Chapter – 2

Review of Related Literature
2.0 Introduction

Translation is a highly complex activity. It draws many beliefs around it. There are people who strongly feel that translation is not possible at all, as to reproduce a text in another language is beyond human endeavour. Some others feel that translation should not be done because it amounts to the desecration of that text. There are some who hold the view that texts on science can be translated but literary texts cannot be. Another belief associated with translation is the search for exactness. However, it is absurd to look for exactness between cultures. The belief of exactness is sometimes reduced to the belief of equivalence. The question is – on what scale can a person measure the degree of equivalence? These beliefs exist even as translation takes leaps on the way to progress. Translations continue to be produced on vast scale irrespective of the ‘possibility’ and the ‘impossibility’. The contradictions exist, as part and parcel of the whole task, yet the translator strikes a balance somewhere. [Kalyani P.K. (2001:126)]

Nair (1996) quotes Encyclopaedia Americana and states that-“How old is formal translation? Encyclopaedia American states that “This art is as old as written language”. Literary historians have been able to trace it as far back as 3000 BC.” Though the practice of translation is as old as 3000 BC, no science of translating has been evolved till today. As Hans J. Vermeer, in his article “What does it mean to translate?” remarks, there has been an abundance of scientifically embroidered theories as well as “scientific theories of translation” but there is no “scientific translating” [Nair (1996:18)] Many efforts have been made to theorise the process of translation. Here is an overview of certain theories about concepts and applicability of translation.
2.1 Translation: at Historical Perspectives

Nair (1996:19 to 42) has given a short outline of the history of translation theories. The important events and publications are mentioned here. According to it, Esienne Dolet, the French man was perhaps the first scholar in the west who enumerated certain principles for the conduct of literary translations. Even before serious translation stated in England, there was what can be called a native tradition of translation in France. In his short out-line entitled “How to Translate well from One Language into Another” (1540), Dolet established five principles:

1. The translator must fully understand the sense and meaning of the author, although he is at liberty to clarify the obscurities.

2. The translator should have a perfect knowledge of both the SL (Source Language) and the TL (Target language)

3. The translator should avoid word for word renderings.

4. The translator should use forms of speech in common use.

5. The translator should choose and order the words appropriately to produce the correct tone.

Even earlier than that, a number of literary figures have frequently made noteworthy comments and theoretical reflections on translation. Among them are Cicero, Horace, Quintilian Pliny, Longinus, Petrarch, Terence and Aulus Gellins. For both Cicero and Horace, the art of the translator consisted in judicious interpretation of the SL text. So as to produce a TL version based on the principle of expressing not word for word but sense for sense.
Horace advocated the borrowing or coining of new words because he always thought that translation ought to enrich the existing literary systems.

The next great Roman theoretician Quintilian, in his book X of *Institution Oratoris*, discusses the practice of imitation, and held that absolute imitation is useless as well as impossible. Even nature can not create an exact likeness of something and if ever one produces such a copy, it will definitely be inferior to the substance. Quintilian also spoke about the dominance of invention over imitation and about the need to complete with a model rather then to imitate it. This idea of contest was adopted and elaborated by Longinus in “*On the Sublime*” where he compares translating to wrestling with a stranger opponent and a struggle that culminates in inevitable but honourable defeat. Petrarch was against the idea of closely following the footsteps of previous writers but advocated “following and admiring model at a respectful distance”.

In the Middle Ages and in the early Renaissance, there was no theory of translation. Translation was then regarded as closely linked with textual interpretation. Later, in the sixteenth century, translation flourished greatly but there was little theorizing about its practice. It was during this time, George Chapman began to translate. And it was he who for the first time gave thought to the process of translation. He made comments on art of translation in his first Homeric translation “*Seven Books of the Iliad*” (1598); and later on, in his “Homer Prince of Poets (Iliad 1-12). Chapman focused his attention on the entire artistic world of the author. May be, that is why, his views on translation are still treated with respect. He is perhaps, the first self-conscious English translator who tried to evolve a theory about his art. In his “Epistle”, Chapman stated that a translation must
1. avoid word for word renderings

2. attempt to reach the ‘spirit’ of the original, and

3. avoid over loose translations by basing the translation of a sound and scholarly investigation of other versions and glosses.

Chapman’s concept was only partly acceptable to Ben Jonson and others who advocated the literal theory in the early seventeenth century. According to Ben Jonson, verbal equivalence alone was not sufficient for a good translation, but the translator should try to establish equivalence at all levels between the original and the translation.

During the second half of the seventeenth century a number of significant statements on translation were made by the writers like John Denhum, Abraham Cowley, Sir Richard Fanshawe, Sir Edward Sherburne and Thomas Stanley. They not only translated extensively but also theorised on the art of translation.

Another name which is important in seventeenth century translation criticism is that of the Earl of Roscommon. His “Essays on Translated Verse” was highly appreciated by Dryden and others in the eighteenth century. He suggested that the translator should build up a sympathetic bond with the original author, so that he becomes not a mere interpreter but the author himself.

Though sensible thinking on the process of translation surfaced during seventeenth century itself, it was Dryden was firmly set the basis for the English translation theories. He meditated on extreme notions and broadly antagonised translation as paraphrase and imitation. He can rightly be called the first English lawgiver of translation.
In 1791 was published the first sustained English work on translation by Alexander Fraser Tytler. His “Essay on the principles of Translation” contained the germs of most of the important theories put forward by English translation critics in the later ages.

Several other writers tried their hands at translation during the eighteenth century and many of them expressed their views on this act in the prefaces to their works. The most important among them are Alexander Poge, William Gulthrie, Thomas Gordon, Philip Francis, Thomas Franklin, Samuel Johnson and William Cowper.

With the dawning of romanticism, the idea of individuality asserted itself in the practice of translation. A large number of classified literary works were translated into the modern languages. Greater attention was devoted to influence studies in the TL rather than to the actual process of translation. The question whether translation is a creative work or rather a mechanical function was posed by Coleridge’s differentiation between imagination and fury in his “Biographia Literaria.” Shelley regarded translation as a “way of filling in the gaps between inspirations” and clung on to the notion of the un-translatability of poetry in the “Defense of Poetry.”

During the post romantic period, Friedrich Schleirmacher advocated the creation of a separate language for the purpose of translation only. This theory was upheld by many nineteenth century English translators like F.W. Newman, Carlyle and William Morris.

Towards the later half of the nineteenth century, in 1861, D.G. Rosselti published his translations from the early Italian poets, together with the Vita Nuova of Dante. In the preface to his book, he laid down his
principles of translation. “The only true motive for putting poetry into a fresh language must be to endow a fresh nation, as far as possible, with one more possession of beauty”.

Thomas Carlyle along with the Pre-Raphaelites like D.G.Rossetti, asserted the supremacy of the original author over the translator. This notion that the translator should aim not at the common reader but only at the scholars was reiterated by Matthew Arnold in his lecture ‘On Translating Homer’. While Arnold argued only that the translator must focus basically on the SL text. H.W. Longfellow advocated considerable curtailing of the translator’s freedom as well as by maintaining that the duty of a translator is only to report what the author says and not to explain his meanings. This extreme literalist view held by Longfellow and his followers were attacked severely by Edward Fitgegerald who held that a text must live at all costs. Thus, three types of translations were advocated by translation critics in the late nineteenth century. These views continued to influence the literary circles upto the First World War.

In the early twentieth century, translation was recognized as a major discipline crucial to communication between nations and also for cultural interventions between them. There were attempts even to christen it afresh. Many labels including Translation Science, Translation Theory and Translastics were suggested, but it is the term “Translation Studies” proposed by Andre Lefevere in 1978, (in a brief appendix to the collected papers of the 1976 Louvain Colloquium on ‘Literature and Translation’) that got widespread approval.

In the twentieth century, however, many people started thinking seriously about translation and their work provided significant insight into the translation process. It also helped a great deal in raising the status of translations.
The views of Ezra Pound, a prolific translator as well as a profound theoretician, greatly influenced twentieth century Translation Studies. His approach allowed more freedom for the individual translator’s responses. He was seen as an artist who moulded meanings with words. Pound listed the aims of translation as –

(a) Fidelity to the original

(b) Meaning

(c) Atmosphere

By the term ‘fidelity to the original’ Pound was referring to the creation of both: the meaning as well as the atmosphere of the Source Text. By ‘Atmosphere’, he meant both – the contextual and the intertextual associations. He believed that meaning is not an abstract or autonomous entity and that it can occur only in a particular atmosphere or context. Hence, the creation of background is necessary to arrive at the meaning of a text.

I.A. Richards, the well-known American critic, has made remarkable contribution to the field of translation theory though his book *Towards a Theory of Translating* published in 1953. He based his notions of translation on his aesthetic beliefs that - (1) a unified ‘meaning’ which can be discerned exists, and that, (2) a unified evaluative system exists by which the value of that ‘meaning’ can be judged.

In the sixties of the twentieth century there was notable development in Translation Studies and two important literary figures namely F.C. Catford and Eugene A Nida dominated the field. In 1964, Catford
published “A Linguistic Theory of Translation’. In this book, he primarily tried to analyse what translation is. He defined some broad types of translation in terms of the “extent” "levels” and "ranks” of translation.

It was around this period that Eugene A. Nida came out with his books on translations which were based on his actual experiences of translating the Bible. He is perhaps the most dominating figure in the field of twentieth -century translation theory. He wrote several books on translation:

(a) Towards a Science of Translation (1964)

(b) Theory and practice of Translating (1969)

(c) Exploring Semantic Structures (1974)

(d) Language, Structure and Translation (1975) etc.

He tried to analyse the process of translation very minutely and stated that "Translating Consists in producing in the RL the closest natural equivalent to the message of the source language, first in meaning and secondly in style." He proposed the following model to represent diagrammatically the related procedures of the translation process:

```
SOURCE LANGUAGE          RECEPTOR LANGUAGE

Text                     Translation

Analysis                 Re-structuring

Transfer
```
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Nida also tried to stress that translation is essentially a process of communication, which involves two languages. He recognized that it is impossible to deal with language as a linguistic signal without reckoning its essential relationship to the cultural context as a whole. Hence, he constructed the following ethno linguistic design of communication.

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
  & S & M & R \\
  C & & & \\
\end{array}\]

Here, "S" is the source (speaker and encoder), "M" is the message (expressed in accordance with the particular language structure), "R" is the receptor (recorder and receive) and "C" is the cultural of the language of which the massage is itself a part and parcel. He proposed the following diagram as model for translation.

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
  S_1 & M_1 & R_1 \\
  C_1 & & \\
  \end{array}\]

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
  S_2 & M_2 & R_2 \\
  C_2 & & \\
\end{array}\]

The translator, who is initially R, becomes S\(_2\) in that he reproduces M\(_1\) and M\(_2\). By making use of the above model, Nida was stressing two significant factors. The first is the essential difference in the from between M\(_1\) and M\(_2\) and secondly the identical relationship of M\(_1\) and M\(_2\) to their respective cultural contexts. Perhaps the greatest contribution of
Nida to theory of translation is his advocacy of "dynamic equivalence" as opposed to "formal equivalence". According to him, while formal equivalence focuses "attention on the message itself in both form and content," dynamic equivalence attempts to assure that "the relationship between the receptor and the message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message" Nida also mentioned the following four principles as underlying the process of translation:

1. Language consists of the systematically organized set of oral-aural symbol.

2. Association between symbols and referents are essentially arbitrary.

3. The segmentation of experience by speech symbols is essentially arbitrary.

4. No two languages exhibit on identical system of organizing symbols into meaningful expressions.

The words of Nida are especially important because in them theory and practice converge and meet. He has discussed almost every problem in translation.

Wolfram Wilss's diagram of a two-phase model and three phase model for the translation process also needs mention. His theory channelled the thoughts of translation theorists to the concept of translation creativity or translation spontaneity.

In 1975, George Steiner brought out his "After Babel" in which he gives a critical review of a number of translation theories. In 1980, Susan -
Bassnett McGuire published her "Translation studies" which discusses in detail the translation of literary texts.

In fact, all the important books on translation published recently - during some last years uphold the right of the translation to be different from the original. Certain important names in this regard are – Myriam, Roger T Bell, Peter Newmark, Andre Lefevere etc.

Since the mid 1980's, the point-of-view which sees literature as a "Polysystem" has evolved. This Polysystem Theory is based on a view of literature as a complex and dynamic system; a conviction that there should be a continued interplay between theoretical models and practical case studies; an approach to literary translation which is descriptive, target oriented, functioned and systemic; and an interest in the norms and constrains that governs the production and reception of translation, in the relation of between translation and other types of text processing, and in the place and role of translation both within a given literature and in the interaction between literatures.

The view that a translator need not be the servile follower of the creative genius but is in his own right a curative genius at par with the original author was voiced very vehemently from the fifties of the 20th century.

Renator Poggioli in his article "The added artificer" proposed a totally new hypothesis, which proposes that translation could be described as pouring new wine into an old bottle. According to him, the translation pours his sparkling spirit into the most suitable container available to him, although he neither owns the container nor has he moulded it with his own hands.
There has been a very strong assertion of the individuality of the translation in the twentieth century. The translator is no longer required to translate the original word by word. On the other hand, he is respected as creative writer. Translation has brought the different nations closer in this century. And to be sure, translations is bound to play a very crucial role in the years to come.

2.2 Concept and Meaning of Translation

To define translation specifically is, if not impossible, yet very difficult. It may be explained as the process to re-create the work from one language to another language. Here the form doesn't get changed, only the language changes. The great translator and theoretician, Eugene A. Nida defines: [Nida (1975:33)]

"Translation consists in producing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent to the message of the source language, first in meaning and secondly in style".

The definition does point out the importance of finding the closest equivalence. By "natural" we mean, says Nida, that the equivalent forms should not be "foreign" either in form (except of course for such inevitable matters as proper names) or meaning. That is to say, a good translation should not reveal its non-native source. However, it is not always possible that equivalence in both meaning and style can always be retained. When therefore one must be abandoned for the sake of the other, according to Nida, the meaning must have priority over the stylistic forms.
Looking to it from another angle, we can say that the process of translation is mainly a process of communication between different languages. About the nature of this communication process, different views have been expressed; of which some deserve special attention.

### 2.2.1 Nature of Translation

G.Gopinathan and S.Kandaswami (1993:37 to 42) have given an analysis about nature of translation as following.

(a) **Translation As Communication Of Meaning**

Dr. Johnson’s famous definition represents this view. Quoting his definition “to translate is to change into another language, retaining the sense.” A.H.Smith, a modern critic, has suggested that a modification is necessary in this definition because in all sorts of translation, there is always a possibility of some effect of the original being lost. He has modified this definition as “to translate is to change in another language, retaining as much of the sense as one can “Scholars, generally agree that each act of translation involves some loss of meaning and this “basic loss of meaning is on a continuum between over translation and under translation” [G.Gopinathan (1993:37]

However, there is divergence of opinion among scholars whether translation is the transference of meaning alone, almost all scholars are agreed on the significant aspect of meaning in translation.
(b) **Translation as Unification of Cultural Contexts**

Translation is a kind of cultural bridge between languages. Cultural Anthropologists, like Malinowski and others have stressed the socio cultural significance of translation. Each language has got a special cultural environment, which is formed by the historical, anthropological, social and geographical aspects, traditions etc. in which the speakers of a language lives. In each language, there are such numerous words, which have got long cultural background and associations. Malinowski’s theory of “context of situation” is highly useful in the study of socio-cultural problems in translation, says G.Gopinathan in his article “The Nature and Problems of Translation”. [G.Gopinathan (1993:39)] Here, the term “context of situation” implies the total cultural context of the word of a particular language. And the term ‘culture’ embraces the entire way of life, tradition, social and geographical background etc. of the speakers of the source language. Translation in Malinowski’s words, implies the “unification of cultural context” and wherever a cultural unity is lacking, the translation of words having reference to particulars uses in a limited field is more difficult to achieve by means of a single lexical equivalents and requires at best circumlocutions and often more lengthy explanations themselves in part recruiting the relevant context of situations. Above this, the other critics like Firth and M.A.K. Halliday have also stressed the need for considering the total context of the text in literary translation.

(c) **Translation as Interpretation**

As a Russian Scholar Mednikova rightly points out, “translation is a way of commenting.” We find that translation, especially of literature, needs an ‘interpretative transfer’ Roman Jakobson also says that, “translation
proper or interlingual translation is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs in some other language.” James Holmes also reaches the conclusion that “all translation is an act of critical interpretation”.

It means, translation as an act of interpretation involves creative approach to the literary text. No two translations of the same text can be identical. The cultural, socio-semantic, aesthetic and stylistic aspects of literary piece of works are effectively translated only by interpretative techniques like substitution and comprehension

(d) Translation: Equivalence of Meaning and Style

J.C. Catford in his book *A linguistic Theory of Translation* defines translation as “the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL).” In explaining the terms “textual material” and “translation equivalence” Calford gives primary importance to levels of language viz. phonology, graphology, grammars and lexis; and further defines translation categories in terms of extent levels and ranks. Even though Calford indicates the importance of meaning in translation, in his treatment of the whole process of translation, meaning becomes a main or secondary aspect and the formal aspects of language becomes the central theme of the study. So, it seems necessary to re-interpret his definition in the light of the views of other linguists like Nida who give primary importance to meaning, and only secondary importance to style, in translation.

The view expressed by Nida (which is quoted at the beginning of this chapter) is more useful for a comprehensive analysis of the process of translation. In short, as Tancock says, the translator’s task is two fold: first, he must translate the exact meaning of the original texts; secondly, he has to give his reader some impression of the flavour of original text.
(e) Translation as a Process of Metempsychosis

The process of translation is nicely equated to the process of transmigration of soul by G. Gopinathan, in his book *The problems of Translation*. He compares this process with the Indian traditional concept of “Parkaya Pravesha” entering of the soul into another body of the ‘Metempsychosis’ of Pythagoras. The German philosopher, Schopenhauer (1891) maintained that in translation no less labor and genius is needed than “transference of soul”. This concept may be useful in developing a synthesis of the various views discussed earlier, as translation is the unification of cultures, or as interpretations.

In the context of translation, meaning is the inner content or soul of the text which is being transferred, and style is the outer aspect in which meaning is clothed. Style can be divided into the levels of phonology, word, morphology and syntax. When translation is performed, the meaning or soul is mainly transferred. The style of the SL text at the various levels is replaced by the levels of style in the TL. But a peculiar aspect of translation is such that the traits of the style or body of the SL text are also transferred to the body or the style of the TL text along with the soul or meaning.

In this way, the “metempsychosis” of translation is the transference and unification of the soul and body, meaning and style from one culture to another culture. This process demands a ‘recreation’ and in this way translation is the interpretation of the spirit of the original text in the context of a new language and its culture.
The total structure of language itself is dual or dialectical. In other words, it is a combination of semantic and stylistic structures. Hence, we can interpret translation as a dual process of transference of semantic structure of the SL text into that of TL text and replacement of stylistic structure of the SL text by that of TL. This metempsychosis process of translation can be made clear by the following figure:

Translation as Metempsychosis

In this way, it can be concluded that in the process of translation, the translator has to translate not only words, but along with that, he translates meanings, spirit, mood, culture etc. along with the stylistic elements, as far as possible. And this procedure also includes interpretation at certain extent.
2.2.2 Issues Pertaining to Translation

Though we have discussed the concept of translation in detail, certain age-old notions pertaining to translation have been left un-discussed so far; hence, they deserve some mention here.

In his article *The Problem of Equivalence in Translation* Bhalchandra Nemade has selected and listed some common notions in form of questions. Each one of these needs to be considered separately.[Nair (1996:88 to 94)]

**(A) Whether Translation should be free from the Original or Faithful to the Original?**

The debate has been going on ever since translations began. Each and every century has offered its own advocates for both the sides. The latter half of the twentieth century however, seems to have opted for a free and lively translation, provided it is able to produce in the TL readers strong and aesthetic pleasure.

**(B) Whether Translation is an Art, Science or a Skill?**

The twentieth century does not accept the claim that literary translation can be scientific. Han J Vermeer in his article “What Does It Mean to Translate?” says, “There are scientific theories of translation. But human translating remains intuitional.” Thus, translation is conceived more as an art and a skill than as a science.
(C) Whether Translation should be like the Original or like a Translation?

After the 1960s Eugene A. Nida proposed the theory of dynamic equivalence. The stress in translation has always been on the ability of the translator to create an equivalent effect on the target language readers as that has been produced in the source language readers by the original text. This leads to the idea that the translation work should read like a translation. However, the translator should be given the privilege to give his own interpretation of the work so as to create a strong aesthetic impact on his readers, because no two persons will ever be affected in exactly the same way by any work of art.

(D) Whether Translation should be in a Foreign Language or in The Native Language?

There is the notion that a translation done into one’s own mother tongue will be more powerful than that done into a second language. However, this rule need not be universally true. There are well known writers who also do not use their native language for creative purposes.

(E) Whether Translation is a Product of Inspiration or Will-Power?

In recent times, the conception of a translator as mere craftsmen of words, who has nothing original to say, is not accepted. Rather a translator is regarded as a literary artist searching outside himself for the form suited to express what he wishes to convey. Yet, translation seems to be at one level a produce of inspiration, and at another level a product of will-power. That is, translation is a process in which another man’s creation is being adopted to suit one’s own purposes. This perhaps is the right approach.
(f) **Whether The Translation should Retain the Original Work’s Time, Culture And Other Properties or Reflect the Time, Style, Culture etc. of its Own**

Generally, it is believed that if the translation is produced in a different age, it should use the language of that original period itself to create a similar effect on its readers. But sometime, it may create confusions, or even misunderstandings. So regarding time, perhaps, it is better to stick to the ways of the translator’s period than trying to evoke the spirit of the remote past by using antique language.

In short, a literary work should be in the language which an average reader of the period understands. Likewise, when actions which have cultural significance are described, it is better to make explicit the intention behind the action. A translator should not delete or substitute culturally loaded descriptions as the main purpose of any translation is to make one culture available to another.

(g) **What are the Types of Untranslatability?**

There are mainly three types of untranslatability:

(i) Linguistic untranslatability.

(ii) Cultural untranslatability.

(iii) Aesthetic untranslatability.

This will be discussed in detail in 2.6 in the same chapter.
(h) What are the Motives of Translation?

The motives of translation can be many and varied. It is essential for the growth of national literature. Enrichment of one's own language may be another motive behind translation. Sometimes, there is moral or didactic purpose. Translation is also regarded as an important instrument in the study of rhetoric and improving the style of oratory. In the modern times, the primary motive for translation is the desire to know and appreciate different cultures. The fast acquisition and dissemination of information and thoughts are also another motive for translation in today's world. In other words, translation for us is a window to the world.

(i) How can we evaluate a Translation?

Assessment of translated works has always posed some problems to the critics. Eugene A Nida has tried to distinguish between good and bad translations. He considered works which achieved dynamic equivalence with the SL texts as good translations. The works which aimed only at formal correspondence with the source texts and which were paraphrases of the original texts were treated as bad translations.

There can also be other standards to test a translation.

(a) The corrections with which the receptors understand the message of the original.

(b) The ease of comprehension.

(c) The involvement a reader experiences as a result of the adequacy of translation.
In short, there can never be 'the translation', but only 'the best translation.' As there are not precise rules or laws to judge a translation as absolutely right or absolutely wrong, there can only be a good translation or a bad translation. This implies that the struggle to reach the translation is infinite.

2.3 The process of Translation

Translation is a complex process. It is very necessary to understand the process of translation in detail.

The translator must know, at least two languages - (1) The source language & (2) The target language. But, as we discussed earlier, any language is closely connected with the culture of its speakers. So, the translator must have the understanding of the religion, history, society etc. of both the languages. In this way, the translator’s work is like a hurdle-race. He has to keep in mind, not only what does the author say. But also, 'what does he mean by it?' Above this, he has to keep in mind the style, and other complexities of the language used by the original author. Kalyani P.K. [2001] has nicely analysed the process of translations; and various steps of translation are discussed here.

Now, when the translator actually begins his work of translation, the very first problem will be what to translate? How does one choose the text to be translated? Each translator has his own way of choosing the text. But one must remember, to translate a work is to dignify it.

Another important question regarding translation is who should translate? Shall the translator be the author himself, or an alien? But, it is often seen that when the author translates his work, there is a possibility of the
‘uncharitable’ mistaking. Secondly, when the author translates the work, he is likely to take greater and undue liberties with the original work with an intention to improve it. When Tagor himself translated ‘Gitanjali’, he took a lot of liberties, so much, so that the English ‘Gitanjali’ is not a translation of the Bangla ‘Gitanjali’ alone. It includes some other poems too. On the other hand when another person, who is not the author, translates a work, he is more respectful to the original and aims at the closest approximation of the SLT.

The next important point to be decided would be the basic qualifications a translator should have. A translator, no doubt has to be bilingual. He has to be proficient in both SL & TL. Most often it is wished that the TL is his mother tongue. Further, there are two more requirements. First the translator must be a practiced reader and meaning-maker. Secondly the translator should be one who habitually writes in the TL. These are not rules prescribed for an ideal translator, but are only suggestions to make translator better in his work. And the problem of all problems probably is ‘how to translate?’

There cannot be a perfect and final solution of this problem, as the problems of translation are the problems of language and culture, which are highly complicated. As language is the basis of translation, first of all, we must understand the nature of language in detail:

### 2.3.1 Dual Nature of Language

Inherent in language are certain dualities – says P.K. Kalyani, in “Translation Studies.” Language is physical as well as mental; semantic as well as temporal; private as well as public; and comprises truth as well as falsity. It is very essential for the translator to understand the dual nature of language.
Language is both physical and mental. The first step in communication is the formulation of the concept in the mind. This is followed by the selection of the right elements of the medium. Only after taking these two steps, communication is possible. Both the physical and mental, the concrete and the abstract elements play equally vital roles. To tackle the physical, concrete element of language, one has to capture the abstract element of it, which is a tough task; and an efficient translator alone is capable of conveying this to the reader.

Language is both semantic and temporal. The temporal and semantic elements in a language are interdependent. The semantic element changes along the temporal scale. So, a translator has to determine not only what is said but what was meant to be said. He must study the perennial linguistic change with regards to vocabulary and syntax. He has to study the situation in which the works were used, all the functions of the words and the logical connection between both what is meant and was meant. This is not an easy task. Each age and civilization works in their own way with words, verbal taboos and with levels of vocabulary. Each age and civilization attaches values to their resignation of objects in varied ways.

Besides, language is also public and private. Language which is socially stimulated is a set code of exchange shared by a group of people. Language survives only in a group. A private language hence is a language in which the vocabulary and other entities of language are drawn from publically available ones, and are colored by personal emotions and motives. The ‘private’ in language has a very restrictive sense. Yet, it goes a tough problem for the translator. To understand the private reference and recapture it in translation is a strong challenge thrown to the translator.
Truth and falsity find inherent co-existence in language. The ambiguity in language finds a perfect co-existence with stark plainness:

“Ambiguity, polysemy, opaqueness, the violation of grammatical and logical sequences, reciprocal incomprehension, the capacity to lay stress – these are not pathologies of language, but the roots of its genius. Without them, the individual and the spices would have withered”

These paradoxical elements provide richness to the language while posing difficult problems for the translator.

2.3.2 Language, Culture, Time and Space

All these terms are inter-connected. The development of a language is through its interconnection with culture on the planes of time and space. Language is always natural by the society and its culture.

Language and culture are closely interlinked at the temporal plain. A living language changes and grows with time. Each new event that takes place enriches the linguistic units of the language. Language grows in various dimensions under the influence of the developments in social, political, economic and scientific fields. No two statements are perfectly identical if they occur in sequence on the temporal scale. The relationship between language and time is one of direct proportion. As time progresses language develops by dropping certain words, adding certain words and coloring certain others e.g. what ‘democracy’ meant for Plato, has been given additional qualification in the modern political situation. Words and values shift constantly at an amusing speed. The progress in time carries with it new schedules of feelings and emotions, ideologies and beliefs. Such a constant flux is a great problem for the translation. To
produce a text perfectly identical to the original is a task past human capability when a translator selects a work, he should know what was the culture of the language used at the period when it was written; how much has it changed due to various influence; the belief and the legends of the past, and what the word meant to the author and his audience and what it means today.

Language could be studied vertically as well as horizontally. A language extending over a large physical terrain will retain regional moulds and dialects. One may be able to locate the place of origin of a person by the dialect he uses. Translation has to be diachronic as well as synchronic. A diachronic translation is vertical, across time; and a synchronic translation is horizontal, across space. The influence of space on the interaction between culture and language may be well exemplified through various dialects.

With this wide difference in culture within the language and between the languages, the problem of the translation is to convey the special SL sensibility in the TL.

2.3.3 Translation: as an Act of Interpretation

Translation necessitates a lot of interpretation. In fact translation is equated with interpretation, understanding. Translation is not a linguistic activity primarily but a psycho-linguistic operation which presupposes a semantic interpretation of the source language text. The render, or the translator, first, has to study any word of SL with its grammatical significance, contextual significance, cultural significance along with its association with other words, sentences and the whole text. On interpreting the word on these levels, he comprehends it. The hermeneutic
process of understanding would be clearer if one studies a specific situation. It is clear that when receiving and understanding a message, the person can perform an act of translation in the full sense of the word. Thus, in translation, the translator performs an extra act of equating the SL item in the TL items.

In short, the translator’s first duty is to understand, comprehend and interpret the SL text fully and completely.

2.3.4 Translation: as a series of Interconnected Activities

Translation involves a series of interconnected activities beginning with identification of the right SLT and ending with finding and expressing the SLT in the apt TL medium. Nida considers this entire process as a system of decoding and recoding; He says,

“Essentially the translation process is one in which a person who knows both the source and the receptor language, decodes and message of the source language and encodes it into an appropriate equivalent from the receptor language”.

Decoding consists of comprehension and analysis while recoding consists of reformulation and restructuring. The transfer from decoding to recoding takes place in the subconscious while the other two activities are more associated with the conscious part of the mind.

The theory of decoding and recoding is well explained and discussed in Nida's book "Toward a Science of Translation: With special Reference to principles and procedures in Bible Translation." The translator first comprehends and analyses the SLT. He understands the cultural aspects,
the linguistic aspects and the idiolect aspects of the text; he understands
the context in the text which may be grouped as cultural context, subject
context, referential context and the linguistic context, he comprehends
the words, neologism, figures of speech, acronyms, ambiguities etc; he
understands the proper nouns and their denotations and connotations; he
comprehends the literal allusions; he comprehends the intentions of the
author; he analyses the quality of the text - whether it is literary,
scientific, technical etc; he analyses the nature of the text - whether it is
vocative, informative or expressive or a combination of one or more of
these. In Nida's words:

"The translator than should not be overly occupied with trying to
reproduce the formal, surface structures of the SL text. Instead, his main
concern should be with the deep (semantic) structure underlying these
forms. There deep structure constitutes 'a set of relations for which a
verbal symbol is a sing' and the translator must realize that the verbal
symbol has as its 'referent' ' a concept or set of concept which people
may have about objects, events, abstracts and relations' (Nida 15)

Even as the comprehension of the SLT proceeds thus, the translator
transfers his ideas to the TL. This of course cannot be an isolated activity.
With this stage of transformation glides the stage of reformulation and
restructuring of the SLT into TL. While recoding, the translator takes care
of the essential principles of translation namely fidelity, economy and
readability. When these reformulated and restructured ideas are given the
final shape, it becomes the TLT. This process may be represented by a
diagram as follows:
Wilss discusses the process of translation, suggesting such two models, namely the three-phase model and the two-phase model. The three-phase model suggests that the process of translation passes through three stages namely the decoding, transfer and the recoding phase. It is represented by the following diagram:

Wilss also refers to a two-phase model. According to this model, translation process consists of two successive, sometimes partly or fully, overlapping operations: an SL text identification or text analysis phase and TL reconstruction or text synthesis phase. Here the gap between decoding and recoding is reduced. The following diagram explains this process:
However, of the two models, Wilss prefers the two-phase model because in this the decoding phase is not underestimated by putting translation creativity in transfer phase. According to him:

Corresponding to the decoding process, the recoding process is also shortened and simplified because just as several stages in back transformation in decoding can be skipped, several stages in multiple approximation process can be eliminated while recoding. Here there is no re-clothing of old meanings into new form, but recreating a new form - meaning synthesis. Now two processes become simultaneous and even decoding can take place in the target language itself or at a preverbal stage. (Wilss, 3)

Steiner also discusses translation in a similar way in his book After Babel. He holds that translation encompasses a hermeneutic motion, which consists of four steps. First, the translator, on reading the text, feels that “there is something to be understood" This intuitive feeling occurs
because of his previous experience of the language. Secondly, he
proceeds to comprehend it. He calls this move "incursive and extractive."
He studied the text deciphers and analyses it. What he does at this second
stage is decipherment and "decipherment is dissective, leaving the shell
smashed and the vital layers stripped." After deserting the SLT, the next
step is to assimilate and replace the newly acquired knowledge. He calls
this move 'incorporative' what happens at this stage is "the portage home
of the foreign 'sense' and its domestication in the new linguistic cultural
matrix" (Steiner, 333). The final step is a creative one and the translator
strikes a balance between the SLT and the TLT. At this stage, the
translator takes care not to lean towards the SLT and subdue his
creativity. "The insinuation of self into otherness is the final secret of the
translator's craft". (Stainer, 74)

When the translator restructures the SLT, he is temporarily caught up in a
Cul-de-sac, ("Translation studies"-by P.K.Kalyani, 77). Is it possible to
translate literary works? Is it possible to translate thoughts, emotions,
style, form etc? The answer is both positive and negative. In trying to
answer these questions one could call the two apparently opposing
theories of linguistics for aid. One theory stipulates that the dissimilarities
between languages are only surface deep. Beneath this surface lies the
universal and common language. The superstructure of language is
derived from the deep foundation of language, which is genetic,
historical, and social translation involves a delving deep into the universal
through the superficial disparities and to bring to light the analogous,
common aspects of the ultimate depth. The opposite view hold that the
universal depth is fathomless as well as complicated and abstract, so
much so that it becomes irrelevant and misleading. Such an extreme view
underlines the impossibility of translation.
These are two extreme views about the possibility of translation. In reality, translation is neither totally impossible nor absolutely possible. If translation is impossible, there cannot be any communication at all for translation is the basis of thought and understanding. Impossibilities can be overcome. But this overcoming does not mean that translation can be perfect always.

In other words, the translation seeks the nearest equivalent of the SL item in the TL. Between the two extremes of translatability the translator may strike a balance without doing injustice either to the SLT or the TLT. In his attempt to find such a balance, Popover identifies four types of equivalences. Linguistic equivalence, paradigmatic equivalence, stylistic equivalence and textual equivalence. Linguistic equivalence, seeks word for word translation. In paradigmatic equivalence, the translator finds equivalence between the elements of grammar. The third of equivalence is the stylistic equivalence where the translator aims at an expressive identity with an invariant of identical meaning. Textual equivalence, the fourth type, pertains to the systematic structuring of the texts. The translation finds the equivalence of form and shape of the SLT in the TLT. A good translator has to make a suitable combination of those various types of equivalences and render his work as enjoyable as possible.

Nida views the problem of equivalence in a more general manner. He identifies two types of equivalence namely formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. The formal equivalence "focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content." In formal equivalence the translator is concerned with such correspondences as poetry-to-poetry, sentence-to-sentence and concept-to-concept. Nida calls this type of
translation as 'gloss translation for it aims at readers' maximum understanding of the SL context. The dynamic equivalence is "basal on the principle of equal effect." In finding dynamic equivalence, the translator has to see the message leaving same effect on the TL reader....

In short, as we have seen, the process of translation is just like to perform as operation on the two different bodies together, transplanting not only all the physical parts of one to the another, but the translator has to shift the soul of the SL text also, and so it is really difficult.

2.4. Effective Strategies for a good Translation

As we have discussed, to perform the act of translation is not an easy one. It is just like a hurdle - race where at each and every step, one has to face a lot of difficulties. However, many theories have been formulated by experts in the field to help the translators make better translations. But no theory is so comprehensive that the translators do not have any more problems. Every translator encounters certain problems when he undertakes to translate a material. And every time, using the individual intuitive power and knowledge, one solves the problems.

However, various ways to overcome these problems have been suggested by various critics. Having done a comprehensive study of them, we can here point out some of the very common procedures to overcome these hazards in the way of translation. S.Nair (1996 : 80 to 87) has commented over this topic, and accordingly, various strategies can be classified as following
2.4.1 Borrowing

Borrowing the SL expression is a very frequently used procedure.

Usually this technique is used when there is no equivalent term in the target language for a particular source language word. Words with strong cultural connotations, names of dress, dishes etc. usually pass into other languages as borrowed terms e.g. the word ‘Sari’ can be used into English as an borrowed term. This is because this form of dress which is typically India has no equivalent in the English language. The word has been borrowed long back and today it needs no explanation for an average English reader. The same is the case with ‘dhoti’ which is a dress worn by Indian men.

But certain other terms may not be so familiar to the English readers e.g. certain specific types of dressed or ornaments worn by Indian rural people. In such cases, when using the borrowed term for the first time, it is better to use a combination of methods like borrowing and definition.

Or, some unknown borrowed words, can also be made effective if the target text readers are given the opportunity to grease the full significance of the word through repeated use. Once a term is accepted in the target language, it can be used just as any other word in the language without adding any special notes to it.

2.4.2 Definition

Definition is another method used for dealing with elements of culture. In this process, the unfamiliar word is explained. Though the languages differ widely, human nature as well as the core of human experience
remains the same throughout the world. This common ground facilities translation to some extent. Through defining the term, the translator will be making known the unknown. But it is also true that each cultural term will be so much changed with meanings and associations that no definition will ever adequately reveal the whole of its contents or connotations. Secondly, definitions are after unwieldy and cannot be used in literary forms like poetry. But in prose writings, definitions can be used in such a way that they do not stand apart from the rest of the text.

2.4.3 Literal Translation

This was commonly used method in the early days of translation. It was strongly advocated by many imported English critics who held that the translator’s duty was to adhere as closely as possible to the original. Not even a single word is to be omitted. When Dryden broadly categorized translation into three groups, he first mentioned paraphrase by which he more or less referred to literal translation.

But, its main drawback is that it may sometimes result in unidiomatic or coarse language. This is especially so when the method is adopted in the translation of larger units like phrases and idioms. Mostly in such cases, the literally translated terms lose the connotations, and rather it seems old. Literal translation results only in formed equivalence and hence, it is not favored by modern critics.
2.4.4 Substitution

When certain term of SL is too specific in meaning, and it may sound too strange to the TL reader, substitution can be used e.g. substitution may also be used in situations where the difference between the SL term and the substituted TL term does not greatly affect the flow of description in the work.

This procedure is adopted translators when two cultures overlap partially. The substituted term need not be identical but they will have some qualities in common, so that the target language readers will be able to grasp significance of the substituted term in the given context. Substitution can be used in cases where the source cultural element does not coincide largely with the target language concept. The main advantage of this method is that it makes reading easy for the target text readers. But it has the drawback of leveling up differences and thus eliminating the strangeness of the foreign culture. Some time substitution is used in cases where the SL term is highly unacceptable in the target language.

2.4.5 Lexical Creation

Lexical creation, or coining a new word, is also used by translators when the particular situation in a text is not congenial to other commonly used procedures such as literal translation, definition, borrowing or substitution. Lexical creation demands great ingenuity on the part of the translator. These new words become absorbed into the stream of the target language in course of time. When creating a new lexical term, the translator should see to it that it conforms to the existing rules of the language and it does
not seem to stand apart. He should also make sure that the situation very much demands this step.

So, where the situation demands it, the translator should be ready to put to test his own creative ingenuity.

**2.4.6 Transliteration**

Transliteration is commonly used when the SL term cannot be substituted with an adequate TL term and when the SL term cannot be translated literally into the TL e.g.

Its main virtue is that the TL readers will able to grasp even the phonological aspects of the SL term. Also, the term will be culturally empty, so that it can contain any meaning that is attributed to it. In most of the cases where this technique is adopted, the meaning will be made evade by the context in which the word is used.

**2.4.7 Omission**

Omissions are made by the translators when they do not disturb, but facilitate communication. IN some cases, the culturally or linguistically unmatched elements may have only a slight significance and then the use of any of the above given techniques may draw unnecessary attention to the term that is intended by the original writer. Such terms can be easily omitted.

**2.4.8 Addition**

Addition is required in instances where the cultural features of the source text are totally unfamiliar to the target language receptors. Addition may be in the form of sentences added to the text itself. Or it may be in the
form of notes given separately or glossary given at the end of the text. The meanings of the most of the words, which are unfamiliar to the TL readers, are explained in the glossary.

### 2.4.9 Transcriptions

The transcriptions, the essence of the source text is accepted while details are transformed at the discretion of the translator, so as to create the intended effect. In certain situation, transcriptions' become essential e.g.

In this way, we have listed some of the procedures that can be adopted by a translator to deal with the problems of unmatched elements of culture and language. Many of these methods can be used in combination as well. For example, borrowing and definition, transliteration and giving notes etc. Ultimately, how to translate, and how to solve these problems in the way of translation, depend on the intuitive power of the translator himself. He has to choose his own way, as he will be law-maker of the work when he translates it. The traditional evaluative terms such as ‘good’ and ‘bad’; ‘faithful’ and ‘unfaithful’ should be abandoned and a translated text should be judged by its adequacy as well as acceptability in the target culture. The concept of adequacy is source oriented, while acceptability is target oriented. This approach gives weight to both the source and target cultures.

### 2.5 Problems and Issues in Translation

“If language was simply a nomenclature for a set of universal concepts, it would be easy to translate from one language to another. One would simply replace French name for a concept with the English name. If languages were like this the task of learning a new language would also
be much easier than it is. But anyone who has attempted either of these tasks has acquired, alas, a vast amount of direct proof that languages are not nomenclatures that the concepts...of one language may differ radically from those of another...Each language articulated or organizes the word differently. Languages do not simply name existing categories, they articulate their own.”

(Culler, 1976: 21-2)

It proves that each language has its own system to express various concepts, with different linguistic, grammatical, semantic and phonetic levels. And the smallest unit of the language, which we would expect to poses individual meaning, is the word. Defined loosely, the word is "the smallest unit of language that can be used by itself". (Bollinger and Sears, 1968: 43). As translators, we are primarily concerned with communicating the overall meaning of a stretch of language. To achieve this, we need to start by decoding the units of structures, which carry that meaning. And so, to find out the equivalence at word level will be our primary motive.

So, here, we shall discuss problems arising from lack of equivalence at word level; what does a translator do when there is no word in target language which expresses the same meaning as the source language word?

“As word is not a mere lexical entity. It is given a writer to the society and by a society to the writer. The word that is 'created' by the poet belongs to the society. In this way, a word is loaded with various connotations, denotations in a specific culture or society.” – Notes P.K. Kalyani (2001 : 88 – 89)
Secondly, besides conveying the dictionary meaning, within a sentence, a word conveys a special meaning. It tells one whether it is a subject, objects or denotes action within a sentence. The position of a word in a sentence could make the entire sentence meaningless or meaningful.

Thirdly, the weight and position given to the word in a sentence; or the tone and stress expressed on a particular word also can change its meaning to certain extent.

In short, a word can derive its final meaning when it is checked in the context of the other words, with reference to its connotation denotations, at semantic level, with its position in the sentence of syntactic level - and most important is perhaps, the flavour of the culture melted in it. Sometimes, as we know, some idiomatic expressions may main something totally different from the dictionary meanings of the same words.

It means the word operated in an associative field. When the concrete word is given special emotive touch, the gravity of the word is increased. While translating the words, the translator should take care to preserve the uniqueness of the word because of its position in the sentence and the text, as well as its relationship with the speaker and listener. [P.K. Kalyani 2001 : 89]

The job of the translator becomes complicated when the word has a wider range of meaning, as when used in a humorous situation, as a pan or in a word play, that mixes various shades of meaning to bring about the required effect. In such a situation the translator has to read between the lines. The translator has to study the word, its relations with other words in the sentence, its structural relations with other sentences and overall cultural context.
So, in nut shell, we can point out certain situations which cause problems regarding the meaning of 'word' - as follows

2.5.1 Word with a Significant Function

When a word has a significant function in a given culture, it is difficult to translate. e.g. in Gujarati when it is said, “ખડ્ધા જીન”-*with a throding heart*- but this may be due to happy or unhappy event when the cultural reference is totally clear, the word can be understood properly. In the same way, certain names and nick names are used with specific intention. e.g. Sarika, Kusum etc. in Gujarati the names are closely connected with its meaning and they are used in the stories with specific intention to create specific effect. This special effect is lost when the same noun is used in another language.

2.5.2 Homonyms And Polysemic Words

Homonyms and polysemic words are indeed a problem for the translator. Homonyms (one of two or more words spelled and pronounced alike, but different in meaning e.g. pool' of water and 'pool' the gamed are false friends. Polysemy is the capacity of the word to mean different things. Such differences may range between nuances to antithesis. These differences in meanings when dislocated could create confusion and lead to the loss of credibility of the language. The word "Karma" has various meanings. It means duties to be performed, deeds of past, religious rites etc. The translator has to choose the right equivalent, taking into consideration the given context.
2.5.3 Localised Situations

Idioms and metaphors are specific problems of localized situations. A translator has to be thorough with the localized situations in SLT. These are language items which are specifically and specially natured by the culture and socio-behavioral patterns of the respective language. So are items like belief and legend. Such items, which are a "new piece of performance, a semantic novelty...can clearly have no existing 'equivalence' in the TL. What is unique has no counterparts" (M.B. Dangul, 22). In such contexts, the translator resorts to a "created substitute". These created substitutes are made mainly on the basis of the function of the phrase what the western writers’ means by 'almond eyes' is referred to in Indian English as 'lotus eyes'. Proverbs also have a local touch and only a creative substitute can solve the problem.

The same is the predicament of the translator when he translates slangs, abstract terms, derogatory words, colloquial words and words which carry extra sentiments and emotions. To find the absolute equivalent of such words in another language is almost an impossible task. In such situations, the translator should look for the feeling of the speaker along with the meaning of the word.

2.5.4 Proper Names

Proper names also take local touch and it is the biggest problem whether they should be translated with appropriate substitutes, or should be kept as they are. The Tamil translators of Shakespeare, after studying the significance of the characters, its natures its role in the play, and its relationship with other characters, render an Indian name with relevance
to the local culture to make the play more natural. But many names are so deeply rooted in the culture that to translate them into other language will be absolutely difficult. e.g. the name of Sarika in *Sarika Pinjarastha* by Saroj Pathak. In Indian culture, the bird named Sarika is kept in the cage and so the name is used here. It is deeply rooted in Indian culture.

2.5.5 Expression Of The Deepest Experience

Words and phrases which convey deepest experiences of the writer hardly find absolute equivalences. E.g. the extreme anger of the mother in the story *Sarika Pinjarastha* is expressed in such words as “लल्लू, क्यों मुझे खाना?” It can be translated as “*Why do you get hungry?*” But the translation fails to catch the echo of the anger. In the same way the other deeply rooted feelings like love, hatred, helplessness may lose its effect when expressed in other language. The topic is discussed in detail with lustrations in ch. 3.5

2.5.6 Extra Lingual Items

As we have already discussed, extra lingual items like tone and punctuation are also quite significant. The same expression may give even directly antithetical meaning, if the tone is ironical or satirical. Therefore, it is the job of the translator to analyse the tone of the SLT.

There are some general situations in which to find out an equivalent is difficult. It poses problems for the translator. To be more precise, we can list out the words which commonly pose difficulties for literary translation, chiefly in two categories: (1) Cultural Problems and (2) Linguistic Problems. We can list out the problems, more comprehensively, though the following chart. The following discussion is based on the analysis made by Nair (1996 : 73 to 80)
Problems of Translation

Cultural Problems

1. Ecology
2. Material culture
3. Social culture
4. Description of non-verbal Communication
5. Proper nouns

Linguistic Problems.

1. Idiolect
2. Dialect
3. Register
4. Style

2.5.7. Cultural Problems

(a) Ecology (I.E. Flora, Fauna Geographical Features etc.)

In so far as the ecology setup varies from region to region, the description of flora and fauna in a given locality in a given language, may not have equivalents in the language and locality into which the text is not of too much importance, the translator may omit the reference, provided it will not affect either the beauty or the coherence of the text.

(b) Material Culture: (Food, Clothes, Housing, Transport, Communication etc.)

Cultural items in the realms of food and dress rarely gets equivalents. But such words cannot be wholly omitted as they hold greatly in creating the
atmosphere which may be peculiar to the culture that is described in SLT. Hence, transliterating such words in the TL script is the best option that a translator can make. He can also explain such words by giving a broad definition, if required.

(c) **Social Cultures: (Customs, Ideas, Relations, Organizations, Work and Leisure etc.)**

Custom and practices in one country may be widely difference from those in another. Hence, great care must be taken to the translation of such words. Sometimes, the reference to a particular custom may sound so strange do the TL community that it can adversely affect their judgment of the SL community. On such occasions, it is the translator’s privilege to use his direction to create the right response to the SL text.

(d) **Descriptions of Non Verbal Communication: (Facial Expressions, Gestures etc.)**

These also create serious difficulties when the source language culture and the target language culture are widely different. Eugene A. Nida has mentioned in his article “Principles of Translation as Exemplified by Bible Translating” that the expression ‘He beats his breast’ means ”to congratulate oneself” in the chokwe language of Central Africa though the same gesture suggests repentance in English. The very same gesture in most of the Indian languages suggests extreme grief. Hence, gestures and mannerisms cannot be translated literally if they are to be understood in the right sense by the TL readers. This is a point to be seriously borne in mind while translating gestures and body language. A literal translation as in the above mentioned case, would often convey the very opposite of what is implied.
(e) Translation of Proper Nouns (Names, Nicknames etc.)

Translation of proper nouns often poses a great deal of trouble for the translators. A name is SL may have a specific meaning which is mostly lost in the TL. And if the meaning is to be preserved than the name it will have to be changed in translation. Often, the translators would not go to the extent of changing the names. Instead, the name may be transliterated and retained as such resulting in the loss of the name’s implications.

Sometimes, various languages use different meaning systems. Hence, it is also essential for the translator to understand the significance of the meaning system before he decides to use any particular name.

2.5.8. Linguistic Problems

Some of the problems of translation which are generally classified as culture-based are listed above. A translator may also be confronted with problems which are more of a linguistic nature than altered; Strictly speaking, there is no problem which can be labeled as purely cultural or linguistic as the two are interconnected.

All human speed consists of intensely conventionalized signals which are arbitrarily selected and hence meaning can never be wholly separated from the expressed form. Every word in a language is embalmed in its socio-cultural particularity. It may be possible to find a TL equivalent for a term in the SL but it cannot be said that this word has the same social and cultural values as the SL word. Even in a single language for that matter, synonyms do not create the same kind of response in the reader e.g. let us take certain synonyms of the word “big”. They can be “large”, “hefty”, “major”, “extensive”, “grand”, “huge”…etc. It can be said that
they are synonyms because their spheres of meaning coincide for the most part. But, each one has got a specific shade of meaning, and so cannot be replaced anyone of them for the other unthinkably. If this is the case with synonyms within a language, than the concept of perfect translation between languages can be nothing more than a belief. However, the theory of language universals is based on the hypothesis that there is no area of meaning encompassed by one language that cannot be conveyed by using another language. This theory points to the possibility of translation. Yet, it cannot be maintained that perfect translation is always possible. For example, for dozens of words in Indian languages which refers to the lotus, moon, the English language has just a single word. Can it be said that this single word carries all the connotations of all the words for “lotus, “moon” in our language?

In short, language and culture are so much intermingled that it is not possible to separate them. T.C. Calford holds that within the concept of a ‘Whole language’ there can be varieties of languages such as (a) idiolects (b) dialects (c) registers, and (d) styles.

(a) Idiolect

Idiolect is language variety, which is related to the person identity of the speaker. This is very difficult to be reproduced in another language and the translator may have to stretch his creativity too far to produce the similar effect in the TL e.g.

(b) Dialect

This type of language variety can be (i) geographical (ii) temporal, or (iii) social. That is, the language variety may be related to the geographical
province of the speaker (e.g. American English, British English, Indian English etc.), the time dimension in which he lives (e.g. Old English, middle English, Contemporary English etc.) or the social class to which he belongs (e.g. the upper class language, slang etc.) All these language varieties test the potential of the translator. It is almost impossible for the translator to reproduce this special dialect in TL. He uses the standard language most of the time, losing the special effect of SLT. However, he can make the readers conscious of the difference in the verbal competence of the speakers by using ellipses, wrong pronunciations, falterings etc. This method, if used carefully, can impart some effect.

(c) Register

This is language variety related to a particular profession, group etc. For example, there can be scientific jargons, journalistic jargons etc. A character in a literary work belonging to a particular profession may use harmonistic language. However, registers and hence their use do not pose much problem to the translator.

(d) Style

Style is dependent on the speaker’s attitude to life in general and to the person addressed in particulars. It may also reflect the speaker’s status, personality etc. In any literary work, there can be characters who speak in a formal, colloquial or intimate manner. A skillful translator will be able to distinguish the style of a speaker easily and can make him speak in the same style in the translation also.
2.6 Untranslatability

P.K. Kalyani (2001 : 82, 83 notes that) Inherent in translation is the problem of loss and gain. The problem of loss arises when there is an absence in the TL of the concepts and terms equivalent to those in SL. Catford categories the untranslatable items under two headings namely the linguistically untranslatable and culturally untranslatable. To this, we can add one more type - i.e. aesthetic un-translatability.

2.6.1. Linguistic Untranslatability

Linguistic Un-translatability occurs when there is non availability of syntactical, lexical substitute for an SL item in the TL. This can be mainly due to two factors: (1) Polysemy (ii) Oligosemy.

(i) **Polysemy:** It occurs when a word has more than one meaning. For example, the English words "bank", "right" etc. are polysemous. Such words become untranslatable when more than one meaning of a particular word becomes functionally relevant in the SL text.

(ii) **Oligosemy:** Another instance of un-translatability occurs when there is oligosemy or restriction of meaning e.g. for the Gujarati word "Sakhi", we generally use "friend" in English. But friend is not the exact equivalent of "Sakhi" as 'Sakhi' is oligoseymous and can refer to a female friend alone.

2.6.2 Cultural Untranslatability

According to Calford, cultural un-translatability occurs because of the difference in SL and TL cultures. It happens when a situational feature in
the SLT does not find a relevant substitute in the TL. While Calford is of the view that languages of the same family may not face this problem, McGuire is of the opinion that even in such a situation translation can be made only loosely.

This may cause great difficulties for the translator. Eregene A Nida in his article: Principles of Translation as Exemplified by Bible Translating" lists three situations when the meaning of the words in terms of their referents and their function in the given cultural contexts become rather untranslatable.

(i) The situation occurs when a term in SL does not have a corresponding referent in the TL which performs the same function for example, in some languages there is no word for "Snow", for such a phenomenon is outside the range of experience of their speakers.

(ii) When the referent in the SL is present in the TL but has a different function to perform. e.g. the Greek word "hart" is "abdomen" in conob and "liver" in the Kabba-lakka lung. In such situation's duty to find the substitute term for the intended meaning.

(iii) The third situation occurs when a term in the SL does not have a corresponding referent or any other referent with a parallel function in the TL. In such circumstances, either foreign words are borrowed or descriptive phrases are employed. For example, when speaking about amethyst in a language, which does not have a name for it, the translator can say "Valuable Stone called amethyst."
We can include Idioms, phrases, proverbs, metaphors, beliefs and legends etc., which are closely connected with culture, in this list of cultural untranslatability. While translating them, either we have to define them, or replace them with proper substitute of the TL culture e.g.

### 2.6.3 Aesthetic Untranslatability

This is an area, which is not usually mentioned in translation criticism. This may be because beauty lacks a common parameter with which to measure it. Moreover, beauty is supposed to lie in the eyes of the beholder. That which is moving to one reader, may appear quite boring to another one. This is because a text when it is read by a reader does not remain absolutely "objective" but is turned into a "subjectified object", as remarked by Poulet. Hence, aesthetic appreciation of the same work will vary from reader to reader. Therefore, a common parameter to measure aesthetic effects cannot be used. The TLT readers can perceive, perhaps, the beauty of the SLT - as perceived by the translator. But if the reader knows the source language too, and if he reads the original work for his response to its aesthetic appeal may differ. So aesthetic value of any work is difficult to translate.

### 2.7 Concept Of Feminism

#### 2.7.1: Etymology

From French *féminisme*, ultimately from Latin *fēminīnus*, from *fēmina* (woman). *Feminism* first recorded in English 1851, but meant at first "state of being feminine." Sense of "advocacy of women's rights" is from 1895. [http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/feminism]
2.7.2: What Is Feminism?

Feminism refers to movements aimed at establishing and defending equal political, economic, and social rights and equal opportunities for women. Its concepts overlap with those of women's rights. Feminism is controversial for challenging traditions in many fields and especially for supporting shifting the political balance toward women. Some feminists argue that men cause and benefit from sexism. Others argue that gender, like sex, are social constructions that harm all people; feminism thus seeks to liberate men as well as women. Feminists, persons practicing feminism, can be persons of either sex.

“Eversince antiquity, there have been women fighting to free their half of the total population of the world from male oppression. Feminism is neither a fad nor a logical extension of the civil rights movements. The inequaties against which the feminists protest – legal, economic, and social restrictions on the basic rights of women – have existed throughout history and in all civilizations. Naturally the principles of feminism were certiculated long ago. [Singh Sushila, 2004 : 13].

Feminist theory emerged from these feminist movements and includes general theories and theories about the origins of inequality, and, in some cases, about the social construction of sex and gender, in a variety of disciplines. Feminist activists have campaigned for women's rights—such as in contract, property, and voting—while also promoting women's rights to bodily integrity and autonomy and reproductive rights. They have opposed domestic violence, sexual harassment, and sexual assault. In economics, they have advocated for workplace rights, including equal pay and opportunities for careers and to start businesses.
The movements and theoretical developments were historically led predominantly by middle-class white women from Western Europe and North America, but, since then, more women have proposed additional feminisms.

Nancy Cott defines feminism as the belief in the importance of gender equality, invalidating the idea of gender. Feminism has changed traditional perspectives on a wide range of areas in human life, from culture to law. Feminist activists have campaigned for women's legal rights—such as rights of contract, property rights, and voting rights—while also promoting women's rights to bodily integrity and autonomy, abortion rights, and reproductive rights. They have struggled to protect women and girls from domestic violence, sexual harassment, and rape. On economic matters, feminists have advocated for workplace rights, including maternity leave and equal pay, and against other forms of gender-specific discrimination against women. Although the terms feminism and feminist did not gain widespread use until the 1970s, they were already being used in public parlance much earlier; for instance, Katharine Hepburn speaks of the "feminist movement" in the 1942 film Woman of the Year.

Feminism is a political philosophy whose aim is to advance the standing of women in society. Most feminists believe that women should be treated equal to men, if not better.

Feminism is the movement that women should have equal rights as men. This includes all areas of life, both in public and in private at home. A feminist would support equal pay for men and women.
The rise of feminism has contributed greatly to a rejection of traditional institutions and ways of thinking. “...feminism is a political perception based on two fundamental premises: (1) that gender differences is the foundation of a structural inequality between women and men, by which women suffer systematic social injustice, and (2) that the inequality between the sexes is not the result of biological necessity but is produced by the cultural construction of gender differences. This perception provided feminism with its double agenda: to understand the social and psychic mechanisms that construct and perpetuate gender inequality and then to change them.” (Morris, 1).

Feminism is both an intellectual commitment and a political movement that seeks justice for women and the end of sexism in all forms. However, there are many different kinds of feminism. Feminists disagree about what sexism consists in, and what exactly ought to be done about it; they disagree about what it means to be a woman or a man and what social and political implications gender has or should have. Nonetheless, motivated by the quest for social justice, feminist inquiry provides a wide range of perspectives on social, cultural, and political phenomena. Important topics for feminist theory and politics include: the body, class and work, disability, the family, globalization, human rights, popular culture, race and racism, reproduction, science, the self, sex work, and sexuality.

Entries covered under the rubric "feminism, topics" concern philosophical issues that arise as feminists articulate accounts of sexism, critique sexist social and cultural practices, and develop alternative visions of a just world. In short, they are philosophical topics that arise within feminism.
Although there are many different and sometimes conflicting approaches to feminist philosophy, it is instructive to begin by asking what, if anything, feminists as a group are committed to. Considering some of the controversies over what feminism is provides a springboard for seeing how feminist commitments generate a host of philosophical topics, especially as those commitments confront the world as we know it.

The term ‘feminism’ has many different uses and its meanings are often contested. For example, some writers use the term ‘feminism’ to refer to a historically specific political movement in the US and Europe; other writers use it to refer to the belief that there are injustices against women, though there is no consensus on the exact list of these injustices. Although the term "feminism" has a history in English linked with women's activism from the late 19th century to the present, it is useful to distinguish feminist ideas or beliefs from feminist political movements, for even in periods where there has been no significant political activism around women's subordination, individuals have been concerned with and theorized about justice for women. So, for example, it makes sense to ask whether Plato was a feminist, given his view that women should be trained to rule (Republic, Book V), even though he was an exception in his historical context. (See e.g., Tuana 1994)

2.8 History

Simone de Beauvoir wrote that "the first time we see a woman take up her pen in defense of her sex" was Christine de Pizan who wrote Epître au Dieu d'Amour (Epistle to the God of Love) in the 15th century. Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa and Modesta di Pozzo di Forzi worked in the 16th century. Marie Le Jars de Gournay, Anne Bradstreet, and François
Poullain de la Barre wrote during the 17th. Mary Wollstonecraft wrote in the late 18th century.

**Waves of Feminism**

“The early feminist did not use the term feminism. Had they given any name to themselves, possibly it would have been something like “defenders” or “advocates” of women.” (Singh : 2004 – 14). However, Feminists and scholars have divided the movement's history into three "waves". The first wave refers mainly to women's suffrage movements of the nineteenth and early twentieth century's (mainly concerned with women's right to vote). The second wave refers to the ideas and actions associated with the women's liberation movement beginning in the 1960s (which campaigned for legal and social rights for women). The third wave refers to a continuation of, and a reaction to the perceived failures of, second-wave feminism, beginning in the 1990s.

**2.8.1 First Wave**

First wave feminism refers to an extended period of feminist activity during the nineteenth century and early twentieth century in the United Kingdom and the United States. Originally it focused on the promotion of equal contract and property rights for women and the opposition to chattel marriage and ownership of married women (and their children) by their husbands. However, by the end of the nineteenth century, activism focused primarily on gaining political power, particularly the right of women's suffrage. Yet, feminists such as Voltairine de Cleyre and Margaret Sanger were still active in campaigning for women's sexual,
reproductive, and economic rights at this time. In 1854, Florence Nightingale established female nurses as adjuncts to the military.

In Britain the Suffragettes and, possibly more effectively, the Suffragists campaigned for the women's vote, with Emmeline Pankhurst the leader of the movement. In 1918 the Representation of the People Act 1918 was passed granting the vote to women over the age of 30 who owned houses. In 1928 this was extended to all women over twenty-one. In the United States, leaders of this movement included Lucretia Mott, Lucy Stone, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony, who each campaigned for the abolition of slavery prior to championing women's right to vote; all were strongly influenced by Quaker thought. American first-wave feminism involved a wide range of women. Some, such as Frances Willard, belonged to conservative Christian groups such as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Others, such as Matilda Joslyn Gage, were more radical, and expressed themselves within the National Woman Suffrage Association or individually. American first-wave feminism is considered to have ended with the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution (1919), granting women the right to vote in all states.

The term first wave was coined retrospectively after the term second-wave feminism began to be used to describe a newer feminist movement that focused as much on fighting social and cultural inequalities as political inequalities.

2.8.2 Second Wave

Second-wave feminism refers to the period of activity in the early 1960s and lasting through the late 1980s. The scholar Imelda Whelehan
suggests that the second wave was a continuation of the earlier phase of feminism involving the suffragettes in the UK and USA. Second-wave feminism has continued to exist since that time and coexists with what is termed third-wave feminism. The scholar Estelle Freedman compares first and second-wave feminism saying that the first wave focused on rights such as suffrage, whereas the second wave was largely concerned with other issues of equality, such as ending discrimination.

The feminist activist and author Carol Hanisch coined the slogan "The Personal is Political" which became synonymous with the second wave. Second-wave feminists saw women's cultural and political inequalities as inextricably linked and encouraged women to understand aspects of their personal lives as deeply politicized and as reflecting sexist power structures.

**2.8.3 Third Wave**

Third-wave feminism began in the early 1990s, arising as a response to perceived failures of the second wave and also as a response to the backlash against initiatives and movements created by the second wave. Third-wave feminism seeks to challenge or avoid what it deems the second wave's essentialist definitions of femininity, which (according to them) over-emphasize the experiences of upper middle-class white women.

A post-structuralist interpretation of gender and sexuality is central to much of the third wave's ideology. Third-wave feminists often focus on "micro-politics" and challenge the second wave's paradigm as to what is, or is not, good for women. The third wave has its origins in the mid-1980s. Feminist leaders rooted in the second wave like Gloria Anzaldúa, bell hooks, Chela Sandoval, Cherríe Moraga, Audre Lorde, Maxine Hong
Kingston, and many other black feminists, sought to negotiate a space within feminist thought for consideration of race-related subjectivities.

Third-wave feminism also contains internal debates between difference feminists such as the psychologist Carol Gilligan (who believes that there are important differences between the sexes) and those who believe that there are no inherent differences between the sexes and contend that gender roles are due to social conditioning.

2.8.4 Post-Feminism [Based on: http://en.wikipedia.org]

Post-feminism describes a range of viewpoints reacting to feminism. While not being "anti-feminist", post-feminists believe that women have achieved second wave goals while being critical of third wave feminist goals. The term was first used in the 1980s to describe a backlash against second-wave feminism. It is now a label for a wide range of theories that take critical approaches to previous feminist discourses and includes challenges to the second wave's ideas. Other post-feminists say that feminism is no longer relevant to today's society. Amelia Jones wrote that the post-feminist texts which emerged in the 1980s and 1990s portrayed second-wave feminism as a monolithic entity and criticized it using generalizations.

One of the earliest uses of the term was in Susan Bolotin's 1982 article "Voices of the Post-Feminist Generation", published in New York Times Magazine. This article was based on a number of interviews with women who largely agreed with the goals of feminism, but did not identify as feminists.
Some contemporary feminists, such as Katha Pollitt or Nadine Strossen, consider feminism to hold simply that "women are people". Views that separate the sexes rather than unite them are considered by these writers to be sexist rather than feminist.

In her book Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women, Susan Faludi argues that a backlash against second wave feminism in the 1980s has successfully re-defined feminism through its terms. She argues that it constructed the women's liberation movement as the source of many of the problems alleged to be plaguing women in the late 1980s. She also argues that many of these problems are illusory, constructed by the media without reliable evidence. According to her, this type of backlash is a historical trend, recurring when it appears that women have made substantial gains in their efforts to obtain equal rights.

Angela McRobbie argues that adding the prefix post to feminism undermines the strides that feminism has made in achieving equality for everyone, including women. Post-feminism gives the impression that equality has been achieved and that feminists can now focus on something else entirely. McRobbie believes that post-feminism is most clearly seen on so-called feminist media products, such as Bridget Jones's Diary, Sex and the City, and Ally McBeal. Female characters like Bridget Jones and Carrie Bradshaw claim to be liberated and clearly enjoy their sexuality, but what they are constantly searching for is the one man who will make everything worthwhile.

2.8.5 Post-Structural Feminism

It also referred to as French feminism, uses the insights of various epistemological movements, including psychoanalysis, linguistics,
political theory (Marxist and post-Marxist theory), race theory, literary theory, and other intellectual currents for feminist concerns. Many post-structural feminists maintain that difference is one of the most powerful tools that women possess in their struggle with patriarchal domination, and that to equate the feminist movement only with equality is to deny women a plethora of options because equality is still defined from the masculine or patriarchal perspective.

2.8.6 Postmodern Feminism

It is an approach to feminist theory that incorporates postmodern and post-structuralist theory. The largest departure from other branches of feminism is the argument that gender is constructed through language. The most notable proponent of this argument is Judith Butler. In her 1990 book, Gender Trouble, she draws on and critiques the work of Simone de Beauvoir, Michel Foucault and Jacques Lacan. Butler criticizes the distinction drawn by previous feminisms between biological sex and socially constructed gender. She says that this does not allow for a sufficient criticism of essentialism. For Butler "woman" is a debatable category, complicated by class, ethnicity, sexuality, and other facets of identity. She states that gender is performative. This argument leads to the conclusion that there is no single cause for women's subordination and no single approach towards dealing with the issue.

In A Cyborg Manifesto Donna Haraway criticizes traditional notions of feminism, particularly its emphasis on identity, rather than affinity. She uses the metaphor of a cyborg in order to construct a postmodern feminism that moves beyond dualisms and the limitations of traditional gender, feminism, and politics. Haraway's cyborg is an attempt to break
away from Oedipal narratives and Christian origin-beliefs like Genesis. She writes: "The cyborg does not dream of community on the model of the organic family, this time without the oedipal project. The cyborg would not recognize the Garden of Eden; it is not made of mud and cannot dream of returning to dust."

A major branch in post-modern feminist thought has emerged from the contemporary psychoanalytic French feminism. Other postmodern feminist works highlight stereotypical gender roles, only to portray them as parodies of the original beliefs. The history of feminism is not important in these writings—only what is going to be done about it. The history is dismissed and used to depict how ridiculous past beliefs were. Modern feminist theory has been extensively criticized as being predominantly, though not exclusively, associated with Western middle class academia. Mary Joe Frug, a postmodernist feminist, criticized mainstream feminism as being too narrowly focused and inattentive to related issues of race and class.

2.9 Contemporary Movements

2.9.1 Eco Feminism

It links ecology with feminism. Eco feminists see the domination of women as stemming from the same ideologies that bring about the domination of the environment. Patriarchal systems, where men own and control the land, are seen as responsible for the oppression of women and destruction of the natural environment. Eco feminists argue that the men in power control the land, and therefore they are able to exploit it for their own profit and success. Eco feminists argue that in this situation, women are exploited by men in power for their own profit, success, and pleasure.
Eco feminists argue that women and the environment are both exploited as passive pawns in the race to domination. Eco feminists argue that those people in power are able to take advantage of them distinctly because they are seen as passive and rather helpless. Eco feminism connects the exploitation and domination of women with that of the environment. As a way of repairing social and ecological injustices, eco feminists feel that women must work towards creating a healthy environment and ending the destruction of the lands that most women rely on to provide for their families.

Eco feminism argues that there is a connection between women and nature that comes from their shared history of oppression by a patriarchal Western society. Vandana Shiva claims that women have a special connection to the environment through their daily interactions with it that has been ignored. She says that "women in subsistence economies, producing and reproducing wealth in partnership with nature, have been experts in their own right of holistic and ecological knowledge of nature's processes. But these alternative modes of knowing, which are oriented to the social benefits and sustenance needs are not recognized by the capitalist reductionist paradigm, because it fails to perceive the interconnectedness of nature, or the connection of women's lives, work and knowledge with the creation of wealth."

However, feminist and social ecologist Janet Biehl has criticized ecofeminism for focusing too much on a mystical connection between women and nature and not enough on the actual conditions of women.
2.9.2 Gender-Neutral Language

It is a description of language usages which do not recognize gender, and are aimed at minimizing assumptions regarding the biological sex of human referents. The advocacy of gender-neutral language reflects, at least, two different agendas: one aims to clarify the inclusion of both sexes or genders (gender-inclusive language); the other proposes that gender, as a category, is rarely worth marking in language (gender-neutral language). Gender-neutral language is sometimes described as non-sexist language by advocates and politically-correct language by opponents.

2.9.3 Heterosexual Relationships

The increased entry of women into the workplace beginning in the twentieth century has affected gender roles and the division of labor within households. Sociologist Arlie Russell Hochschild in The Second Shift and The Time Bind presents evidence that in two-career couples, men and women, on average, spend about equal amounts of time working, but women still spend more time on housework. Feminist writer Cathy Young responds to Hochschild's assertions by arguing that in some cases, women may prevent the equal participation of men in housework and parenting.

Feminist criticisms of men's contributions to child care and domestic labor in the Western middle class are typically centered around the idea that it is unfair for women to be expected to perform more than half of a household's domestic work and child care when both members of the relationship also work outside the home. Several studies provide statistical evidence that the financial income of married men does not affect their rate of attending to household duties.
In Dubious Conceptions, Kristin Luker discusses the effect of feminism on teenage women's choices to bear children, both in and out of wedlock. She says that as childbearing out of wedlock has become more socially acceptable, young women, especially poor young women, while not bearing children at a higher rate than in the 1950s, now see less of a reason to get married before having a child. Her explanation for this is that the economic prospects for poor men are slim, hence poor women have a low chance of finding a husband who will be able to provide reliable financial support.

Although research suggests that to an extent, both women and men perceive feminism to be in conflict with romance, studies of undergraduates and older adults have shown that feminism has positive impacts on relationship health for women and sexual satisfaction for men, and found no support for negative stereotypes of feminists.

2.9.4 Male Reaction

The relationship between men and feminism has been complex. Men have taken part in significant responses to feminism in each 'wave' of the movement. There have been positive and negative reactions and responses, depending on the individual man and the social context of the time. These responses have varied from pro-feminism to masculism to anti-feminism. In the twenty-first century new reactions to feminist ideologies have emerged including a generation of male scholars involved in gender studies, and also men's rights activists who promote male equality (including equal treatment in family, divorce and anti-discrimination law). Historically a number of men have engaged with feminism. Philosopher Jeremy Bentham demanded equal rights for
women in the eighteenth century. In 1866, philosopher John Stuart Mill (author of "The Subjection of Women") presented a women's petition to the British parliament; and supported an amendment to the 1867 Reform Bill. Others have lobbied and campaigned against feminism. Today, academics like Michael Flood, Michael Messner and Michael Kimmel are involved with men's studies and pro-feminism.

A number of feminist writers maintain that identifying as a feminist is the strongest stand men can take in the struggle against sexism. They have argued that men should be allowed, or even be encouraged, to participate in the feminist movement. Other female feminists argue that men cannot be feminists simply because they are not women. They maintain that men are granted inherent privileges that prevent them from identifying with feminist struggles, thus making it impossible for them to identify with feminists. Fidelma Ashe has approached the issue of male feminism by arguing that traditional feminist views of male experience and of "men doing feminism" have been monolithic. She explores the multiple political discourses and practices of pro-feminist politics, and evaluates each strand through an interrogation based upon its effect on feminist politics.

A more recent examination of the subject is presented by author and academic Shira Tarrant. In Men and Feminism (Seal Press, May 2009), the California State University, Long Beach professor highlights critical debates about masculinity and gender, the history of men in feminism, and men's roles in preventing violence and sexual assault. Through critical analysis and first-person stories by feminist men, Tarrant addresses the question of why men should care about feminism in the first place and lays the foundation for a larger discussion about feminism as an all-encompassing, human issue.
Tarrant touches on similar topics in Men Speak Out: Views on Gender, Sex, and Power (Routledge, 2007).

2.9.5 Pro-Feminism

Pro-feminism is the support of feminism without implying that the supporter is a member of the feminist movement. The term is most often used in reference to men who are actively supportive of feminism and of efforts to bring about gender equality. The activities of pro-feminist men's groups include anti-violence work with boys and young men in schools, offering sexual harassment workshops in workplaces, running community education campaigns, and counseling male perpetrators of violence. Pro-feminist men also are involved in men's health, activism against pornography including anti-pornography legislation, men's studies, and the development of gender equity curricula in schools. This work is sometimes in collaboration with feminists and women's services, such as domestic violence and rape crisis centers. Some activists of both genders will not refer to men as "feminists" at all, and will refer to all pro-feminist men as "pro-feminists".

2.9.6 Anti-Feminism

Anti-feminism is opposition to feminism in some or all of its forms. Writers such as Camille Paglia, Christina Hoff Sommers, Jean Bethke Elshtain and Elizabeth Fox-Genovese have been labeled "anti-feminists" by feminists. Daphne Patai and Noretta Koertge argue that in this way the term "anti-feminist" is used to silence academic debate about feminism. Paul Nathanson and Katherine K. Young's books Spreading Misandry and Legalizing Misandry explore what they argue is feminist-inspired
Christina Hoff-Sommers argues feminist misandry leads directly to misogyny by what she calls "establishment feminists" against (the majority of) women who love men in *Who Stole Feminism: How Women Have Betrayed Women*. Marriage rights advocates criticize feminists like Sheila Cronan who take the view that marriage constitutes slavery for women, and that freedom for women cannot be won without the abolition of marriage.