Chapter II
The Problems of Translation

The process of translation is often hindered by structural, lexical and contextual constraints. Rhythmical, alliterative and onomatopoeic aspects have been hurdles at the lexical level. Cultural nuances of the language constitute the congenital merits of any literary work. They tend to resist translation and make translation unpoetic. Puns, equivocations and idioms constitute the lexical problems that literary translators encounter. Most of the lexical problems arise from the problems of equivalences. There are four types of equivalences: (1) one-to-one equivalence; (2) one-to-many equivalence; (3) many-to-one equivalence; and (4) one-to-none equivalence or null equivalence. The first type of equivalence is relatively unproblematic as a word in the Source language has only one equivalent in the Target language: for instance, the word *amor* (Latin) has love (English) as its equivalent. But it becomes problematic when the lexical gap between the two languages widens due to cultural, social and historical differences. The second type of equivalence is inherently problematic due to alternatives of equivalents offered: the word *amor* (Latin) offers three alternative meanings-*erose*, *filia* and *agape*-in Greek. Here the Source language covers a wide range of contextual meanings. When such words are translated, the translator has to choose the potent and vital meaning most appropriate to the context. For instance, when divine love is referred to, *agape* is the meaning appropriate to the context.

The third type is also problematic as the exactness or precision of meaning changes in translation. The fourth type leads to the problem of untranslatability. While translating idioms and proverbial expressions the translator confronts an obvious dilemma: whether he should transfer the items from the Source language and transcribe them in the Target language. The transfer of the untranslatable words and their transcription in the target language provide a local colour to the translation. Thus, translation is a creative process at every level of which the translator makes a choice. The choice of the translator is political as well as aesthetic, though they are more or less synonymous. In the matter of equivalence, the translator's choice is not between alternative yet exact equivalents, but between equivalents more or less inexact. So the choice depends on the ideology of the translator and the aesthetic that he follows. As any literary text is a synthesis of politics and aesthetics of the writer, the translator's choice of equivalents depends on the requirements of his textual politics.

All types of translation involve loss or gain off meaning. Translation also causes skewing of meaning while decoding and encoding ideas. This results from the choice of the nearest equivalent. In this regard, J.C.Catford remarks: "In translation, there is the substitution of TL meanings for SL meanings; no transference of TL meanings into SL. In transference, there is an implantation of SL meanings into the TL text. These two process must be clearly differentiated in any theory of translation" (1965:27).

The distinction between translation and transference is essential to define linguistic untranslatability.

J.C.Catford defines translation as a uni-directional process which involves "the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)" (1965:20).It is primarily a linguistic act as it involves an operation performed on languages. Though the definition seems to be simple, it calls for comment on two terms, namely "textual material" and "equivalent." The use of the term "textual material" underlines the fact that in normal conditions of translation it is not the entirety of a SL text that is replaced by TL equivalents. At one or more levels of language there may be replacements by non-equivalent TL material. For example, when the English text *what time is it?* can be translated into French as *Quelle heure est-il?*, there is replacement of SL grammar and lexis by equivalent TL grammar and lexis. There is also replacement of SL graphology by TL graphology. But, the TL graphological form is in no way a translation equivalent of the SL graphological form. Hence, the central problem of any translation practice is that of finding translation equivalents. Several theorists speak on the problems of equivalence in translation. Roman Jakobson, Eugene Nida and Anton Popovic have contributed to the theory of equivalence. In his essay "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation" (1959), Roman Jakobson approaches the problem of equivalence as a linguistic problem: "Equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics" (Brower, 1962: 239).He argues that the

translator recodes and transmits the SL messages into TL messages and thus translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes. In Jakobson's discussion, the problem of equivalence focuses on the differences in the structure and terminology of languages rather than on the inability of one language to render a message written in another verbal language. He emphasizes that the problem of equivalence is related to the structure and syntax of the language.

The conventional terms such as literal, free and faithful translation became outdated with the publication of Eugene Nida's two major works *Towards a Science of Translating* (1964) and *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (1969), which he co-authored with Taber. Nida, who has applied a communication model for his theory of translation, distinguishes between Formal equivalence and Dynamic Equivalence. Nida explains: "Formal Equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content…One is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language" (1964:159). Formal equivalence or formal correspondence is thus oriented towards the SL structure. The most typical of this kind of translation is "gloss translation," with a close approximation to SL structure, often with footnotes, to gain close access to the language and customs of the source culture (Nida and Taber, 1969:24). In such a translation, a translator is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence,

and concept to concept. This kind of translation allows the reader to understand as much of the source language context as possible.

Dynamic or functional equivalence is based on what Nida calls "the principle of equivalent effect," where "the relation between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message" (1964:159). Here the message is tailored to the receptors' linguistic needs and cultural expectations, aiming at complete naturalness of expression. Nida defines the goal of dynamic equivalence as to seek "the closest equivalent to the source-language message" (1964:166; Nida and Taber 1969:12). This receptor oriented approach considers adaptations of grammar, lexicon, and cultural references essential to achieve naturalness, to minimize the foreignness of the SL setting. The emotive impact of the message is the same for the audience irrespective of the fact that whether they belong to the source culture or target culture.

Yet another theory of equivalence is mentioned by Anton Popovic, who, in his *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation* (1976), identifies four types of equivalence- Linguistic equivalence, Paradigmatic equivalence, Stylistic or Translational equivalence and Textual or Syntagmatic equivalence. In linguistic equivalence there is homogeneity on the linguistic level of both SL and TL texts. It closely resembles word for word translation. Paradigmatic equivalence aims at equivalence of the elements of a paradigmatic expressive axis: elements of grammar which Popovic regards as a higher category than lexical equivalence. .In stylistic equivalence, there is functional equivalence of

elements both in the source text and the translation, aiming at an expressive identity with an invariant of identical meaning. When there is equivalence of the syntagmatic structuring of a text, an equivalence of form and shape exists and this is called textual equivalence. Translation is far more than replacement of lexical or grammatical items; the process also involves discarding the basic linguistic elements to achieve the expressive identity.

An important work on equivalence by Werner Koller, *Einfubrung in die Ubersetzungswissenschaft* (1979), examines closely the concept of equivalence and the linked term correspondence. According to him, correspondence falls within the fields of contrastive linguistics, which compares two language systems and describes the differences and similarities contrastively. Its parameters are those of Saussure's langue. Equivalence, on other hand, relates to equivalent items in specific ST-TT pairs and contexts. Here, the parameter is Saussure's parole. Koller points out that while knowledge of correspondences is indicative of competence in the foreign language, knowledge and ability in equivalences are indicative of competence in translation.

Koller describes five different types of equivalences. They are Denotative equivalence, Connotative equivalence, Text-normative equivalence, Pragmatic equivalence and Formal equivalence. The denotative equivalence is related to the equivalence of the extra linguistic content of the text. The connotative equivalence is related to the equivalence of the connotative dimensions of a text. The text – normative equivalence is related to text types,

with different kinds of texts behaving in different ways. The pragmatic equivalence is quite similar to Nida's dynamic equivalence. It is oriented towards the receiver of the text or message. It is also called communicative equivalence. The formal equivalence is related to the form and aesthetic of the text.

Theorists like James Holmes think that the use of the term equivalence is perverse. Dionye Durisin argues that the translator of a literary text should not be concerned with establishing equivalence of natural language, but of artistic procedures. The procedures cannot be considered in isolation, but must be located within the specific cultural- temporal context within which they are used (Bassnett, 1991:28). Equivalence in translation should not be approached as a search for sameness, but as a dialectic between signs and structures within and surrounding the Source language and the Target language text. As complete equivalence is not possible, there is always the question of loss and gain. Nida discusses in detail the difficulties encountered by the translator when faced with the terms or concepts in the Source language that do not exist in the Target language. This leads to the question of untranslatability. The complexity of languages makes one infer that literary art is untranslatable, both linguistically and culturally.

Catford distinguishes two types of untranslatability, linguistic and cultural. Linguistic untranslatability occurs when there is no lexical or syntactic substitute in language for the Source language item. This is the result of the differences between the Source language and the Target language.

Cultural untranslatability is due to the absence in the target culture of a relevant situational feature for the Source language text. Translation is not an isolated endeavour; it is a part of an ongoing process of intercultural transfer: a transfer across linguistic and cultural boundaries. The translator has to present the aspects of social culture that is unfamiliar to the receiving audience. They consists of elements of the material culture like food, dress and tools, factors of social structures like customs and law, features of the natural world like weather, flora and fauna, and social functions like festivals, rituals and ceremonies. Such elements of the source culture have no equivalents in the receptor language. The translator may transfer the source culture item untranslated into the Target language; he may transcribe the item in the Target language and provide an explanatory footnote for the readers of the receptor culture.

Popovic also distinguishes two types of untranslatability without making a separation between the linguistic and the cultural. The first is defined as the problem of connotation:

> A situation in which the linguistic elements of the original cannot be replaced adequately in structural, linear, functional or semantic terms in consequence of a lack of denotation or connotation. (Gentzler, 1993: 85)

The source culture item eludes translation due to the failure of target culture items to denote it in the target language. The second type goes beyond the purely linguistic; it reflects the inadequacy of language itself:

> A situation where the relation of expressing the meaning, i.e., the relation between the creative subject and its linguistic expression in the original does not find an adequate linguistic expression in translation. (Gentzler, 1993:85-86)

The creative subject finds appropriate expression in the source language, but it fails to find appropriate expression in the target language. Since language is a modeling system within a culture, cultural untranslatability is inevitably implied in any process of translation. The types of untranslatabilty Catford and Popovic define correspond to each other.

Linguistic untranslatability arises mainly due to the problem of suggestive meaning. A word attains different shades of meaning through its context, etymology, appropriation, time and place, association, contrast, gender, and collocation. For instance, the word *hello,* the Standard English form of friendly greeting when meeting, translates as *Cava? hallo* (French), *Wiegeht; hallo*(German)and *Ola; pronto; ciao* (Italian). While English does not distinguish between the words used for greeting someone face to face or when answering the telephone, French, German and the Italian all do make that distinction. The Italian *pronto* is used as telephonic greeting like the German *hallo*. The Italian *ciao* is used equally on arrival and departure, and not to the specific context of arrival or initial encounter. Moreover, German and French use as forms of greeting brief rhetorical questions, whereas in English rhetorical questions like *How are you?* or *How do you do?* are used only in formal situation . So, the translator, who is faced with the task of translating

hello into any language, should first extract a core of meaning which is applicable to his translation of the word *hello*. Jakobson has described this as interlingual transposition, while Ludskanov, in his *A Semiotic Approach to the Theory of Translation,* calls it Semiotic transformation. It is the replacement of the signs encoding a message by signs of another code, preserving invariant information with respect to a given system of reference. In the case of *hello* the invariant is the notion of greeting.

Since language is a cultural construct, certain amount of cultural untranslatability is implied in any process of translation. A word is a cultural symbol which can suggest a particular image or dimension of meaning in the mind of the reader of the SL. The difficulty with the TL readers is that they react to such cultural items only in the context of their own cultural environment. The translator is, therefore, forced to identify himself with the cultural context of the original work in order to make his readers understand the cultural elements in the work. For this, sometimes the translator has to use appropriate techniques of adjustments like loan translations, explanations and indications to suggest the cultural dimension of the meaning. Cultural problem occurs mainly in the translation of socio – cultural vocabulary: idioms and proverbs, images, folk similies, myths, satire, humour and so on. The problem of cultural translation occurs not only in the translation of folk literature but also in the case of "sophisticated literatures."

Translations are not made in a void. Translators function within the spatio-temporal coordinates of a culture. They are influenced by the overtones

and underpinnings of their culture; they are often the product and the producer of culture. Translators, through the subtle interplay of politics and power structures in their translations, often tend to perpetuate the hierarchical patterns perceived and preserved by their culture. They directly or indirectly sanctify the cultural Othering practiced as a form of hegemonic oppression to drive certain communication to the margins of the cultural space. Translation is a process of negotiation and not a linguistic homogenization. Maintaining the ethnic and cultural elements in the source language and producing an appeal of transfer in the target language help to preserve the cultural identity of the original.

Even when different theories have been put forward regarding the central issue of equivalence, it is an obvious fact that complete textual equivalence, both contextual and linguistic, is impossible. On a linguistic level, there are cases where there is null equivalence and zero equivalence, when translation is made from one language to another. For instance, when an English SL text containing *My father was a doctor* was translated into French, it sounded as *Mon pere e'tait docteur* and in Russian as *otets u men'a byl docktor*. Here the translation equivalent of the English indefinite article, "a" is the French article "*zero*". As Russian has no system of articles there is no translation equivalent of the English indefinite article. So the Russian equivalent of "*a*" in this text is "*nil.*". Hence, equivalences can be established only at a higher rank.

Since each language is culturally embedded, it is difficult to find cultural equivalent for certain words in the SL text. When translating *butter* into Italian, the translator finds that there is a word for word substitution for *butter* as *burro* in Italian language. Both *butter* and *burro* describe the product as made from milk and marketed as a creamy slab of edible grease for human consumption. But within their separate cultural context, *butter* and *burro* are different. *Burro* in Italy, normally light coloured and unsalted, is primarily used for cooking while in Britain *butter*, most often bright yellow and salted, is used for cooking as well as for spreading. There is no distinction between these two sounds, and moreover, there is no apt equivalent for the word *butter* in Italian language.

The problem of equivalence takes the translator to the limits of translation. Though the process of translation requires only three stages - analysis, transfer and restructuring- this system seems to be much complicated in each level. The analysis stage involves grammatical analysis, semantic or referential analysis and finding connotative meaning. In grammatical analysis, the translator is preoccupied with the task of determining the meaningful relationship between words and combinations of words. The semantic categories such as object (nouns/ pronouns), event (verbs), abstract (adjectives and adverbs) and relation (preposition, conjunctions, and affixes) are identified. They are restructured to form the "kernels" from which every language attains its elaborate structure. These kernel expressions are not to be translated literally. They are only the basis for transfer into the receptor language; they not only provide the clearest and least ambiguous statements of the

relationships but also constitute forms which correspond most closely with those expressions that are likely to occur in the receptor language. In the analysis stage, usually paraphrasing or back transformation is done for convenience. Still, problems may arise in the case of certain phrases because of the unexpected significance given to one of the elements. *The grace of God* is understood by people as the gracious quality of God rather than what he does for men. In that case Grace acts as an abstract rather than an event. So the translator has also the duty to look into the figurative meaning of the word.

One of the remarkable features of language is the immense possibility that can be explored in the use of words. In fact, in most of the instances, the surrounding context points out clearly which of these basic meanings of word is intended. A word usually derives its meanings through syntactic marking and semotactic marking. When a particular meaning of a word is specified by the grammatical construction in which it occurs, it is called syntactic marking. For example, the term *fox* may occur in three different contexts- *It is a fox*; *He is a fox*; *She will fox him*; with three quite different meanings. In the first sentence, the presence of *it* identifies fox as an animal, because this is the only sense of *fox* for which *it* is a legitimate substitute. The *fox* here belongs to the same grammatical class as that of animal, mammal and so on. In the second sentence, the presence of *he* forces us to take a sense of *fox* that applies to a person. In this sense, *fox* is a legitimate substitute only for a class of terms, including the man, that young fellow, that politician, and so on, and the only sense of *fox* that applies to a person is "cunning." In the third sentence, *fox* is a

verb, as it finds a position between the modal *will* and the object pronoun *him*. The verbal sense of *fox* is "deceive by clever means."Sometimes semotactic environment of words is essential in differentiating the meaning. In the case of the sentences: *He bought a chair at the furniture*; *He was condemned to the (electric) chair*; and, *Please address the chair*: the word *chair* derives its meaning through the environment in which it stands. The most common sense is understood in the first sentence, and it would be recognized as a countable, concrete object even in the absence of the word *furniture*, in the sentence. In the second sentence, *chair* remains a concrete object, but the presence of the verb *condemned* and (optionally) of *electric* forces us to a specialized meaning of *chair* as an instrument of execution. In the third sentence, *chair* refers to a subject (the person who occupies it) which can be addressed. So the generic sense, specific sense and the patterns of overlapping, which commonly appear in language should be distinguished before making translation. Otherwise, semantic analysis may lead to utter confusion.

Words have not only referential meaning, but also emotional meaning referred to as connotative meaning. The connotations of words are highly individual. The linguistic setting, the speakers association with words, and the circumstances of usage are the areas that lend connotation to the words. The attitude of the speaker contributes largely to connotations. This means, for example, that words used primarily by children or in addressing children are considered childish speech not appropriate for adult usage. In British English, there is the distinction between upper class speech (U) and lower class speech

(non –U). An interesting example is that of the use of word *napkin* which is U, as against the use of *serviette* which is non- U. The education levels, language defining sex, technical usages, and religious usages and so on are highly connotative.

Sometimes words used precisely by the same persons in different circumstances carry quite different connotations. *Damn* used in church bears a meaning different from the same word used in beer hall, even though it is uttered by the same person. Similarly, words which tend to co-occur with other words, acquire from them various connotations. For many persons, *green* probably suffers from its occurrence in *green with envy, green at the hills*, and *green fruit*. From such habitual association *green* acquires some unfavourable features of emotive meaning. Though traditionally connotative meaning has been associated with words or phrases, there are also units like pronunciation, choice of words, forms of discourse and themes that have connotative value lending great problem for the translator.

Words which assume different meanings in different social or cultural contexts are likely to be misunderstood. If early translators mistranslate such words, they may be mistranslated in subsequent version. This is especially true in the translation of translations like the Bible translation. The English versions of the Bible were translated from the Latin Vulgate, translated from Hebrew by St.Jerome. In the English Bible Christ addressed his mother "Woman" in two different contexts. The first situation was just before his first mystery: the marriage of Kanav. Mary requested Him to help the host with adequate supply

of wine: "And Jesus said to her, 'Woman, what concern is that to you and to me?'" (St.John 2:4). The second situation was just before his crucifixion: "When Jesus saw his mother and the disciple whom he loved standing beside her, he said to his mother, 'Woman, here is your son.'" (St.John 19:26).On metareference to the early versions, it can be seen that Aramiac, the language spoken by Jesus and his disciples, has a one-to-many equivalence with Hebrew, Latin and the Germanic languages. In Aramiac the same word is used for woman and mother. The situation could have been misunderstood and the meaning was mistranslated by the early translators. Another word mistranslated by the early translators is "the eye of a needle." It appears in a parable Jesus narrated to the people who followed him: "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of the needle than for someone who is rich to enter the Kingdom of God" (St.Mark10:25). This statement created the impression that the rich are not entitled to the Heaven. The phrase "eye of the needle" was infact a merchant's slang. During Jesus' times the synagogues were not only places of worship but also places for barter of goods: "He told those who were selling the doves, 'Take these things out of here! Stop making my Father's house a market place'" (St.John 2:16). In ancient synagogues there were two gates: an open gate for the congregation and a constricted one for merchants and their animals carrying the loads of goods. A kind of tax/toll was levied for carrying goods inside. Animals like camels had to try very hard to pass through the toll gate which was narrow and constricted. This gate was known as "eye of the needle" among the merchants and the tax collectors. This merchant's slang was

misunderstood and mistranslated by early translators, and carried across to different target languages.

After having completed the process of analysis, it is then necessary that the result of the analysis be transferred from language A to language B. This takes place in the translator's brain. The personal problems which confront the translator are not the result of any conscious bias against his task or the content of the message, rather they are largely unconscious predispositions about translation procedures which tend to colour his work. Perhaps, some of the problems may be stated in terms of the relationship of the translator to the subject matter, the receptor language, the nature of communication and the procedures which he should use.

It is usually thought that a translator must first analyze all his material, then transfer and finally restructure it. It does not happen so that the translator usually swings back and forth between the analytical and the restructuring process by way of the transfer. Obviously, there will be a loss of semantic content, but the process should be so designed to keep this to a minimum. The most common problem of content transfer arises in the case of idioms, figurative meanings of individual words, shifts in the central components of meaning, redistribution of semantic components and provision of contextual conditioning.

Idioms speak volumes about the culture in which it stands. In translation, three types of transfer are made: idiom to non-idiom, idiom to idiom, and, non- idiom to idiom. When *to grid up the loins of the mind* (I Peter 1:13) is

transferred as *to get ready in one's thinking*, an idiom is transferred into a non-idiomatic expression. Likewise, an idiomatic expression like to *have a hard heart* may be transferred as another idiomatic phrase like *his ears have no holes*. In some cases certain non- idiomatic expressions like *faith* may be rendered as an idiomatic expression like *to hang on to God with the heart.* In transfer, figurative expressions are also shifted: from figurative to non-figurative, figurative to figurative, non-figurative to figurative. In the case of *possess the gate* when changed to *possess the city*, the shift is from non-figurative to figurative .When *heart* changed to *liver* or *praise the Lord with the tongue* to *praise the Lord with the lips*, the shift is from figurative to figurative. When the phrase *to trust* is changed as *to lean on*, the shift is from non-figurative to figurative.

The most dangerous kind of modification occurs when the central component of meaning is shifted. For example, the Greek word, *devil* etymologically means *slanderer*, but this literal meaning means nothing in another language. Here, an expression such as *chief of demons* will be more accurate. Pleonastic expressions also seem quite awkward and unnecessarily repetitious when transferred into a receptor language. For instance, in Job 33:2, *The tongue in my mouth speaks* is rather ludicrous, for it asks where else one can have his tongue. Epistolary formulas such as Romans 1:1 − 7, or Ephesians I: 1 − 2 are also troublesome for the translator. The historical significance of events and the religious symbolism involved in the text also pose great problems for the translator. For example, in translating John 15, it is

not necessary that the people know about grape vines or that they understand the precise methods of cultivating and pruning such plants. Here, the translator can use a generic term which will designate almost any kind of plant having similar types of growth and requiring pruning to produce better. On the other hand, in *the cursing of the fig tree* (Mark 11:12. 14) and the *fertilising of the fig tree* (Luke 13: 6. 9), special reference should be made to the *figtree*, since this has the symbolic value of identifying the fruitfulness of the Jewish national life.

As with the transfer of the semantic content, it is not obligatory that the structural form must be preserved. There is nothing sacrosanct about such feature as sentence length or phrase structure patterns. Too much effort to reflect the source leads to overloading of communication. But when structural adjustment is needed for intelligibility of translation, it may be used. The structural adjustment affects the entire range of linguistic structure from the discourse to the sound. One of the most common problems of adjustment in discourse is the handling of direct and indirect discourses. Some languages show a decided preference to one or another form and in such cases necessary changes must be made. For example, instead of saying, *They glorified God*, one must translate it as, *They said, God is wonderful*. The problem of discourse structure frequently involves distinctive use of pronominal forms. This is especially true of the case of third person pronouns when referring to the first person. For instance, *the Son of Man* in discourse by Jesus must be modified as *I, who am the Son of Man*. An even more important problem is the way in

which the receptor language handles the identification of participants, whether by nouns, pronouns or substitute reference. Sequence of tense may also pose problem. In some languages only the initial verb of a paragraph indicates the temporal setting, and all the dependant verbs use a neutral tense. Whatever the pattern of the receptor language may be, it is essential that proper adjustment must be made; otherwise, the discourse will sound badly organized or even contradictory.

While dealing with the sentence structure, the translator faces problems concerning the word and phrase order, double negatives, gender, class and number concord, active and passive constructions, co-ordination and subordination, apposition, and ellipsis. The word and phrase order creates problem when there is a number of optional patterns. Though these different options may appear similar there are subtle distinctions, which a translator should be aware of. Double negatives are often confusing; for in some languages they add up to a positive, while in others they constitute a strong negative expression. In some cases, one form of double negative may be positive and another form may be negative. While some languages, like the Indo- European, adhere strictly to gender, class and number concord, some languages pay very little attention to such distinctions. In Quechua, a term may occur in a plural form at the beginning of a paragraph but in subsequent appearances, the same term does not have plural suffix, as they consider the regular occurrence of plural suffix as childish.

The problems of active and passive constructions also figure largely in the problems of transfer. This is especially true in languages which have no passive at all or which may have a decided preference for the active. In such cases passives are changed to actives or pseudo actives. There is no difficulty in transferring a passive with an agent into active, for instance, *Jesus was baptized by John* becomes *John baptized Jesus*. But in case where the agent is not mentioned, transfer becomes problematic. For example, in a sentence like *Judge not that you be not judged,* the real agent of the record event is God; it may be translated as, *Judge not so that God will not judge you.*

Transfer normally involves a number of shifts in coordinate and subordinate patterns. The phrases *grace and apostleship* (Rom 1:5) is better rendered as a subordinate construction, *the privilege of being an apostle*, in many languages. Similarly, to the translation of clause structures, what may be coordinate in one language may correspond to a subordinate construction in another language. Thus *He went and found it* is to be transferred as *Having gone, he found it.*

Problems also loom in the areas of apposition and ellipses. To translate *God and father* literally in some languages is to imply that these are two different persons. In such cases, the phrase is to be rendered as *God, the Father* or *God, who is the Father*. All languages employ ellipses, but the patterns are different. The translator should be aware that *He is greater than I* can be rendered as *He is greater than I am great* or *He is great, I am not*. But in certain cases like *The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the*

Sabbath(Mark 2:27), it is to be translated as two practically combined positive-negative sentence: *the Sabbath was made for the sake of helping people; people were not made for the sake of honouring the Sabbath*. This is because the events which contribute to the benefit of man and Sabbath are different, and for this reason implied terms like *helping* and *honouring* are to be used.

The grammatical and the morphological categories of words pose problem for a translator while transferring the message. Usually, shifts from noun to verb, noun and pronoun are made; but in some languages, like in Maya, *and, in order to*, *because of* are all translated as possessed nouns. *John and Peter* is transferred as *John his-withness Peter*. To show temporal gradation of a word is easy. But in languages where there is no temporal gradation, like, past time of a few minutes ago, past of earlier today, past of yesterday, past time of a month to a year, the translator requires a good deal of information concerning the form to be used. The translator should also be aware of the places to use dead and alive suffixes. The various patterns of honorifics constitute another difficulty for the translator. He should keep in mind various terminologies to define high class, low class and speaking to peers.

In the recasting of borrowed words, especially proper nouns, the translator attempts to follow the phonological structure of the receptor language. Hence *Mark* becomes *Maliko* and *Peter* becomes *Petelo*. If the name or the borrowed word accidentally resembles another word in the receptor language, the translator is in a threat. For instance, a systematic transliteration

of Messiah in one of the languages of West Africa turned out to be identical with an indigenous expressions meaning *death's hand*. When the connotation, the emotional flavour and impact of the message is delivered, the next step is to restructure the message from SL to TL. In this task, the translator awaits problems concerning the varieties of language, the essential components of style and the techniques for employing the type of style desired.

The language shows its potentiality in areas such as social levels, situational levels, geographical levels and discursive levels. Linguistic variation occurs mainly to show age, sex, education, occupation, social class or caste and religious affiliation. The situational levels of language force the translator to choose whether the message obtained is formal, technical, informal, casual or intimate. The geographical dialect causes problem, but the cultural element involved in the dialect misleads the translator. The range and magnitude of the dialect in a language leads the translator to the real problem. The only practical and satisfactory solution to the problems of dialect is to accept any one dialect as culturally more important and linguistically more central form of speech and to translate exclusively in this dialect, thinking that it will eventually supercede other dialects. The translator can also employ forms which have the widest possible distribution among the various dialects and which are at the same time acceptable to speakers of the principal dialect. The registers in the source language must be translated into good and bad, pedantic or normal, refined or colloquial, formal or ungrammatic, in the target language dialect.

Before dealing with the type of the discourse to be used, the translator must be aware of the universals of discourse for effectiveness. He should know the markers for the beginning and the end of discourses: for example, *once upon a time* to show clearly that one is beginning a story, and *they lived happily thereafter* to indicate the end of a discourse. There are markers for internal transitions. For instance, usages like *On the other hand, however…, then all of a sudden…, Now everything was changed,* introduce new paragraph in a discourse. Markers that show temporal relationships such as *when, after, sometimes, next year,* and so on , spatial relationships such as *in, on, around, long way off, went, came,* and logical relationships such as *moreover, therefore, although,* should also be observed in a discourse, Markers of successive references to the same objects like pronominal references, deictic references, synonyms, must also be noticed. Above all these, author involvement in a discourse is to be identified while restructuring. Back transformation, separation of the various degrees of fore- grounding and back grounding into primary, secondary, or tertiary structures, reduction of near – kernels to their most essential features, analysis of the extent of parallelism and contrast used, diagrammatic lining up of the chains of participants and events, and treatment of non- primary sets as dependent structure with their own internal relationships are some of the techniques to be used for analyzing the discourse structure of a passage.

A study of the problems of translation will not be complete unless the translational problems of different genres of texts are not considered. In the

translation of different works, the translator is faced with choices which have been traditionally defined as faithful translations, adaptations and free versions. However, instead of treating these as autonomous choices, they can be treated as points of departure from the original text on the sliding scale of translation. The failure of many translators to understand that a literary text is made up of a complex set of systems, existing in a dialectical relationship with other sets outside the boundaries, has often led them to focus on particular aspects of a text at the expense of others.

Translating poetry is considered more difficult than any other literary mode. Andre Lefevere, in his work *Translating Poetry, Seven Strategies and a Blueprint* (1975), catalogues seven different strategies employed by English translators of Catallus's *Poem64*: phonemic translation, literal translation, metrical translation ,poetry into prose translation, rhymed translation ,blank verse translation, and, interpretation. He also distinguishes between *versions*, where the substance of the SL text is retained but the form is changed, and *imitations* where the translator produces a poem of his own which has only title in common with the source text. From these categories, it is obvious that a translator must first decide what constitutes the total structure and then decide on what to do, when translating a type of poetry with a series of rules that are non-existent in the TL. So the translator is engaged in the act of "creative transposition." While doing so, there are cases where the translation of poetry becomes prosaic. He finds it difficult to translate poetic language which is embedded in proverbs, epigrams, aphorism, and parallelism and so on. Problem

may arise not only in the recreation of the linguistic and formal structure of the original but also in the spatial arrangement of words. Perhaps, the greatest problem is to resurrect a text from a period remote in time. Here, not only the poet and his contemporaries are dead but also the significance of the poem in its context is irrelevant.

Poetry resists translation due to various reasons. It instantly evokes a visual image in the mind of the reader. Poetry presents images to objectify emotions. Poetic images have universal and cultural values. Poetry serves two functions: expressive and aesthetic. The translator has to decide intuitively or consciously which function is more important. He faces the twin problem of transferring as well as translating. The structural constraints, cultural incompatibility, allusive, satirical and ironic statements, puns, rhyme schemes, rhythms, emotive and symbolic references, and stylistic techniques are the major problems the translator faces in the translation of poetry. This is why W.H.Auden reminds that poetry is that which is lost in translation.

Verse is an integral part of the poetic form. So versification is a prerequisite for the translation of poetry which is a creative re-composition to reflect the artistic reality of the original. A good translation of poetry captures the sense and style of the original poem in the vital verse form. The translator recreates the poetic work in the target language synthesizing the matter and the manner of the original. In spite of the challenges of untranslatability, translation of poetry remains a paradox of creative imitation.

The translator of a prose text also faces certain problems. Jiri Levy points out the central questions that the translator of literary prose texts encounter:

> What degree of utility is ascribed to various stylistic devices and to their preservation in different types of literature…? What is the relative importance of linguistic standards and of style in different types of literature…? What must have been the assumed quantitative composition of the audiences to whom the translators of different times and of different types of texts addressed their translations? (quoted in Bassnett,1991:119-120)

A translator of prose is expected to find answer to these questions while translating the prose text. He has to perform a twin function: to translate and to solve the problems at the same time.

Hilaire Belloc, in his work *On Translation* (1931), has laid down six general rules for the translator of prose texts. The translator should consider the original work as an integral unit, while translating in sections; he should ask himself constantly as to what sense is to be rendered. Instead of considering word for word translation, the translator should render it idiom by idiom and intention by intention. Belloc warns the translator against *les faux amis*; that is, those words or structures that appear to correspond in both SL and TL may not actually correspond. For instance, the word *demander* means *to ask,* but usually it is translated wrongly as *to demand*. He advises the translator to "transmute

boldly." He suggests that the essence of translating is the "resurrection of an alien thing in a native body." Apart from all these, he warns the translator not to embellish otherwise the reader will be distracted. .

Theatre is one of the most neglected areas in translation. A drama text is usually read as something incomplete, since it is only in performance that the full potential of the text is realized. This presents the translator with a central problem: whether to translate the text as a purely literary text or to translate it in its function as one element in another. Anna Ubersfeld perceives performance of a dramatic text as a translation:

> The task of the director, therefore, is to 'translate into another language' a text to which he has a prime duty to remain 'faithful'. This position is based on the concept of *semantic equivalence* between the written text and its performance; only the 'mode of expression' in the Hjelmslevian sense of the term will be altered, the form and content of the expression will remain identical when transferred from a system of test- signs to a system of performance – signs.(quoted in Bassnett, 1991: 120-21)

The performance of a dramatic text is the best example of the intersemiotic translation Roman Jakobson speaks of. A drama text is a system of verbal signs; the text conveys the message through semiotics. The performance of the drama text is a translation of the verbal text into a system of non-verbal signs; it conveys the message through visual semiotics.

The translator of dramatic text has to decide whether to consider the text as complete in itself or to treat it as incomplete since the completion of the dramatic text will be realized only through its performance. The system of language is only one component in the complex system of theatre. The drama as a literary text is not self-contained. This is experienced when a drama is read in the same way as a novel is read. It implies that there is the influence of outside elements in every context. The dramatic text is only an outline. This is expected to be filled up by the art of the actors and stage symbolism. A reader cannot get full satisfaction from a play as he gets from a novel. This is because its descriptions, explanations or personal comments exist outside the text.

The dialogue of a drama unfolds in space and time and it is contextualized in extra-linguistic situation. The actual signification of the dialogue depends on the context. The dialogue is characterized by rhythm, intonation, pitch and loudness. Hence, the translator is expected to "hear" the voice of the characters and take into account the "gesture" of the language. Thus, the translator of the drama faces the problem of performativity. This condition must be satisfied before translation. A text written with an intention to performance contains distinguishable structural features that make it performable. It is the task of the translator to determine these structures in order to translate them into the target language. The problem of performativity is complicated by the differing concepts of performance. The concepts and conventions of theatre may be different in the source culture and target culture: the form of the text, nature of language, the style of acting, the code of

performance may vary. In this context, the role of the translator and his translation become important. The polyphonic nature of the play with dialectical variation is a linguistic problem to the translator.

With theatre translation, the problems of translating literary text take on a new dimension of complexity; for, the text is only one element in the theatre discourse. The language in which the play is written serves as a sign in the network of what Thadeus Kowzan calls *auditive* and *visual* signs. The text also contains a set of *paralinguistic* systems. In addition, the play text contains within it the *undertext* that determines the movements an actor speaking the text can make. The translator has to clearly observe not only the importance of the context but also the gestural patterning within the language. After selecting the necessary style, the translator is bound to use formal and lexical features for the sake of efficiency.

Each translation produces a new version of a given text, an effort to reach an ideal, perfect translation. But each previous version, being context bound, represents a reading accessible to the time in which it is produced. Moreover, each text is so individualistic that an attempt to translate it will obviously create metatexts. So, in this context, there is null equivalence in translation; and therefore, the process of transfer from SL to TL can be better called transcreation, a twin process of translation and recreation. Octavio Paz calls all texts as "translations of translation of translations" (1971:9). He asserts that all texts are original irrespective of the nature of its composition.

He contends that every translation is distinctive; every translation is a discovery which attributes uniqueness to the text.

The two terms that finds significant place in the art of translation are transliteration and transference. In transliteration, SL graphological units are replaced by the TL graphological units, but these are not translational equivalents, since they are not selected on the basis of relationship to the same graphic substance. In the process of transliterating a text, the transliterator replaces each SL letter or other graphological unit by the TL letter, or other unit, on the basis of a conventionally established set of rules. The transliteration rules specify transliteration equivalents which differ from translation equivalents in two ways: first, they are not necessarily relatable to the same graphic substance as the SL letters; and second, they are in one-to-one correspondence with SL letters or other units.

The process of setting up a transliteration system involves three steps. First, the SL letters are replaced by SL phonological units. Then the SL phonological units are translated into the TL phonological units. The TL phonological units are then converted into TL letters or other graphological units. A transliteration process form Russian into English is as follows. The Russian (Cyrillic) graphological unit Б is convertible into the Russian phonological unit /b/. This /b/ has phonic features similar to the English phonological unit /b/. This English phonological unit /b/ is convertible into the English graphological equivalent B. Thus, letter B is the English transliteration equivalent of the Russian Б.

Confusions may arise in transliteration due to several complicating factors. When a given SL letter may have more than one SL phonological correspondent, only one of the possibilities can be chosen as the basis for transliteration. For example, in the transliteration from English into Russian, let the English graphological letter C have two SL phonological units, /k/ and /s/. It is the duty of the transliterator to choose between the Cyrillic letters K and C. It is also difficult to transliterate when two or more SL units have the same TL phonological translation equivalent. For example, in the transliteration from Sanskrit (Devanagiri) to English, the SL graphological unit can have the same TL phonological unit /s/. In some cases where the TL phonological unit is converted to graphological unit, there may be choices of letters to select from. Thus, in transliterating Russian K into English, the transliterator chooses the phonological translation equivalent in the TL as /k/.Then he has to choose between//k/ and /c/ as the TL graphological unit. In some particular cases complication arises when the TL graphological units are not immediately convertible into TL phonological units. This happens in languages where the writing system is logographic: for example, Chinese. The Chinese graphological unit-the character- is directly convertible to a lexical or a grammatical unit of the language. For instance, the character/ᵛ, can be transliterated into English by first converting it as a lexical item, and then transliterating it as, say, *ren*. But this process is not considered transliteration since the graphological units of the TL form are not in one –to – one correspondence with the graphological units of the SL. On the contrary, this

process of writing in which the letters or graphological units are in one-to-one correlation with phonological units can be called transcription.

In transference, there is transference of meaning, but this is not translation. A normal translation contains values of TL items that are entirely set up by formal and contextual relations in the TL itself. There is no carry over into the TL values set up by formal and contextual relations in the SL. But it is also possible to have a TL text which has values set up in the SL. This process is called transference. The best example of transference is found in the article "Navaho Colour Categories" on colour terms in Navaho (Landor, Ervin and Horowitz, 1960:368). The colour terms *ico* and *dootl'iz* have a selectional range covered in English by six terms: red, orange, yellow, green, blue and purple. In English *ico* means approximately the same as yellow+ orange and *doot'iz* as green+ blue +purple. For the purpose of translation, the translator coines two new colour terms *yoo* (yellow/orange) as the translation equivalent of *ico* and *bogop* (blue/green/purple) as the translation equivalent of *dootl'iz*. These two new terms are not translation equivalents, but transference equivalents, which contain units that are phonologically and graphologically English. But, in its formal and contextual meaning, they have been derived from membership of a lexical set in Navaho. Similarly, transference can also be carried out at the level of grammar. In grammatical transference the SL grammatical items are replaced in the TL text by quasi- TL grammatical items, deriving their formal and contextual meanings form SL and not from TL.

The presence of translated texts poses a problem in literary history. This problem is acute in Third World Countries like India. In India, literature in English and other Indian languages reflect the same trend and they can be called Indian literatures. It is neither English nor Indian, but a "third." This trend has a parallel situation in translation. A translation belongs neither to the source language nor to the target language; it is a "third" literature. The literary historian is confronted with the task of accommodating the translator in the literary history. In the literary history of the Empire like British literary history, the writers of the Empire have been juxtaposed with the writers of the colonies, erasing the cultural difference between the colonizers and the colonized. This has since become a parallel; the translators are accommodated along with the original writers in most literary histories. But in this model of literary histories the relation between the original writer and the translators is hierarchical. This results in the subordination and inferiority of translation in literary history.

India is the largest Anglophone country. English is not an alien language to Indians. So, English translations assume greater significance in Indian context. In the "Foreword" to *Kanthapura*, Raja Rao remarks that one has to convey in a language the spirit that is one's own. This is a difficulty any translator faces. Like an Indian English writer, a translator of Indian literary works has to deal with the non-English speaking people in non-English speaking contexts. Here, the translator has to face the dilemma of fidelity to the original and the experience it represents. The English writer should convey the

spirit of the Indian region. The translation becomes a success only when the spirit of the original is recreated in the translation. The local colour of the source text can be maintained by code mixing or code switching.

Translation is an attempt to carry the cultural identity implicit in the source language to the target language. According to the Positivist scholar, Hippolyte Taine, a literary work is the expression of the psychology of the individual, which in turn is the expression of the milieu and the period in which the individual lived and of the race which he belonged to. All human achievement can be explained with reference to the causes summed up by Taine in his famous three term formula: "la race, le milieu, et le moment." Literary scholarship, including translation takes as its object the causal explanation of the literary text in relation to these three factors. The translator's task consists of transferring this explanation in the target language. This task is minimum when the cultural gap between the two languages is the least. The translator attempts this by subverting the spatio-temporal constraints in translation. That is why Theodore Savy contends that translation includes the bridging of time as well as bridging of space. Thus, translation is a means to overcome the constraints of space and time in literary studies.

Inspite of its complexities, new translation is always encouraged in the context of new historical and literary experiences. Sri Aurobindo remarks that a scripture like *The Gita* means to be restated in every age in the contemporary thought and idiom, because it embraces within itself the dialectical experience of the temporal and the eternal. But with the changing concepts of nationalism

and the national languages, inter-cultural barriers are created in the art of translation. So the translator becomes not a creative artist but an element in the master- servant relationship with the SL text. Hence Dante Gabriel Rossetti could declare that the work of the translator involves self-denial and repression of creative impulses. He suggests: "often would he avail himself of any special grace of his own idiom and epoch , if only his will belonged to him ; often would some cadence serve him but for his author's structure- some structure, but for his author's cadence…" (1968:175-9). But, Edward Fitzgerald opposed this view. He took an extreme position. In a letter to E.B. Cowell, he remarked: "It is an amusement to me to take what liberties I like with these Persians, who, (as I think) are not Poets enough to frighten one from such excursions, and who really do want a little Art to shape them"(Bassnett,1991:3).These two positions, the one establishing a hierarchical relationship in which the original author acts as a feudal overlord exacting penalty from the translator, the other establishing a hierarchical relationship in which the translator is absolved from all responsibility to the culture of the SL text, led to the colonial, imperialistic influence on translation.

Translation is a process of carrying across from one language to another, from one culture to another. In the process of carrying across the peripheral linguistic layers of the text, translation also carries across certain deep layers wrought into cultural, ideological, and ethnographic and gender constraints. Translation ceases to be a mere linguistic act, neutral and simple. Translation

is complex at every level of its execution. In this regard, the formalist Levy comments:

> A translation is not a monistic composition, but an interpretation and a conglomerate of two structures. On the one hand there are the semantic content and the formal contour of the original, on the other hand the entire system of aesthetic features bound up with the language of the translation. (Bassnett, 1991: 5-6)

Even at the linguistic level translation requires analysis based on semiotic, formalistic and aesthetic perceptions. Besides, translation is a cultural reconstruction with its own equations of power and dominance, centre and margin. That is why translators function as cultural ambassadors among language and culture.