bilingual, but also bi-cultural, bi-social transference, including the entire complex of emotions, associations and ideas, which intricately relate different nations’ languages to their lifestyles and traditions. Fiction translation involves the exchange of the social experiences of individuals in the fictional world with readers in another culture or society. It is also a difficult task for the translator of fiction to explore the style of a fiction and the message the author conveys about social life, human relationships, values etc.
In a country like India with its long-standing multilingual literary tradition, it is a matter of regret that most languages are not perfectly comprehensible even to the speakers hailing from neighbouring languages. Then the risk involved in the practice increases a thousand fold when one seeks to bridge the yawning off between two languages like Gujarati and English which are separated by time and space and more significantly share a history complicated by colonialism.

Fiction translation requires attention to each of the various levels on which a text functions. These levels create two major problems in the process of fiction translation:

(a) Linguistic and Stylistic Issues
(b) Cultural Issues

Under these two umbrella terms many other related issues are also faced. Translation, as mentioned earlier is as old as language is. It is occasioned by the social needs of people. Whenever, for instance, two linguistic groups interact as neighbours to each other, translation from one to each other languages becomes inevitable if they must meaningfully communicate with each other.

**Linguistic and Stylistic Issues**

The first step towards the study of the process of translation must be to accept the fact that translation has a central core of linguistic activity.

Language, if linguistically studied, contains mainly three components:

(i) Sound
(ii) Grammar
(iii) Meaning
2.5.1.1 Problems of Style

Style is one of the features that distinguish fiction translation from other forms of translation. A thorough stylistic analysis of the text is a prerequisite in literary translation. The particular characteristics that mark the text as belonging to a particular author are expected to be found in a translation. A fiction translation necessarily involves close attention to matters of style.

Phonology, lexis, morphology, syntax etc. constitute style. If the style of the SL text at these various levels is not replaced by the levels of style in the TL, it creates problems in the areas of syntax, phonology, morphology and so on. Changes in style are certainly necessitated by the differences between SL and TL. Passive constructions are sometimes made active, rhetorical questions are sometimes turned into direct statements, short sentences are sometimes combined and the direct thought or conversation has sometimes been changed to indirect thought.
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and conversation. Different narrative modes, author’s and characters’ perspectives, emotive behaviour of characters, general stylistic and idiosyncratic peculiarities also fall under this category.

Translation of fiction involves the exchange of the social experience of individuals in the fictional world with readers in another culture or society. Both the social factor and the authorial factor (authorial individualism) are emphasized in the process of fiction translation. Therefore, the reproduction of style is considered the core in translation of fiction. It is also a difficult task for the translator of fiction to explore the style of a novel and the message the author conveys about social life, human relationships, etc. Translation of fiction depends largely on various factors, including aesthetic conventions, historical and cultural-social circumstances, authorial individualism and the author's worldview.

Some scholars consider literary translation successful only if style has been conveyed together with content, and a stylistic analysis can help the translator to establish priorities in the decision-making process on the micro-level. In the context of translation, meaning is the inner content or soul of the text which is being transferred and style is the outer aspect in which meaning is clothed.

**2.5.1.2 Problems of Meaning**

On the semantic level, a literary text carries some message or statement about the real world or the author's reaction to it, and this is often considered the core which any translation must reproduce. However, the message of a fiction is often implicit and connotative rather
than explicit and denotative, giving rise to different readings and multiple interpretations.

This kind of problem is faced by the translator due to the semantic restriction of words resulting in some gaps, i.e. some areas covered by a word in one language cannot be covered by any word or form of the word in the other.

At a semantic level, language is essentially a conceptual system and despite the claim of a universal conceptual framework common to all human languages, languages differ in the way they clarify experience. The greater this experience, the more complex the problem of finding exact translation equivalent is. There are mainly three kinds of problems of meaning:

(i) Problems of Suggestive Meaning
(ii) Socio-cultural Problems
(iii) Problems of Common Vocabulary

To communicate the suggestive meaning of the SL text into TL text becomes a challenging problem. The suggestive meaning mainly depends on:

(a) The peculiar expression of the word in the text with a particular motive
(b) Its shades of meaning
(c) Particular social context

The socio-cultural meaning of a word, according to Bhartrhari, depends upon its use in the sentence, its context, etymology, appropriateness, time and place, association, contrast, gender, collocation, its power of expressing the meaning, the speaker and the tone.
Common vocabulary problems are the results of:

(a) Similar words with dissimilar meaning
(b) Similar words with similar and dissimilar meaning

In the context of translation, meaning is the inner content of the text which is being transferred and style is the outer aspect in which meaning is clothed.

Apart from the problems of style and meaning, there is one more problem, i.e. the problem of form. It is not only the individual words of a text but also its form which acts as a signifier with a signified that changes from culture to culture and from age to age. In short, the problem faced by a translator is that the meaning of a prosaic form changes with the transformation of social values, may not be effective in another age and culture. For example, the epic form does not signify for the contemporaries what it did in the ancient times. Thus, using the same form for a translation in a different culture may carry quite a different meaning and produce the opposite of a faithful rendering.

2.5.1.3 Syntactic Issues

If the problems related stylistics and semantics are vexing, the grammar of the language poses no less a dilemma to the translator. There is a world of a difference in the syntactical organization between Gujarati Language and English Language, e.g. English language sentences with a rigorous SVO word-order except in the passive voice. But Gujarati has more inflections by the agency of which the sentence patterns freely vary from SOV to OSV. Due to this flexibility of the word order and greater possibility for inflections, Gujarati sentence structure becomes assimilative in nature.
Problems such as SL compound words transferred into TL phrases or clauses, several emphatic particles in TL grammar for one particle in SL grammar, use of verbs in place of nouns and adjectives, substituting nouns for pronouns, change in the structure and mood of a sentence are usually faced by a literary translator.

When an SL phrase or a sentence can have more than one TL structure, it leads to structural ambiguity. Moreover, words can have several meanings even within the same part of speech and grammar rules if differently applied, can produce more than one syntactic analysis for a sentence. One word can be assigned more than one category in grammar such as it can be used both as a noun & verb, noun & adjective, verb & adjective or adjective & adverb. Discussing this problem further, TL has to use a phrase to express what SL expresses in a single word. The same problem is raised by idioms as idioms are culture-bound. A translator while translating idioms, very often has to use a phrase or a clause to express a single idiom. Sometimes both SL and TL use the same construction for different purposes or different constructions for the same purpose. For instance, in English passive construction is used for different purposes.

In general the grammatical modifications can be made more readily, since many grammatical changes are dictated by the obligatory structures of the target language.

2.5.2 Cultural Issues

In 1990 Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, two towering translation studies scholars, famously announced what had been under way for some time: the ‘cultural turn’ in translation studies. In brief, they envisaged that "neither the word, nor the text, but the culture becomes the operational ‘unit of translation’. (Lefevere & Bassnett, 1990, p. 8).
The culture of every nation is considered to be an important aspect of the identity of that nation. It may be claimed that culture has a profound effect on the structure and lexicon of the language of that nation, i.e. every statement in any language has its local colour. When the source and target languages belong to different cultural groups, the first problem faced by a fiction-translator is finding terms in his/her own language that express the highest level of loyalty possible to the meaning of certain words. The people of a given culture look at the things from their own perspectives. Some words look like equivalents but they are not. They have special connotations or different focuses in different cultures. Even when words seem to be synonymous from one cultural setting to another, they carry their own cultural baggage.

Edward Sapir claims that human beings are at the mercy of the language that has become the medium of expression for their society and culture; language habits of the group of people determine experience generally and every disjointed structure signifies a separate authenticity. A translator encounters the complexities of differences between the cultures. The subject of cultural difference is very problematic. Sapir (1956) utters:

*No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached.* (p. 69)

Even the slightest variation from the SL cultural term can be taken as an act of subversion against the culture it represents. Some terms are so deeply rooted in their source culture, that they are specific and exclusive.
to the culture that produced them and therefore, they have no equivalent in the target culture.

Furthermore, in every culture there are certain actions, which are symbolic. If the action is simply translated literally, it may result in a wrong meaning. Social relationships are also a cultural element. In some cultures, people have different words to refer to each relative. Customs, traditions, rituals are also parts of a culture. Be it a marriage, funeral or festival, the story and the significance or hidden symbolism behind it becomes stumbling block for the translator. Beliefs and feelings change from culture to culture. Lotman declares, ‘No language can exist unless it is stepped in the context of culture; no culture can exist which does not have at its centre, the structure of natural language.’ Language is the heart within the body of culture; the surgeon operating heart cannot neglect the body that surrounds it.

Well, in fact, the problems of translation vary in nature and degree with the nature of the text and the purpose of the translation. While the main purpose of translation of a creative work is to produce a replicated creative work in the TL, which can give aesthetic satiation to the reader.

2.6 Review of Research in Translation

The research in translation aims at research in culture, ethics, researcher’s subjectivity, the globalisation of translation, theories of translation and so on. Theories pertaining to research on translation offer an overview of various ways of handling the issues come across during the process of translation.

E. Nida (1976) classifies translation theories into three: philological theories, linguistic theories and socio-linguistic theories.
Philological theories emphasize on the literary texts. They rely upon philology as the study of the development of language and the classical literary studies. Nida (1976, pp. 67-68) states that these theories deal corresponding structures in the source and receptor languages and attempt to evaluate their equivalence... they are normally concerned with all kinds of stylistic features and rhetorical devices.

According to Nida (1976), linguistic theories emphasize on the differences between the Linguistic structures of the STs and TTs, rather than a comparison of literary genres and stylistic features of the philological theories. Their development is due to two factors: first, the application of the rapidly expanding linguistics, and second, the emergence of Machine Translation. The eminent theorists are Eugene Nida, Roger Bell and J. C. Catford.

Socio-linguistic theories are based on communication process. They link translation to communicative theory and information theory with special emphasis on the receptor’s role in the translation process. They require the translator exhibit language competence as well as language performance.

According to Newmark (1988), translation theory is concerned mainly with determining appropriate translation methods for the widest possible range of texts. It also provides a frame work of principles, rules and hints for translating texts and criticizing translations.

On the basis of the several translation theories some of the theorists have tried to define the term ‘translation.’ E. Nida and Taber (1969, p.12)
“Translation 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.”

Catford (1965, p. 20) “Translation is the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual materials in another language (TL).”

A 17th century French critic coined the phrase, ‘les belles infidels’. This means that translations like women, could be either faithful or beautiful, but not both at the same time. Faith pertains to the extent to which a translation accurately renders the meaning of the source text, without adding to or subtracting from it, without intensifying or weakening any part of the meaning and without distorting it. The translator is to consider the thought of his author, and his words, and at the same time to find out the counterpart to each in another language.

Friedrich Schleiermacher, the German theologian and philosopher, in his seminal lecture, ‘On the Different Methods of Translation’ (1992) distinguished between translation methods that move “the writer toward [the reader]” i.e. transparency, and those that move “the reader toward [the author] i.e. an extreme fidelity to the foreignness of the source text.

The criteria, to judge fidelity of a translation vary according to the subject, the precision of the original contents, the type, function and use of the text, its literary qualities, its social / historical context, so forth.

The translation of Gujarati literature is also governed by different conditions related to readership, sensibility and literary culture. Translators in Gujarati use various methods ranging from literal translation to free translation. As a result, some of the Gujarati translators
and critics also present their views on translation methods, techniques, approaches, strategies or challenges faced by a translator.

**Mohanbhai Patel (1970)** represents Gandhiji’s views on Translation:

1. Translation introduces the classic literature from foreign languages to the native speakers.
2. A good translation:
   (a) Should read like the original one.
   (b) Should provide certain tips to the native speakers regarding unfamiliar idioms, illustrations, metaphors, mythology etc.
   (c) Should read as if created in SL.
   (d) Should preserve the salient features of the ST.
   (e) Should be reliable as a source for reference in place of ST.
3. A translator if fails to seize the writer’s expressions, must drop the idea of translating.
4. Some texts demand word-to-word translation whereas some demand just paraphrase.

Mohanbhai Patel discusses the challenges faced by a translator. He is of the opinion that transference of the form of an SL word into the form of a TL word poses difficult questions to a translator. The job of a translator is to preserve in TT both matter and manner of SL. Translation demands special craft on the part of the translator. Familiarity with the subject and attitude towards translation do matter the success of the outcome.

Critics have framed specific principles for a translator. Theodore Savory quoted in his ‘*The Art of Translation*’ two different views: one view emphasises on ‘translation’s fidelity to the creation (ST)’ whereas the other view focuses on ‘translation’s fidelity to the re-creation (TT)’.
Patel also underlines the problems of ‘shade of meanings’, ‘matter & manner’, types of translation-readers, their attitude towards TT, issues in poetry translation and ends with raising questions to certain translations from Sanskrit into Gujarati.

The eminent Gujarati critics also opine on the differences between ‘word-to-word translation’ and ‘sense-to-sense translation’. Literary translation insists on bringing not only the same sense but also same feelings and emotions in TL style. The translation should echo the sound of the original language. SL stylistics cannot always be translated into TL stylistics as both language and writer have their own style whose aesthetic pleasure might not be experienced in translation. But a translator is also a creator and hence, s/he is expected to identify the style of the source language text and bring in target text some of the essential features like seriousness, liveliness, humour, wit, simplicity, vulnerability etc. S/he may wholly conceal all the literary powers of the first author and alter his style beyond his recognition.

Babu Suthar presents his views which are altogether different. He believes that we owe much to translators and even more, translations. The writer and his/her ST give birth to the translator and TT. Translation proceeds from the original. Suthar here agrees to Walter Benjamin’s views: “Fidelity and freedom – the freedom of rendering in accord with the meaning, and in its service, fidelity in opposition to the word – these are old, traditional concepts in every discussion of translation. They no longer seem useful for a theory that seeks in translation something other than reproduction of meaning.” And he opposes the views rendered by metaphysicians as they emphasise on ‘fidelity to SL & ST’ instead of
‘fidelity to TL & TT’. A translator translates for a particular class of readers. Too much fidelity to the original will make his/her translation dependent. In the process of translation intention is more important than ST meaning and form. The job of a translator is to find the intention towards TL to bring the echo of the original. A bad translation wipes out foreignness of the ST whereas a good translation preserves it. And translators do this job. Hence, according to Blanchot they are ‘hidden masters of our culture’ and “we are in no measure able to be grateful to them.”

In short, literary translation often adheres as closely as possible to the source text. And thus, it often stretches the boundaries of the translation to produce an unidiomatic text. It also adopts words or expressions from the SL in order to provide ‘local colour’ in the translation.

2.7 Conclusion

The study of translation, its traditions and theories is essential and inevitable because of the continuous development occurring within the discipline of translation studies. It is marked by changes and events. Nowadays, translation research has taken another path, which is more automatic. The invention of the internet, together with the new technological developments in communication and digital materials, has increased cultural exchanges between nations. This leads translators to look for ways to cope with these changes and to look for more practical techniques that can enable them to translate more and waste less. They also feel the need to enter the world of cinematographic translation, hence the birth of audiovisual translation. The latter technique, also called
Screen translation, is concerned with the translation of all kinds of TV programs, including films, series, and documentaries. This field is based on computers and translation software programs, and it is composed of two methods: dubbing and subtitling. In fact, audiovisual translation marks a dramatic changing era in the domain of translation.

In short, translation has a very wide and rich history in the world literature. Since its birth, translation was the subject of a variety of research and conflicts between theorists. Each theorist approaches it according to his/her viewpoint and field of research, the fact that gives its history a changing quality.

This chapter dealt with the review of related literature. The theories on translation that the researcher studied in order to strengthen the research work were discussed here. It presented a critical review of the history and various theoretical perspectives of translation. The history and the theoretical issues were very important to the present study to compare and to contextualize them with the issues of the present study. It also looked at the tradition of translation in Gujarati literature and the problems of translating Gujarati fiction. It also presented a brief review on research in translation.