Chapter 5
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Every research has its outcome. Without comprehensive result, no research work can be regarded as success. In the present research work, through extensive investigation and with the help of corpora and feedback from the areas concerned has conceived results. After going through a detailed research on the “Treatment of Polysemous Words in the English Translation of Urdu Fiction”, Novel ‘Miratul Uroos’ by Nazir Ahmed which is also considered as first Urdu Novel and its Translation ‘The Bride’s Mirror’ by G.E. Ward has been chosen, to evaluate the different contours of the assumptions and comes out with the solid findings and conclusions. In this back drop, the present chapter is designed for casing the conclusion of our research work.

In this chapter, we aim at summarizing the discussions carried out in earlier chapters and have drawn conclusions from the discussions presented in the different sections of the thesis. The chapter spreads over two sections i.e. Section-A and Section-B. The first section comes up with a chapter wise summary of the research work, while the second section presents the conclusions drawn from the current study and end with some implications for further research.

Section-A: Summary

In this section, we have made an effort to briefly present the summary of all the chapters.

In chapter-1, we have dealt with the introduction where we have discussed that the present research is an attempt to investigate the Polysemy and Polysemous
words in Urdu Fiction. The present study also critically reviews the current translation methodologies used in the Translation of Urdu Fiction into English.

Conversely, insights from translation studies have rarely been brought to bear on stylistics. This research work aims to redress the balance a little, by concentrating specifically on issues of style (Polysemous Words) and translation.

- The style of the source text and how it can be conveyed by a translator.
- The notion of style as choice and how this affects translation.
- The voice of the translator in the translated text.
- The need for a special stylistics of translated texts to account for their relationship to a source text.
- The role of cognitive notions such as inferred translator, implied author and state of mind in the study of translation.

Understanding Translation:

What defines a translated text as a translation? Translated texts are distinguished by their independence from two sorts of pre-existing compositions: the foreign-language texts that they translate and texts that were originally written in the translating language. Time is crucial in ensuring that a translation will be relatively autonomous from the foreign text that it translates. The temporality of a translation differs from that of the foreign text because languages and cultures undergo different forms and speeds of development. As a result, a translation reveals historical continuities and divergences between the two languages and cultures that it brings into contact.

Purpose of the Study:

The purpose of this study is to investigate treatment of Polysemous words when they are translated from Urdu language (L1) into English (L2). This study is
different from prior studies related to translation in the sense that, it is not concerned with how process of translation takes place from L1 to L2; instead, the research investigates the treatment of polysemous words from one language to another language.

**Objectives of the Study:**

- To study the linguistic literature on the general and special problems of polysemy.
- To explore the polysemous words, particularly within fiction of Urdu.
- To identify the polysemous words within the fiction of Urdu and their related meaning.
- To explore the treatment of Urdu polysemous words when they are translated into the English L2.
- To investigate the differences between the homonymous words and polysemous words in Urdu language.
- To explore where is the gap remain when polysemous words are translated into English language L2.
- To analyze difficulties that appears in translating polysemous words from Urdu language into English language L2.

**Significance of the Study:**

The significance of the present study stems from the fact that most of the studies on translation, which have been conducted with a view that the Translation of various art forms like music, films and literature from a region is necessary for global understanding of a region and its life.
This study is also significant because the translation has an important role to play in the context of Indian Studies, keeping in view the multilingual and pluristic cultural nature of one’s country. Over and above this study is significant because it is serious attempt in getting a better understanding of the polysemous words of Urdu language and how they can be translated into English language L2 and used to support teaching and learning of translation studies.

It is important since it is expected to be a good source of valuable information to the teachers, linguists and translators who has Urdu as a Native language or second or as a foreign language in general because this information is necessary to provide a better understanding and translating the Urdu language into other languages.

This study provides clear picture to teachers and educational supervisors by conveying to them the importance of the polysemous words in the translation studies, when they are translated from L1 to L2.

Finally, the result of this study may also help interested people in the field of translation studies to have a better understanding of the process of translating the polysemous words from Urdu language L1 to English language L2 or to any other language.

**Limitations of the Study**

The researcher investigates translators’ attitudes towards treatment of polysemous words from source language L1 to target language L2. This study conducted on the great Novel of Urdu ‘Miratul Uroos’ by Deputy Nazeer Ahmed of 19th century and its translated version ‘The Bride’s Mirror’ in English by G.E. Ward in the very starting of 20th century.
The novel *Miratul Uroos* is chosen out of big Urdu fiction and taken a sample because of the following reasons:

- It is considered as a first novel of Urdu fiction.
- It is the first Urdu novel which is translated into the English.
- Besides translated into English, it has been also translated into modern Urdu of 20th century.
- It shows two dimensions of translation, one inter-lingual translation i.e. from Urdu to English and second is intra-lingual translation i.e. from 19th century Urdu to 20th century Urdu.

**Research Methodology:**

Drawing on the fields of Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies on a theoretical level, this thesis follows the following steps:

- Construction of parallel corpora, including the automatic identification and harvesting of parallel corpora from the Urdu and English text.
- Tools for processing parallel corpora, including automatic sentence alignment, word alignment, phrase alignment, detection of omissions and gaps in translations, and others
- Methods to evaluate the quality of parallel corpora and word alignments
- Using parallel corpora for the derivation of language processing tools in new languages
- Using parallel corpora for automatic corpus annotation
- Using parallel corpora for cross-language information retrieval and extraction
A brief survey of Urdu fiction translated into English:

Urdu fiction has a long and colorful history that is inextricably tied to the development of Urdu. In the case of Urdu, some of these factors obtain. In Urdu, the emergence of the novel was preceded by a long-standing tradition of *Qissa* and *Dastan* narration. The flexible nature of the genre allows a number of works to be classified as NOVEL by writers and critics. **Qurratulain Hyder**, called Hasan Shah’s “Nashtar” the first novel in any Indian language. Hyder’s pronouncement led to some counterclaims and rebuttals in the months that followed the publication of her translation, mainly in Urdu literary circles.

The Historicity in the Translation of Fiction:

The translator’s lexical and syntactical choices are linked to specific periods in the history of the translating language, so that any translation mixes the present and past forms that constitute current usage. Obviously, the farther back in time the translation was produced, the more noticeable the historical dimension of its language will be. The language of pragmatic translations is similarly linked to their historical moments. Most of the forms unmistakably date the translation in the present.

Translation traditions

The factor that historians most often use to codify a translation tradition is a discursive strategy. When it is assumed today that translation (including non-literary translation) must produce a “clear” and “elegant” text (even if the original does not possess these qualities), the affirmation assumes the Platonic figure of translating, even if unconsciously. The rise of modern translation traditions in western countries such as Great Britain, France, and Germany coincided with an increasing sense that languages and cultures are national in significance, expressive of the identities and destinies of national collectives.
First, that of Metaphrase, or turning an Author word by word, and Line by Line, from one Language into another. (Dryden 1956: 182)

Dryden was thus tracing a canonical tradition of English literary translation by including only translators who were influential poets.

**Historical narratives**

A history of translation, then, like any history, endows translation practices with significance through a specific narrative form or mixture of forms.

Goethe’s historical account of German translation methods is basically structured as a romance. The narrative that informs a translation history, as this example suggests, turns on the particular factors that the historian selects to describe the chronological succession of translation practices. These factors are drawn from the basic constituents of any translation practice: discursive strategies and conceptual discourses, the translator’s agency, especially in relation to commissioning institutions and cultural norms, and the reception of the translated text. Consider Susanne Starke’s account of the English women who translated German texts during the nineteenth century. Since translation is a form of writing, even if derivative, these women still risked a violation of the gender hierarchy.

This thesis is an attempt to highlight, what is polysemy and what are polysemous words, particularly within fiction of Urdu, and to examine where the gap remains when they are translated into English language L2.

Lexical ambiguity presents one of the most intractable problems for language processing studies, especially in translation studies and not surprisingly, it is at the core of research in lexical semantics.

Polysemy raises psycholinguistic and translation issues of a different nature which have so far received little attention. It is to be hoped that this work will help to fill a gap and also provide impetus for further study at the cross-over of the two
disciplines of translation studies and stylistics with special reference to polysemous words.

**In chapter-2**, an attempt has been made to discuss the Semantic Space for this research which is further divided into 5 sections.

Semantic space is used in the craft of translation. First question arises in one’s mind that what is semantic space and follows with another question why it is useful in translation studies.

To answer the first question ‘semantic space’ can be defined as ‘a set of words related in meaning’. To make it more specific, ‘a set of words which cover a certain conceptual area and which bear certain specifiable relations to one another.’

The words in a semantic space share a common semantic property. Most often, fields are defined by subject matter, such as body parts, landforms, diseases, colors, foods, or kinship relations.

Cultural attitudes to particular areas of human activity can often be seen in the choices of metaphor used when that activity is discussed. A useful linguistic concept is that of semantic space, sometimes called just space, or space of meaning.

A meaning of a word is dependent partly on its relation to other words in the same conceptual area. To answer the second question ‘why’ it is useful, it is because without semantic space means, lack of word-meaning range and it is really hard to translate words which is having the variety of meanings of a word, which cannot be handle easily. So for the sake of good translation, translator must have the knowledge and understanding of the usefulness of different shades of words, range
of words and their range of meaning. To make the work much more affective and close to source language (L1) which is translated to target language (L2).

Therefore for the sake of the understanding and knowledge of types of words/phrases/sentence and their meaning this chapter has been divided into following sections;

In section-I we have dealt with the discussion of the theoretical concepts and notions related to Ambiguity and its types. Context may play a role in resolving ambiguity. A word, phrase, or sentence is ambiguous if it has more than one meaning. Words like 'light', 'note', 'bear' and 'over' are ‘lexically’ ambiguous.

**Types of ambiguity:**

Commonly there are two types ambiguities found in a language, whether it is spoken or written form of language. If in translation ambiguous words or phrases or sentences are not handle properly the whole translated work or text loses its meaning and it would formulate havoc among readers.

In other words the meaning of ambiguous word or phrase or sentence of language1 (L1) text (source language) from which it is translated to language2 (L2) (target language) will be misinterpreted and misunderstood.

So for the sake of clarity, before translating the text from source language to target language, translator must understand and know these two types of ambiguities.

1. Lexical ambiguity

2. Syntactic/Grammatical/Structural ambiguity
1. Lexical Ambiguity: Lexical ambiguity is by far the more common one. There are various tests for ambiguity. The above examples of ambiguity are each a case of one word with more than one meaning. The verb 'desert' and the noun 'dessert', which sound the same but, are spelled differently, count as distinct words (they are homonyms). Are the members of these pair’s homonyms or different forms of the same word? There is no general consensus on how to draw the line between cases of one ambiguous word and cases of two homonymous words. Sometimes one meaning of a word is derived from another. When people use ambiguous language, generally its ambiguity is not intended. Relativity is illustrated by the words 'heavy' and 'old' (these are vague as well).

2. Syntactic/Grammatical/Structural ambiguity: Structural ambiguity occurs when a phrase or sentence has more than one underlying structure, such as in phrases like 'Indian history teacher', 'a student of high moral principles' and 'short men and women', and the sentences 'The girl hit the boy with a book' and 'Visiting relatives can be boring'. These ambiguities are said to be structural because each such phrase can be represented in two structurally different ways, e.g. '[Indian history] teacher' and 'Indian [history teacher]'.

In section-2, we have presented the Homonymy and its classification including definitions with the views of some scholars.

Homonymy may be defined as two or more words identical in sound and spelling but different in meaning, distribution and in many cases origin are called homonyms. In linguistics, a homonym is, in the strict sense, one of a group of words that share the same spelling and the same pronunciation but have different meanings usually as a result of the two words having different origins.
Classifications of Homonyms:

When different words are spelled the same way but pronounced differently, they belong to category **Homonyms proper**. Homonyms proper are words, as it has already mentioned, identical in pronunciation and spelling, like *fast* and *liver*. The important point is that homonyms are distinct words: not only different meanings within one word.

**Homophones** are words of the same sound but of different spelling and meaning:

**Homographs** are words different in sound and in meaning but accidentally identical in spelling.

Accordingly, Professor A.I. Smirnitsky classified homonyms into two large classes:

a) Full homonyms

b) Partial homonyms

**a) Full homonyms:**

Full lexical homonyms are words, which represent the same category of parts of speech and have the same paradigm.

**b) Partial homonyms:**

i). Simple lexico-grammatical partial homonyms are words, which belong to the same category of parts of speech. ii). Complex lexico-grammatical partial homonyms are words of different categories of parts of speech, which have identical form in their paradigms.
iii). Partial lexical homonyms are words of the same category of parts of speech which are identical only in their corresponding forms.

Same paradigm comprises cases when there is only one word form that is when the words are unchangeable. It is, for instance, impossible for two words to be identical in all word forms and different in basic forms, or for two homonyms to show no difference either in lexical or grammatical meaning, because in this case they are not homonyms.

In section-3, we have made an effort to briefly present the characteristics of the Polysemy and difference between homonymy and polysemy

Polysemy term is taken from the Greek language. A polysemy is a word or phrase with multiple, related meanings. A word is judged to be polysemous if it has two senses of the word whose meanings are related. English has many words which are polysemous.

**Difference between Homonymy and Polysemy:**

Homonyms are two or more words having the same written or spoken form. Whereas polysemy word, on the other hand is a word having two or more related meanings. In a dictionary, homonyms are therefore listed as separate words but the multiple meanings of a polysemic word are usually listed under the same entry. Semantic shift can separate a polysemous word into separate homonyms.

In section-4, we have studied the full information of Theme and Functional words and have also provided relevant information about Semantics. This section also discusses the position role of Themes, Functional words and Semantics in Translation studies.
**Theme** is a term used in linguistics as part of an analysis of the structure of sentences (their thematic structure): it refers, not to the subject-matter of a sentence (its everyday meaning), but to the way speakers identify the relative importance of their subject-matter, and is defined as the first major constituent of a sentence (seen here as a string of constituents). There is no necessary correspondence with a functional grammatical element (though in English theme and subject often coincide). e.g. The man is going,

**Functional words** can be defined as ‘Words, such as prepositions, conjunctions, or an article, that has little semantic content of its own and chiefly indicates a grammatical relationship. Also called *form word, functor*. Some define function words as, “Words that serve a grammatical function but has no identifiable meaning.” Functional words (or grammatical words or auto-semantic words) can also be defined as words that have little lexical meaning or have ambiguous meaning, but instead serve to express grammatical relationships with other words within a sentence, or specify the attitude or mood of the speaker. Words that are not function words are called content words (or open class words or lexical words): these include nouns, verbs, adjectives, and most adverbs, although some adverbs are function words (e.g., then and why). Dictionaries define the specific meanings of content words, but can only describe the general usages of functional words. By contrast, grammars describe the use of functional words in detail, but treat lexical words in general terms only.

Functional words might be prepositions, pronouns, auxiliary verbs, conjunctions, grammatical articles or particles, all of which belong to the group of closed-class words. Interjections are sometimes considered function words but they belong to the group of open-class words. Function words might or might not be inflected or might have affixes.
Functional words belong to the closed class of words in grammar in that, it is very uncommon to have new functional words created in the course of speech, whereas in the open class of words (that is, nouns, verbs, adjectives, or adverbs) new words may be added readily (such as slang words, technical terms, and adoptions and adaptations of foreign words).

Each functional word either gives some grammatical information on other words in a sentence or clause, or cannot be isolated from other words, or it may indicate the speaker's mental model as to what is being said.

Functional words or grammatical words, as a class, can have distinct phonological properties from content words. Grammatical words sometimes do not make full use of all the sounds in a language. For example, in some of the Khoisan languages, most content words begin with clicks, but very few function words do. In English, only function words begin with voiced th- [ð]

The following is a list of the kind of words considered to be function words:

Pro-sentences — yes, okay, etc.

This section also discusses Semantics, which plays very important role in translation. In translation equivalents words or meanings are very important. The word semantics comes from Greek language ‘semantikos’ means ‘significant’. Linguistic semantics is the study of meanings that humans use language to express. Other forms of semantics include the semantics of programming languages, formal logics, and semiotics.

It is often used in ordinary language to denote a problem of understanding that comes down to word selection or connotation. In written language, such things as paragraph structure and punctuation have semantic content; in other forms of
language, there is other semantic content. In philosophy of language, semantics and reference are related fields.

The assumption behind this theory is that syntactic properties of phrases reflect the meanings of the words that head them. With this theory, linguists can better deal with the fact that subtle differences in word meaning correlate with other differences in the syntactic structure that the word appears in. Lexical semantics is a linguistic theory that investigates word meaning. This theory understands that the meaning of a word is fully reflected by its context. Here, the meaning of a word is constituted by its contextual relations. To conclude it can be said that a good translation work could not be done without the awareness of types of words/phrases/sentences and their meaning. If themes change then the meaning change automatically. Thematic scenario plays an important role in understanding of the meaning of a word. Because words and their meaning play crucial role in translation.

In section-5, we have dealt with a brief conclusion of chapter two.

In chapter-3, we have dealt with the ‘Conceptual Transfer from Semantic Space’ to provide justification for the principle, that translation should produce the same effect on the reader as the original text, It should ask what relation translation has to the texts that move between cultures; it should have ideas about why texts move and how translated texts can represent such movement; and it should be able to inquire into the ethics of intercultural relations and how translators should respond them for that it is further divided into 7 sections.

It should ask what relation translation has to the texts that move between cultures; it should have ideas about why texts move and how translated texts can represent
such movement; and it should be able to inquire into the ethics of intercultural relations and how translators should respond them. In short, by relating the work of translators to the problematics of intercultural transfer, translation studies should take its rightful interdisciplinary place among the social sciences, arts and sciences.

In section-1, an attempt has been made to provide a general description of the Transferability which is used for translation studies and considers the issue of transferability, a well-known concept in the translation of literature from source language L1 to the target language L2. In order to answer this question properly, we need a clear idea of the kind of transfer relevant to translation. Now what is text? Texts—including only oral texts—ever exist without the materiality of a support? Transfer in this case enables a process of interpretation which borders translation. Is there any strictly translated text? There is a difference between translating a text and just talking about it or producing a similar text.

As we have seen, not all acts of transfer need give rise to complete acts of translation. Exactly what is transferred? For the purposes of translation studies, the privileged object of transfer is the text, independently of whatever meaning, information, message or signification might have been attributed to that text prior to transfer.

It is often assumed that the kind of transfer most pertinent to translation is that which takes place exclusively between different languages. Since “language A” and “language B” are insufficient descriptions of the two places minimally involved in translation, some alternative vocabulary must be sought. Similarly, since numerous languages are spoken in more than one community, it must be admitted that texts can be transferred from one community to another and yet not
require translation because the original language of the text is able to seek out its appropriate receivers.

Neither “language” nor “community” is sufficient criteria for the description of the kinds of places minimally involved in translation. It is enough to define the limits of a culture as the points where transferred texts have had to be (intralingually or interlingually) translated. That is, if a text can adequately be transferred without translation, there is cultural continuity. And if a text has been translated, it represents distance between at least two cultures.

Transfer and translation concern situations of contact and exchange, not lineal separations. According to the solidarity of these definitions, specifically intercultural transfer is a precondition for general translation, and translation itself therefore logically indicates both the existence of intercultural transfer and the points separating the cultures concerned.

Instead of using preconceptions about cultures in order to form preconceptions about translations, it is thus possible to use facts about translations in order to locate contacts and differences between cultures.

a) Translation can be approached from transfer and few comments on the nature of transfer provide us with two basic ways of approaching its relation with translation. On the one hand, translation is partly knowable through the analysis of texts which have been translated (or, more ambiguously, through the past-participle form “translated text” or TT, which, from the perspective of the translating translator, can also be read as “target language text” TLT).
Two complementary approaches are thus available from the outset: one is textual (translation as representation), the other is extra-textual (translation as response).

b) **Transferability against belonging** in short, what is the opposite of translation? Translators are most successfully thwarted by the material they cannot get their hands on; translation can fail because some aspects of texts are difficult to transfer situation and sometimes impossible to convey to the situation of translational reception.

In short, translation works against constraints on transfer. Why should there be constraints on the transfer of texts? What resists transfer is not language, but the text’s situational ability to become part of an action.

c) **Distance can break performance** in transferability what is transfer beyond the restricted and usually oral situation will leave the text decidedly out of place. • *Indefinite transfer*: Some texts need neither reply nor reference to an I-here-now they can in principle be transferred indefinitely, within the constraints of world and time. (Example: *Ghalib ke Khutoo*)

d) **Textual worlds increase transferability**, more metaphorically, if a text cannot be taken away from its owners, it is sometimes possible to convert the owners into signs and to transfer them along with the text.

In section-2, we have discussed the study and importance of the **Equivalence in Translation Studies**.

Equivalence plays very important role in the transferability. Once the text of source language L1 is not transferred or translated properly it will create problem in reader’s mind of target language L2. Equivalence has been extensively used to
define translation, but few writers have been prepared to define equivalence itself. The brief survey offered by Wilss (1982, 134-135) simply presents guesses suggesting that the English term “equivalence” entered translation studies from mathematics, that it was originally associated with research into machine translation, and that it has or should have a properly technical sense.

In all, if equivalence is ideally to define translation, we must take steps to redefine ideal equivalence.

- **Equivalence is directional and subjectless**

The following are fairly representative equivalence-based definitions of translation:

Interlingual translation can be defined as the replacement of elements of one language, the domain of translation, by equivalent elements of another language, the range [of translation].” “Translation may be defined as follows: the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent material in another language (TL).” “Translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message.” “[Translation] leads from a source-language text to a target-language text which is as close an equivalent as possible and presupposes an understanding of the content and style of the original.”Equivalence is directional and subjectless.

- **Equivalence is asymmetrical**

Saussure does not talk about translation. Equivalence can be defined in terms of exchange value, expressed as a relationship between texts and determined in the specific locus of the translator as a silent trader. The theory of translation is concerned with a certain types of relations between languages and is consequently a branch comparative linguistics. Translation equivalence may be set up and translation performed between any pair of languages or dialects-related or
unrelated and with one kind of spatial, temporal, social or other relationship between them.

Translation, as a process, is always unidirectional, the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by the equivalent textual material in another language (TL). The equivalence factor occupies a major position in the translation theory. Catford (1965) views translation task as that of establishing target language (TL) equivalence for source language (SL) textual element. Equivalence at word level, Baker (1992, p.26-42) proposes the following classification of strategies to solve non-equivalence at word level.

From the above it can be drawn that in the study of equivalence in translation shows how translators accurately render text in translation from source language (SL) into target language or vice versa. Therefore the translators, by finding equivalence in translation can show the tentative nature of their assertions, invite the readers, as intelligent individuals, to join and choose which translation is accurately render the thoughts, concepts and words of original text.

In section-3, we have discussed the study of the **Dictionary based translation** and its problems.

The best of example of dictionary based translation is machine translation. Machine translation uses a method based on dictionary entries, which means that the words will be translated as a dictionary does word by word, usually without much correlation of meaning between them.

There are many ways to try to find corresponding translations for the search keys but dictionary based translation is one of the most commonly used approaches.
Dictionary based approaches are fairly easy to implement and they offer quite effective tools for retrieving translations for unknown search keys.

In its simplicity, dictionary based translation is basically translation with a help of a dictionary. When user inputs a query to a information retrieval system, the query is attempted to translate using a dictionary in recovering the desired translation. In dictionary based translation the words and phrases are translated on the basis of dictionary entries. But the biggest problem arises when a word / word string of a source language L1 have more than one meaning. When this word of L1 translated into target language L2 it forms ambiguity or loss of its real meaning.

a) Problems in Dictionary based Translation (Machine Translation MT)

Word missing in Dictionary entry

New words and word combinations are generated all the time in all fields of the human conversation.

Words missing from a dictionary, or words out-of-vocabulary, as the problem is also referred, is a huge problem for dictionary based translation systems.

Inflected words in many languages the words are marked to reflect their grammatical information such as gender, number or tense, this is called inflection. What makes this a problem in dictionary based translation, is that inflected words are not listed in dictionaries in their inflected form but in their base form.

Phrases are not as problematic as usual for languages like German or Finnish where multi-word expressions are rather compound words than phrases.
Lexical ambiguity, one major problem is the natural lexical ambiguity of source and target languages. In every language, there are words which have multiple senses. As an example, the English word string has 17 different meanings according to Word Net. Even if the word string was found in a dictionary it would have 17 senses, how could a machine know which one is the correct translation? This kind of word sense identification requires heavy examination of the word context.

For instance when an English language L1 word string ‘movement in engine’ translated into Urdu/Hindi language L2 as ‘engine me aandolan’ means ‘revolution in engine’ instead of ‘speed in engine’ the whole translation work lost its meaning.

It is the stepping stone to success in the translation world.

In section-4, we have dealt with discussion in the Selection of ‘Keywords’ in translation.

**Keyword Analysis or Keyword Research**

In translation studies when source text L1 translated into target text L2 these keywords play an essential role. By selecting these keywords or words which have communicative load translated, the translation work L2 quite near to the source text L2.

Translation theory shares a number of concerns with what is commonly called communication theory.

In section-5, we have dealt and discussed what is **Disambiguation**?
Word - sense removal of ambiguity or disambiguation concerns finding a suitable translation when a word can have more than one meaning. Shallow approaches assume no knowledge of the text. They simply apply statistical methods to the words surrounding the ambiguous word. Deep approaches presume a comprehensive knowledge of the word. About 90% of an average text corresponds to these simple conditions. The English has two senses. So in the light of the above to remove the ambiguity from source text L1 to target text L2 manual human interference is necessary. Knowledge of the cultures is essential.

In section-6, we have discussed how we can remove the ambiguity during translation i.e. **Word based Disambiguation, Approaches and Methods**

**Word based Disambiguation** or Word sense disambiguation is the process of identifying the sense of a word in a sentence. In translation studies, word sense disambiguation (WSD) is an open problem of translating the source language L1 to target language L2, which governs the process of identifying which sense of a word that is the meaning used in a sentence, when the word has multiple meanings which creates the situation known as polysemy. Especially this situation is worst when translation job is done by machine i.e. Machine Translation (MT)

A rich variety of techniques have been researched, from dictionary-based methods that use the knowledge encoded in lexical resources, to supervised machine learning methods in which a classifier is trained for each distinct word on a corpus of manually sense-annotated examples, to completely unsupervised methods that cluster occurrences of words, thereby inducing word senses. WSD task has two variants: "lexical sample" and "all words" task.
Differences between dictionaries

One problem with word sense disambiguation is deciding what the senses are. In cases like the word bass above, at least some senses are obviously different. Different dictionaries and thesauruses will provide different divisions of words into senses. Most research in the field of WSD is performed by using Word Net as a reference sense inventory for English.

Part-of-speech tagging

It is instructive to compare the word sense disambiguation problem with the problem of part-of-speech tagging. Both involve disambiguating or tagging with words, be it with senses or parts of speech. Moreover, humans do not agree on the task at hand give a list of senses and sentences, and humans will not always agree on which word belongs in which sense.

Common sense

To properly identify senses of words one must know common sense facts. Moreover, sometimes the common sense is needed to disambiguate such words like pronouns in case of having anaphoras or cataphoras in the text.

Sense inventory and algorithms' task-dependency

A task-independent sense inventory is not a coherent concept: each task requires its own division of word meaning into senses relevant to the task. In machine translation, the problem takes the form of target word selection. Here the "senses" are words in the target language, which often correspond to significant meaning distinctions in the source language (aaya could translate to Urdu aaya ‘governess' or aaya 'come').
Discreteness of senses

Finally, the very notion of "word sense" is slippery and controversial. For example, in Senseval-2, which used fine-grained sense distinctions, human annotators agreed in only 85% of word occurrences. Word meaning is in principle infinitely variable and context sensitive.

Approaches and Methods

As in all natural language processing, there are two main approaches to WSD are deep approaches and shallow approaches.

Deep approaches presume access to a comprehensive body of world knowledge. Shallow approaches don't try to understand the text. They just consider the surrounding words, using information such as "if peer has words days or weeks nearby, it probably is in the day sense; if peer has the words person or human nearby, it is probably in the name sense." These rules can be automatically derived by the computer, using a training corpus of words tagged with their word senses. There are four conventional approaches to word based disambiguation or word sense disambiguation (WSD):

Supervised methods: These make use of sense-annotated corpora to train from.

Almost all these approaches normally work by defining a window of N content words around each word to be disambiguated in the corpus, and statistically analyzing those N surrounding words.
(i) **Dictionary- and knowledge-based methods**

It is based on the hypothesis that words used together in text are related to each other and that the relation can be observed in the definitions of the words and their senses. Two (or more) words are disambiguated by finding the pair of dictionary senses with the greatest word overlap in their dictionary definitions. For example, when disambiguating the words in "paye", the definitions of the appropriate senses both include the words *got* and *legs* (at least in one dictionary).

An alternative to the use of the definitions is to consider general word-sense relatedness and to compute the semantic similarity of each pair of word senses based on a given lexical knowledge base such as Word Net.

(ii) **Supervised methods**

Supervised methods are based on the assumption that the context can provide enough evidence on its own to disambiguate words (hence, world knowledge and reasoning are deemed un-necessary). Probably every machine learning algorithm has been applied to WSD, including associated techniques such as feature selection, parameter optimization, and ensemble learning.

(iii) **Semi-supervised methods**

Because of the lack of training data, many word sense disambiguation algorithms use semi-supervised learning, which allows both labeled and unlabeled data. It uses the ‘One sense per collocation’ and the ‘One sense per discourse’ properties of human languages for word sense disambiguation. Also, an ambiguous word in one language is often translated into different words in a second language depending on the sense of the word. Word-aligned bilingual corpora have been used to infer cross-lingual sense distinctions, a kind of semi-supervised system.
(iv) Unsupervised methods

The underlying assumption is that similar senses occur in similar contexts, and thus senses can be induced from text by clustering word occurrences using some measure of similarity of context, a task referred to as word sense induction or discrimination. Performance has been lower than other methods, above, but comparisons are difficult since senses induced must be mapped to a known dictionary of word senses. If a mapping to a set of dictionary senses is not desired.

(v) Other approaches

\[ P_{XZW}(x, y, w, z) = P_{XY}(x, y)P_{WZ}(w, z) \]

Few more other approaches may vary differently in their methods to work on word based disambiguation:

Identification of dominant word senses; the knowledge acquisition bottleneck is perhaps the major impediment to solve the Word based Disambiguation problem. Unsupervised methods rely on knowledge about word senses, which is barely formulated in dictionaries and lexical databases.

Obviously knowledge is a fundamental component of Word based Disambiguation. Knowledge sources provide data which are essential to associate senses with words. They can vary from corpora of texts, either unlabeled or annotated with word senses, to machine-readable dictionaries, thesauri, glossaries, ontologies, etc.

- Machine-readable dictionaries (MRDs)
- Corpora: raw corpora and sense-annotated corpora
- Other resources are; such as word frequency lists, stop lists, domain labels, etc.
In section-7, we have made an effort to briefly present the characteristics of the **Mutual Information Leading to Disambiguation**

High mutual information indicates a large reduction in uncertainty; low mutual information indicates a small reduction; and zero mutual information between two random variables means the variables are independent.

Mutual information is symmetric: \( I(X; Y) = I(Y; X) \).

Mutual information is *additive* for independent variables. More quantitatively, if \( P_{XYWZ}(x, y, w, z) = P_{XY}(x, y)P_{WZ}(w, z) \) then \( I(X, W; Y, Z) = I(X; Y) + I(W; Z) \).

This follows easily from the definition of the mutual information. If cost provides 1 bit of information about taste and height provides 2 bits of information about weight, then it makes sense that cost + weight should provide 3 bits of information about taste + height.

- The Data Processing Inequality (DPI) states, loosely, that post-processing cannot increase information. More quantitatively, consider two random variables, \( X \) and \( Y \), whose mutual information is \( I(X, Y) \).

If Shannon entropy is viewed as a signed measure in the context of information diagrams, as explained in the article Information theory and measure theory, then the only definition of multivariate mutual information that makes sense is as follows:

\[
I(X_1; \ldots; X_{n-1}|X_n) = \mathbb{E}_{X_n}(I(X_1; \ldots; X_{n-1})|X_n).
\]
This definition of multivariate mutual information is identical.

For the purposes of translation studies, the privileged object of transferability is the text, independently of whatever meaning, information, message or signification might have been attributed to that text prior for transferability.

In section-5 chapter 3, we have dealt with a brief conclusion

In chapter-4, we have compared the translated and source text and its results with an investigation of the comparison between English translation of text ‘The Bride’s Mirror’ by G. E. Ward and Urdu source text ‘Miratul Uroos’ by Nazir Ahmed. But the real focus is only on the treatment of polysemous words which are translated into English text. However, these analyses were conducted by computer as well as manually where it is found necessary, whereas all the other statistical analyses were performed by computer using data analyzer software and program. For this research, the chapter is further divided into 5 sections.

In section-I, an attempt has been made to examine The Problems of Translating Fiction No discussion of the concept of cultural translation can easily dispense with an analysis of the very concrete devices of such translation if it strives to maintain contact with the political and existential issues at stake in the debate on cultural translation. The political meaning of cultural translation is not a quality external to the concept and capable of being discussed in a haphazard way. Precisely by becoming cultural, translation opens up the problem of its intrinsic political meaning and therefore while translating the Fiction, the translator usually face the following problems:

i) Problems of finding equivalent terms and expressions in the target language for the terms and expressions in the source language (SL) are the concern for the translator.
ii) Total Equivalence involves the use of completely identical term in the target language.

iii) Facultative equivalence involves one word of the source language being translated into one of the several words in the target language.

iv) Approximate equivalence involves the use of one word in the target language for more than one word in the source language.

v) Null equivalence in which no effort is made to translate the word.

Translator has to solve the problem of equivalence if there are no equivalents available in the receiving culture (L2). If the translator suppresses the distinctive qualities of the writer’s culture and language and tries to adapt to the standards of the receiving culture (L2), the question of fidelity to the source (L1) automatically arises.

The translator faces the problems with the proper names if they present unfamiliar phonemes.

The translator also faces the problems of transferring the literary genres, forms, idioms and proverbs of the source culture (L1).

The translator has to translate a minority culture text for a dominant culture audience he has to adopt certain devices to convey the full implications of the translated text.

It has been long taken for granted that translation deals only with language. Cultural perspective, however, has never been brought into discussion.

In section-2, an attempt has been made to examine Issues Involving in Translating Polysemous Words: As discussed earlier polysemous words are those which have more than one meaning, but related senses. Charles Fillmore and Beryl Atkins’ definition stipulates three elements:
(i) the various senses of a polysemous word have a central origin,
(ii) the links between these senses form a network, and
(iii) understanding the ‘inner’ one contributes to understanding of the ‘outer’ one.

Since the test for polysemy is the vague concept of relatedness, judgments of polysemy can be difficult to make. Because applying pre-existing words to new situations is a natural process of language change, looking at words' etymology is helpful in determining polysemy but not the only solution; as words become lost in etymology, what once was a useful distinction of meaning may no longer be so. Some apparently unrelated words share a common historical origin, however, so etymology is not an infallible test for polysemy, and dictionary writers also often defer to speakers' intuitions to judge polysemy in cases where it contradicts etymology. Urdu has many words which are polysemous. Qlam means ‘pen’

maine ek qlam kharida

Maine uska sir qlam hote dekha

Mujhe ek gulab ki qlam chahiye

‘I need a grafted stem of rose’

The above examples show that the three (3) different meaning of the word ‘Qlam’ but they carry the senses which are related to each other so the word qlam is a polysemous word.

Section-3 deals with corpora of the two fictions which have been taken for comparison to find out how polyseymous words of the original text, Urdu fiction (L1) are translated into target language, English (L2). Is there any loss of meaning during translation of the source language polyseymous words or the translator has
filled it or translated them properly. For this the comparison has been made between two texts.

The study is an attempt to present polysemy of a verb through an image schematic structure and its metaphorical extension. It explains how a verb conveys different senses. As discussed earlier, Polysemy refers to a word’s having more than one related senses. ‘Most lexical items are polysemous, to a greater or lesser extent. A polysemous item associates a phonological form with a number of more or less discrete though related meanings, which cluster in a family resemblance category.’ (Taylor 2003:124).

A prototype is a typical member of a category to which other members are related through an image schematic structure. In other words, it is a central or core member of a category and others are peripheral members of the category.

The related claim is that knowledge of language emerges from language use (Croft and Cruse 2004). The analysis in the present study has been done on some polysemous words but this discusses only one verb: bharna. The study is an attempt to present polysemy of a verb through an image schematic structure and its metaphorical extension.

**The verb: bharna**

The verb *bharna* means ‘to fill’ in Urdu language.

1. mujhe ye ghaRa bharna hai
   
i this pot fill
   
   ‘I have to fill this pot with water.’

2. mujhe gaadi me tel bharna hai
In the above sentences bharna means to pour something in a container. The content is in liquid form. Both the container and the content are physical, concrete objects. In examples (1) and (2), the container is the pot and the petrol tank respectively, whereas the content is water and petrol respectively. The container may or may not be completely filled with the content.

The container, the content and the agent form the image schema for the verb bharna.

3. cylinder me gas bharwao
   cylinder poss gas fill
   ‘Get the gas filled in the cylinder.’

4. taayar me hawa bharwao
   tyre loc air fill
   ‘Get the air filled in the tyre.’

In the above sentences the content is gaseous which means the gas or the air is filled in the cylinder or tyre respectively. The cylinder and the tyre are the containers which may or may not be filled completely.

5. mera basta kitaabon se bhara hua hai
   my bag books with fill be-pres
   ‘My bag is filled with books.’

6. meri tashtari bhari hue hai
my plate fill be-pres

‘My plate is full.’

The bag is the container and the books are the contents. This act is performed by an agent. In example (6) the plate is a container, which is filled with food, the content.

7. drum me gehun bhara hai

container loc wheat fill be-pres

‘The container is filled with wheat.’

In the above sentence bharna means to store something in a container. The content is solid. There is an agent who puts the wheat in the container so as to store it. The drum is the container and the wheat is the content.

8. mobile me gaanaa bharwa liya

mobile locative songs fill took

‘I got songs downloaded in my mobile.’

It is metaphorically conceptualised as the container in which the songs are metaphorically conceptualised as the content.

9. sir me gobar bhara hai

head loc buffalo dung fill be-pres

‘Your head is filled with buffalo dung.’

The head is not a conventional or typical container. It is metaphorically conceptualised as the container which contains the cow dung. One conceptual
domain, usually concrete, physical and experiential, is mapped on to another conceptual domain, usually abstract and mental, through metaphors. The container here is concrete whereas the content is abstract.

10. bus me aadmi hi aadmi bhare paRe hai

 bus loc many people fill be-pres

‘The bus is filled with people.’

The above sense in example (10), means the place is *occupied* with people and one cannot enter the place. Here the taxi, bus and the bathroom are the containers and the people inside them are the content, which are countable. However, there is no agent who fills them.

11. aaj aasmaan baadlon se bhara paRa hai

 today sky clouds with fill be-pres

‘Today the sky is filled with cloud.’

The above sentence means that the clouds are collected or gathered in the sky. In the above two sentences, the process of gathering takes place on opposite planes. The lake and the sky are the containers, whereas the fish and the clouds are the contents of the container, respectively. The agent is not specified. The sky is not a typical container. It is metaphorically conceptualised as the container.

12. peR chiRiyon se bharapRa hai

 tree birds with fill be-pres

‘The tree is filled with birds.’
The container is neither enclosed nor flat. The birds are the content of the container tree. It is not a conventional container, it is metaphorically conceptualised as the container. The agent is absent here.

13. saRak patton se bhari paRi hai

road leaves with fill be-pres

‘The road is covered with leaves.’

The flat road is metaphorically conceptualised as the container, and the leaves are metaphorically conceptualised as the content. It is a non human activity, and the agent is not specified.

In section- 4 the Comparisons of Translated and Source Language Text has been made. In this section only two words (bhar and khali) have been taken into consideration from the Source text i.e. Miratul Uroos by Nazir Ahmed and translation of the Source text have been seen i.e. ‘The Bride’s Mirror’ by G.E.Ward.

In section-5 result based on the finding after deep analyses of the treatment of polysemous words of the Source text L1 i.e. Miratul Uroos by Nazir Ahmed and how much the translator got success in translating these polysemous words into the translated text L2 i.e. ‘The Bride’s Mirror’ by G.E.Ward.
Section B: Conclusions

The idea is that in translation, the communication of the meaning of a source-language text by means of an equivalent transferred in target-language text. Whereas interpreting undoubtedly antedates writing, translation began only after the appearance of written literature. Translation is the transmittal of written text from one language into another. Although the terms translation and interpretation are often used interchangeably, by strict definition, translation refers to the written language, and interpretation to the spoken word. Translation is the action of interpretation of the meaning of a text, and subsequent production of an equivalent text, that communicates the same message in another language.

Translation Studies examines the art and craft of translation, i.e., what is translated, how it is translated, how it is received in the receptor language, and especially what is said so often to be lost in translation.

Translation Studies approaches literature from a new and dynamic perspective that changes the way we view literature, cultures, and each other. Translation destroys language walls and illuminates the gestures, assertions, and utterances of other nations. Translation heightens our sensitivity to the sensibilities of foreign cultures and customs.

Translators always risk inappropriate spill-over of source-language idioms, homonymous words, polysemous words and usage into the target-language translation. On the other hand, spill-overs have imported useful source-language calques and loanwords that have enriched the target languages. Indeed, translators have helped substantially to shape the languages into which they have translated.

Throughout the study it has been observed that a good translation work could not be done without the awareness of types of words/ phrases/ sentences and
their meaning. In addition a translator must have knowledge of themes. If themes change then the meaning change automatically. Thematic scenario plays an important role in understanding of the meaning of a word.

It should always keep in one’s mind that meaning is very important in translation. So in translation, focus must be on types of meaning that is the knowledge of semantics is very essential. Because words and their meaning play crucial role in translation. As far as words are concern they are of many types. They may be homonymous, polysemous, and ambiguous and so on.

Therefore it is not only the knowledge of words and their types, but the meaning and the senses are also very important in understanding and removing the lexical as well as syntactic ambiguities.

Furthermore, for the purposes of translation studies, the privileged object of transferability is the text, independently of whatever meaning, information, message or signification might have been attributed to that text prior for transferability.

One of the amazing things in translation studies is equivalence. To find the out the equivalence for target text L2 is very difficult. Something could not be detached from cultures of one’s society or area or sect or religion or country. So it is very hard to get cultured words equivalence.

For example equivalence words of sindoor, abaya, etc in English language is hard to get because their, they don’t exist, until and unless culture is transferred they are not easy to be understood. These words are directly related to the culture of the particular society/ religion. They are cultured words because cultures are directly related to them. This happened mainly in machine translation where everything is
translated on the basis of dictionary, because dictionary based translation leads to the lost of real sense of words lost and it ends with many errors.

In addition, the keyword selection is also a very important factor in understanding and translating the text from source language L1 to target language L2. If translator gets the keyword of the source language L1, it becomes easy to translate into target language and it leads into error free translation.

One more important thing in translation studies is the removal of ambiguity. Word - sense removal of ambiguity or disambiguation concerns finding a suitable translation when a word can have more than one meaning. Today there are numerous approaches designed to overcome this problem. They can be approximately divided into "shallow" approaches and "deep" approaches.

To remove the ambiguity from source text L1 to target text L2 manual human interference is necessary. Knowledge of the cultures is essential and comprehension of the context is very important to make text disambiguous.

Furthermore, mutual information also plays an important role in removal of the ambiguity or to make text disambiguous. Mutual information leading to disambiguation is one of many quantities that measures how much one random piece of information tells us about another. It can be thought of as the reduction in uncertainty about one random variable given knowledge of another. High mutual information indicates a large reduction in uncertainty; low mutual information indicates a small reduction; and zero mutual information between two random variables means the variables are independent.

One of the amazing findings of the study is that the classical issue in lexical semantics concerns the distinction between semantic generality and polysemy. We have primarily considered Urdu verb bharna designating filling to suggest that
English distinguishes among three different verbs—fill, put into and brought. To simplify matters, the present study argued that we have three different meanings, or concepts here—‘fill’, ‘put into’ and ‘brought’—each of which exists as the meaning of a particular lexeme in English, or is lexicalized. Urdu has only one verb bhar, which is unidirectional. Since this verb corresponds roughly to the same situations as the three English verbs together, we for the sake of simplicity concentrated on selected number of words including the verb bharna. The question is now whether the three meanings are lexicalized in Urdu. There are at least three theoretical and methodological possibilities here, e.g.,

- semantic generality,
- polysemy and
- agnosticism.

Finally, word lists, as we have seen, may well be used for some purposes (e.g., for checking the word-class categorization of “property” words or the aktionsart categorization of verbs, etc.), but are of marginal value when too little is known about the lexical meaning of phenomena under consideration or when the phenomena involve too many language-specific lexical idiosyncrasies.

On the basis of the particular test it can be argued that each of Urdu words analyzed in the present study distinguishes among several meanings, very much along the lines of the English system.

We hope that the present study will be good points of departure for numerous future projects in lexical typology.

From the pedagogical perspective, this type of finding regarding the treatment of polysemous words of source language can play a significant role in enhancing the readers and learners knowledge about the Translation Studies.
As a general conclusion, it has become clear that the Translation can really go in its scope and function beyond the traditional approaches. It should not concentrate only on the structural aspects of language. Rather, it must deal with issues related to the functional aspects of polysemous words of language as well.

This study has gone in this direction, proving that such a type of translation analyses can help a great deal in exploring the homonymous, polysemous and ambiguous aspects represented in a given literary text. Although, the study does not primarily deal to criticize the translation done by G.E. Ward, it can be argued that an important part in Translation Studies also lies in the skillful and convincing translation of polysemous words from one language to other language.

Although this analysis has focused on and explored only polysemous words, it can be taken as model for exploring and investigating other concepts, not only in literary texts but also in real spoken discourse as well. The study, I hope has succeeded to come up with new thoughts and ideas dealing with issues that are hardly taken into consideration and seriously discussed in the world of Translation Studies.