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CHAPTER V

Theories of Translation in the East and the West

To translate is to put an original text (source text) roughly through a process of decoding and find out an equivalent of it in the target language through the process of recoding. Translation is both an easy and difficult task. It is easy because a ready text is available to work upon. It is at the same time very complex in nature because it is not just limited to a simple exercise of reproducing the source text into the target language. It is an amalgamation of various factors like social, cultural, semiotic, linguistic, psychological and political that determines the indeterminacy of the text. Abstract though it may seem, the aporia of non-translatability has resulted into rethinking the art of translation.

'To be, or not to be; that is the question' Hamlet's dilemma introduces the fundamental uncertainty that characterizes the translation procedure as a whole. Theories of translation have buttressed the actual translation activity since time immemorial. It is the skeletal system that gives the product its final shape. There is a need for a close relationship between the theory and the practice of translation. McGuire corroborates this universal principle by citing one brilliant example. She observes:

The translator who makes no attempt to understand the how behind the translation process is like the driver of Rolls who has no idea what makes the car
move. Likewise, the mechanic who spends a lifetime taking engines apart but never goes out for a drive in the country is a fitting image for the dry academician who examines the how at the expense of what is. (77)

Thus, in order to approach the question of the translation of literary works a close analysis of contemporary translation theories (in the West as well as in India) becomes imperative.

The concept of Translation was subsumed into the corpus of theory as early as with the publication of Cicero and Horace's statements on translation. Translation has been variously defined by eminent scholars like Theodore Savory who terms it as an 'art', Eric Jacobsen as 'craft', and Eugene Nida as a 'science'. None of these terms are adequate enough to define translation. In reality, it is something more than these art, craft and science. B. K. Das points out 'It is a process of analysis, interpretation and creation which leads to a replacement of one set of linguistic resources and values for another. In the process art of the original meaning is lost but an easily identifiable core is 'kept'. " (2) The elusive nature of translation makes it difficult to define it in terms of literary and non-literary textual material.

According to J.C.Catford's opinion: "Translation is an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another" Clearly, then, any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language – a general linguistic theory". (qtd. in Das, 70).
Thus, Translation theory is of pivotal importance to anyone interpreting literature. When we trace the literary history, we find that it is characterised by the proliferation of literary theories and over the years translation theory has become increasingly relevant to all.

The field of Translation Study against the multilingual backdrop and shrinking spaces and disappearing boundaries explores the process by which texts are transferred from one culture to another as translation has proven to be a major factor for the development of culture all over the world. In the present age-culture has become “hybridized”: The world is shrinking, bridging the vast distances and slowly but steadily we are giving into globalisation. The cultural barrier is gradually breaking down. With the rapid development in India and other parts of the world, the European focus is completely lost. We are not governed by Western ideologies. Throwing an open challenge to the imperialistic view, new approaches such as Translation studies have been branching out in multiple ways. The field of Translation Studies has morphed from its nascent stage in to a widely acclaimed field of research and study. Therefore, in these changing circumstances, we need not look at it through Western prism. In the modern context, translation is viewed as a creative restructuring of the original with relation to the socio-cultural matrix of the text. R. Parthasarathy rightly points out that “it is an attempt to give voice to the voiceless languages of the world” (169). It is both necessary and useful in bringing different literatures of the world together despite linguistic and cultural differences. We are aware of the fact that for every word in any one language there is not another word accurately equivalent in the same
language, let alone in other language. The question that is uppermost in our minds is what should be the role of a translator then? Moreover, how do we define contemporary translation theory?

Viewed against the literary backdrop, modern translation theory like modern critical theory began with the advent of structuralism and has remarkably proliferated in the recent years. B. K. Das aptly points out that in the last four decades of the twentieth century, modern translation theory "has developed from the linguistic approach of the nineteen sixties through the textual focus of the seventies to the culturally based approach of the eighties and after" (166). Needless to say, that the history of translation theory until Roman Jakobson can be considered as an extension of the same formal versus free theoretical distinction, i.e. either translation could be based upon the form of the original writing or take absolute liberty with the form of the original to appear creative. George Steiner remarks, "Identical theses, familiar moves and refutations in debate recur, nearly without exception, from Cicero and Quintilian to the present day" (239). Tejaswini Niranjana seems to echo Steiner's observation when she asserts:

Western Writings on translation go back at least to the beginning of Judeo-Christian time. There never seems, however, to have been much of an attempt to formulate a discipline or an institutional apparatus to regulate translators. Only in the present century (i.e. the twentieth century – coinciding with but largely unmarked) by,
the rise of post-structuralism in literary studies – have there been efforts to give an institutional character to translation through the publication of journals devoted to translations and the formation of professional organisations. (49-50).

Edwin Gentzler formulates five different approaches to translation starting with mid-sixties till date:

(1) the American translation workshop; (2) the ‘science’ of translation; (3) early Translation Studies (4) Poly system theory and Translation Studies; and (5) Deconstruction. When we closely scrutinize and analyse the development of translation theories and studies in order to foresee the future direction, we find that the difference between the original and translated text has been altered. The establishment of ‘Translation Workshop in U.S.A. in 1964’ by Paul Engle at the University of Iowa gave academic credit to literary translations. In recent years we find the rejection of the power hierarchy, which privileged the Source Text over the translated text.

A closer analysis of the trend in the last three decades reveals a steady increase in translation activity. The first issue of Modern poetry in Translation ed. By Ted Hughes and Daniel Weissbort was published in 1965. It provided literary translators a place for their innovative work. With the introduction of translation courses and establishment of translation workshops, the process of acceptance of
translation studies as a discipline got accelerated in the seventies. Paul Engle sealed the urgency of translation in the following words: ‘Translate or Die’ (2).

I.A. Richards was the quintessential theorist who put forward the ‘practice-oriented workshop’ approach to translation in his book *Practical Criticism*. His aim was to establish new “educational techniques” that would lead to “perfect understanding” of the text (TL) and result in a unified and correct response (SL). He made a remarkable contribution in the field of translation theory. He refined his theory of meaning and briefly discussed how one should compare translations to original texts.

He put forward his theory of translation in a paper titled *Towards a Theory of Translating*. He suggested that “the translator should not only be aware that a sign (i) indicates something; but that it also (ii) characterizes (says the same thing or something new about things); (iii) realizes (presents with varying degrees of vividness); (iv) values; (v) influences (desires change); (vi) connects; and (vii) purposes (attempts to persuade)” (252-3)

After a few years, Quine published his paper titled *Word and Object*. He aimed to use translation to demonstrate the innate complexity and dearth of determined meanings in language. In the preface of the book, he stated, “Language is a social art. In acquiring it we have to depend entirely on inter-subjectively available cues as to what to say and when. Hence there is no justification for collating linguistic meanings” (9). In the chapter *Translation and*
"Meaning" he highlights the nature of language which governs the process of translation. According to him:

"Manuals for translating one language into another can be set up in divergent ways, all compatible with the totality of speech dispositions, yet incompatible with one another" (27)

Richards too supports this view when he emphatically says: "Translation theory has not only to work for better mutual comprehension between users of diverse tongues; more central still in its purposing is a more complete viewing of itself and of the comprehending which it should serve". (261)

Richards, however, fashioned his model for the translator aiming at "proper" translation. He firmly believed that the translator could easily develop his own set of rules to solve a communication problem. With proper education and practice, he can arrive at 'perfect understanding' and successfully 'reformulate' that particular message of the primary text (source text).

Ezra Pound's approach is quite different from Richard's theory of proper translation. He focuses chiefly on the diction, rhythm and word order. Ezra Pound's theory of translation underlines the precise use of words. In his essay How to Read Pound outlines the way 'language is charged or energized'. The three important ways are 'melopoeia (the musical property), 'phanopoeia (the visual
property) and logopoeia' (a complex property) which incorporates both the 'direct meaning' and the 'play of the word in the context.

For Pound words on the page did not appear as simply black and white typed marks representing something else, but as words sculpted in stone. Such an approach made translator an artist, an engraver who moulds words and recreates engraved images.

He also suggested that one needs to return to the present and make an attempt to create new relations, derived from the old, which reveal the logic of the other. Thus, his theory of translation involves being both inside a tradition and outside any institutionalized logic. He advises translators to allow themselves to be subjected by the mood, atmosphere and thought processes of the (SL) text in time. The mood and sensibility in time and place of the SL text is to be carried to the present culture for the translation to become a contemporary text in the TL.

Frederic Will, in his book *The Knife in the Stone* expressed that activity of actual translation has less to do with the meaning of the text and more with the energy of expression, how meaning was expressed in language. His ideas seem to reflect a kind of Poundian Theory. He strikes at the root of the traditional notion of translation as "carrying over". The phrase is too restrictive and has inadvertently made translation to fall into categories of "faulty equivalences" and of "versions" of the original. He writes:
"Translation is par excellence the process by which the thrust behind the verbal works of man...can be directly transferred, carried on, allowed to continue...Works of literature are highly organized instances of such thrust...these blocks force themselves on, through time, from culture to culture" (155).

Thus, translation is not viewed as a "carrying over" of content, but as a "carrying on" of the content in language. Language emerges as the main factor that shapes the course and ultimate goal of translation. In the introduction to Selected Translations, W.S. Merwin writes:

But if we take a single word of any language and try to find an exact equivalent in another – we have to admit it cannot be done. A single primary denotation may be shared; but the constellation of secondary meanings; the movement of rings of associations, the etymological echoes, the sound and its own levels of association, do not have an equivalent because they cannot... Yet if we continue, we reach a point where some sequence of the first language conveys a dynamic unit, a rudiment of form. Some energy of the first language begins to be manifest, not only in single words but in the charge of their relationship (1979: 8).

Theory of translation up to the sixties underlines that "in the process of translation that which manifests itself is less what the language says and more
what it does, i.e. words take on an energy in their contextual, intertextual life". (Gentzler, 40)

Seminal works such as Eugene Nida's *Message and Mission and Towards a Science of Translating*, Noam Chomsky's *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* may be considered as the culmination of translation theories in the sixties. Nida is one of the most significant theorists and his translation methodology is both scientifically and practically viable. Nida outlines his methodology as follows:-

(1) to reduce the source text to its structurally simplest and most semantically evident kernels, (2) to transfer the meaning from source language to receptor language on a structurally simple level, and (3) to generate the stylistically and semantically equivalent expression in the receptor language. (68)

For him, translating is reproducing in the target language the closest natural equivalent of the content of the source language first in terms of meaning and second in terms of style. The central thesis of Catford's theory of translation is that it is neither transference of meaning nor a Transcoding of meaning but a substitution of meaning. Catford maintained that SL text is translatable to a great degree though not absolutely. Untranslatability features only when it becomes impossible to construct functionally relevant features of the substitution into the contextual meaning of the TL text. Catford puts forward basically two types of untranslatability i.e. linguistic and cultural. Nida's theory as well as Catford's theory provide a scientific basis to translation studies.
J.L. Austin's William James lectures for 1955 under the title *How to Do Things With Words* gave rise to a Speech Act Theory of Translation. According to this model, the translator is viewed both as an Addressor and an Addressee. R.D. Doctor expounds the theory in the following way:

The situation of the Translator is somewhat akin since the Translator is simultaneously Addressor and Addressee as the figure reveals:

```
Adressor1A  Addrtessee  Addressor1B  Addrtessee2
Author / Text  →  Translator as Reader  ↔  Translator as Translator  →  Reader of
Target-Text.
```

The translator is an Addressee in so far as the Source Text is concerned and an Addressor from the point of view of the Target-Text and its Reader/Addressee (qtd. in Das, 1988).

Some of the important translation theorists in the post 1970 period include Homes, Popovic, Lefevere, Toury, Derrida, Sussan Bassnett, Jose Lambert. They have imparted a new dimension to translation studies. Andre Lefevere in his book, *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blue Print*, points out: "Particular emphasis must be given to the fact that the translator has to replace all the variations contained in the source text by their equivalences" (99).
After the brief summation of the major translation theories, I wish to make a critical estimate of contemporary translation theories namely, Polysystem Theory, Feminists Translation Theory, Deconstructive Translation Theory and Cannibalistic Translation Theory.

In 1970s Evan Zohar and Guideon Toury propounded the Polysystem Theory. The term “Polysystem” is a global term that incorporates all of the literary systems, major as well as minor in a given culture. Toury pushes the concept of a theory of translation beyond the parameters of a model confined to faithfulness to the original, or a single (age-old) relationships between the source and target texts. Evan Zohar, the leader from Tel Aviv vehemently questioned the ‘validity of the superiority’ bestowed on the original over the translation. He writes:

How many times have we been tortured by the clichés of the uninitiated, veteran or novice, the translation is never equal to the original, that languages differ from one another, that culture is ‘also’ involved with translation procedures, than when a translation is ‘exact’ it tends to be ‘literal’ and hence loses the ‘spirit’ of the original, that ‘meaning’ of a text means both ‘content’ and ‘style’ and so on. (Poetics Today, 2:4:1-7)

Itamar Evan Zohar introduced the term ‘polysystem’ for the aggregate of literary systems. It encompasses a wide spectrum, including everything from ‘high’ or ‘canonized’ forms such as poetry to ‘low’ or ‘non-canonized’ forms (children’s
literature, popular fiction) etc. in a given culture. With the help of polysystem theory, Zohar makes an attempt to explain the function of all kinds of literary work within a society. It identifies three cases which expedites translation activity. First, the initial stages of development of a literature, secondly, when a literature becomes weak or 'peripheral', and thirdly, when there is crisis or literary 'void' in a literature.

Evan-Gentzler observes:

Translation Studies disciples, like several translation theorists before them tended to look at one-to-one relationships and functional notions of equivalence; they believed in the subjective ability of the translator to derive an equivalent text that in turn influenced the literary and cultural conventions in a particular society. Polysystem theorist presumes the opposite: that the social norms and literary conventions in the receiving culture ('target' system) govern the aesthetic presuppositions of the translator and thus influence ensuing translation decisions. (107).

Evan-Zohar and Toury's Poly System Theory has enabled Translation Studies to break down age-old conceptual barriers and discover a method for better defining translations. Poly System Theory can be truly treated as a logical extension of the demands made by early theorists. They have expanded the parameters of the framework and appear to transcend "legitimate" linguistic literary borders as intended by the likes Lefevere, Holmes and Broeck. In the introduction
to Translation Theory and Intercultural Relations, the editors Even-Zohar and Toury write:

Having once adopted a functional (istic) approach, whereby the object is theory dependent, modern translation theory cannot escape transcending “borders”. Just as the linguistic “borders” have been transcended, so must the literary ones be transcended. For there are occurrences of translational nature which call for a semiotics of culture. (Even-Zohar and Toury, 1981:X)

Evan-Zohar suggests that when translated literature commands a ‘primary position’, the borders between translated texts (TT) and source text (ST) ‘diffuse’ and the process of defining translation becomes much liberalized. The borders then expand to include ‘versions’, ‘imitations’ and ‘adaptations’. If translation activity is guided by a given situation and prime objective becomes to introduce new work in the target culture, translated texts naturally incline towards recreating the source texts forms and textual relations. Again, if the form of the source text is too native or alien, then surely it becomes difficult for the literary system of the target culture to accept and identify with the translated text. The situation is reversed and translation tends to be a ‘secondary activity’ within a given polysystem when a translator makes an attempt to find ‘ready-made’ models for translation result in translations that confirm to ‘pre-established aesthetic norms’ in the target culture at the cost of the texts “original form”. Thus, a translator should be driven by literary and cultural interests of their own, a desire (their work) to be accepted within another culture. According to Evan-Zohar relationship between
translated texts and the literary polysystem cannot be categorized as either primary or secondary, but as variable, depending upon the specific circumstance operating within the literary system.

Toury further expands the boundaries of even that which early Translation Studies has already heralded. In opposition to another source text governed theory, Toury claims a Target Text theory for translation, focusing chiefly on the actual relationships constructed between the source text and its "factual replacement." Toury distinguishes between three kinds of translation norms:

1. Preliminary norms (involves factors which govern the choice of the work).

2. Initial norms (categorizes the individual translation's choice, whether to subject one self either to the original text with its norms, or the target culture's linguistic—literary norms, or a combination of both).

3. Operational norms (actual decisions made during the translation process).

The above mentioned norms encompass various priorities that subconsciously influence the translators decision process.

Susan Bassnett has pointed out the contribution of Evan-Zohar to translation studies in the following words:
The way in which translation studies began to mount an offensive against the dominance of the original and the consequent relegation of translation to a position of subservience was initially through the work of Evan-Zohar and his colleagues, most notably Gideon Toury, on Polysystem theory. (Comparative Literature, 141).

Zohar suggests that high translation activity takes place when a literature is in its embryonic stage of development or when a literature perceives itself to be marginal. Moreover, the translation activity gains momentum when there are crises or turning points in a culture. We all are aware of the fact that translation theories have always dependent upon some sort of equivalence like linguistic, structural or dynamic between the original and translation. The Poly system theorists have deviated from this position 'by treating translation in the terms of actual product rather than an ideal faithful version of the original.

Thus, Evan-Zohar and Guideon Toury have treated translation in terms of actual product rather than an ideal faithful rendition of the original. Deconstructionists go a step ahead and claim that the 'Original' is also a work of translation of thoughts and ideas. There is no remarkable difference between the original and the translation.

According to Derrida, "... the writer writes in a language and in a language whose proper system, laws and life his discourse by definition cannot dominate absolutely. He uses them only by
letting himself after a fashion and upto a point, be governed by the system. And reading must always aim at a certain relationship unperceived by the Writer, between what he commands and what he does not command of the patterns of the language he uses..." (qtd. in Das; 4).

This proves that the text has some patterns of language that has not been faithfully followed by the author himself. The function of deconstruction is to reiterate that we do not think in a vacuum. Any work of art is an extension of our thoughts, a translation of our thoughts. In a way, the 'original' is also a kind of 'translation'. Refuting Robert Frost's take on translation that 'Poetry is what is lost in translation', the Deconstructionist assert that 'Poetry is lost in the very act of creation'.

Edwin Gentzler has succinctly delivered Deconstructionist view of translation in the following passage:

The subject of translation theory has traditionally involved some concept of determinable meaning that can be transferred to another system of signification. Deconstruction questions such a definition of translation and uses the practice of translation to demonstrate the instability of its own theoretical framework. Deconstruction resists systems of categorization which separate "source" text from "target" text or "language" from "meaning".
denies the existence of underlying forms independent of language, and questions theoretical assumptions which presume originary beings, in whatever shape or form. In translation, what is visible is language referring not to things, but to language itself. Thus the chain of signification is one of infinite regress – the translated text becomes a translation of another earlier translation and translated words, although viewed by deconstructionists as "material" signifiers, represent nothing but other words representing nothing but still other words representing (147).

When we analyse any translation theory, it invariably demands some determinable meaning which must be reconstructed/reassembled in another language (target language). Deconstructionists question the very separation of language from an 'identifiable meaning' and thus become a starting point to re-examine translation theory in general. Referring to the Tower of Babel Derrida even treats God as a deconstructionist, "for He interrupts the construction of the Tower of Babel". In this act, God interrupts himself and thereby produces "disschemination" (detouring from a chemin-path). Addressing the tribe of Shems, Derrida argues that God is saying, "You will not impose your meaning or your tongue, and I, God therefore oblige you to submit to the plurality of languages which you will never get out off." (Gentzler: 164)
Thus, according to Derrida the task of the translator is to ensure the survival of language and, by extension the survival of life. And translation puts us in contact with the ‘plurality of languages’ rather than with some sort of original meaning. Derrida further posits that translation behaves like a "child" which is not just a "product" subject to the law of "reproduction", but has, in addition, “the power of speech on its own" in a new and different fashion, supplementing language, sounding the “Babelian note” (Gentzler :166).

Derrida’s translation “theory” is neither prescriptive nor aims to propose a better model of transporting. On the contrary, it merely suggests that one must think less in terms of initiating or reproducing and more in terms of how languages relate to each other. Thus, translation activity must ensure the rebirth, the regeneration, the emergence and “the holy growth” (Babelian aspect) of languages in the global world.

Polysystem theory and Deconstructionist theory are closely followed by two new theories, namely, The Feminist theory and The Cannibalistic theory in the post-deconstruction world. These two approaches – one by Feminist Canadian translation theorists and another by Brazilian translation theorists are likely to gain ground in the 21st century due to acceptability. Feminist approach to translation studies in Canada chiefly criticise the fidelity theory. The cynical observation ‘les belles infideles’ or “Translation is like a woman who if beautiful, cannot be faithful” was questioned by Feminist Translation Theorists, led by Lori Chamberlain. While referring to the sexualization of the translation terminology, Chamberlain opines that:
... perhaps most familiarly in the tag 'les belles infideles' like women, the adage goes, translations should be either beautiful or faithful. The tag is made possible both by the rhyme in French and by the fact that the word 'traduction' is a feminine one, thus making 'les beaux infideles' impossible. This tag owes its longevity — it was coined in the seventeenth century — to more than phonetic similarity; what gives it the appearance of truth is that it has captured a cultural complicity between the issues of fidelity in translation and in marriage. For 'les belles infideles', fidelity is defined as an implicit contrast between translation (as woman) and original (as husband, father, or author).

However, the infamous 'double standard' operates here as it might have in traditional marriage: the 'unfaithful' wife/translation is publicly tried for crimes the husband/original is by law incapable of committing. This contract, in short, makes it impossible for the original to be guilty of infidelity. Such an attitude betrays real anxiety about the problem of paternity and translation; it mimics the patrilineal kinship system where paternity — not maternity — legitimizes an offspring (Venuti, Rethinking Translation, 57-74).

Lori Chamberlain draws our attention to 'Cultural Complicity' between fidelity in translation and in marriage. Her views were vehemently supported by notable
translation theorists like Susan Bassnett, Barbara Johnson, Barbara Godard, Sherry Simon and Annie Brisset, who used 'metaphors of infidelity' in the 1980s.

In Canada, the translation is viewed from a feminine perspective. In the book Theorizing Feminist Discourse / Translation Barbara Godard has raised theoretical questions about the nature of language, women's discourse and feminist translation. Gentzler points out that, 'the complicated question of Canadian identity problems of colonialism, bilingualism, nationalism, cultural heritage, weak literary system, and gender issues are involved – seems to provide a useful platform from which to begin raising questions about current translation theory'. (184)

In the mid-1980s, the Canadian translation theorists restructured it (prevalent translation theories) on Helene Cixous 'notion of 'in-betweenness' as 'feminine' writing takes place 'in between two poles of male and female'. The concept is made clear by Nicole Ward Jouve in the following extract:

The translator is a being in-between. Like words in translation, s/he endlessly drifts between meanings. S/he tries to be the go-between, to cunningly suggest what readings there could be in the foreign language other than those the chosen translation makes available – you are led to reflect on how particular translations become constructed. What gets lost, what is
gained, what and how altered, in the passage from one
language to the next. (47)

If the binary notion of translation in the past presumed original and
translated texts as two poles, interpreted as masculine and feminine respectively,
the feminist translation theory by stressing on the notion of in-betweenness,
'reconstructs the space in which the translation takes place as bi-sexual,
belonging neither to one or to the other'.

The French-Canadian theorists and other women are well aware that a
common bond exists between feminist theory and translation theory. Edwin
Gentzler has emphasized this in the following words:

As women's discourse has been repressed by more dominant
forms in western culture, so too have some approaches to
translation theory been subsumed by more dominant forms of
literary theory. The theoretical insights gained by the feminist
contributors should prove not only valuable in terms of gaining
insight into the nature of language, but also in terms of
Translation Studies struggle to gain acceptance within the larger
institution of comparative literature and literary theory' (198).
Feminist theorists advocated for the re-creation of the original in the work of the translation. Hence, translation is viewed as re-creation. Translation is subjected not only to two semiotic systems (source language and target language) but to two different cultures. Translators therefore, not only say what the author says, in another language (target-language) but they also say what the original means. In other words, translators re-create the original in the target language.

The Canadian Feminist Group comes very close to the Brazilian translation theorists as both aim towards celebrating the role of translator. Susan Bassnett judiciously sums up the achievement of the Brazilian and the Canadian groups of translation theorists in the following passage:

The Brazilian and the Canadian groups of translation theorists have in common the aim of celebrating the role of the translator, of making the translator visible in an act of transgression that seeks to reconstruct the old patriarchal / European hierarchies. Translation seen in their terms is indeed a political activity, and one of the utmost importance. Haraldo and Augusto de Campos use translation as a way of affirming their right as Brazilians to reread and repossess canonical European literature, while the Canadian women see translation as fundamental to their existence as bilinguals and as feminists struggling against phallo / logo-centric values. Both groups are concerned to find a translation practice and terminology that will
convey the rupture with the dominance of the European heritage even as it is transmitted. In their different ways, one group with the metaphoric language of blood and death, the other with a series of metaphors deriving from the notion of the "mother-tongue" are proposing a post-colonial notion of translation, which contests the old imperialist view. (157-8).

Brazilian translation theorists such as de Campos brothers (Haroldo and Augusto de Campos) view translation as a form of 'transgression' – a kind of post – modern and non-Eurocentric approach to translation. Brazilian translators have introduced a new metaphor – the image of the translator as a 'cannibal'. The metaphor is based on a revised notion of what Cannibalism signifies, considered from a different perspective. In the words of Edwin Gentzler,

This term is not to be understood as another form of possessing the original, but as a liberating form, one which eats, digests and frees oneself from the original. Cannibalism – it is to be understood not in the Western sense, i.e. that of capturing, dismembering, mutilating and devouring, but in a sense which shows respect i.e. a symbolic act of taking back out of love, of absorbing the virtues of a body through a transfusion of blood. Translation is seen as an empowering act, a nourishing act, and an act of affirmative play that is very close to the Benjamin /
Derrida position, which sees translation as a life force that ensures a literary text's survival. (192).

The cannibalistic notion of translation involves a changed idea of the value of the original text in relation to its reception in the target culture. The traditional nineteenth-century notion was based on the idea of a master-servant relationship paralleled in the translation process—either the translator takes over the source text and 'improves' and 'civilizes' it (Fitzgerald) or the translator approaches it with humility and seeks to do it homage (Rossetti). The cannibalistic theory of translation rejects both and offers a different view, one that is linked to the view of translation propounded by Jacques Derrida, when he argues that the translation process creates an 'original' text, the opposite of the traditional position whereby the 'original' is the starting point.

The de Campos brothers chiefly aim towards erasing the boundary between the source text and target text. Bassnett points out that "the images of translation as cannibalism, and vampirism whereby the translator sucks out the blood of the source text to strengthen the target text, as transfusion of blood that endows the receiver with new life, can all be seen as radical metaphors that spring from post-modernist translation theory". (155) This echoes with the Poly system theory and Deconstructionist theory of the rejection of the power hierarchy. The new approach does not privilege the original over the translated text and force the translator to take a secondary place. By avoiding traditional notions of faithful / free, Bassnett argues, the de Campos brothers' theory of
translation not only does away with a sense of loss, but also participates in a positive act of affirmation, of pleasure, and of joy. It is essentially inspired by love and reverence for a foreign culture. Else Viera posits the importance and relevance of cannibalistic theory in the following way:

The cannibalistic translational philosophy of nourishing from two reservoirs, the source text, and the target literature, and to the same extent, the reverse reading of translation operated by Benjamin and Derrida exposes a number of epistemological questions that traditional traductology is unfit to answer. Or, using Benjamin’s terms, traditional traductology demands a translation, a revision...if, in the cannibalist, philosophy, translation becomes a two-way flow, the very terminology ‘source’ and ‘target’ becomes depleted. By the same token, the power relation between source and target, superior/inferior ceases to exist. (qtd. in Das, 131)

In the light of new developments, a reassessment of definitions and erasure of boundaries have become the prime concern of the theorists. As a result, the translator is situated between two languages and two cultures.
The process may be outlined as follows:

\[\text{Language1} \quad \overrightleftarrows \quad \text{Translator} \quad \overrightarrow{\downarrow} \quad \text{Language3/Metalanguage} \]

\text{(Restructuring)}

The translator draws from both source language (language 1) and Target language (language2) and in his mind the two blend. When languages meet, a third language (meta language) better known as literature three comes into existence. Whether one translates or transcreates, the source text is renewed by being reincarnated into another language. This has been stated by George Steiner in relation to the translation of poetry, but this should be the ultimate goal of all translation: ‘At its best, the peculiar synthesis of conflict and complicity between a poem and its translation into another poem creates the impression of a “third language” of a medium of communicative energy which somehow reconciles both languages in a tongue deeper, more comprehensive than either’. (29)

I would like to further elucidate by quoting a few lines from John Donne’s immortal work ‘The Flea’:
Mee it suck'd first, and now sucks thee,
And in this flea, our two bloods mingled bee;

... I take a step forward and explain the same from a different perspective. Keeping in mind intercultural transfer in its linguistic, historical and socio-political aspect, a translator should draw nourishment from the source language and the target language to enrich the translated work, the literature three, therefore belonging neither to one nor to the other. It becomes an act of 'in between-ness'.

Thus,

Finds't not thy selfe, nor mee the weaker now;
'Tis true, then learne how false, feares bee;

By this crossover between the two linguistically and socio-politically drawn territories (Source Language - Target Language) we enrich the translated text and it 'temple' is. Translation then becomes a medium of both unilateral and bilateral communication between two languages.

A translator by instinct is a bilingual if not a polyglot. The entire process of translation becomes a symbolic act of taking back out or love from both the source language and target language and enriching the literature three. By doing so, it neither causes harm to the source language nor to the target language. It is the empowering act. Translation work depends on the flesh and blood of a given SL, but develops like an independent muscle of language (TL) through discipline.
and new developments. However, this should not be confused with mixture' or 'fusion'. It is the process of interweaving two semantically and semiotically different languages into a new fabric, a new pattern retaining individual identity, culture and history.

The main aim is to enable the translated text to read as if it had been written by the author directly in the new language. Alexis Nouss asserts in *Translation and Metissage*... “Rather than “translated from” or “translated into” it would be better to speak of “translated between” (147). It moves between two languages and two cultures, playing on the 'uncertainty or indeterminacy' of meaning both in Source Language and Target Language and becomes a kind of transformation of the original.

The demarcation line between Target Language and Source Language is gradually dissipating and the gap has been bridged in recent years. When translation succeeds in bridge-building languages, it reads like an original work. In the process it has become an indispensable tool for comparative literature.

In the west, we observe that modern translation theory has become gradually more liberal, systematic and self-conscious. It has evolved a long way since its structuralists beginnings. We are now standing on the threshold of a pulsating new phase; where we find ourselves open to alternative ways of ‘intra and intercultural communication’.

The Indian literary tradition is replete with renderings of Sanskrit texts, into regional languages or ‘Bhasha languages’ (G.N.Devy’s term). The procedure never called for explicit codification of rules, theories or maxims. These renderings were never termed as ‘translated works’ rather it always enjoyed the
status of ‘New Writings’. In India, we have some equivalent words for ‘translation’, like ‘Rupantar’ which means ‘change in form’, ‘Bhasantar’ means in another language (comes very close to the word translation) or "anuvad" means ‘following after’. Thus, for Indians then translation is ‘after life’ or a ‘new life’. None of the above mentioned equivalents demands fidelity to the original.

R.S. Pathak has brilliantly outlined the status of translation in India in the following words:

There was almost no tradition of translation in ancient India in its modern sense except for ‘bhashya’ and “Teeka” which can be considered translation in its very loose sense. But both of them were practiced in the same language. Barring a brief affair with translation through Burzoe’s translation of Panchtantra in Pahalvi language in the sixth century and then by Abdullah Ibnal Mofka in Arabic there were not many translations from non-Indian to Indian languages. The poets of the Bhakti period in India were translators in a different and loose sense, as they strove to translate ancient Indian knowledge and wisdom manifested in different treatises through Sanskrit by appropriating it in various Indian bhashas. In the second half of the seventeenth century Dara Shikoh’s translations of the Upanishads from Sanskrit into Persian deserve particular mention here. But the real impetus to translation activities was
given in the British colonial period, though most of them were not free from colonial/political considerations. Excepting translation of some ancient Indian classics and treatises into Western languages most of the translations were into Indian languages and works selected for translations from the Western (English) to Indian languages were such as would serve their (colonizer's) purposes. If translations of Khayyam's Rubaiyats and even some of the Indian literary classics were attempted to exoticize the Orient to the West, then the translations by William Carey and company were motivated more by religious expansionist intentions than by 'catholicity' of Christianity. Translations from English to Indian languages in the subsequent years crushed and 'complexed' Indian creative sensibility, though there is no denying the fact that they helped in introducing some new literary trends and movements in Indian literatures. (V-VI)

In the pre-colonial days we find that Sanskrit texts used to be rendered into various Bhasha languages and as a result we have numerous versions of the Ramayana and the Mahabharata in different regional languages of India. These renderings can be categorized as 'free translation' and were never tested on the ground of 'fidelity' or 'originality'. The translated works were treated as 'original'. When we trace the history of Indian linguistic tradition the first thing that strikes us the most is that our literary study has flourished in a multi-lingual context. And India has a tradition of linguistics that is a combination of both
material view and a transcendental view of language. Bhartrhari's exposition of
the 'sphota theory' may serve as a starting point for constructing a theory of
translation. Bhartrhari's contention is what Derrida claims – the wholeness of the
preverbal state which precedes both speech and writing. Mohit K.Ray points out
that "Derrida uses the technical term "sign" to refer to the whole, and this is
Bhartrhari's sphota. And what is "signified" for Derrida is artha for Bhartrhari. For
both Derrida and Bhartrhari the linguistic whole – the sign or sphota – has an
inherent force of differentiation that produces the double manifestation of inner
meaning (signified/artha) and spoken sound (signifier/dhvani)." (67)

Thus, we already inherit (as a literary heritage) the traits of contemporary
Western theories, an indigenous theory of our own. We may owe a lot to the
West for the industrial growth, but do we have to look up to them for literary
growth also? Do we become less authentic if we follow our own literary tradition?
In the global world, the hard and software of intelligence demands a reversal of
the roles – the original text and the translated text, where translated text
essentially serves as the starting point and also ensures the survival of the
original. Comparing the Indian tradition of translation with the West, Sujit
Mukherjee writes:

If we were to start now, the consciously secular outlook we have
adopted as national policy would persuade us to choose not a
religious text but a body of literary works to translate over and
over again into all our languages, and derive the kind of benefit
which translating the Bible has given to its translators and scholars. Something of this nature did happen around 1961 as part of the centenary celebrations of the birth of Rabindranath Tagore, when more of his writings got translated into more Indian languages than ever before. The Rabindranath canon is large enough for several generations to remain engaged in the task if it is ever to be completed (81)

In this connection, I would like to cite one example from Rabindranath Tagore’s Gitanjali:

Tomar sonar thalaye sajabo aaj  
dukher asrudhar.

Janani go, ganthbo tomar  
golar muktohar.

Chandrasurjo payer kache  
mala hoe jodiya ache,

Tomar buke shobha pabe amar  
dukher alankar.

Dhan, Dhanya tomari dhan,  
Ki korbe ta kao.

Dite chao to diyo amaye,  
Nite chao to lao,

Dukho amar ghorer jinis,
Khanti ratan tui to chinis –

Tor Prasad diye tare kinis,

Emore ahonkar.

The English version of it goes like this:

Mother, I shall weave a chain of pearls for thy neck
with my tears of sorrow.
The stars have wrought their anklets of light to
deck thy feet, but mine will hang upon thy breast.

Wealth and fame come from thee and it is for thee
to give or to withhold them. But, this my sorrow is
absolutely mine own, and when I bring it to thee as
my offering thou rewardest me with the grace.

(Gitanjali, LXXXIII)

He has done away with the words like 'Sonar thalaye,' 'Chandra,' 'Surya,' 'Shobha,' 'Dukher Alaankar' etc. Throughout he has replaced and recreated new imageries in his poems. The basis of the poem that results is musical, decorative and ideal: ideal in the sense, of the word's connection with idea: "ideal" as opposed to "real" in the receptive language. The translated work draws images, expression, rhythm and beauty from the west. The East merges with the West for Rabindranath Tagore's aim was not to merely translate but to idealise the real, to decorate, it with appropriate verbal beauties. The vehicles of words carry the
feelings to the readers. Rabindranath Tagore once commented that translation is like an itch on the back, when someone else does it for you, you are not satisfied but at the same time you cannot reach the spot. This kind of analogy can only be drawn by a person of his stature. Tagore's valuable observation reaffirms the elusive nature of translation. Tagore's Gitanjali in English is vastly different from the original Bengali version of the poem. Self-translators like R.N. Tagore, Manoj Das, Girisih Karnad are transcreators who recreate the Source Language Text in the Target Language taking absolute liberty with it, yet being loyal to it. Translators don't enjoy this privilege because they are not the authors of the texts which they translate into Target Language. Why can't they do so? Why their stand is always questioned?

Different theorists have defined translation theory in different ways. Each theory has its own validity though may not be free from limitations. Just like theories of criticism, no theory of translation can be ultimate or absolute. Moreover, no literary translation can be final, since literature in itself is elusive. B. K. Das points out, "If a critic is now considered as not merely an interpreter but a co-creator, the translator is not a mere renderer of an SL text into a TL text, but a co-creator" (161) Translation has become a creative work.

Under the present circumstances, what should be the role of the translator who has the sole responsibility of reproducing not only linguistically but aesthetically rich work of art? I would not be straying much if I state that the translator firstly should have the spark of creativity within him. He should also
possess an insight into the use of source language and target language. If he is not well acquainted with the culture and language of a particular country then he will surely fail to do justice to the said work. The translator should strive to position himself between two cultures and while recreating the target text, the target culture and language should govern his creative pursuit. Translation work needs to be internalised. Each should identify with his own culture.

Here in lies the success of Cannibalistic concept of translation theory. They advocate for the erasure of the boundary drawn between the source and target text and not between two cultures. Thus it becomes a symbiosis of two cultures. Then the power relation between source and target, superior/inferior ceases to exist and translator or the translated text is not relegated to a secondary place. It enjoys the status of ‘New Writing’.
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