1.0. Introduction

Translation is perhaps as old as literature or literary creation itself. There has been many an instance of one or the other type of translation or inter-lingual transference from one language to the other languages from time immemorial. But in due course, translation became a centre of feelings in the attempts of the translators in translating the literary works with their trans-cultural and cross-linguistic elements of a Source Language (SL) into a Target Language (TL). Then, the scholars felt the need to promote certain principles and procedures for translating a work of art from its Source Language into a Target Language; and it led them to craft theories of translation, which make translation feasible. Throughout the world, translation has made inter-linguistic communication between communities effective.

This study is an attempt to bring out the hidden treasures of the cultural and linguistic devices apart from the meaning and diction of the couplets of the Tamil literary work *Tirukkural* and its English translations by select translators. As the translation of the *Tirukkural* from its Source Language Tamil into the Target Language English centers around two cultures embodying two different genetically unrelated languages, this study involves a trans-cultural and cross-linguistic exercise.

1.1. Origin of Translation

Though no chronological details of translation or the period in which it originates or how far it covered is yet available in great detail, Nair brings out such details in her *Aspects of Translation* as:
Literary historians have been able to trace it (translation) as far back as 3000 BC . . . . Since several languages were spoken in the vast Assyrian empire, the emperor’s proclamations were translated into several languages. This is supposedly the first ever attempt at a formal translation. The proclamations of Hammurabi, the ruler of Babylon were translated into several languages in 2100 BC.” (1)

In ancient times, Romans made great attempts in the field of translation; and so “Eric Jacobson considers it (translation) as a Roman invention” (Kanagaraj 19). E. S. Muthuswami’s (1999) article “Theories of Translation” gives the details on translation like its origin or invention and its gradual development. The Greek slave Livius Andronicus is the first translator ever recorded in Europe as he “translated Homer’s Odessey into Latin in 240 B.C.” (83). Then Cicero and Horace translated the Greek classics into Latin even before any systematic study on translation was made. They recognized two types of translation: “word for word” rendering and “sense for sense” rendering; and took up the second type (83). In the Middle Ages, “Latin was the medium of education in Europe” and many classics were translated from Greek into Latin and not much was translated from Latin into Greek (84). He refers to the citation of George Chapman on things to be avoided in translating ancient classics:

1. Avoid word-for word renderings
2. Attempt to reach the spirit of the original
3. Avoid over-loose translations, by basing translations on a sound scholarly investigation of other versions and glosses.(84)
1.2. Need for Translation

As communication is the natural mode of expressing one’s feelings and emotions which covers three dimensions of speaker (sender), message (medium), and audience (listener) language originates, people of different regions of the world made their own languages, through which they could communicate with their fellowmen. Yet, they were not able to communicate with others who lived in the other parts of the world and spoke other languages. As man is a social animal, he had the necessity to communicate with others by expressing and conveying his ideas, feelings and emotions. Owing to the dissimilarities of languages all over the world, it became a difficult task. In order to overcome this difficulty, translation became a necessity in the literary field.

1.3. Definitions of Translation

There are very many definitions and meanings for the word or the process of translating. The word translation is derived from the Latin *translatio*, originated from Latin *transferre*, an affixing of *trans* and *fero* together which means to carry across or to bring across (Ordudari 2). Translation is defined as “the communication of the meaning of a source – language text by means of an equivalent target- language text” (Oxford Companion to the English Language).

“Translation is an art . . . . Translation is almost as old as original authorship and has a history as honourable and as complex as that of any other branch of literature” (Savory 37). According to J.C. Catford, “Translation is an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another” (1). It is “the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by
equivalent textual material in another language (TL)” (20). Chaudhuri opines that it is “a binary of the original text” (4).

“Translation is one of the most complex intellectual challenges known to mankind” (Nida 155). Susan Bassnett (2003) stands on par with Horst Frenz in defining it as “neither a creative art nor an imitative art”; and Bassnett sums up Levy’s opinion that “a translation is not a monistic composition, but an inter-penetration and conglomerate of two structures. On the one hand there are semantic content and the formal contour of the original, on the other hand the entire system of aesthetic features bound up with the language of the translation” (5-6).

Regarding the effect of translation “a literary translation has a double existence: as a work of literature, and as a work of translation”. It is an “act of shifting from one dialect to another, from one register of speech to another, of mixing two to three languages within the span of a single sentence” (Devy 50).

From these definitions of translation, it may rightly be considered that it (translation) is a shift from one language (SL) into another (TL). Also, it is the transformation of an idea, information or text from its source language (SL) into a target language (TL) without changing its effect, meaning and culture. There are different types of translations such as translating information, literary translation, scientific translation and technical translation. Among these, literary translation is more difficult for the translator than any other type of translation, as it is more creative than creative writing and is rightly called a re-creative art and even a multifaceted art.
Though translation is as old as the written language, remarkable contributions to the field of translation were made in the beginning of the 12th century only. At that time, Latin was given prime importance and it became the language of education in the European countries. From then onwards, translation was exercised by religious men who were well versed in Latin. But in the middle age, translation was confined to the extent of translating religious articles into Latin. George Steiner divides the literature of the theory, practice, and history of translations into four basic periods which cover a span of one thousand and seven hundred years (Kanagaraj 19).

Kanagaraj and Kirubahar cite the four divisions of the literature of the theory, practice and history of translation of George Steiner:

The first period is extended from the statements of Cicero and Horace on translation up to the publication of Alexander Fraser Tytler’s Essay on the Principles of Translation in 1791. In this period the statements and theories about translation stem directly from the practical work of translating a particular classic into another language.

The second period covers periods up to the publication of Larbaud’s *Sous invocation de Saint Jerome* in 1946. This period is characterized by the hermeneutic inquiry with a development of vocabulary and methodology of approaching translation. This is the study of the general principles of biblical interpretation with the purpose of discovering the truths and values of the Bible, and it is seen as a receptacle of divine revelation, with a development of vocabulary and methodology.
The third period begins with the publication of the papers on Machine translation in the 1940s and is characterized by the introduction of structural linguistics and communication theory into the study of translation.

The fourth period is characterized by a revision to hermeneutic; almost metaphysical inquiries into translation and interpretation. (19-20)

1.4. Stages of Translation

They (Kanagaraj and Kirubahar) cite the four different stages of the translating process of the Second Wycliff Bible, in the history of translating Bible, in their Anatomy of Translation. The first stage involves in a collaborative effort of collecting old Bibles and glosses and establishing an authentic Latin text; the second stage involves in a comparison of the different versions of the Bible; the third stage involves in counseling with old grammarians and old divines about hard words and complex meanings; and the last stage involves in translating the Source Language text (SLT) as clearly as possible into the Target Language text (TLT) based on sentence to sentence translation to retain the spirit of the original text (21).

1.5. Categories of Translation

In the field of translation, the categories, principles, procedures and processes of translation gain more importance than its definitions for they direct and lead the translators to fulfill their task of translating a literary work of art following one or the other method among them. Translation is a vast area which needs categorization before dealing with it in detail.

Theodore Savory categorizes the art of translation into five and deals with four categories in detail and omits the fifth category which he mentions as interpreting. The first category is on translating “information statements” which
does the role of giving information; and it is considered to be the perfect translation. The second category is about the characterless translations done “for the general reader” who reads it without realizing even in which language it is written. The third category is a composite one yet literary translation, including the translation of prose into prose, of poetry into prose, and of poetry into poetry. In this category, the theoretical impossibility of perfect translation has a serious effect as the commercial value is totally neglected. It is primarily done for the purposes of intellectual exercise and intellectual pleasure. The fourth category includes the learned, scientific and technical translations which have certain characteristics of their own, mainly done for the purpose of learning with the interests of trade (21-24).

Among the four categories of translations, scientific and technical translations need no cultural background. Unlike science and technology, literary works have cultural factors which are not universal; and something special for its own place, people, time and language. As a result, literary translations differ from one another and from the original since they belong to a different age and culture and geo-political environment. Literary translation, which falls under the third category, is delicate and the translators have tried their best to compete with the SL text while they recreate a work of art in a TL. Savory observes the fact that translating “idioms and idiomatic phrases provide clear-cut difficulties” to every translator. Translating “proverbial expressions” too is difficult for any translator since they reveal the traditional and cultural characteristics of a race, time and place (17). According to him, “a translator’s duty is to act as a bridge or channel between the mind of the author and the minds of his readers” (51).
Basnette (1980) categorizes translation studies into four general areas of interest. The first area involves the “history of translation” and is a component part of literary history (7). The second area “translation in the TL culture” extends the work on single texts or authors and includes work on the influence of a text, author or genre on the absorption of the norms of the translated text into the TL system and on the principles of selection operating within that system (7). The third area “translation and linguistics” includes studies which place their emphasis on the comparative arrangement of linguistic elements between the SL and TL text with regard to phonemic, morphemic, lexical, syntagmatic and syntactic levels (8). The fourth category called “translation and poetics” includes the “whole area of translation” (8).

1.6. Methods of Translation

Orduhari, in his article “Translation Procedures, strategies and methods”, cites the eight translation methods of Newmark (1988):

1. Word-for-word translation: in which the SL word order is preserved and the words translated singly by their most common meanings, out of context.

2. Literal translation: in which the SL grammatical constructions are converted to their nearest TL equivalents, but the lexical words are again translated singly, out of context.

3. Faithful Translation: it attempts to produce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the TL grammatical structures.
4. Semantic Translation: which differs from faithful translation only in as far as it must take more account of the aesthetic value of the SL text.

5. Adaptation: which is the freest form of translation, and is used mainly for plays (comedies) and poetry; the themes, characters, plots are usually preserved, the SL culture is converted to the TL culture and the text is rewritten.

6. Free translation: it produces the TL text without the style, form, or content of the original.

7. Idiomatic translation: it reproduces the message of the original but tends to distort nuances of meaning by preferring colloquialisms and idioms where these do not exist in the original.

8. Communicative translation: it attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership. (3-4)

While discussing the different methods of translation, Kanagaraj and Kirubahar quote the nine methods of translation which include Newmark’s translation methods: word-for-word, literal, faithful, semantic, adaptation, free, idiomatic, communicative and equivalent effect translations. “Word – for-word translation: demonstrated as interlinear translation with TL immediately below the SL words . . . Cultural words were translated literally” (46). It is effective and “easy in the case of nouns and verbs” and brief simple sentences. “Literal translation goes beyond one-to-one translation when syntactical structures differ from S.L. and T.L.” (38). In Literal translation, “the SL structure is converted to the corresponding TL syntax” while translating a work of art literally into the TL (46).
Faithful Translation attempts to get at the contextual meaning of the original, within the constraints of the TL grammatical structures. Cultural words are transferred and grammatical abnormalities are preserved.

Semantic Translation pays attention to the aesthetic value of the SL text. Instead of using cultural equivalents, use is made of culturally neutral words . . . . (46)

Adaptation is the “freest form of translation” which is used “in translating plays, poems, while themes, plots and characters are preserved; the SL culture is freely changed into the TL culture. The text is almost rewritten” (46-47).

Free translation gives priority to the “communication of the matter without much care for the manner” and the importance is on “the content and not the form.” In idiomatic translation, the “message of the original is faithfully conveyed, but nuances of the meaning are lost.” Communicative translation is an attempt to “transmit the exact contextual meaning in such a way the content and language are made acceptable to the Receptor”. (47)

Communicative and semantic translations achieve accuracy and economy. Semantic language is at the author’s linguistic level while communicative translation is at the reader’s level achieves accuracy and economy at the readers’ level. Cultural components tend to be transferred intact or replaced with culturally neutral items. (47)

“Equivalent Effect: aims at producing an original effect that is equivalent to the original” which Nida calls dynamic equivalence (47).

Though there are many theories and methods of translation, each theory and each method is intertwined with one another. Anjana Tiwari (2002) refers to three
translation theories (methods of translation) such as (i) “Paraphrase method (the translator rewords the original language),” (ii) “Dynamic equivalence method (the translator produces the closest equivalent meaning of the original text),” and (iii) “Literal or complete equivalent method.” These three theories may seem to differ for the experts, translators and learners by name and nature but much difference will not be found in these three types of translations. Yet “literal method of translation” is believed to be far superior to the other two methods, since the scholars of language and literature involve in translation (52).

Besides the theories, principles and procedures for translating a work of art, translating a literary work is a hard task since it is based on the life of a particular race of people who belong to a particular region of the world and have a tradition and culture of their own and follow certain norms and regulations in their life. Among the literary translations, the translation of poetry poses the greatest hurdle since the poets have the basic right to handle or deviant with grammatical structure and play with words and imagination and imagery.

1.7. Principles in Translation

According to AL-Zoubi MD. Q. R and Rajul Bhargava, the process of translation “is based both on a semantic theory and an information theory” whether the translation is literary or non-literary (69). The principle which works behind this process of translation is:

The transformation of a source language text into a target language text by means of a process which takes place within the memory as: (1) the analysis of one language-specific text (the source language text) into a universal (non-language specific) semantic representation, and (2) the synthesis of
that semantic representation into a second language-specific text (the
target language text or the TLT). (70)

According to Savory, “there are no universally accepted principles of translation”
(49). Yet he states them “shortly in contrasting pairs”:

1. A translation must give the words of the original.
2. A translation must give the ideas of the original.
3. A translation should read like an original work.
4. A translation should read like a translation.
5. A translation should reflect the style of the original.
6. A translation should possess the style of the translator.
7. A translation should read as a contemporary of the original.
8. A translation should read as a contemporary of the translator.
9. A translation may add to or omit from the original.
10. A translation may never add to or omit from the original.
11. A translation of verse should be in prose.
12. A translation of verse should be in verse.(50)

Basnette emphasizes the translators to follow the five principles of Dolet:

1. The translator must fully understand the sense and meaning of the original author, although he is at liberty to clarify obscurities.
2. The translator should have a perfect knowledge of both SL and TL.
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 words appropriately to produce the correct tone. (54)

With the help of these translation principles alone, a translator cannot come to a conclusion about which category he or she should follow or which method to be used while translating a poetic work of art, since controversial opinions are found together. While he (Dolet) recommends “addition and omission of words” and “translation of verse into prose”, he advises the translators never “to add or omit words” and “to translate verse into prose”. He states that the translating of poetry is an important section of the art, since it is the art of employing words on the senses: like that of a painter does with colours (Basnette 75).

1.8. Strategies of Translating Poetry

While Basnette (1980) tries to investigate the problems of translating poetry, she refers to Andre Lefevere’s seven strategies.

1. Phonemic translation, which attempts to reproduce the SL sound in the TL while at the same time producing an acceptable paraphrase of the senses.

2. Literal translation, where the emphasis on word-for-word translation distorts the sense and the syntax of the original.

3. Metrical translation, where the dominant criterion is the reproduction of the SL metre. . . . like literal translation, this method concentrates on one aspect of the SL text at the expense of the text as a whole.

4. Poetry into prose, where the distortion of the sense, communicative value and syntax of the SL text result from this method, although not to the same extent as with the literal or metrical types of translation.
5. Rhymed translation: where the translator enters into a double bond of metre and rhyme.

6. Blank verse translation: where structure is emphasized with a greater accuracy and higher degree of literalness.

7. Interpretation: it has two types: (i) version where the substance of the SL text is retained but the form is changed and (ii) imitation where the title and a few other aspects of the SL are retained. (81-82)

1.9. Priorities in Translation

According to Nida, “the best translation does not sound like a translation” and “a translator must strive for equivalence rather than identity” (12). It must primarily aim at reproducing the message of the SLT into TLT. Certain fundamental sets of priorities are also given by Nida and Charles, as a base for judging a translated work of art such as:

1. Contextual consistency has priority over verbal consistency (word- for – word concordance),

2. Dynamic equivalence has priority over formal correspondence,

3. The aural (heard) form of language has priority over the written form,

4. Forms that are used by and acceptable to the audience for which a translation is intended have priority over forms that may be traditionally more prestigious (5-14).

1.10. Symbols/Signs in Translation

Besides categories, principles, processes and priorities, there is another area named symbols used in translation are treated as signs by logicians and semanticists. They are none other than the words of a language in general; and Nida
discusses and cites three types of signs: (i) “indexical sign” which may be either non-human or human, (30) (ii) “conventional signs” which are “symbols” and free from formal contamination with the objects they refer to, and (iii) “linguistic signs” which have iconic quality (31). But the relationship between the meaning of a symbol and the communication event is quite complicated and difficult to put in plain words. As a symbol may be a kind of linguistic response to a situational stimulus or situational response to linguistic stimulus, Nida 1964, supports and quotes Charles Morris’ division of “study of meaning into three main parts” made by some symbolic logicians, “(i) semantics, (ii) syntactics, and (iii) pragmatics” (34).

While semantics deals with the relationship of signs or symbols to referents, syntactics is concerned with the relationship of symbol to symbol; for the meaning of expressions is not to be found merely in adding up symbols, but also in determining their arrangements, including order and hierarchical structuring and pragmatics deals with the relation of symbols to behavior.

(34)

Nida quotes Lounsbury’s three different dimensions of meaning also, in order to bring out three diversities of semantic fields and contexts in terms of a series of contrasts: “(1) situational vs. behavioural meanings; (2) linguistic vs. extra linguistic meanings; and (3) intraorganismic vs. extra organismic meanings” (41).

The contrast between situational and behavioural meanings involves a broad field of investigation which includes both the stimulus – bearing parts of the context and the responses to it. Regarding the contrast between the linguistic
and extralinguistic meanings, one tends to think only of the extralinguistic elements while the same elements also have linguistic distributions which Nida explains with examples (42).

1.11. Contexts in Translation

Like the different types of signs and symbols, contexts too have their own divisions and kinds such as immediate context, displaced context, transferred context. In the immediate context, the symbol is used to identify an object of immediate environment; in the displaced context, an object or person not present is referred to; and in the transferred context the applicability of the symbol from a class of objects to another related class is considered, while translating a work of art (Nida 30-32). Besides these, Nida and Taber describe other contexts such as discourse context, communicative context and cultural context. In the discourse context, the meaning of a particular unit must be analyzed in terms of the wider context of the total relevant discourse; in the communicative context, the meaning of a message cannot be adequately analyzed without considering the circumstances involved in the original communication, and in the cultural context, the meaning of the words should be analyzed in terms of the total cultural setting of the SL and the TL too (243). And the meaning of a word can be considered based on its context and contextual meaning should be given priority while translating a word or work of art from its SL into a TL.

When the meaning of a word is considered in translation, Magdy M. Zaky’s differentiation between the “referential meaning or lexical meaning” and “contextual meaning” is useful to a translator. The meaning of a word is often referred to as “referential” meaning or lexical meaning. They can also be known as
“conceptual” meaning or “denotative” meaning. But the meaning of a “word is governed not only by the external object or idea that particular word is supposed to refer to, but also by the use of that particular word or phrase in a particular way, in a particular context, and to a particular effect” (Zaky n.pag). Rendering the lexical meaning of a word or phrase while translating a work of art from its SL into TL will not become the actual translation of the SL text; because each language has its own individuality in its usage of words and phrases and their contexts. In many languages, for instance, in Tamil, a word has many meanings and renders varied meanings according to the context. So, contextual meaning should be given more importance than the lexical meaning of a word in translating a work of art from the SL into the TL.

Contextual meaning alone cannot render a good translation of a work of art; because there are certain procedures to be followed by a translator while translating. According to Nida, a good translation needs some fundamental procedures in order to make semantic adjustments in transfer; and he divides them into two categories: technical and (2) organizational. Technical procedures concern the processes followed by the translator in converting a source-language text into a receptor-language text; organizational procedures involve the general organization of such work . . . . Technical procedures consist essentially of three phases such as (1) analysis of the SL and TL; (2) careful study of the SL text; and (3) determination of the appropriate equivalents. (241)

Nida is of the opinion that a translator should be well versed in the SL and the TL; and he or she should have
a good grasp of the linguistic structures of the two languages not only in terms of the usual types of transfers from one language to another, but also and more specifically in terms of the types of transforms which occur within a specific language . . . the translator must have a complete understanding of the meaning of lexical elements whether endocentric or exocentric. (241)

Even an “analysis of a source-language text is a more complicated task than it is often assumed to be” (242). After determining the form of the text, the meaning must be studied in terms of several semantic stages such as “lexico-grammatical features of the immediate unit, discourse context, communicative context and cultural context of the source language, and cultural context of the receptor language” (243).

1.12. Equivalence in Translation

“A conscientious translator will want the closest natural equivalent,” and it is necessary while translating a work of art from its SLT into the TLT (Nida & Taber13). Translation requires equivalence; and a translator needs to maintain it while translating a work of art. A translator must determine all the syntactic, referential and emotive semantic elements. Leonardi quotes the two different types of equivalence of Nida and Taber namely “formal correspondence and dynamic equivalence,” where “formal correspondence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content, unlike dynamic equivalence which is based upon the principle of equivalent effect” (Leonardi n.pag.). Nida and Taber state that the “dynamic equivalence in translation is far more than mere correct communication of information” (25). While determining equivalence between the SL and the TL, Nida reduces the process into two simple procedures: decomposition and
recomposition. Recomposing the message into the simplest form in the SLT is as important as that of recomposing it into the TL. But Leonardi is of the opinion that “Catford’s approach to translation equivalence clearly differs from that adopted by Nida since Catford had a preference for a more linguistic – based approach to translation . . . .” Equivalence in translation is maintained with the help of shifts. She [Leonardi] cites Catford’s definition of shift

Catford defines them (shifts) as departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL. Catford argues that there are two main types of translation shifts, namely level shifts, where the SL item at one linguistic level (e.g. grammar) has a TL equivalent at a different level (e.g. lexis) and category shifts which are divided into four types:

1. Structure-shifts, which involve a grammatical change between the structure of the SL text and that of the TL text;
2. Class-shifts, when an SL item is translated with a TL item which belongs to a different grammatical class, i.e. a verb may be translated with a noun;
3. Unit-shifts, which involve changes in rank;
4. Intra-system shifts, which occur when SL and TL possess systems which approximately correspond formally as to their constitution, but when translation involves selection of a non-corresponding term in the TL system. (Leonardi n.pag.)

But experts in translation theories and translators like Nida and Taber (1974) discuss the problems caused by shift or the transfer of relationships of word structure. They categorized the problems into two principal types such as: “(i) the
grammatical classes of words which may be used and (ii) the so-called morphological categories which are associated with the various classes” (115-16).

The numerous subtle problems of morphological categories are:

(a) aspects (aspectual features of the verbal patterns i.e., completive vs. incompletive and punctiliar vs. durative), (b) tenses (normally three basic tenses: present, past and future with several tenses of relative time; but some languages have a number of temporal gradations), (c) inclusive and exclusive first person plural (translators tend to favour the inclusive forms when there is real obscurity, for the exclusive would seem to imply too great a barrier between the writer and his readers), (d) the distinction between persons who are dead or alive (some languages mark continually the differences between the persons who are dead and those who are still alive), and (e) honorifics (various patterns of honorifics which are not restricted merely to matters of grammatical categories which involve lexical usage, complexity of grammatical expression, and word form. (116-17)

1.13. Steps in Translating

The technical procedures can be applied to all types of translating, but they may cause some procedural problems owing to the varied ways in which a translation process may be organized. Though different procedures are employed for different types of translations, Nida (1964) offers some principal steps to be followed while translating a work of art. They are:

1. Reading over the entire document
2. Obtaining background information
3. Comparing existing translations of the text
4. Making a first draft of sufficiently comprehensive units
5. Revising the first draft after a short lapse of time
6. Reading aloud for style and rhythm
7. Studying the reactions of receptors by the reading of the text by another person
8. Submitting a translation to the scrutiny of other competent translators; and
9. Revising the text for publication. (241-47)

Besides following the various procedures and steps suggested by experts, Nida and Taber suggest that a translator must maintain equivalence by adjusting the “numerous features of the sentence structure” in the process of transfer from the SL into the TL while translating a work of art. Some of the most important features among them are: “(a) word and phrase order, (b) double negatives, (c) singular and plural agreement, (d) active and passive structures, (e) coordination and subordination, (f) apposition, (g) ellipses, and (h) specification of relationship” (113).

Linguistic organization of the SLT could be dealt with to use the relevant verbal structure to bring out the SLT content into the TL. “The hunt for precise lexical correspondences may lead one (translator) into trouble even in cases where the SLT contains words that look unidimensional” (Balasubramanian 2).

The “word and phrase sentence order” in one language may differ from that of another language (Nida and Taber 113). In many Indian languages, the sentence structure is normally Subject-Object-Verb like Tamil, while the sentence structure
of English is Subject-Verb-Object. It is the duty of a translator to adjust the basic patterns of the SL with that of the TL in the transfer process. “Double negatives” too create confusions in some languages. Like arithmetic multiplication formula, double negatives “add up to a positive” in some languages, while they create emphatic negative or stress negative sense in some other languages. Regarding the subject-verb (singular and plural) agreement, “gender, class and number” are taken into consideration (114). In some languages, there may not be any distinction between the singular and plural, for instance, for singular and plural of the second person “you”, there is no difference in the concord of the English language, while in Tamil, the word itself changes according to the number and context as nī, nīṅkal and tāṅkal; and the verb too agrees with the number and context of the subject.

“Active and passive construction” also poses problems of transfer; because, there are some languages which do not have passive construction at all. And even if the language has its passive construction, transferring a passive when there is no agent becomes more difficult for the translator since he has to supply the agent according to the context. In “coordination and subordination”, transfer normally involves a number of “shifts” (114). An “apposition” can always be changed into a dependent expression. All languages have “ellipses”, but their patterns are quite diverse in different languages. Regarding the specification of relationship, the relationship between the participants and the action must be made more specific (115).

1.14. Translational Procedures

Ordudari approves and supports the procedures, strategies and methods stated and practised by famous translators like Nida and Newmark. Newmark
brings out the difference between translation methods and translation procedures. Translation methods relate to whole texts, while translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language. He [Ordudari] cites the different translation procedures proposed by Newmark in his article “Translation Procedures, strategies and methods”:

- Transference: it is the process of transferring an SL word to a TL text which includes transliteration or ‘transcription’.
- Naturalization: it adapts the SL word first to the normal pronunciation, then to the normal morphology of the TL.
- Cultural equivalent: it means replacing a cultural word in the SL with a TL.
- Functional equivalent: it requires the use of a culture-neutral word.
- Descriptive equivalent: in this procedure the meaning of the CBT (culture bound term) is explained in several words.
- Componential analysis: it means comparing an SL word with a TL word which has a similar meaning but is not an obvious one-to-one equivalent, by demonstrating first their common and then their differing sense components.
- Synonymy: it is a near TL equivalent.
- Through-translation: it is the literal translation of common collocations, names of organizations and components of compounds. It can also be called loan translation.
- Shifts or transpositions: it involves a change in the grammar from SL to TL, for instance, (i) change from singular to plural, (ii) the change
required when a specific SL structure does not exist in the TL, (iii) change of an SL verb to a TL word, change of an SL noun group to a TL noun and so forth.

- Modulation: it occurs when a translator reproduces the message of the original text in the TL text in conformity with the current norms of the TL, since the SL and the TL may appear dissimilar in terms of perspective.

- Recognized translation: it occurs when the translator normally uses the official or the generally accepted translation of any institutional term.

- Compensation: it occurs when loss of meaning in one part of a sentence is compensated in another part.

- Paraphrase: in this procedure the meaning of the CBT is explained. Here the explanation is much more detailed than that of descriptive equivalent.

- Couplets: it occurs when the translator combines two different procedures.

- Notes: notes are additional information in a translation. They can appear in the form of footnotes. (5-6)

Hariyanto, Sugeng, in his article “Problems in Translating Poetry,” cites the seven procedures stated by Newmark (1981), to be followed while translating metaphors:

- The first procedure is reproducing the same image in the TL if the image has comparable frequency and currency in the appropriate register. This procedure is usually used for one-word metaphor…. 
- The second procedure is replacing images in the SL with a standard TL image within the constraints of TL cultures.
- The next is translating a metaphor by simile, retaining the image in the SL. This procedure can be used to modify any type of metaphor.
- And the rest of the procedures, translating metaphor (or simile) into simile plus sense, conversing metaphor into sense, deleting unimportant metaphor, and translating metaphor with some metaphors combined with sense, are not considered appropriate for poetry translation.

(n.pag.)

1.15. Cultural Problems

A literary work reveals the life style, social institution, cultural background, moral, religious and ethical codes of the people who live in the particular region at a particular period in their language. Literature is the index of life which reflects all these aspects prevailing in its contemporary period in the particular region. Each language has a unique culture of its region and the race who adapts the language and certain characteristics of the language. As translation involves both SL and TL, it is quite complicated to translate a literary work of art which belongs to a particular region, race, culture, language and time into another language where every aspect differs from that of the Source Language. Also, “each language has its own linguistic forms. A literary translation should lead the target-language reader into the sensibilities of the source-language culture” (Thriveni n.pag.).
While discussing the procedures, strategies and methods of translating cultural elements in a work of art, Ordudari quotes the four procedures of culture-specific concepts of Graedler:

1. Making up a new word.
2. Explaining the meaning of the SL expression in lieu of translating it.
3. Preserving the SL term intact.
4. Opting for a word in the TL which seems similar to or has the same relevance as the SL term. (n.pag.)

Also, for translating culture-bound terms, he prefers the four major techniques of Harvey such as (i) functional equivalence, (ii) formal equivalence or linguistic equivalence, (iii) transcription or borrowing and (iv) descriptive or self-explanatory translation (Ordudari n.pag.). Rantanen, in his article “On the treatment of elements that have to be left untranslated,” states that “the foreign element is kept in its original form; this can be done when the element is there just for the foreign colour or when the context is so clear that the TL reader can guess the right meaning without too much trouble” (5). But without explanatory notes or description, the foreign word cannot be grasped by the TL reader.

At the same time, a translator ought to overcome so many barriers such as finding equivalent words for the cultural terms, social customs and traditional ceremonies handled in the SLT while translating it into a TL, transferring the textual meaning of the SLT into the TLT and maintaining the cultural and the linguistic effect of the SLT into the TLT. Finding an equivalent word for a cultural term of the SL in the TL may not be possible due to its unavailability. Translating the cultural terms and culture-bound words, which are used to express the cultural
practices or customs of a particular region, may create an instrumental difficulty for the translators as well as the readers, in finding the equivalent term to explain the cultural terms and culture-specific experiences; and to understand what is revealed in the translation.

Culture is unique by nature as it belongs to a particular race and language; and not universal as it differs from race to race and place to place and language to language. Bhatnagar (1993) feels, “Culture is the treasure of people’s creative activity, the spiritual heritage that one generation leaves to another” (17). Though culture is not universal, the cultural “concepts like family, love and happiness are universal” (18). Indian culture differs from the western culture. The traditional family in India is a male dominating institution where women are subjected to subjugation, strict discipline and absence of freedom. Like India, each nation has its own tradition, social norms, languages, customs, cultures, tradition, beliefs, games, amusements, and food habits.

Thriveni tries to highlight the cultural elements in translation in an Indian perspective and she argues that if the specific reality is not familiar to the reader, the translation may not have readability at all. In her own words:

The process of transmitting cultural elements through literary translation is a complicated and vital task. Culture is a complex collection of experiences which condition daily life; it includes history, social structure, religion, traditional customs and everyday usage. This is difficult to comprehend completely. Especially in relation to a target language, one important question is whether the translation will have any readership at all, as the specific reality being portrayed is not quite familiar to the reader. (n.pag.)
And it may not be out of place to argue that the contention of Thriveni does not always mean it for the simple reason that the translations in the target languages are read, learned and enjoyed by many foreign readers who are not quite familiar with the SL as well. Regarding the cultural elements, the foreign readers may need some added notes to understand the cultural terms, social norms, beliefs, games, traditional customs and flora and fauna. If translation is not done for the famous religious books and great literary works, no one will be able to know of them.

Cultural factors and linguistic factors go hand in hand when one deals with the principles of literary translation. Proper nouns are the real cultural elements, which come under the literary forms of a particular culture of a language that resist translation. They can be transferred from SL into the TL but cannot be translated. So, a proper noun is not supposed to be translated. It may lose its value if it is translated or interpreted into another language. Instead, the same name can be transliterated to maintain the beauty of the SL and explanatory note can also be added to make the reader adapt the exact meaning and effect. Thriveni adds that “customs and tradition are part of a culture. Be it a marriage or a funeral, be it a festival or some vows, the story and the significance or hidden symbolism behind it become a stumbling block for a translator” (n.pag.). Beliefs and feelings create serious problems to the translators since they change from culture to culture. Religious elements, myths and legends also pose real trouble to the translator as they are different from place to place. Geographical and environmental elements also play an important role in creating difficulties to the translators.

“Translating means translating cultures, not languages” for the fact that “language and culture are interwoven and that the integration of an element into a
culture cannot be said to have been achieved unless and until the linguistic expression of that element has been integrated into the language of that culture” (Ivir 35). The procedures available to the translator for the translation of unmatched elements of culture (object, concept, social institution, pattern of behaviour, etc.) and their usage in particular communicative situation are also brought out in detail in his article “Procedures and Strategies for the Translation of Culture”. While translating a cultural element from its SL into the TL, if there is an absence of the particular cultural element of the SL in the TL, the translator ought to rely upon different procedures like description, explanation, substitution or transliteration to fill such gaps in order to convey the same idea in the TL.

When Savory (1969) explains the problems in translating a literary work, he brings out the difficulties caused by the formation of gaps and the ways and means to fill those gaps, which cannot be translated, but at the same time, there is a need to fill those gaps to make the translation a complete one. In his words, “Troubles of a different kind arise from gaps in languages, which cannot be filled by translating because for a word that may be quite familiar in one language there is no equivalent in another” (16). Besides him, other translators like Vinay, Darbelnet, Rabin and A.H. Smith too recognize the existence of gaps but by using other terms such as lacunes, blank spaces, gaps and voids, and search for the possible ways to fulfill the gaps. Ivir is of the view that these gaps may be of any one of the cultural factors; cultural gaps or blank spaces between gaps which are “due to differences in extra-linguistic reality and those due to language-specific linguistic (lexical) mapping of the same extra linguistic-reality” (36). Culture includes language also; and “linguistic differences are seen as cultural differences” (37). The procedures
available for translating the unmatched elements of culture are: (i) cultural gaps due to differences in extralinguistic reality and language – specific linguistic mapping of the same extralinguistic reality; (ii) filling the gaps by following the procedures: borrowing, definition, literal translation, substitution, lexical creation, omission and addition (37).

1.16. Linguistic Problems

According to Catford, “Language is a type of patterned behavior” (1). It reflects the social and cultural aspects of the human race. In linguistics, the grammatical or lexical form is more important than the phonology or graphology; because they can be operated “usually in combination as the exponents of grammatical/lexical forms” (4). “The fundamental categories of linguistic theory-applicable at least to the levels of grammar, phonology and probably graphology- are unit, structure, class and system” (5).

The unit is the category set up to account for those stretches of language-activity which carry recurrent meaningful patterns. The patterns themselves still have to be accounted for- and these are what we call structures. A structure is an arrangement of elements. Thus, the elements of structure of the English unit ‘clause’ are P (Predicator), S (Subject), C (Complement) and A (Adjunct). (6)

“Structure is stated in terms of ordered arrangements of elements.” Class means “a grouping of members of a unit in terms of the way in which they operate in the structure of the unit as exponents of these elements are themselves groups.” A system means, “a finite set of alternants, among which a choice must be made . . . these alternants, the terms in a system, are the members of a class: thus the
members of the class ‘initial consonant’ …can alternate as exponents of that
particular class” (7).

As Nida and Taber (1974) say, “Each language has its own genius” (3).

Each language has its own heritage by its unique origin, lettering, dialect and
usage. It has specific scripts, proverbs, idioms and phrases, colloquial expressions,
slangs, games, stories, legends, myths, poetry and songs; and no language is
inferior to any other due to its characteristics or heritage or origin. It is difficult to
translate culture-based words such as colloquial expressions, slangs, idioms,
proverbs, gods, food items, relationships, customs and ceremonies from a SL into a
TL for a translator. Basnette (1980) too accepts the views of Nida. She stands on
par with Jakobson in declaring that “all poetic art is technically untranslatable” and
she quotes Jakobson as:

only creative transposition is possible: either intralingual transposition –
from one poetic shape into another, or interlingual transposition – from one
language into another, or finally intersemiotic transposition – from one
system of signs into another, e.g., from verbal art into music, dance, cinema
or painting. (15)

But, by using the terms intralingual and interlingual, Jakobson paves a path to
translation. In addition to the views of Nida and Jakobson, she points out the two
types of untranslatability as distinguished by Catford:

linguistic and cultural. On the linguistic level, untranslatability occurs when
there is no lexical or syntactical substitute in the TL for an SL item . . .

Linguistic untranslatability, he argues is due to differences in the SL and the
TL, whereas cultural untranslatability is due to the absence in the TL culture of a relevant situational feature for the SL text.” (32)

Without translation, the mastery of literary field or literary world will not be a complete one. But literary translation is not possible without creation. Translation is a re-creative art, which adds grace to both the SL and the TL; and helps the foreign readers to taste the sweetness and pursue the beauty of the SL text.

Patil in his article on “Literary Translation: Its Importance, Ways and Difficulties”, comments on the need for translating: “translation is as necessary as our very breathing to understand global relations in terms of Arts, Science and Commerce . . . Translation recreates and intensifies the channel of life and diversifies human activities” (10). According to him, “translation should be faithful and idiomatic. Nothing should be added or anything should be omitted” and it is “like transferring an employee from one office into another but without promotion or demotion.” He is of the opinion that “translation is possible, desirable and essential” (13). A good translator must be well versed in both the SL and the TL; familiar with the structure of the SL and the TL, their “linguistic diversities” and the subject of translation. He must use the right meaning of the SL text in order to avoid “the loss of sensibility” which is possible in translating “idioms, proverbs, and imageries” (13-14). According to Patil, “medium to medium translation is possible excepting poetry. Since it has uninterpretable emotional shades, poetry is bound to lose its flavour if it is translated into another medium” (19).

Das is of the view that “translation is both linguistic and cultural activity and it is concerned with communication of meaning” (20). The difference in the
sentence pattern should be remembered; for instance, the normal sentence pattern in the SL (Tamil) is SOV, while it is SVO in the TL (English). He states:

Translation of poetry is the most difficult mode of translation. This is because it abounds in figures of speech such as similes, metaphors, irony, paradox etc. and unprecedented phonological syntactic and semantic patterns such as rhyming alliteration, versification, morphological parallelism and above all syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations between words. (32)

Linguistic as well as non-linguistic aspects of a poem should be considered while translating poetry. Poets may portray a picture or a scene of their own imagination in a poem as it is the free flow of emotion and ecstasy. So, for a translator of poetry, it is not easy to move with the writer of the SL text in the same wavelength.

Although a literary text can be translated into a TL in many ways, the task of translator is too hard to translate poetry, due to its complex nature and “ornamental words based on lyricism” (28). Unlike translating factual and informative writings, poetry poses various problems in translating as it is imaginative writing which leads to a wide range of meaning and explanation.

Narain too is of the opinion that translating “poetry or prose is a very difficult task because of its complex nature” (100). She quotes Raffel (1971):

“Poetic translation is an art, not science, and much of the art is concerned with choosing – choosing what to put in, what to leave out, and what shape to give the work as a whole, what tone” (100). She insists that like poets, translators too have the license to choose, leave, mould and reshape a poetic work of art while translating it into another language.
According to Narain, besides the plain meanings of the words of poetry, they carry “cannotive, stylistic and cultural meanings” also. At the same time, she insists that “poems are more appreciated for their quality, style, metre, rhyme and figures of speech than the mere meaning” (105). She brings out some of the problems of literary translation:

- Problems of translation of imaginative material including the use of metaphors, similes, comparisons etc.
- Problem of translation of words having several meanings.
- Problem of translation of diminutive forms which is typical of literary material.
- Problems regarding the individual style of the author.
- Problem of translation of colloquial terms which are characteristic to a particular language.
- Problem of translating foreign, borrowed words from other languages. (101)

It may not be easy for a translator to fix the equivalent words in the TL; and lack of equivalents may lead to the loss of effectiveness in the translation.

Narain insists on the importance of style in translation through her uttering: “style is an essential characteristic of every piece of writing … but different literary works have discernibly different styles” (100). When the style of a literary work is concerned, each and every aspect of that work such as the literary form, diction, tone, mood, images, metrics, figures of speech, words, phrases and clauses should be considered.
Xiaoshu too asserts on the importance of literary style in translating a work of art in his article “Translation of Literary Style.” He states:

The quality of a translation . . . depends on the theoretical knowledge and practical skill of the translator. It is because translation is not only a science, a science with its own peculiar laws and methods, but also an art of reproduction and re-creation. (n.pag.)

Hariyanto, in her article “Problems in Translating Poetry” deals with the possible problems like linguistic, literary, aesthetic and socio-cultural problems in translating poetry. The two points to be considered in terms of linguistic factors are “collocation and obscured (non-standard) syntactical structures” and “the translator can construct the structure in the TL as closely as possible to the original structure” (n.pag.).

While discussing the features of poetry, Lefevre states the difficulties of maintaining the rhyme and meter as:

Rhyme is difficult to translate into language with a different vowel and consonant distribution. Meters are not easily transposed from one language to another . . . . Non-western cultures do not always use end rhyme in their poetry, even though virtually all known poetry is constructed around some kind of sound similarity or sound repetition and some kind of rhythm, which may or may not be regulated into formal meter. (70)

1.17. Evaluation Parameters

When a translation is done, Narain stresses that it is the duty of the translator to assess the quality of his literary work by using the following set of evaluation parameters:
1. Readability, i.e., whether the translation is easy to read or not.

2. Originality, i.e., whether it can pass from an original written in the target language depends on its conformity to the norms of the literal work of the target language.

3. Effectiveness, i.e., whether the overall impression of the translation is as effective as the original.

4. Satisfaction, i.e., whether it can satisfy its intended readers.

5. Loyalty, i.e., whether it is loyal to the original in doing justice to the original author.

6. Credibility of the translator, i.e., whether he is known for his competence in the target language.

7. Creativity of the translator, i.e., whether he uses the language creatively or not. (106)

As “transcreations rather than translations are rated high by the majority of the readers” in the area of poetic translation, Narain suggests reading a translated work to “a group of knowledgeable readers” before finalizing it. (106)

In discussing the responsibilities of a translator, Fiero, in his article “From Hebrew to Algonquian: Problems in Form and Content,” states:

A translator has the responsibility to transfer the information contained in a source language document to the vehicle of a target (or receptor) language, in such a way that the information received by the new audience will, as nearly as possible, have the same meaning content as it had for the original audience. This is more than a matter of appropriate vocabulary. (23)
Though we have discussed various theories and methods of translating, it is quite impossible to stand with a particular writer’s theory or principle since each writer directly or indirectly supports or accepts the theories or categories or principles or procedures of translation framed by one or the other writer. As no theory of translation is made for translating a particular Source Language (SL) into a particular Target Language (TL), the translators are not in a position to stick on to a particular expert’s view or theory.

In the words of Fornanek, the ancient Tamil is a “very melodious and homogenous language . . . rich in synonyms leaving pace for suggestions.” And English is “a typically modern language, not very musical, sharing its richness with Latin, which lends to it, words with very precise meaning fit for science, but often of little poetical grace” (148). Translating a poetic work of art belonging to a “melodious and homogenous language” like Tamil into a modern language which is “not very musical” is not easy for any translator and a translator ought to face many difficulties in transferring the cultural and linguistic elements from the SLT into the TLT (148).

1.18. Aim, Scope and Methodology

The style-sheet of the seventh edition of the MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers is followed in writing this dissertation. This chapter is devoted to a study on the theories of translation with special reference to the cross-linguistic and trans-cultural elements of translation.

The present dissertation is devoted to a trans-cultural and cross-linguistic study of the select English translations of the Tirukkuṟaḷ which confines to the translations of G. U. Pope, V.V.S. Aiyar, Kasturi Sreenivasan, K. R. Srinivasa
Iyengar and P.S. Sundaram, applying the general theories of translation. As far as the translation of the *Tirukkural* from its SL Tamil into the TL English is concerned, the characteristics of these SL and TL are to be considered. Based on the above discussed theories, categories, principles and procedures of translation, the study will take into account, the cultural matrix in which the *Tirukkural* was written and how it is effectively rendered in English and how far these translations are successful besides the inherent difficulties met with by translators and the transcultural strategies evolved by them to linguistically get over these inherent difficulties in translation. The present study also attempts a comparative analysis of the language and style, the figures of speech, the poetic diction from the linguistic perspective and by invoking basic principles of literary criticism.

The next chapter presents an overall view of the SL text *Tirukkural*, its author, his works, its place in Tamil classics, its place in world literature, its praiseworthy nature; and it also attempts to study the translations of the *Tirukkural* in English and review them and the articles on the *Tirukkural* and its translated versions in English; and the works and articles relating to the masterpiece of the saint Tiruvalluvar, whichever are available for reference.