Chapter I

The Poetics of Translation

Translation is often designated to the margins with the original text occupying the centre of critical attention. The art of translation involves the rendering of a source language (SL) text into the target language (TL) text so as to ensure that the surface structure and meaning of the SL will be preserved as closely as possible, but without distorting the TL structures. Such a restricted concept of translation is the result of the low status accorded to translation. Distinctions are generally made between the writer and the translator to the detriment of the latter. In this regard, Hilaire Belloc remarks: “The art of translation is a subsidiary art and derivative. On this account it has never been granted the dignity of original work and has suffered too much in the general judgement of letters” (1931:4). Translation is often perceived as a mechanical rather than creative process. But a clear insight into the process of translation reveals that translation is a serious political act. The problematic of translation involves complex issues like cultural and linguistic colonialism, hegemony, resistance and alternative uses of language.

There are several theories of translation. J.C. Catford defines translation as the replacement of textual materials from Source language (SL) to Target language (TL). In this process the translation begins from morphemes, words,
clauses, sentences and ends with the complete text. But Katherine Burnwell regards translation as the transfer of textual materials from one language to other using appropriate tools. A translator uses linguistic tools which can be classified into genetic and typographical. In this process, translation involves transfer of the source text to target language equivalent. Eugene Nida defines translation as the transfer of message from source language to receptor language without loosing meaning and following the original style. This process involves a naturalization or domestication of the text in the target culture. Peter Newmark considers translation a twin process of decoding and encoding. Translation involves a decoding of the source text and its encoding in the target language.

Etymologically, translation means “carrying across.” The Latin equivalent translatio is derived from translatus, the past participle of transferre (trans means “across” and ferre means “to carry”). It has often been regarded as the interpretation of the source text in target language. So translation refers to the transfer of thoughts and ideas from one language (SL) to another (TL). Translation is also regarded as the revitalization of the original text in another but contemporary verbal space. Like a literary text, a translation also at once imitates and transcends the original. Originally, translation was considered a univocal discipline. Of late, translation studies has encompassed dimensions beyond the textual medium. In contemporary perspective translation means translation of cultural, political and historical contexts and concepts rather than mere linguistic ones.
Translation involves political and cultural dimensions that concern translation of not only languages but also cultural contexts. Translation illustrates how different languages, cultures or political contexts can be integrated to provide a cultural synthesis. Translation as a linguistic medium is capable of mediation or appropriation through the construction of hegemonic linguistic structures. Translation is a creation of new cultural and political maps, of shared territories of identity and articulation. An understanding of the potential of translation has led to the development of a new field of interdisciplinary study called Translation Studies which deals with the theory, practice and application of translation.

Translation Studies can be prescriptive by suggesting theories and rules for translation and descriptive by considering translation as a process and product. Translation is a manifold activity. Joseph Casagrande identifies four types of translation (1969:334-35). The first type is pragmatic translation: it refers to the translation of a message with accuracy of the information conveyed in the source language. Translations of scientific and technical texts come under this category. The second type is called aesthetic-poetic translation. In this type of translation, the translator takes into account the emotions and the means which convey them. Translation of literature comes under this type. The third type is ethnographic translation. Its objective is to explain the cultural contexts of the source and target language versions of the text. The fourth type is linguistic translation. It is concerned with the equivalent meanings and the constituent morphemes of the target language text. The core activity of translation is definitely linguistic. But it
appropriately belongs to semiotics. Translation involves the transfer of meaning contained in one set of language signs into another set of language signs. In his article, ”On Linguistic Aspects of Translation,” Roman Jacobson distinguishes three types of translation. The first type is intra-lingual translation or rewording: an interpretation of verbal signs by other signs of the same language. The second type is inter-lingual translation or translation proper: an interpretation of verbal signs by signs of some other language. The last type is inter-semiotic translation or transmutation: an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs which belong to non-verbal sign systems (Brower, 1962:232-39). The last type involves a change of genre and hence it is part of genre studies. The intention of the translator and the method he adopts lead to another distinction between free and literal translations. The former is a loose translation whereas the latter is a word for word translation, transferring each word from the source text to equivalent word in the target language. The extent of freedom in loose translation leads to the formation of adaptation which is a new rendering of the original.

Language is the material embodiment of social reality and the medium of expression of the self. Edward Sapir asserts that human experience is determined by language skills of the individual in the community: each linguistic structure represents a separate reality of experience. He explains: “No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same reality. The worlds in which the different societies live are distinct world…” (1956:69).
Sapir’s concept, which was later endorsed by Benjamin Lee Whorf, is popularly known as Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. This hypothesis states that there is a systematic relationship between the grammatical categories of the language a person speaks and how that person understands the world and behaves in it. Language is the heart of the body of culture.

Translation is not an isolated art, but an ongoing process of inter-cultural transfer. Translation is at once a cultural and a linguistic mediation that involves different stages in the process of transfer across linguistic and cultural signs. Translation is often an ethnographic project, but is politically charged with great significance. It involves a relationship of equality between texts, authors, systems of language and culture. Translation is a process which involves two languages and two cultures. It functions with the mutual reflection and mutual contribution of languages and cultures. In this regard, Octavio Paz claims that translation is the principal means for understanding the world we live in. The world, he says, is presented to us as a growing heap of texts,

each slightly different from the one that came before it: translations of translations of translations. Each text is unique, yet at the same time it is the translation of another text. No text can be completely original because languages itself, in its very essence, is already a translation first from the non-verbal world,
and then, because each sign and each phrase is a translation of another sign, another phrases. (1992:154)

This is a radical view of translation, which sees it not as a marginal activity, but as a primary one. Almost the same views are expressed by Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Jorge Luis Borges and Carlos Fuentes. Indeed, Fuentes has remarked, that “originality is a sickness, the sickness of a modernity that is always aspiring to see itself as something new” (1990:70). He points to the recurrent uses of linguistic signs and structures in literary texts.

The role and function of translation vary at different periods of culture. For example, translation, established within the Roman system, has continued to be a point of debate until present day. The persecution of Bible translators during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when scholars were avidly translating and retranslating classical Greek and Roman authors, is an important link in the development of Capitalism and the decline of feudalism. In the same way, the hermeneutic approach of the great English and German Romantic translators is connected with the changing concepts of the role of the individual in the social context. George Steiner, in *After Babel*, divides the writings on the theory, practice and history of translation into four periods. The first extends from the statements of Cicero and Horace on translation to the publication of Alexander Fraser Tytler’s *Essay on the Principles of Translation* in 1791. The central characteristic of this period is the practice of translation. In Steiners’ view, the second period, which
coincides with the publication of Larbaud’s Sous l’ invocation de Saint Jerome in 1946 is called the period of theory and hermeneutic enquiry; it is marked by the development of a vocabulary and methodology of approaching translation. The third period begins with the publication of the first papers on machine translation in the 1940s and is characterized by the introduction of structural linguistics and communication theory into the study of translation. According to Steiner, the fourth period, coexisting with the third, has its origin in the early 1960s and is characterized by a vision of translation that sets the discipline in a wider frame of interdisciplinary studies. But, it is virtually impossible to divide periods in terms of years: for, as Lotman points out, human culture is a dynamic system and any attempt to locate stages of cultural development within strict temporal boundaries contradict that dynamism.

Certain concepts of translation prevail at different times, and certain other concepts prevail at all times. T.R Steiner, in his English Translation Theory, analyses translation theory between 1650-1800, starting with Sir John Denham and ending with William Cowper, and examines the eighteenth century concept of translator as painter or imitator. In Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in Comparative Literature Context (1993), Andre Lefevere, traces the establishment of a German tradition of translation starting with Luther and moving on through Gottsched and Goethe to the Schlegels and Schleiermacher and ultimately to Rosenzweig. Through the study of Shelley as translator, Timothy Webb, discusses
the work of an individual translator in relation to the rest of his writings and to the contemporary concepts of the role and status of translation. These studies show that even though these theories are not rigid notions of the period, they seek to investigate changing concepts of translation systematically.

The contributions of Cicero and Horace on translation made us think that the volume of translation in Roman literature was the result of the Romans inability to create imaginative literature. They stressed on the creative imagination of Greeks as opposed to the practical bearing of Roman mind. So the Romans perceived themselves as a continuation of their Greek models and Roman literary critics discussed Greek texts without regarding the language of the texts as an inhibiting factor. They believed, as Cicero pointed out, that the ideal source language text should be imitated and should not be crushed by the rigid application of Reason: “If I render word for word, the result with sound uncouth, and if compelled by necessity I after anything in the order of wording, I shall seem to have departed from the function of a translator” (Bassnett, 1991:43). Horace also expressed a similar view. In his *Ars Poetica* (Art of Poetry), he warns against the over-cautious imitation of the source model:

> A theme that is familiar can be made your own property so long as you do not waste your time on a hackneyed treatment; nor should you try to render your original word for word like a slavish
translator, or in imitating another writer plunge yourself into difficulties from which shame, or the rules you have laid down for yourself, prevent you from extricating yourself. (1965: 77-97)

Thus, for Horace and Cicero, the art of the translator is to produce a version based on the principle *nonverbum de verbo sed sensumm exprimere de sensus* (of expressing not word for word, but sense for sense). This argument is the modern equivalent of the distinction between the verbatim or word for word translation and the literal or sense for sense translation.

With the spread of Christianity, translation came to acquire the function of disseminating the word of God. The translator was entrusted with the mission of applying both the aesthetic and the evangelistic criteria in his translation. Simultaneously, translation came to be used as a tool in both dogmatic and political conflicts as nations began to emerge strong and the centralized power structure of the church began to weaken. The first translation of the complete Bible into English was the Wycliffe Bible produced between 1380 and 1384. The second Wycliffite Bible, composed between 1395 and 1396, had four stages in the translation process: (1) a collaborative effort of collecting old Bibles and glosses and establishing an authentic Latin source text; (2) a comparison of the versions; (3) counselling “with old grammarians and old divines” about hard words and complex meanings; and (4) translating as clearly as possible the
“sentence” (i.e. meaning), with the translation corrected by a group of collaborators. The history of the Bible translation acquired new dimensions with the advent of printing in the sixteenth century. Erasmus summed up the evangelizing spirit of the Bible translation when he declared its intention:

I would desire that all women should reade the gospell and Paules episteles and I wold to God they were translated into the tonges of all men so that they might not only be read and knowne of the scotes and yrishmen. But also of the Turkes and the Sarracenes….

I wold to God the plowman wold singe a text of the scripture at his plow-beme. And that the wever at his lowmen with this wold drive away the tediousness of tyme. I wold the wayfaringeman with this pastyme wold expelle the weriness of his iorney. And to be shorte I wold that all the communication of the Christen shuld be of the scripture for in a manner such are we oureselves as our daylye tales are. (Bassnett, 1991:48)

The Bible remained the most translated book until 1950’s. Thereafter Communist Manifesto took over this position with Soviet Union spending millions of roubles for the translation, publication and circulation of the text.

The next great English translation of the Bible was made by William Tyndale. It was followed in quick succession by the appearance of Coverdale’s Bible, The Great Bible and the Geneva Bible. In spite of protests, translation of the Bible could not be stemmed, and each successive version drew
on the works of previous translators, borrowing, amending, revising and correcting. The aims of these translators were: (1) to clarity errors arising from previous versions, due to inadequate SL manuscripts or to linguistic incompetence; (2) to produce an accessible and aesthetically satisfying vernacular style; and, (3) to clarify points of dogma and reduce the extent to which the scriptures were interpreted and re-presented to the lay people as a meta-text. At the same time, serious attempts to formulate a theory of translation were also made.

One of the first writers to formulate a theory of translation was the French humanist Etienne Dolet, who was tried and executed for heresy after “mistranslating” one of Plato’s Dialogues in such a way as to imply disbelief in immortality. In the work entitled La maniere de bien traduire d’une langue en aultre (How to translate well from one language to another), Dolet established five principles for the translator: (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 prefect 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; and (5) the translator should choose and order words appropriately to produce the correct tone. Through these principles, Dolet stressed that the translator is a more than a competent linguist and translation involves a scholarly and sensitive appraisal of the SL text. He gave
a new awareness on the role of translation in the system of literature and literary scholarship. His views were reiterated by George Chapman, later:

The work of a skilfull and worthy translator is to observe the sentences, figures and formes of speech proposed in his author, his true sence and height, and to adorne them with figures and formes of oration fitted to the originall in the same tongue to which they are translated: and these things I would gladlie have made the questions of whatsoever my labours have deserved. (Bassnett, 1991:55)

Chapman repeats his theory fully in *The Epistle to the Reader* of his translation of *The Iliad*. He states that a translator 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 on a sound scholarly investigation, other versions and glosses. Chapman’s theory is still relevant in the practice of translation as many practitioners still adhere to these principles.

The importance of translation during the Renaissance period was brought forth by Edmond Cary. The State and the Church intruded into the realm of translation. Cary pointed out the political and religious interference in the process of translation:

The translation battle raged throughout Dolet’s age. The Reformation, after all, was primarily a dispute between translators. Translation became an affair of State and a matter of Religion. The Sorbonne and the king were equally concerned with it. Poets and prose writers debated the matter. Joachim du Bellay’s
D’efense et Illustration de la Langue francaise is organized around problems relating to translation. (Bassnett, 1991: 55-56)

As a result, the translators were forced to affirm to the present through the use of contemporary idiom and style.

In poetry, the liberty taken with the SL text by renowned translators like Wyatt and Surrey made the art of translation known as “adaptations.” But whatever be the criticisms raised, translation of this period opted for a voice that had immediate impact on contemporary readers. Thus, translation in Renaissance Europe played a vital role in the political, religious and literary fields. In this context, George Steiner remarks:

At a time of explosive innovation, and amid a real threat of surfeit and disorder, translation absorbed, shaped, oriented the necessary raw material. It was, in a full sense of the term, the matiere premiere of the imagination. Moreover, it established a logic of relation between past and present, and between different tongues and traditions which were splitting apart under stress of nationalism and religious conflict. (1975: 24)

By the mid-seventeenth century, the effects of the Counter- Reformation, the conflict between absolute monarchy and the developing Parliamentary system, and the widening gap between traditional Christian humanism and science had all led to radical changes in the theory of literature and hence in the role of translation. One of the major theorists of this period, Sir John Denham warned the translators against applying the principle of literal translation to the translation of poetry.
The translator of poetry should not confine himself to the art of translating language into language. He explains:

for it is not his business alone to translate Language into Language, but Poesie into Poesie: and Poesie is of so subtile a spirit, that in pouring out of one Language into another, it will all evaporate; and if a new spirit be not added in the transfusion, there will remain nothing but a *Caput mortuum*. (Bassnett, 1991:59)

He regarded the translator and the original writer as equals, operating in two different social and temporal contexts and their functions are equally important in their chosen fields. Abraham Cowley remarked in his *Preface* to his *Pindarique Odes* that he had taken, left out and added what he pleased in his act of translation. His aim was not to let the reader know precisely what the original author said but to show his way and manner of speaking. He seemed to justify the liberty he had taken with the original texts in translation.

John Dryden’s contribution to translation is remarkable as he tackled the problems of translations by formulating three basic types: (1) metaphrase, or longitudinal translation, which involves turning an author word by word, and line by line, from one language into another; (2) paraphrase, or translation with latitude, the Ciceronian, “sense- for sense” view of translation; and (3) imitation, where the translator can abandon the text of the original as he sees fit. Of these, three types discussed in *Preface to Ovid’s Epistles*, he chooses the second as the more balanced path. He argues that the translator must be a poet, a master of both
languages, and must understand both the characteristics and “spirit” of the original author, besides following the aesthetic canons of his own age. Like a painter of a portrait, the translator’s duty is to make his work resemble the original. In keeping with this view, in his Dedication of the Aeneis, Dryden claimed to have followed the path of moderation between the two extremes of paraphrase and literal translation. He claimed that his characters were more English than Greek. Alexander Pope also advocated the middle path with emphasis given to a close reading of the source text with a view to retaining the style and spirit of the original text alive. He tried to strike a balance between over-faithfulness and looseness. He underlined the moral duty of the translator to his contemporary readers. Pope claimed that in his translation of Homer his characters were much more Augustan than Greek. Thus, the Augustans emphasized the role of the translator as painter or imitator with a moral duty to both his original text and to his contemporary readers.

Goethe argued that every literary work must pass through three phases of translation. The first phase acquaints the readers with the foreign countries on contemporary terms. Goethe cites German Bible as an example of this tendency. The second mode is that of appropriation through substitution and reproduction, where the translator reproduces the sense of the foreign work in his own terms. He cites as example, Wielend and the French tradition of translating. The third one aims at a perfect identity between the SL text and the TL text through the creation of a “new manner” which fuses the uniqueness of the original with a new form and
structure. The problem of this approach is that it is moving dangerously close to a theory of untranslatability. Goethe cites the work *Voss* as an example of a translation which had achieved the third level.

Samuel Johnson also felt that a translator should be contemporary to his times. Since the purpose of a writer is to be heard, the original writer and the translator tried to achieve this. The first systematic study in English about the translation processes was made by Alexander Fraser Tytler towards the end of the eighteenth century. He set up three basic principles: (1) the translation should give a complete transcript of the idea of the original work; (2) the style and manner of writing should be the same as that of the original; and (3) the translation should have all the ease of the original composition. But Tytler argues that the translator cannot use the same colours as the original, but can give his picture “the same force and effect.”

Coleridge, in his *Biographia Literaria*, distinguished between fancy and imagination. He considered imagination an infinitely superior organic power which induces a poet to write. This argument forced translation theorists to debate on how to define translation— as a creative enterprise or as a mechanical work. Two conflicting views were prevalent in that period. One exalted translation as a category of thought process, with the translator regarded as a creative genius, enriching the literature and language into which he is translating. Few Romantic scholars considered translation a creative enterprise. They saw translation in terms of its mechanical function of making known a text or an author. They thought that
translation involved a mechanical imitation of a text, and stressed the problem of meaning involved in any translation.

Poetry resists translation due to the visual sensation it evokes. A poetic text consists of words and silent gaps between words; both the words and silent spaces contribute to the meaning of the poem. A translator can translate the text, but not the text within the text. So the Romantics shifted their critical focus from the process of translation to the idea of untranslatability. The two ways which could lead translation out of this predicament was: the use of literal translation, concentrating on the immediate language of the message; or the use of an artificial language somewhere in between the SL text where the special feeling of the original may be conveyed through strangeness. This forced Friedrich Schleiermacher to propose the creation of a separate sublanguage for exclusive use in translated literature. This view was shared by a number of nineteenth century English translators such as F.W. Newman, Thomas Carlyle and William Morris. Newman declared that the translator should retain every peculiarity of the original wherever possible.

Dante Gabriel Rossetti, in his “Preface” to the translations from Early Italian Poets, declared that “the only true motive for putting poetry into a fresh language must be to endow a fresh notion, as far as possible, with one more possession of beauty” (1968:175-9). As the originals are often obscure and imperfect, it is perceived as a property, as an item of beauty added to a collection, with no concessions to the taste or expectations of contemporary life. Consciously
and deliberately produced archaic translations make translators reject the ideal of universal literacy. The translator does an injustice to the contemporary audience by making the translation unreadable as the original. William Morris’s translation of Homer gained significance due to its deliberate archaism. Though it was admired by writers like Oscar Wilde, it was a deviation from the position of the Augustans. When the style of the translator is contemporary to the original, it is likely to be obscure and difficult like the original.

The Victorian critic Matthew Arnold asserted that a translator should follow the contemporary language of his age and not that of the original, if the original is a classic. Homer’s language was contemporary to his age, but the translation would become archaic if the translator chose to be the contemporary of Homer. Translation of classics is a kind of literary resurrection. Here the translator faces the problem of giving life not only to the poem but also to the poet and his contemporaries. In order to upgrade the art of translation, Arnold, in his first lecture *On Translating Homer* advised the would-be translators:

Let not the translator, then, trust to his notions of what the ancient Greeks would have thought of him; he will lose himself in the vague. Let him not trust to what the ordinary English reader thinks of him; he will be taking the blind for his guide. Let him not trust to his own judgement of his own work; he may be misled by individual caprices. Let him ask how his work affects those who both know Greek and can appreciate poetry. (Bassnett, 1991:69)
He advised the translator not to try to affect his readers through his work as the original might have affected its natural readers.

Henry Wadsworth Longfellow had an extraordinary view of translation. He added another aspect to the role of a translator. While discussing his translation of Dante’s *Divina Commedia*, he defended his choice of blank verse:

The only merit my book has is that it is exactly what Dante says, and not what the translator imagines he might have said if he had been an Englishman. In other words, while making it rhythmic, I have endeavoured to make it also as literal as a prose translation….In translating Dante, something must be relinquished. Shall it be the beautiful rhyme that blossoms all along the line like a honeysuckle on the hedge? It must be, inorder to retain something more precious than rhyme, namely fidelity, truth,- the life of the hedge itself…

The business of a translator is to report what the author says, not to explain what he means; that is the work of the commentator. What an author says and how he says it, that is the problem of the translator. (1964:65)

He meant that a translator is only a reporter, a language technician. Longfellow denied the translator even the right of a reader. In this regard, Susan Bassnett comments: “the translator is relegated to the position of a technician, neither poet nor commentator, with a clearly defined but severely limited task” (1991: 70). In complete contrast to Longfellow’s views, Edward Fitzgerald declared that the
translator should attempt to bring a version of the SL text into the TL culture, indicating a patronizing attitude that demonstrated another kind of elitism. He remarked that it were better to have a live sparrow than a stuffed eagle. He viewed translation as a means to upgrade the status of the SL text as it was perceived on a lower cultural level. Such an elitist attitude led to both the devaluation of translation and to its marginalization.

In *The Literary Translation of Poetry, Seven Strategies and a Blue Print* (1975), Andre Lefevere enumerates:

1. **Phonemic translation**: It attempts to reproduce the SL sound in the TL, while at the same time making an acceptable paraphrase of the sense. This method works well in the translation of onomatopoeic words, but in other cases the result is often clumsy and senseless.

2. **Literal translation**: It is a word-for-word translation. But this method distorts the sense and syntax of the original.

3. **Metrical translation**: It aims merely at the reproduction of SL metre in the target language. It concentrates only on one aspect of the source language text and abandons the text as a whole.

4. **Poetry into Prose translation**: The translator converts poem into prose in translation, it distorts the sense, communicative values and syntax of the SL text. But this method is superior to the literal and metrical methods of translation.
5. Rhymed translation: In this method, the translator is pre-occupied with the metre and rhyme. As the translator is restricted by a double bondage, the end product is only a mere caricature of the original poem.

6. Blank verse translation: In this type, the translator has to face the restrictions imposed by the choice of structure. But this method ensures greater accuracy, higher degree of precision and better literary and aesthetic qualities.

7. Interpretation: Under this heading, Lefevere discusses what he calls “versions,” where the content of the SL text is retained, but the form is changed. He also talks about imitations, where the translator produces a poem of his own, which has only title and point of departure, in common with the source text.

Lefevere’s study emphasizes the deficiencies of the methods followed by a translator. The translation fails, if the translator focuses on some elements at the expense of others. While following one of the methods, the translator fails to consider the poem as an organic structure. So a combination of the methods is an acceptable solution.

J.C. Catford, in his *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (1965) defines some broad types of translation in terms of three criteria: extent, level and rank of translation. His classification is not confined to translation of poetry and it has gained much popularity among the practitioners of translation. He has made an
attempt to link translation with linguistics. His epoch making work, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, opens with a striking statement: “Any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language- a general linguistic theory” (1965:1). He has introduced the types and shifts of translation. The first criterion of translation is the extent of translation: whether it is full or partial translations. This distinction refers to the extent of the SL text which is submitted to the translation process. In full translation, the entire text is translated; every part of the SL text is replaced by the TL text material. In partial translation, some part or parts of the source text are left untranslated; instead, they are simply incorporated in the TL text. This may be due to the untranslatability of certain lexical items. This may also be due to the translator’s intention to give local colouring for the TL text. Next criterion of translation is the level of translation: whether it is total or restricted translations. This distinction refers to the levels of language involved in translation. The concept of total translation is rather misleading as it is never attained. It may be defined as “the replacement of SL grammar and lexis by equivalent TL grammar and lexis with consequential replacement of SL phonology graphology” (1965:22). This can never be achieved as each linguistic unit contains within itself a set of non-transferable associations and connotations. Hence, Roman Jakobson maintains that all poetic art is technically untranslatable, as complete equivalence is a myth. Restricted translation is defined as the “replacement of SL textual materials by equivalent TL textual material at only one level” (1965:22). In this case, translation is performed only at the phonological or
at the graphological level, or at anyone of the two levels of grammar or lexis.

There are two main types of restricted translations: phonological translation and graphological translation. Phonological translation is a kind of restricted translation in which the SL phonology of a text is replaced by equivalent TL phonology, but there are no other replacements except such grammatical or lexical changes as may result accidentally from phonological translation. For instance, an English plural “cats” may come out apparently as singular “cat” in phonological translation into a language which has no final consonant cluster. The basis for translation equivalence in phonological translation is the relationship of SL and TL phonological units to “the same” phonic substance. For example, the phonological translation of English “had” into Greek is /xent/. The distinctive phonic substance related to English /h/, voiceless, glottal fricative is /x/. Greek has only one phoneme related to nearly the same phonic substance. The English /a/ has the same phonic features present in Greek /e/. English /d/ is a voiced, apical stop and Greek has an apical stop /t/, but in Greek the components “stop” and “voice” co-occur only when a nasal precedes. Therefore, the translation equivalent of English /d/ must be /t/ or /nt/. Greek normally uses the latter while using English with a Greek accent. As Greek has only one vowel in the low front region /e/ as opposed to the /e/ and /a/ of English, and as the voicing of stops is conditioned by the preceding of the nasal, Greek has a single phonological translation equivalent, /xent/, for the three English phonological forms /hed/, /had/ and /hand/. There are also instances where one SL phonological item has more than one TL
phonological equivalent. Here, the particular TL equivalent depends on the particular features of phonic substance that can be related to the SL item on that particular context.

Phonological translation, like total translation, involves change of rank or regrouping into the formal units of the TL. For example, in phonological translation between English and Japanese, equivalence has to be established not merely at phoneme rank but with upward change of rank to the next higher unit in the Japanese phonological hierarchy, namely the “mora” or “kana”, identical to English syllable. Thus, English platonic love / plətonik ləv/ has its Japanese phonological translation equivalent /puratonikkurabu/. This is because, the English phonemes /p/ and /v/ have, as Japanese translation equivalents, the morae /pu/ and /bu/; the phoneme /k/ has its equivalent, two Japanese morae /k-ku/. Moreover, the Japanese high vowels /u/ and /i/ are often realized voiceless or as phonic zero; hence /pu-ra/ is most nearly relatable to the same phonic substance as English /pl/, with the aspiration of /p/ manifested phonically as a partially voiceless /l/.

Graphological translation is a restricted translation in which the SL graphology of a text is replaced by equivalent TL graphology. The basis for equivalence is relationship to “the same” graphic substance. For example, Greeks writing in English often replace a script “a” by “α” or an “n” by “η”. It is particularly clear in the case of “η” for “n” it is graphological translation, since the only thing in common between “n” and “η” is the relation to similar graphic substance.
Grammatical translation is a kind of restricted translation in which the SL grammar of a text is replaced by equivalent TL grammar, but with no replacement of lexis. The basis for equivalence here is relationship to the same situation – substance. Thus, the English SL text, *this is the man I saw* is translated into Arabic as *haada ‘/man /li see-t-u*. Here, the process of grammatical translation is such that English clause-structure SPC= Arabic SPC or SC; the latter being translation equivalent of an English SPC structure in which P= be (present time), as here. So here, we have SPC=SC. The exponent of S in the English text is the item *this*, for which the Arabic equivalent is *haada*. The exponent of C in English is the NGP, *the man I saw*, out of which the definite article can be translated as *al*. The lexical items *man* and *see* remain unchanged. The NGP equivalent in Arabic language is MHQ, in which M is the definite article, H is the lexical item and Q is the rank shifted clause of structure SP. Thus, an appropriate morpheme rank-bound total back translation of the Arabic C would be *the man which see-d-I-him*. This is grammatically translated as *Haada al-man ili see-t-u*.

Lexical translation is another kind of restricted translation in which the SL lexis of a text is replaced by equivalent TL lexis, but with no replacement of grammar. Here too, the basis of equivalence is the relationship to the same situation substance or contextual substance. The above example, *This is the man I saw* is lexically translated into Arabic as *This is the rajul I shuf –ed*. Here, the English SL grammar is preserved, but the lexical items *man* and *see* are replaced by the TL equivalents *rajul* and *shuf*. It is clear from this example that the process
of picking up a few words of the language, and then throwing them into utterances in the speaker’s primary language is lexical translation. It is also interesting to note that grammatical and lexical translations are the converse of each other. That is, grammatical translation from language A to language B is the same as lexical translation from language B to language A.

This can be explained in terms of back translations. The last criterion is the grammatical or phonological rank at which the translation equivalence is established: whether it is rank bound translation or rank unbounded translation. When the selection of the target language equivalents is deliberately confined to one rank; either from sentence to sentence, clause to clause, group to group, word to word or from morpheme to morpheme, it is called rank bound translation. When the equivalences shift freely up and down the rank scale, but tend to be at higher
ranks, such translations are termed as rank unbounded translation. In addition to these divisions, Catford also mentions popular terms like free, literal and verbatim translation. A free translation is always an unbounded translation. Verbatim or word-for-word translation is a rank-bound translation, where equivalents are sorted out at word level. Each translation remains between these two extremes. It begins with word-for-word translation and moves on to make changes in conformity with the grammar. For instance, the Russian text *Bog sn’im’il* can be translated into English as:

- God with them! (word for word)
- God is with them! (literal)
- Never mind about them! (free)

All these types of translation confirm that poetic art is technically untranslatable as complete equivalence is a myth.

It is a known fact that when a number of translators translate the same text there will be as many translations as there are translators. The different “versions” of translation are determined by second types of “shifts” the translators use in the process of translation. J. C. Catford identifies two major translation shifts: level shifts and category shifts. He defines shifts as “departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from SL to the TL” (1965:73). Level shifts occur when SL items of one linguistic level, say grammar, has a TL translation equivalent at a different level, say lexis. Shifts from grammar to lexis and vice-versa are the only possible level shifts in translation. Examples of level shifts
sometimes occur in the translation of the verbal aspects of Russian and English, as these languages have an aspectual opposition seen most clearly in the “past” or “preterite tense”: the opposition between Russian imperfective and perfective, and between English simple and continuous. Here, the polarity of marking is not the same. In Russian, the perfective is marked while the imperfective is unmarked. Similarly, the English continuous form is contextually and morphologically marked and the simple form is unmarked. Moreover, the Russian imperfective is translatable with almost equal frequency by English simple or continuous forms. But the marked terms are mutually untranslatable.

A Russian writer can create a certain contrastive effect by using an imperfective and then, so to speak, “capping” this by using the perfective. For instance, “to ze delal Bel’ tov v prodolzenie etix des’ ati let? Vse/il pocti vse. Cto on sdelal? Nicego i/i pocti nicego” (Catford, 1965:75). The imperfect delal is “capped” by the perfective sdelal. delal can be translated by either did or was doing. Since there is no contextual reason to make explicit reference to the progress of event, the former is the better translation. In English, this is not possible. We must use a different lexical verb that refers to completion in contextual meaning. Therefore, the whole passage can be translated as: “What did Bettor do during these ten years, Everything, or almost everything. What did he achieve? Nothing, or almost nothing” (Catford, 1965:75). Cases of more or less incomplete shift from grammar to lexis are quite frequent in translation between other languages. For example, the English text, This text is intended for ...may
have as its French TL equivalent *Le present Manuels’ adresse a’*... Here, the SL modifier, *This*, has as its TL equivalent the modifier, *Le present*, a lexical + a civical adjective.

The category shifts are divided into four types: structure, class, unit and intra-system. The first type, the structure shifts are the most frequent category shifts. They occur in phonological, graphological as well as in total translation. In grammar, structure shifts can occur at all ranks. They involve a grammatical change between the structure of the source text and that of the target text. For instance, in English, *the Man is in the boat*, has a Gaelic equivalent, *Tha an duine anns a’bhata*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English: The man / is / in the boat.</th>
<th>Gaelic: Tha an duine / anns a’bhata.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Catford, 1965:77)

Based on complete formal correspondence, of clause-structure, this can be translated as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English: Is / the man / in the boat?</th>
<th>Gaelic: Am bheil / an duine / anns a’bhata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

These two examples, in fact, illustrate two different types of translation shifts; in the first, there is structure shifts; in the second, there is unit shifts. The structure-shift
can also be found at other ranks; for example, at group rank. In the translation between English and French, there is often a shift from MH (Modifier and Head) to ((M)HQ (modifier) +Head + Qualifier)

English: A White house (MH)
French: Une maison blanche ((M)HQ)

The second type, the class shifts occur when the TL equivalent of SL item is a member of a class different from the original item. The class shift is the result of the translator of a source language item by a target language item which belongs to a different grammatical class; for instance, a verb may be translated with a noun. The logical dependence of class on structure makes it clear that structure shifts usually entail class shifts. In the above example, the translation equivalent of the English adjective white is the French adjective blanche. Since both white and blanche are exponents of the formally corresponding class adjective, there is no class shift. But we can also recognize two such classes of adjective; those operating at M and those at Q in NGP structure. English white is an M adjective while French blanche is a Q adjective. This is class shift. The third type, unit shifts involve changes in the rank of the target language. When the unit at one rank in the SL has a different unit in the TL, it is called unit shift. For example:

SL text 1: The woman came out of the house.

TL text 1: Zenscina vysla iz domu.
SL text 2: A woman came out of the house.

TL text 2: Iz domu vysla zenscina. (Catford, 1965:78)

In this case, the change of English *the* to *a* is correlated with a change in the sequence of elements in the structure of the Russian clause. This textual equivalence can be stated as:

\[
\text{English } \textit{the} \text{ in (N) at } /s/ \quad = \quad \text{Russian } /\text{SPA}/ \\
\text{English } \textit{a} \text{ in (N) at } /s/ \quad = \quad \text{Russian } /\text{SPA}/
\]

The English, *the*, a term in a system operating in Nominal Group, at the place in Clause-structure-Subject, has as its Russian translation equivalent, Subject-Predicator-Adjunct (SPA), of elements in the Russian clause structure and *a* has its translation equivalent, the inverse sequence of elements in the Russian clause (Catford, 1965:29). The fourth type, intra system shifts occurs when source language and target language possess systems which correspond to each other formally as to their constitution. But when translation takes place, it involves the selection of a non-proceeding term in the target language system. We use the intra-system shift for those cases where the shift occurs internally. In each language, the system uses singular or plural. In translation it frequently happens that the translation equivalent of SL singular may be the plural and vice versa.

For example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>advice</td>
<td>des conseils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>news</td>
<td>des nouvelles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lightning = des ' éclairs
applause = desapplaudiscements.

(Catford, 1965: 80)

This also happens in the case of articles. For instance, English and French have four articles, namely zero, definite, indefinite and partitive. But it often occurs that the equivalent of an article is not the formally corresponding term in the system.

Anton Popovic distinguishes several types of shifts. The first type is the Constitutive Shifts. This is the inevitable shift that takes place as a result of differences between two languages, two poetics and two styles. This is common in almost all translations. Second type is Generic Shift. When the constitutive features that define a text as belonging to a particular genre change, it is called Generic Shift. In this case the original text belongs to one genre and the translation belongs to a different genre. Sometimes, either the genre of the source text or the genre of the translation or both may be peculiar to the language. The third type is Individual Shift. It arises when the translator introduces his own style and idiolect with particular emphasis. This results in individual deviations from the original and other versions of the translation. The fourth type is Negative Shift. This is the result of information incorrectly translated due to unfamiliarity with the source language or the structure and form of the original. This is exceptional when the structure or form of the original is unfamiliar as the original belongs to a genre peculiar to the language. This is also common due to the translator’s unfamiliarity with the source language. The last type Popovic identifies is Topical Shift.
This arises due to the altering of topical facts of the original in the translation. This is usually found in the adaptations or imitations of the source text.

Most of the discussions on the practice of translation in the early twentieth century followed the views of the Victorian practitioners of translation. Some translators feel that the translation of poetry is empirically possible but logically impossible. Poetry is synthesized from the thoughts, emotions and perceptions of the poet; the sense and style are so blended that poetry eludes translation. In addition to the communication of content, translation of poetry demands a close resemblance to the form and structure of the original. So few theorists are not skeptical about the efficiency of translation of poetry. Perfect translation is not possible at least in the case of poetry. Ezra Pound categorizes poems into three types based on the translatability of poetry: Phanopoeia, Melopoeia and Logopoeia. Poems that can be easily translated come under phanopoeia. Poems that cannot be rendered into translation are classified as melopoeia. Poems that are generally untranslatable but can be still paraphrased are called logopoeia. The translation of poetry can be judged adequate or not on the basis of whether it satisfies certain minimum requirements like retaining the sense, style and structure of the original in the target language.

Much of the debate on the theory of translation in the first half of the twentieth century is the continuation of the Victorian concepts of translation-literariness, archaizing, pedantry and the production of a text of little literary
merit for an elite minority. Two theories in translation emerged in the 1970’s:- Skopos theory by Hans J. Vermeer and Polysystem theory by Itamar Even-Zohar. As the Greek word “skopos” suggests, the theory focuses on the purpose of the translation, which determines the translation methods and strategies to be employed to produce a functionally vital text. This result is the Target Text (TT), which Vermeer calls as “translatum.” Therefore, in Skopos theory, facts like Source Text (ST) is to be translated and what the function of the TT will remain crucial for the translator. The underlying rules of the theory are: (1) a translatum (TT) is determined by its Skopos; (2) a TT is an offer of information in a target culture and TL, concerning an offer of information in source culture and SL; (3) a TT does not initiate an offer of information in a clearly reversible way; (4) a TT must be internally coherent and a TT must be coherent with the ST. An important advantage of Skopos theory is that it allows the possibility of the same text being translated in different ways according to the purpose of the TT. In this regard, Vermeer explains:

What the skopos states is that one must translate, consciously and consistently, in accordance with some principle respecting the target text. The theory doesn’t state what the principle is, this must be decided separately in each specific case. (2004:234)

The Skopos theory puts the responsibility on the translator to decide the method of translator on the basis of the expected function of the translated text. So the method of translation varies according to the purpose of the translation.
The Israeli scholar, Itamar Even Zohar, has developed Polysystem theory by borrowing ideas from the Russian formalists of the 1920’s. He discusses the place and function of translation within the cultural system. He has coined the term polysystem theory to explain his approach: a semiotic system is very rarely a uni-system but is necessarily a polysystem or a multiple system. It is a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap using concurrently different options, yet functioning as one structured whole the elements of which are interdependent. Translation as a system of transfer functions within the literary system which is itself part of a larger cultural syndrome (Bassnett, 1991:26). Translation is a semiotic system which functions within a literary system that shares the characteristics of a cultural system. A literary work is studied not in isolation but as part of a literary system which, in turn, is part of a cultural system.

The concept of polysystem is well defined by Shuttleworth and Cowie:

The polysystem is conceived as a heterogeneous, hierarchized conglomerate (or system) of systems which interact to bring about an ongoing, dynamic process of evolution within the polysystem as a whole. (1997:176)

Their observation is self-explanatory.

The Polysystem theory of translation has several advantages over the Skopos theory. It links translation to general approaches in the study of literature. Some of the advantages are: (1) literature itself is studied alongside the social,
historical and cultural forces; (2) it moves away from the isolated study of individual texts towards the study of translation within the cultural and literary systems in which it functions; and (3) the non-prescriptive definition of equivalence and adequacy allow for variation according to the historical and cultural situation of the text. Based on these, Even Zohar identifies that translated literatures occupy two primary and secondary positions: (1) when a “young” literature is being established and looks initially to “older” literatures for ready-made models; (2) when a literature is “peripheral” or “weak” and imports those literary types which it is lacking; and when there is a critical turning point in literary history at which established models are no longer considered sufficient, or when there is vacuum in the literature of the country. The translated literature occupies a secondary position when it has no major influence over the central system. It may even become a conservative element, preserving conventional forms and conforming to the literary canons of the target system. Even Zohar points out that this secondary position is the normal one for all translated literatures. Even the traditional translation theorists have divided translations into literary and non-literary translations. Since, translation is a linguistic phenomenon it carries different methods to fulfil its purpose.

Translation is a process analogous to the Aristotelian mimesis. The translator is a reader who reproduces the experiences represented in the source text; he turns it into something greater than itself, something uniquely aware of its form, and thus transforms the nature of its being. So every translation involves a
process of extension, revision, critique and deconstruction. It is used not to modify
the effect of the original, but to pursue it for the best purpose, to provide a version
as equipollent as possible. This function of translation demands of the translator a
basic humility, a submission of his creative being to another’s. A translator is
supposed to be his true self, but he can never be so; for, his sensibility is a mass of
readings and assimilations, absorbed, modified, translated in terms of each other,
and of the milieu of reception in which he has his being. The degree of
modification is always indeterminable, at times more obviously than at other.
The best instances are those where the source culture is most distant from the
target audience. Fitzgerald’s *Rubaiyat*, or Arthur Waley’s translations from
Chinese, are inevitably reduced in Western reception to the idiom of western
thought and utterance. Hence, it can be concluded that translations are always
affected by the intentions of the translator.

The topic of translation and the figure of the translator always struggle with
the marginalization they are driven to within the literary space. Hillaire Belloc
bemoans the under-estimation of translation:

> The art of translation is a subsidiary art and derivative. On this
account it has never been granted the dignity of the original
work….This natural underestimation of its value has had the bad
practical effect of lowering the standard demanded…. The
corresponding misunderstanding of its character has added to its
degradation: neither its importance nor its difficulty has been grasped. (1931: 4-5)

Translation is widely considered a secondary phenomenon, with the translator mostly hidden behind the predominant author of the original. But Walter Benjamin, in his essay “The Task of Translator” (1969), elevates translation to the level of the sublime that is probably never reached. He argues that a translation does not exist to give readers an understanding of the “meaning” or information content of the original. It exists separately but in conjunction with the original, coming after it, emerging from its “after life,” giving the original a “continued life”. For Benjamin translation is a means to aspire to “pure language” (Zohn, 1969:73). He establishes that a process of the supplement of languages takes place through translation consequent to the difference between source and target languages.

Benjamin’s project is based on an all-embracing notion of language: the world is made of language and the ultimate objective is to understand the “textus” of the world to achieve the harmony between the inadequate human languages and the perfect language of God. His idea is influenced by Jewish mysticism and the Biblical ideas of a pristine language, complete and sufficient in itself. The Jews believed that this language existed in paradise and God distinguished it after The Tower of Babel was grounded. The human languages are only the incomplete pieces of the pure and complete original. Benjamin builds the teleology on the basis of this myth. The final aim is to approach the divine language which is the
source of all truths. But this language is no longer communicative, as it is totally free of meaning. Translation is a means to reach the perfect language. It completes languages, puts together the disintegrated “modes of intention,” Benjamin’s equivalent for the Saussurean “signifier.” Translation works towards the perfection of the original which is considered incomplete: “Thus translation, ironically, transplants the original into a more definitive linguistic realm… In translation the original rises into a higher and purer linguistic air” (Zohn, 1969:75). Translation sublimates the continuum of signifiers to a point of saturated perfection.

Benjamin thinks that translations should not try to transfer meaning. It is rather an effort to translate as close to the original as possible by transferring its syntax and the mode of expressing concepts to the target language. Translation also reveals the inherent relationships in a text, which would otherwise remain hidden. Translation does this, not by seeking to be the same as the original, but by harmonizing or bringing together the two different languages. In this way, translation offers growth of its own language as well as pursues the goal of a “pure” and higher language. Benjamin explains:

A real translation is transparent; it doesn’t cover the original, doesn’t block its light, but allows pure language, as though reinforced by its own medium, to shine upon the original all the more fully. This may be achieved, above all, by a literal rendering of the syntax which
proves words rather than sentences to be the primary element of the translator. (Zohn, 1969:81)

Translation should be carried out in such a way as to recognize the original and the translation is regarded as the fragments of a greater language. But this capacity to release the pure language is singular to translation. In this regard, Benjamin remarks:

> It is the task of the translator to release in his own language that pure language which is under the spell of another, to liberate the language imprisoned in a work in his re-creation of that work. (Zohn, 1969:82)

Translation is a process of recreation which liberates the language fettered to the original.

Translation is conceived as a multi-dimensional process in which the translator has to deal with his materials, means, resources and objectives at several levels simultaneously. At each level he has to pursue the simultaneous norms of literary excellence in the translations and fidelity to various ideals; at the sametime, he has to accept many practical compromises in the face of conflicting demands and allegiances. He is always defined by this particular set of freedoms and constraints. He is expected to render textual meanings and qualities “literally” to successfully transpose the syntax, design, structures or form of the original from one language to another. A translator is expected to achieve a communicative intersection between the two sets of languages and discourses. At the same time,
a translation has to strike a balance between the interests of the original author and those of the translator. This is to fulfil the multiple expectations of its imagined readers, and to construct parallels between the two cultures and the two histories or traditions that the translator brings together. A translator is obliged to carry over a text from its original language into another as “literally and as “accurately” as possible.

Domestication or naturalization of the source language text to the receptor culture is a common translation strategy prevalent in both sides of the Atlantic. Lawrence Venuti has coined the term “invisibility” to describe the translator’s situation and activity in contemporary Anglo-American translation culture. He finds that this “invisibility” is produced by the way translators themselves tend to translate “fluently” into English, to produce an idiomatic and readable TT, thus creating an “illusion of transparency.” Venuti bemoans the phenomenon of domestication as it involves an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to the target language and cultural values. Venuti discusses invisibility along with two types of translating strategies: domestication and foreignization. He explains the way the translated texts are typically read in the target culture:

A translated text, whether prose or poetry, fiction or non-fiction is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers and readers when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer’s personality or intention or the essential
meaning of the foreign text— the appearance, in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the “original.” (1995:1)

This entails translating in a transparent, fluent, invisible style, in order to minimize the foreignness to TT. Foreignization, on the other hand, entails choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along the lines which are excluded by dominant cultural values in the target language. He considers the foreignizing method an ethno-deviant pressure used to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text. Venuti regards the foreignizing strategy of translation as a desirable means to restrain the ethnocentric violence of translation. According to him, the foreignizing method can control the domesticating cultural values of the English language world. Venuti terms the foreignizing method of translating, as “resistancy,” which is a non-fluent or estranging translation style. It is designed to make visible the presence of the translator by highlighting the foreign identity of the ST and protecting it from the ideological dominance of the target culture.

India has a long tradition of translation. The Rasa School classifies poetry into two broad categories. Hirayanna terms them as Rasa Kavya and Vastu Kavya. He explains the distinguishing characteristics of the two:

In Vastu Kavya there are the words of the poem; the thoughts and images which they convey from its essential content. It is the disinterested contemplation of them that gives rise to the joy of poetry. This contemplation, as a mental state, involves subjective
and objective factor; it is the total absorption in the objective factor, forgetting the subjective that constitutes poetic experience. But in *Rasa Kavya* the central feature of the situation to be portrayed in it is an emotion; and no emotion is, in its essence, directly describable. The poet cannot therefore communicate it, as he can a thought or image. He can only suggest it to the reader, who has already had a personal experience of it, by delineating its causes and consequences, the objects that prompt it and the reactions which they provoke. That is, the emotional aspect of the situation can be indicated only in an indirect or mediate sense, the media being the thoughts and images, as conveyed by the poet’s words, of the objective constituents of that situation. (1997: 36)

Thus, what forms the content in *Vastu Kavya* becomes the means for suggestion in *Rasa Kavya*. *Vastu Kavya* is the objective aspect of creative literature, like epics and ballads, whereas *Rasa Kavya* is the subjective aspect like lyric poetry.

According to *Rasa School*, a poem induces an art experience in the reader through the medium of *dhvani*, which constitutes all devices used by the artist to communicate the experience. There are various *dhvani* devices like figures of speech, alliteration, allusion, internal rhyme, images and so on. Sometimes, they may be non-functional and ornamental. In a translation the art experience is communicated through two different languages, where two diverse systems of *dhvani* may be required. A *dhvani* device may create one effect in the source
language and a different effect in the target language. It may fail to produce the desired effect and may even produce the undesired or contrary effect. Every language carries its cultural weight. The translator is forced to address an audience with a different cultural identity. When the translation is between culturally similar languages, the problem gets minimized whereas the problem becomes acute when the translation is between culturally dissimilar languages.

The art experience is the direct result of the intelligent and imaginative use of dhvani devices available in the language. Both original writer and the translator try to give the transient, incidental moods a concrete form. Any compromises in the choice of dhvani dilute the ecstasy of the art experience. A translator has to be faithful to both the art experience and the dhvani devices. A translator of Rasa Kavya may sometimes remain more loyal to the art experience than to the dhvani devices. A translator has to exercise discretion in retaining the dhvani devices of the source language in the translation. He may delete, add or alter dhvani devices according to his artistic purpose.

A.K. Ramanujan speaks of translation as a labour that requires intensive input. He speaks about his experience as a translator: “I began this book of translations fifteen years ago and thought several times that I had finished it…. I worked on the last drafts in a third floor office of the Department of English at Carleton College where I sat unsociably day after day agonizing over Tamil particles and English prepositions” (1985:xv-xvi). This statement shows that even the translators’ expertise and craftsmanship cannot solve the problems of
attempting what Dryden had called metaphor. Two principal factors prevent a translator from producing a perfect metaphor, especially of a poem: (1) the words in the text are always “figurative” and therefore cannot be rendered literally; and (2) a truly literal version can never capture the poetry of the original, for “only poems can translate poems.” A poem is always made at several levels, of which the literal level is only one. Hence metaphor is an unachievable ideal. So the translator’s task, more often than not, like Marvell’s love, is “begotten by despair upon impossibility” (Ramanujan, 1985:297). A text’s resistance to translatability arises from the difference between language systems as well as the conflict between author and translator. In this context, Ramanujan argues:

A translator is ‘an artist on oath’. He has a double allegiance, indeed, several double allegiances. All to familiar with the rigors and pleasures of reading a text and those of making another, caught between the need to express himself and the need to represent another, moving between the two halves of one brain, he has to use both to get close to ‘the originals.’ He has to let poetry win without allowing scholarship to lose. Then his very compromises may begin to express a certain fidelity, and may suggest what he cannot convey. (1985:296-7)

But the dilemma is due to more than a split in the translator’s self or a schism in his brain. It also arises from an aporia between loyalty and betrayal, commitment
and freedom, reflection and refraction. A translator has to be true to the translation, so less to the original.

A translator usually works through three sets of conflicting allegiances: to the reader, to the culture of the SL text, and the text’s historical context or tradition. No matter whatever the translator does, he has to be true to the reader of the translation. This reader, both “real” and “imagined,” expects the translator to be faithful to the source text at the level of metaphrase, and at the levels of outer and inner forms. The reader also expects the translator to produce a version that is true to the original; he expects the translation to be a reliable representation of the original text, its language, its poetics and tradition, and its historical and cultural contexts. In order to fulfill the reader’s expectations, a translator has to submit to these conflicting norms: textual fidelity, aesthetic satisfaction and pedagogic utility.

This is difficult for the translator as the phenomenon in question is the culture in which the work is embedded before translation. In the translator’s “Note to Samskara,” Ramanujan states that a translator hopes to translate not only a text but also a non-native reader into a native one. By doing so, the translator, along with his reader, enters an immense network of inter-textual relations, transactions and confluences spanning both time and space. Thus, translation is an open-ended, multi-track process in which the translator, the author/writer, the work and the readers move back and forth between two different sets of languages, cultures,
historical situations and traditions. Therefore, what is expected of a translator is a procedure of “love” and “surrender” towards the original.

The Indian metaphysics equates translation with the transmigration of soul, the Indian traditional concept of Parakya Pravesa or the Metempsychosis of Pythagoras. In this kind of interpretation, meaning is the soul of the text which is being transferred, and style is the body which is clothed by the meaning. In the metempsychosis of translation, there is the transference and unification of soul and body from one culture to another. The soul or significance is not subjected to the laws of temporality, and therefore, significance, even literary significance, is ahistorical in Indian view. Elements of plot, stories, and characters can be used again and again by new generations of writers because Indian literary theory does not lay undue emphasis on originality. In Indian perspective, the true test is the writer’s capacity to translate, to restate, and to revitalize the original. In this sense, Indian literary traditions are essentially traditions of translations.

But western literary traditions often equate translation with the “Other”. In this regard, J. Hillis Miller states, “Translation is the wandering existence of a text in perpetual exile” (Bassnett and Trivedi, 1999: 182). Western literary criticism is responsible for the guilt of translations for coming into being after the original; the temporal sequentiality is held as a proof of the diminution of literary authenticity of translations. The western logic views translation as an intrusion of “the Other.” This philosophy of individualism and the metaphysics of guilt, render Eurocentric literary historiography incapable of grasping the origins of literary tradition.
Often the departure of a translation from the original evokes the compelling suggestion of a threatening, subversive force: the infringement of set parameters of possession and authority. The new languages draw out possibilities beyond the original writer’s intention. Going beyond the authorial intention, there may be possibilities that the translator’s language would not admit, but are instilled in the new text by the structures of the target language. This process obviously works negatively by closing off possibilities that exist in the original. The source text is a semiotic construct of indeterminate range. It is negotiated by seizing on a feasible, tractable part of its range. Translation is the result of imposing on a similar segment another indeterminate construct in another language. This exercise demonstrates its own impossibility, as it passes through a contextually restricted corridor from one expansive verbal system to another. Translation is a process of signification analogous to Derridian “differance.” Thus, translations endlessly extend and indefinitely defer the implications of the original.

The totalizing aspect of translation has become insignificant. That is, the translations attempt to further the signification of the original has become meaningless. This is not because the infiniteness of a field cannot be covered by finite discourses but because the nature of the field called language excludes totalization. It is true that new attempts of signification add something to the original. This results in the fact that there is always more to the original than internally found. But this addition is a floating one because it comes to perform a vicarious function, to supplement a lack on the part of the
signified (Derrida, 1985: 289). So every translation is a binary of the original text. For, the fundamental issue is not the encounter of the two creative individuals but of two languages, two cultures, and two paradigms of the mind, not even two really specific, individuated locations in mental space and time, but the deflected play of all that lies between and beyond. In this context, Juri Lotman comments: “No language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture: and no culture can exist which doesn’t have at its centre, the structure of natural language” (Lotman and Uspensky, 1978: 211-12). Therefore, a translator who treats the text in isolation from the culture is at his peril. This is the reason why Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere, in the introduction to Translation, History and Culture, dismiss the kinds of linguistic theories of translation, “which have just focused on word or text as a unit, but not moved beyond” (1995:4). They also reject the painstaking comparisons between originals and translations which do not consider the text in its cultural environment (1995:5). Cultural dimensions gather importance in the study of translations. Translations should be approached from the angle of cultural studies paradigm.

Bassnett and Lefevere go beyond language and focus on the interaction between translation and culture. They illustrate how culture imparts and constraints translation, and “on the larger issues of context, history and convention” (1995:11). The study of translation, like the study of culture, requires a plurality of voices. As with the study of culture, translation also involves an examination of the processes of encoding and decoding. The move from
translation as text to translation as culture is what Mary Snell-Hornby terms “the Cultural turn” (1990:4). Translation is a paradigm of cultural politics and, therefore, an attempt to rediscover the cultural identity of the translator.

The new approach to translation based on cultural dimensions focuses on the changing standards in translation. The power exercised in and on the publishing industry in pursuit of specific ideologies is evidence to the trend. There are many emerging fields of specialization in translation studies. Translation is fully informed by the tensions that traverse all cultural representations. It is a process of mediation that works through ideology. In this regard, Maria Tymoczko considers the translator a neutral mediator in the act of communication. She explains:

The ideology of translation resides not simply in the text translated, but in the voicing and stance of the translator, and in the relevance to the receiving audience. These latter features are affected by the place of enunciation of the translator: indeed they are part of what we mean by the ‘place’ of enunciation, for that ‘place’ is an ideological positioning as well as a geographical or temporal one. These aspects of translation are motivated and determined by the translator’s cultural and ideological affiliations as much as or even more than by the temporal and spatial location that the translator speaks from. (2003:183)
She means that even the spatio-temporal positioning of the translator is considered by his cultural and ideological affiliations. So translation is a culturally and politically mediated act.

In his epoch making work, *Translation, History and Culture* (1992a), Lefevere examines the concrete factors that systematically govern the reception, acceptance or rejection of literary texts: issues like power, ideology, culture and mediation. Power is manifest in the rewriting of texts and its consumption by the readers. The motivation for rewriting can be ideological or poetological. Lefevere recognizes translation as a form of rewriting:

… the most obviously recognizable type of rewriting and it is potentially the most influential because it is able to project the image of an author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin. (1995: 9)

Lefevere describes the literary systems in which translation functions as an act controlled by three factors. The first is the professionals within the literary system. They include the critics, translators, reviewers and teachers who decide on the poetics and the ideology of the translated text. The second factor is the patronage outside the literary system. These are the persons, institutions or powers that can further or hinder the reading, writing and rewriting of literary texts. The last factor is the dominant poetics that aesthetically condition the period in which translation takes place.
Lefevere identifies three elements of this patronage. The first is the ideological component: this constrains the choice of subject and the form of its presentation. This definition of ideology is not confined to the political. It is generally the idea of form, conviction and belief which conditions one’s actions. Patronage is always ideologically conditioned. The second is the economic component: this concerns the payment of writers and rewriters. Since publishing is an industry it also concerns the marketing strategies of publications. The third is the status component: it explains the status of translation as well as the translator (1995:15). The ideological component dominates the other two. Thus, there is crucial interaction between poetics, ideology and translation. It can be seen that at every level of translation process, if linguistic principles are in conflict with ideological/ poetological views, the latter tend to win. Lefevere considers the ideological affiliations the most important one. Here ideology refers to the translator’s ideology or the ideology imposed on him by patronage.

Translation is a transformative assimilation of culture where two conglomerates of culture are held in tension, each reworked in the light of the other and further refracted by a range of other forces. Usually in this interactive and mutual appropriation process, the host culture has the advantage of the last word. But the source text is equally working on the host language and culture, drawing out possibilities in the latter that would otherwise be unrealized. Therefore, any translation of a particular text must be evaluated in the context of cultural politics.
The process of original composition and translation seem to have no essential difference. Any literary work is an experience; the writer tries to recreate the art experience in the reader. The sensibility of the reader helps him to reconstruct the art experience. So the writer and the reader share the same art experience, the intensity of the experience may vary. The translator is a diligent reader; he is a critic, a judge or an arbiter of the original work. He tries to recreate the experience he had in another reader through the medium of a new language. The only difference between the original work and the translation is in the motive of the creation. The reason for the original composition is intuitive and the reason for the translation is imitative.

An analysis of the theories postulated by contemporary scholars and translators makes it clear that the ideas and concepts of translation undergo a gradual but constant evolution. The function and the role of the translator are radically changed and repeatedly redefined. Translation has reduced the distance between cultures. There is a general agreement that translation is as conscious and spontaneous as the original composition. Any literary work, irrespective of time and language, reflects the culture from which it has emerged. The function of the translation and the characteristics of the translated text must be perceived from this angle.