CHAPTER VI
In the final chapter of my doctoral thesis, I would like to sum up the trends in 'Translation' in the twentieth century in the light of the developments in linguistics and cultural studies and try to show how translation studies have become a tool of Comparative Literature. In the modern context, translation may be defined as a creative re-structuring of the original with relation to the socio-cultural matrix of the text. Viewed against the kaleidoscopic world that we are living in, translation has emerged as a discipline. The use of translation is invaluable in the study of Comparative Literature in the 'multilingual and multicultural' context.

B. K. Das highlights the application and the significance of Comparative Literature in the following passage:

Comparative literature is a study of intertextuality. For instance, if we have to compare a novel of English with that of an Oriya novel we have to use either English or Oriya as the medium. But if we have to compare a French novel (the language we don't know), we have to read first an English version of French novel and then compare it with an Oriya novel and use either English or Oriya, the two languages we
know as the medium of our assessment. What I suggest here is that it is through translation we read the literature written in a language which we don’t now and therefore, translation becomes a tool for the study of Comparative Literature. (126).

Thus, the existence of Comparative Literature depends a lot on translation. And Translation studies as a discipline stimulates the cause of Comparative Literature in the present age. As a discipline it gained momentum in the West with the establishment of Chairs. In the West Chairs of Comparative Literature were set up at Harvard in 1890 and Lyon in 1897. Truly, in the last two decades of the nineteenth century that Comparative Literature began to be established internationally. At the same time translation has also evolved from being mere imitation of the original text to a ‘compound act of reading and writing’ concurrently. And Comparative Literature is a stage of reading made possible and easier by the availability of translation. Susan Bassnett and Lefevere have emphasized this in the following words:

With the development of Translation Studies as a discipline in its own right, with a methodology that draws on comparatistics and cultural history, the time has come to think again. Translation has been a major shaping force in the development of world culture and no study of comparative literature can take place without regard to translation. (160)
In the present age we observe that culture has become hybridized all over the world. Both for international communication and globalisation, translation plays a pivotal role now more than ever before. Translation helps in narrowing the gap among the literatures of the world for the benefit of mankind. New trends in literature come through translation. Moreover, translation versions of world classics into various other languages of the world help in enriching the target languages. In this context Paul St. Pierre makes a valid observation.

The importance of translation can be located in the fact that translation brings the readers, writers and critics of one nation into contact with those of others, not only in the field of literature, but in all areas of development: science and philosophy, medicine, political science, law and religion, to name but a few. Translation, in this way, plays an essential role in determining how a nation establishes its identity in terms of others, be this through opposition to foreign influences, through assimilation or naturalization of the foreign whereby differences are erased to as great a degree as possible, or through imitation of another, usually dominant culture. (qtd. in Das, 68-69).

As the world is shrinking, ‘nativism’ and ‘nationality’ are slowly but steadily yielding place to globalisation. The cultural barrier is also breaking down. In the fast changing literary scenario, translation is both essential and indispensable in bringing different literatures of the world together despite linguistic and cultural differences. As a natural outcome of globalisation, translation theory too has
exploded with developments from purely linguistic approach to the culture-oriented theory in the closing two decades of the twentieth century. Edwin Gentzler has rightly pointed out that, “Modern translation theory, like current literary theory begins with structuralism and reflects the proliferation of the age,” (2). The two approaches that are likely to gain popularity in the present age are the one formulated by Feminist Canadian translation theorists and another by Brazilian translation theorists. Both the approaches are unique and culture-oriented.

Feminist approach to translation studies condemn the fidelity theory and claim the re-creation of the original in the translation work. They view translation as an act of recreation. On the other hand the Brazilian translation theorists project ‘cannibalism’ as metaphor that absorbs the virtues of the original text and empowers the target text. The approach comes very close to Derrida’s position, which views translation as a ‘life-force that ensures a literary text’s survival’. The cannibalistic notion of translation also involves a changed idea of the value of the original text in relation to its acceptance in the target culture. The cannibalistic theorists assert that the translation process creates an ‘original text’, the opposite of the traditional position whereby the ‘original’ is the starting point. I would like to go a step ahead and mention here that translation not only recreates the original text in the target culture, the target culture actually serves as the starting point. The original writer, who is also a translator as he translates his pre-existing thoughts/observation/ideas or influences from other material resources (idea of intertextuality) into written form, is not hailed as the superior other. Thus, the ‘power relation’ has ceased to exist between the original text and translated text.
Among the new theories, the cannibalistic translation theory is likely to gain currency on the ground of acceptability. Bassnett underlines the significance of cannibalistic theory in the following passage:

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. (qtd. in Gentzler, 193). Gentzler further says," In their approach to literary translation, the de Campos brothers refuse any sort of preordained original, but instead view translation as a form of transgression. They use terms not part of any European approach or science, but come up with their own terms, one of which is translation as a form of "cannibalism." (192).

The 'cannibalistic' approach frees the text from the original. The functions of the target text are determined and conditioned by the role the Target Text is likely to play in the target culture. In other words, the target culture and target reader should actually govern the translation process. The original author's 'intention' to the reader (SR) should be conveyed effectively in the target language as the reader of a translation (TR) essentially belongs (most often) to another language and another culture community. Thus, the translator has to firstly bridge the gap between the differences observed in the two language system and
secondly bridge the gap between the differences observed in the two contexts governed by historical, social, political and cultural aspects.

Now some of the questions which come to one’s mind---what should be the role of a translator in the changing circumstances? How will he act as a ‘cultural filter’ so as to balance the pragmatic differences between the two different language systems and two different culture communities? In B.K.Das’ words:

Translator is not only a creator but a comparatist. As Comparative Literature depends on translation for its growth and development, it has become in the words of Bassnett and Lefevere, “a subcategory of Translation Studies (12). And therefore, the translator has become a comparatist who knows two languages (SL and TL) and two literatures (original and translated) well. A translator is both a reader and a writer. He reads a text like a reader and writes it through his translation. He interprets the text as he reads it and re-creates it as he translates it. (102).

Thus, the role of a translator is that of a writer, critic and comparatist. He combines in him all the three divergent roles and makes translation appear and read like the original. This view endorses the concepts of Indian Philosophy and now serves as the turning point in the Western discourse of literary criticism and translation theory in the twentieth Century. Raja Rao makes a very pertinent observation in his famous book *The Meaning of India*. 
According to Raja Rao, 'triple are the constituents of a book--the word, the author, the reader'. The word which says what the 'author has to indicate', and the 'reader has to apprehend' seems to be the one element 'we seem to neglect', as if it were something we know so well that we may not investigate its nature, its function, its end. For the 'word', like every constituted thing, seems to have 'a birth, a life-span, and a death'. Translator adds another dimension to the above mentioned 'triple constituents'.

Some languages have history and according to some all languages have history. It would be better to say just as Indian civilization is the making of the Rishis (the sages) and the Western, of heroes and prophets, that some languages seem to have this breath of eternity in them and have attained then the status of what Albert Einstein called 'the language of the Gods', others are mere vernaculars.

The Sanskrit language is such a language of the Gods and through Sanskrit all Indo-European languages participate in this, including the much abused, in India, English language. After all we must, remember, that Shakespeare used the English language. Raja Rao almost echoes Bhartrihari, the great grammarian. According to him Silence, is the illuminator of the Supreme Brahma's essence. (Mauna Vyakhya prakatita parabrahma tatvam.)

Raja Rao feels that, unless the author becomes an 'upasaka' and enjoys himself in himself (which is Rasa) the eternality of the 'sound' (Sabda) will not
manifest itself, and so you cannot communicate either and so the word here becomes nothing but a 'cacophony.'

The word indeed is 'eternal.' Man faces himself when he seeks the word. Unless the word becomes 'mantra' no writer is a writer, and no reader a reader.

For the right reader-to-be, the writer has therefore to become an 'Upasaka' of the word. We in India need to 'recognize our inheritance.'

When we further analyze the above mentioned proposition, we find that the translator lends another dimension to the existing triangle i.e. author-text-reader. The translator has to investigate into the nature of 'word' that forms the prime feature of his work. A translator is fraught with multiple problems when he renders a text from one cultural context into another. He has to carry over the ideas, thoughts, feelings, sensations without violating the norms of acceptability in the Target Language. The relative success or success in approximation of a translation lies in the choice of the mode of rendering the text and the choice of words. To recreate an effective target language, a translator has to find appropriate words and while doing so he has to see and feel within, the experience of the source author. The harmony between the text and the translator's sensibility serves as the starting point and not the original text. The failures and compromises point towards the difficulties experienced by a translator while forging a new language (the third language). The third language becomes the mode of communication between vastly differing sensibilities and cultures.
The translator makes an honest attempt to break the barriers and carry over the author's vision (ST) into the 'reader-hearer's' consciousness in its totality. In this connection Chandra Rajan says:

As for the more significant strategy the choice of words; therein lies the heart of the matter "Where shall the word be found, where will the word Resound ....." (T. S. Eliot, Underlining mine).

The continual search for the word, the right word, that rare word in the receiving language which expresses the precise nuance of meaning in the original, often eludes one;

(So – arthah tad – vyakti – samarathyā – yogi – Sabdah)

But when it does and it does often times, it is a moment of epiphany. The translator has to make a language of understanding in the receiving language, hammering it out patiently with sweat and tears. But it is not just toil and labour: there is joy in it and satisfaction because it makes one understand the anatomy of both languages, the source and receiving languages infinitely better; and as one goes back to the roots of a word, one is travelling back to the roots of one's culture. (149).

Language serves as an essential part of culture and its expression. These two are inextricably woven together and the translator has to treat them nothing but as whole. It is true that the words on the page i.e. the text don't have a voice
of its own. It is apprehended against the cultural context and preparedness of the receiving consciousness of the target readers. Chandra Rajan further elucidates, "The words on the page, the text, is mute, until its words resound in the reader-hearer's consciousness. I use the phrase reader-hearer because we read with the eye and hear with the ear simultaneously." (149). Thus a target reader has to 'see-hear-touch-feel' the words of the text – there lies the success story of the translator. The role of a translator then is to mediate among different cultures, not to dispute over theories. Bassnett and Lefevere clamp all controversy and power hierarchy by saying, "The 'cultural turn' in contemporary translation theory assigns linguistic study of lexical or syntactic equivalence only an instrumental role and focuses instead on 'the text embedded within its network of both source and target cultural signs'. (12).

We cannot today deny the fact that translation in its multifarious forms has been a major shaping force in the development of world cultures. As an independent discipline it has drawn the attention of translators and scholars all over the world in the present century. It helps to bring a correlation between literature and culture in every multilingual and multicultural society. Globalisation has triggered a burgeoning hybrid culture and culturally the countries of the world are getting closer. This is chiefly because of the influence of the media. In the estimation of many, the universal principles are drawing them closer in spite of substantive differences. The present century has witnessed the redundancy of the concept of servitude and adopted viable means to face the text and grapple with it, and do the best. Edward Said has drawn our attention to this aspect of human
civilization in the concluding paragraph of *Culture and Imperialism* in the following words:

Survival in fact is about connections between things: In Eliot's phrase, reality cannot be deprived of the other echoes [that] inhabit the garden. "It is more rewarding – and more difficult – to think correctly and sympathetically, contra punctuality, about others than only about us." But this also means no trying to rule others, not trying to classify them or put them in hierarchies, above all not constantly reiterating how our "culture" or "country" is number one (or not number one, for that matter). For the intellectual there is quite enough of value to do without that (408).

It is interesting to note here that at the international level translation helps in improving good relations among neighbouring countries and bi-lateral relationships where as at the national level it helps in bringing out national integration. In a way, translation helps the people in their effort at nation building and establishing the national identity. In the Indian context also literary translation helps in the process of nation building. B. K. Das gives an interesting account of the role of translation in the Indian Situation. He observes:

The language of our administrative communication at the national level (i.e. by the Central Government) is done either through the official language, or in English. It needs to be translated into more
than 20 regional languages for the benefit of the people of several states. Similarly the language of the court is either English or Hindi and the judgement is delivered in these two languages. Thereafter the judgement is translated into regional languages for the benefit of the common people. For administrative and judiciary purposes, translation is obligatory in India. For the promotion of commerce, trade and industry in our country, we make use of translation. In the modern world, the need for translation is greater than ever before.

(83-84)

The study of comparative literature in India can be promoted and enhanced through translation. In India if bhasha literatures (refers to modern Indian languages other than English) are translated into English a comparative study of such literatures will be easier and more productive. Instead of translating a bhasha literature into another (say Bangla to Hindi), if we translate it into English we can make a fruitful study of it. We can then have Indian Comparative Literature in English. Translation plays an essential role in the study of Comparative Literature. And Comparative Literature, in turn, helps in creating an all-India ethos and brings bhasha literatures closer for a meaningful study. Thus, the study of translation of bhasha literatures leads to the study of Comparative Literature, and thereby it furthers the cause of national integration.

Not only in India but in other countries of the world where multilingualism is a reality (like France, Canada and Switzerland), translation plays a vital role in
nation building. It is only through translation that various movements in literature, art and trends in political opinion sail from country to country. Paul St. Pierre reiterates the concept of translation as nation building in the following words:

Seen in this light, translation is a social practice with a definite role to play within a given society, serving in a sense as a form of selection process restricting, conditioning, and in any case modulating cultural immigration. Through translation nations define themselves and in doing so they define others. (qtd. in Das, 80).

In a multi-lingual and multi-cultural country like India translation has become indispensable for exchange of thoughts among people belonging to different regions, languages and cultures. In the international field it is impossible for world leaders to communicate among themselves. Here in lies the importance of translation at the international and national level. Two important modern Indian English writers, Amitav Ghosh and Dilip Chitre have emphasized the point that translation is highly essential in our country. Amitav Ghosh observes: "And the thing about translation is that there is no way around it. In a country as multilingual as ours, unless you have really good translations, you are doomed." (qtd. in Das, 80). Translation serves as a bridge that connects people from varied regional areas i.e. languages and acts like a vehicle of words that reach out to the people of India. Dilip Chitre writes: "Even as an independent practicing poet, I live in the Postmodern world transformed by translation. This is my predicament as a
writer I have to build a bridge within myself between Indian and Europe or else I become a fragmented person.” (qtd. in Das, 80)

Thus, the ancient Indian literary heritage which is to be found in languages like Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apbransha etc. can be restored and preserved through translation. Indian literary history has always been eclectic and has come under foreign influence at different points of time. It has left an indelible impression and impact on the literary and cultural practices. In this context, V.A.Sahane makes a pertinent point in the following passage:

The relevance of translations from Indian regional languages into English to our contemporary cultural ethos and literary culture must at once be recognized without any hesitation whatever. Indian culture is a mosaic of many sub-cultures covering different linguistic regions and their regional literatures and lifestyles. Indian culture is more like a salad of different vegetables and organic growth rather than a ‘melting pot’ in which different ethnic components swiftly melt away and lose their identity. The theory of the growth of Indian Civilization can best be symbolized in this beautiful image of the salad rather than in the image of the “cauldron”. American social historians and sociologists (Nallthan Glazer notably, among them) have advanced the theory of the ‘melting pot’ of American civilization (in Beyond the Melting Pot) which suggests that different ethnic cultures of Europe and other
continents have submerged and finally assumed the form and shape of American civilization. This theory has, of course, been challenged by many other historians in the recent past. That apart, Indian Society has always been multi-racial, multi-religious, multi-subcultural and multi-lingual and therefore very much like a salad.

V.A. Shahane further states that:

The relations between the creative writers of Indo-Anglian literature and those of regional Indian literatures should be based on mutual exchange and partnership in shared values of a composite, multifarious culture. A spirit of cooperation, co-existence, and coordination, rather than of isolation and confrontation should govern our multilingual literary culture. (9-10)

In the present century the translation of literatures in India has assumed a special status. The ancient Indian literary heritage can be preserved and rescued only through translation. Indian literature that encompasses all regional literatures of India (say, Hindi Literature, Bengali Literature) and English Literature can reach all the people of India only through translation.

In this global age translation is also taken as linguistic bridge-building. Taking a cue from an anthropologist Malinowski, J.R.Firth thought of translation as
a kind of bridge-building languages or linguistic bridge building. B. K. Das puts it rather succinctly and explains that,

Translation without the medium of language is unthinkable. Therefore, of all the arts, literature alone is faced with the problem of translation for it uses different languages as its medium of expression.

We do not think of translation in the field of fine arts such as music, dance, painting or even architecture or sculpture where the medium is not language. In non-literary translation, the medium is again language. Human beings communicate among themselves through language. But different people speak different languages in different parts of the world. That is why we need translation for the purpose of communication among people of different races, cultures and faiths all over the world. And translation becomes a kind of linguistic bridge-building. (67)

The writer of the source text, his reader and the source text belong to one language. The translator of the source text, his reader and the translated text belong to another language (presumably). The translator, not to mention, has an in depth knowledge about the nuances of both the languages. In the process of translation, the source language text is transformed and substituted and as a result the target language text is born. It involves decoding and recoding, destructuring and re-structuring of the text. Since languages differ in form and structure, it is a journey from one language structure to another. It acts as a kind
of linguistic bridge-building between two languages and cultures. A translator, who is not the original author, takes up the task of bridge-building between the mind of the author and the mind of the reader or between an SL text and a TL text. B. N. Patnaik gives an interesting account of lexical items in Oriya and English in the following words:

Oriya does not have two lexical items corresponding to "assassinate" and "kill". The lexical items 'mariba' and 'hatyakariba' (both corresponding to "kill") belong to two different styles; the first to the colloquial, the second, to the formal, and these are not really directly concerned with the importance of the target. Interestingly, there are some lexical items in Oriya which express the sense of "die" and these indeed are sensitive to whether the dead person is the object of veneration or not. If he is not, then the appropriate word is 'mariba' (not to be confused with 'mariba' "kill") in which the first vowel is/a:/not/a/), but if he is, then the appropriate items would be 'dehatyaga kariba' ("give up the body"), 'swargabasa kariba' (left for heavenly abode) and the like. (16)

Translation is both an inter-language event and a cross-cultural communication. Since the author and the translator traverse in different linguistic and cultural realms, it results in a gap between the pragmatics of the original text and the translated text. The translation must aim at bridging the gap between the
pragmatic differences as observed in the two language systems. And good translations become creations by exploiting this very gap creatively. Here in lies the success of the translator. A translator should aim to excel the source text otherwise it will be discarded just as a shadow of it or a poor reflection.

While rendering the source Text into the Target Language, a translator must take note of the surface meaning as well as the deep meaning. This doubleness leads to a real enhancement of significance. The most important aspect of a good translation is that the language of a translated text is closer to the inner language of the source text. Thus the translator becomes a co-creator of the text. The translator uses the target language in such a way that it comes closer to the inner language. In this way, the inner form of the source text, its typical form and the core language are effectuated in the Target Text in its own way. It will be pertinent to quote K.Chellapan here. He says,

Good translations can and should recreate an inner music and inner form in a new medium and while doing so, there is a surrender and a synthesis, a deviation which is extension, but still pointing to the archetypal idea and form common to both (168).

A good translation should not read like translation in the first place. While reading a translated text a reader must be able to read it as just another work of art in his own language. This is a real challenge to a translator. When a translator starts his creative journey, he roughly first pours into different (language)
dictionaries, journals, literary materials that serve as backdrop of his work. One way to make translations more faithful to the original is to make acquaintance with the context of the book to be translated and cultural background. He must be alive to two cultures before he makes an attempt to build any bridge between them. He then translates it in the form of a draft. Then he again visualizes the problems and lacunas and edits his draft into (readable) target language. The translator must always remember that the words should carry its archetypal culture and at the same time it should not be alien. Nature of problem also varies from text to text. There are fewer problems when one translates within his country that is into regional languages to be precise. (For example from Bengali of to Oriya). Inspite of disparity, we are culturally and socially inter-twined. Untranslatability looms large when one translates from one language into another foreign language (say Oriya, Hindi, Urdu into English). In this case risk is involved-yet it is necessary. As the translator tries to establish equivalence between the source Text and the Target Text he is confronted with unforeseen problems.

Contemporary translation theory has taken a ‘cultural turn’. A translator must strive to attain ‘equiculturality’. The ‘culture’ oriented words only pose the maximum challenge. Even the best translation cannot hope to achieve equiculturality. The translator must try to find equivalents in the target culture. In this way, it not only results in recreation but transplantation of the concept in the new culture. K.Chellappan says, “a translator by preserving the original myths themselves can achieve transculturality, because myths have a way of fusing with each other and suggesting a translanguage.” (168). Since hundred percent
equivalence is not possible, a translator has to make a choice or rather choices. He has to decide what to retain, what to omit, what to substitute and what to transform. Translation process unleashes this inner struggle, across two languages and two cultures. The result of the literary tussle should be recreation.

Moreover, the translated text should not bear any trace of the translator’s struggle while externalizing the inner meaning of the source text. The translator very deftly inter-weaves different linguistic and cultural strands into the tapestry of the translated text. I concur with Alexis Nouss’ view when he says:

When I translate, I translate as much the other into myself as myself into the other, and through this contact, this exposure, this ‘experience of the foreigns’, I find resources in language, and modes of thought and expression which were latent and which I am able to reactivate. I receive the foreigner, who takes refuge in my language but I too take refuge in his. (147)

Thus a translator though a bilingual, after all has to live in the linguistic-cultural area of one or the other of the languages in question. Translation is a major, extremely meaningful and essential literary activity today. A close linguistic-cultural translation should also evoke the image of ‘seamlessness’ effect in the target text. Translation can be termed as a creative endeavour where the translator lets himself into the intangible powers of a language, a mysterious, changeable and unpredictable energy. It takes vast reserves of imagination and flexibility to contend with it.
The status of a translation and its relationship to the original are controversial subjects and remains to be an embattled field till this day. Lakshmi Kannan spells out the impediments in the path of literary exercise in no uncertain terms. She writes:

Translation is of course a highly creative activity that needs a fertile ground for nurturing. But it continues to be plagued by an inhospitable climate that has an adverse effect on the value of the translation/the translator which eludes any but the most discerning eye. The criticism of translation has also not come of age. Lay critics and reviewers dismiss in the last line of their note, often as an after thought, while some blissfully even forget they are writing about a translation. We need more specialist voices for criticism. In the Indian scene, just anyone jumps into the bandwagon. All it needs is a little knowledge (Alexander Pope called it 'a dangerous thing') and some ill will to write a patronising review, the 'damn with faint praise' kind of review. Curiously, one finds the reviewer more ready to forgive flaws in a piece of original 'bad' writing than in a translation. Weasel words, buzzwords, insincere phaticisms, flaccidity are glossed over in an original writing while the same reviewer is indecently happy to chance upon them in a translation.

(169)
Translation is like a symphony, it is expansive, it is open-ended and there is no final answer to it. It should not be approached from a narrowly fixed position. Now to complete a circular movement and come back to where I started, I would like to stress that the gap between the original and translation has been bridged in recent years. Not only that, translation has been accorded an equal status with that of the original in the form of Copyright Act being bestowed upon the translation.

Translation activities in India are on par with the West especially in the field of literary translation. We are heirs to a great past and inherit one of the richest records in the achievement of human imagination. The concept of Translation as Creative Writing on New Writing finds its root deeply embedded in Indian soil. India is a land which has unique soil – a chemical of integrity that unifies. Comparing the Indian tradition of translation with the West, Sujit Mukherjee says,

_Bible_ translation has provided the Western World with an infinitely rich wealth of practice in translating an older text – which is frequently religious in intention as it is literary in effect. We have no comparable experience in India, although parts of the _Vedas_, much of the _Gita_, many poems of the _Therigatha_ – any of these could have served the same purpose. 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. But there is ample material available already for studying the nature of translation in India of the work of one modern Indian poet. (81)

We are on the threshold of the twenty-first century and it would seem imbecile to dispute over theories as actual translation practice in a given culture and language is necessary for the formation of any Theory of Translation. There are other vital issues in the business of translation. Most books are translated today from profit motive rather than artistic integrity. Focussing on the marketability of the translated texts, selected canons are only translated. There are only a handful of people who translate just because they feel the creative urge to recreate. Even publication of a translated work is not free from politics. It is controlled by various forces. Moreover different types of norm are laid down by different organizations. (For example Sahitya Akademi, Unesco and other such organizations). Emerging theories like Canadian Feminist theory, Cannibalistic Translation Theory, Deconstructive Theory and Polysystem Theory have opened up new avenues for the translator. The translator is viewed as a creator now and
the translated text as creative writing. But how can we free the translator? With so many problems, should there be translation? Should we not make the rich literary texts accessible to as many as possible? Would the translators show interest in unearthing these riches? A lot has been achieved and still more is to be done to liberate the translator from the above mentioned deciding forces. A translator should view translation as prime means of enriching his own culture. This can be achieved with the hardening of nationalistic lines and the feeling of belongingness and pride in one's own national culture. The translator should focus on the SL text first, and must serve that text with complete commitment. He will be able to do justice to the text if culture and education is embodied in his attitude. He will not fail in his duty if he becomes an 'upasaka'. The metaphysical concept of 'word' and 'world' is beautifully conveyed in the following verse written by T. S. Eliot (Underlining mine):

Still is the unspoken word, the word unheard,
The word without a word, the word within
   the world and for the world;
And the light shone in darkness and
   Against the Word the unstilled world still whirled
About the centre of the silent Word.

(qtd. in Rajan, 146)

T. S. Eliot's immortal lines seem to reflect the dilemma of the translator whose world centre on 'word'.
A translator, who is first a reader has to be delicately sensitive because then only he can lend adequate expression in another language. He must recreate an aesthetically rich text in the target language. In this connection I would like to quote Bassnett who claims that,

Gadda's definition of system can most aptly be applied to the diachronics of Translation Studies and serves as an illustration of the size and complexity of the work that has barely been begun:

We therefore think of every system as an infinite entwining, an inextricable knot or mesh of relations: the summit can be seen from many altitudes; and every system is referable to infinite coordinated axes: it presents itself in infinite ways. (qtd. in Bassnett, 75)

However, the practice of translation is not without its limitation. It is greatly enhanced by linguistic indeterminacy which is the result of perpetual change. In the post-structuralist parlance the argument goes like this: that is, it is the indeterminacy of meaning that makes the text open-ended. Interpretation of a literary text is never ending. Then, what should a translator do? Which meaning he is going to translate into the target language? According to some, it is not the business of the translator to say what the author means because that is the job of the critic. Others claim that the translator should make an effort to say
what the author says. Research shows that the translator should say both i.e., what the author says and what he means.

Whatever the translation theorists and critics may claim, the only purpose of translation is to make the source language text available in the target language for the readers (target readers) to get the true meaning of it. In order to do his job successfully the translator must develop his linguistic skill and cultural insight into both the languages. (Source Language and Target Language).

The next point that comes to mind is that what should be the actual length of translation, should it be longer than the original? Or shorter? In case of free translation, translation becomes a paraphrase. Naturally it becomes much longer than the original. The numbers of words also do not remain the same in both the languages (SL and TL).

The limits of translation are many and thus, it is imperative to know when and where translation fails. One major limitation of translation is that it cannot successfully convey (or transform) professional jargons, critical terms, idioms from one language to another language, humours and jokes (based on particular culture and community) and, advertisements. Apart from this the ‘ontological and structural considerations’ also point towards the limits of translation. Culture specific words, pop-slang language, rustic words, rhythm and rhyme schemes in poetry also point towards the limits of translatability. In
course of an article K. Balasubramaniam and D.R. Mohan Raj underline the limits of translation.

Irrespective of the ultimate worth of a translation, it should be recognized that the translator is completely limited in his use of the medium that was available for use in its fullest potential to the author of the original. Not only is creative instinct that gave the original impetus difficult to match in a translation, the translator's task is further complicated by the host of limitations imposed on him by both subject and audience. (36)

My closing remarks will be that translation is possible provided the translator combines in him the skills of a linguist and a polyglot. Paradoxically enough, translation becomes successful when done within the limits of translating an original or source text. Inspite of all the limitations that seem to challenge the authenticity of translation and undermine its position, it has become a discipline in its own right. As a discipline it has attracted the attention of translators and scholars everywhere in the twentieth century. In the twenty-first century, translation will play a major role in bringing the literatures of the world together for global benefit.
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