Chapter 1
Introduction

The more self-critical a discipline is, the longer it contributes to the various domains of knowledge. For example, translation as discipline can be easily called a meta-discipline or a donor discipline for it helps numerous other disciplines to develop literature, linguistics, comparative literature to name a few. “Translation is different things for different groups of people. For people, who are not translators, it is primarily a text; for people who are, it is primarily an activity.” Translation is a very complex sphere of academics because it is/can be seen through multiple perspectives and filters. It involves more than one language, culture, community, and many such social arenas at the same time. All those who are involved in/with translation in any way have a different reason, purpose and conception of it.

Translation studies that initially meant a linguistic study of translation have shifted from this narrow notion to a broader idea that covers any activity related to translation. The text we have cited above can allow us the felicity to look at this aspect of “any activity”. Translation for a translator is an act, an on-going process, an act of self-expression within a confined space of a text, a sphere to create a text, a stage to perform; whereas for a reader it is another text that gives him/her an exposure to another world, culture, community etc. It is a gateway to new and may be unknown. We miss the idea of a reader turning into a translator as we think of this, and the intervening process before a translation is undertaken, which can easily answer the questions like why certain text was chosen for translation? Why certain
meaning given? Why certain kind of language is used for representing the source culture? and such others. In fact this is the phase which gives rise to ideas like ‘feminist translation’, ‘communist translation’ etc.

1. Idea of Translation Today

The general idea of translation is that it is the rendering of a source text into a target text with change in (only) language. It is a process where a text changes its attire from one language to another and sometimes undergoes a change in its make-up.

Translation is not just interpretation, as interpretation is itself coloured by many aspects. It is an act of “handing-down, a question of legacy, as key concepts draw on what was hidden in a prestigious anteriority.”\(^2\) The process of “Translating can be seen as a problem-solving activity in which a source element may be rendered by one or more elements in the target language.”\(^3\) It is a device through which we access the otherwise inaccessible. It was held that translations are undertaken and completed with an intention to communicate but these are more an act of self-discovery and self-expression, as the knowledge bank of the translator works behind the making of a translation, influences his/her creative process. Ranged against this idea when we look at the classics being translated in various languages many years after their first appearance, we can very well see that translation is an activity that is driven by public/politics.

Translation studies today are being seen as an independent discipline, though they overlap and share commonalities with a few other disciplines like linguistics, culture studies, comparative literatures etc. The new era of translation studies marks a radical shift from the process-oriented translation, i.e. “proper” translation as
compared to the functional aspects of the translated text, i.e. what the translated text *does* in the target culture. However, within such a framework, one wonders: what is the relationship between the translation process and its impact on the target culture. For example, a translated text makes visible changes to the lives in the text originating in one culture but the same text remains unnoticed in the other. Has it got anything to do with the way that text has been translated by one translator and the manner of the other? Therefore, modern Translation studies reiterate the tripartite mechanism of translation studies: (1) politics of choice of the text, (2) translation process, and (3) the reception of the text in the target culture. Certainly, we need a fresh perspective in order to cater to the needs of all three aspects. Perhaps Comparative Translation would help in dealing with the challenges that translation studies are facing today. (Comparative Translation has been discussed below)

2. Domains of Translation Studies

We need to discuss various domains of translation studies in order to understand the manner in which it operates itself and gets operated.

Translation studies has become an accepted academic subject and books, journals and doctoral dissertations appear faster than one can read them all, and at the heart of most of the exciting new research are broad questions about ideology, ethics and culture.4

There was a time when people questioned the very inculcation of translation studies in academics. They thought translation as an inferior act, let alone its study.

Translation has taken a cultural turn as it were, and we are able to see its obvious relationship with the society in which it is produced and the society where it reaches. It is not just a rendering of words but a translation of culture. It transforms one culture into another while keeping the embedded text-culture alive in one or the
other way because there are more than one ways open for rendering a text into another language and this depends solely on the translator. This decision-making process of a translator is a major issue that has come up in translation studies. It involves all the influences on the translator that frame the interpretation of the text as well as its reproduction.

Evan-Zohar argued that “any model of a literary system should include translated literature, for translation was often the conduit through which innovation and change can be initiated”\(^5\). In a country like India, translation studies are more than just a field of study as translation is very much part and parcel of life. Since the arrival of the English and the establishment of British rule in India and the prominence of English language in academics, we, as Indians are involved in translating everything that we hear, write and read right from our schooling to our undergraduate education. Not only that, the multilingualism of our country is one of the biggest reasons why we should study translation. In India, people are at least bilingual.

The idea of globalization and man being a global citizen also entails a thrust on translation studies as we seek knowledge not just from our limited geographical sphere but from the world at large. Moreover this globalization and its resultant sweeping influence have increased the demands of professional translators and interpreters. Translation has become a vocation that earns one a good amount of money and respect.

In time, translation studies have shifted their focus from source-oriented studies to translator- and target-oriented. A translation is driven by the objective behind it and
the function it tries to fulfil in the target culture. Translation studies focus on the forces that work in making of the translation and the receipt of it in the target culture.

The two most important shifts in theoretical developments in translation theory over the past two decades have been (1) the shift from source-oriented theories to target-text-oriented theories and (2) the shift to include cultural factors as well as linguistic elements in the translation training models. Those advocating functionalist approaches have been pioneers in both areas. (Gentzler, 2001: 70)

Translation studies have moved out of the ideas of equivalence and fidelity. There is no single, objective understanding and interpretation to any text and hence, there cannot be a true translation. No text can be fit into the garb of other language completely and same applies to culture.

…‘prejudices’ are unavoidable and can be positive in all acts of interpretation. Chau claims that this general approach makes the translator at once humble and more responsible, taking part in the active creation of a translation rather than remaining a slave to illusions of necessary equivalence.

A Translator is by no means inferior to an author as s/he gives the text its afterlife. The translatability and the number of translations a text undergoes, decides its position in the literary arena. It is due to translation, similar to reading, that a text reaches its readers and interpreters of a different language and culture, and enjoys wider readership and popularity.

We have an interesting classification of various domains of the translation studies. Holmes’s ‘map’ of translation studies below offers a good view. (from Toury 1995: 10)
3. What is Comparative Translation?

**Nature and Scope**

Comparative Translation is the study of translations of the same text in different languages serving different purposes in the different contexts. Within this very simple yet broad definition by Milton M. Azevedo, Comparative Translation (CT) is represented as “a viable interdisciplinary field combining elements from literary criticism, translation theory, stylistics, and cognitive linguistics”. Comparative Translation is an area of study covering process-oriented translation on one hand and function-oriented translation on the other. It attempts to look at the intricate relationship between the two in order to negotiate two very basic issues: the (political) choice of the text and the process that the text undergoes during and after translation. Moreover, CT also provides scope for studying dynamic inter-literariness and inter-textuality across the linguistic hierarchies. For most of Indian scholars, their benefit of knowing more than two languages facilitates them to read multiple
translations of the same text. Therefore, it opens up possibilities of comparing ‘translatability’ on one hand and translators’ ability on the other, by focusing the relationship between the source and target texts, before and after the reception of the translated text. For example, translations of Tagore in other Indian languages have varied impact on the literary sensibility of people, on the way Tagore is being read and interpreted today, on the way Bengali literature is looked at with and without Tagore etc. CT takes a close look at all the aspects related to more than one component of translation; be it translator, language, literary-readership trends, socio-cultural situations etc.

According to James S. Holmes, comparative translation belongs to “descriptive translation studies” (or DTS), a “branch of the discipline which constantly maintains the closest contact with the empirical phenomena under study. There appear to be three major kinds of research in DTS, which may be distinguished by their focus as product-oriented, function-oriented, and process-oriented.”¹⁰ Product-oriented DTS, that area of research which describes existing translations, has traditionally been an important area of academic research in translation studies. The starting point for this type of study is the description of individual translations, or text-focused translation. A second phase is that of comparative translation description, in which comparative analyses are made of various translations of the same text, either in a single language or in various languages. Such individual and comparative descriptions provide the materials for surveys of larger corpuses of translations, for instance those made within a specific period, language, and/or text or discourse type. In practice the corpus has usually been restricted in all three ways: seventeenth-century literary
translations into French, or medieval English Bible translations. However, such descriptive surveys can also be larger in scope, diachronic as well as (approximately) synchronic, and one of the eventual goals of product-oriented DTS might possibly be a general history of translation - however ambitious such a goal may sound at this time.

This includes

- Translation to translation (same text)
- Translation to translation (same original author)
- Translation to translation (same Translator)\(^\text{11}\)

Toury (1985) classifies comparative translation study into three categories: (1) comparative study of different target translations of one ST into one language, (2) comparative study on different phases, and (3) comparative study of one text into different languages. He writes:

One may compare several translations into one language done by different translators, either in the same period or in different periods of time...; or one may compare different phases in the establishment of one translation, in order to reconstruct the interplay of ‘acceptability’ and ‘adequacy’ during its genesis...; or, finally, several translations of what is assumed to be the same text into different languages, as an initial means of establishing the effects of different cultural, literary, and linguistic factors on the modelling of a translation.\(^\text{12}\)

Such is the nature and scope of CT, however the areas still await more and more comparative studies highlighting the processes and methods involved in it.

**Process/Method**

We know as translators that it is more of a process than a method, for it is a pursuit of creation and criticizing various nuances of the text at the same time which means ‘translation’ as process is a combination of more than one method. The process of
comparative translation is not/cannot be normative in nature because of the inherent creativity and challenges it poses within the dichotomy of linguistic hierarchy.

What is, then, the process of Comparative Translation? The process of CT begins with a critical framework that the translator formulates in order to put together the respective texts. Here the act of transition becomes an entity through which translator wants to address one or the other theoretical issue of creating and/or translating a text. Such an approach subsumes ‘translation’ to criticism, i.e. the former becomes a tool to achieve the latter. It depends heavily upon the reason why one is translating on one hand and why s/he is comparing. Firstly, for example, if we were to suppose we are comparing ‘translation to translation’ (a Tatvamasi written in Gujarati and translated into Hindi and English), we can compare them in two ways. The first approach would only compare (comparative studies) the Hindi and English translations with each other on one hand and with the original text on the other, wherein we might comment upon stylistic features, literary aspects, linguistic and semantic translatability etc. It would be criticism. The second approach would be to make comparison among the original, its Hindi and English translations, and as a result of this process, we end up translating the original text into fourth language for interpretation and understanding (Marathi, for instance). Moreover, such translation would provide another possibility for the critic-translator to see what happens to the original text in this journey of translation: Gujarati-Hindi-English-Marathi (Regional-National-International-Regional). We would like to make it very clear that this approach is not prescriptive in nature.


**Need/Why**

Firstly comparative translation makes critical sense because the function of a translated text is growing in a global cultural context as the world itself is increasingly becoming a translated and translating phenomenon. Secondly, in a larger political framework, comparative study in literary translation helps in the understanding of the “otherness”. Thirdly, translation allows us to clarify certain linguistic phenomena which otherwise would remain undiscovered.

Rooted in the idea that any comparison involves assessment, and any assessment is based on comparison, this study aims at validating through comparison/s. In addition, Frawley argues that meanings can take different patterns: (a) meaning as reference, (b) meaning as logical form, (c) meaning as context and use, (d) meaning as culture, and (e) meaning as conceptual structure. This may hold some truth concerning the relationships between the semantic macrostructures and microstructures in a given source text (ST), but their representation, interrelatedness, and functions as “a semantic unit” in given target texts (TTs) is still vague. Therefore, a systematic and comparative description in the ST and the TT of such unit in terms of macrostructures and microstructures can elucidate translation operativeness in the languages under study.

Studies in such a field are rarely examined by translation scholars and, therefore, this comparative investigation both illuminate the significance of quantitative methods of assessment of comparative translation and highlights the traits common to the qualitative patterns of literary texts. Besides, many studies may also have been done on translation particularly in language pairs (from one source language into one
target language) concerning translation and its problems in terms of syntactical, semantic, pragmatic and cultural factors particularly from well-documented European languages like English, French, Spanish, German etc. into non-European languages, and vice versa. However, when it comes to a multilingual country like India, such a field seems unexplored, i.e. it is more than interesting to look at the constant dialogue among the linguistic and literary traditions and their regional counter parts.

Such comparison aims to (a) compare the behaviour of both macrostructures and microstructures in the literary products, (b) examine inter-textual relations and inter-systemic relations, and (c) to construct a translation model.

**Comparative Translation and Multilingualism**

A multilingual society, being rich by its linguistic and cultural variety, opens up possibilities of studying how sub-cultural groups belonging to different linguistic cultures interact with one another. In our country there are roughly 3000 languages being used by the people, certainly a fine network of inter-literary routes and highways are formulated through which texts keep travelling. These texts carry with them unique features of the sub-culture they belong to on the one hand and also share common features that they share with the other sub-cultures. For example, *Kosala*, when translated into Gujarati from Marathi, it gave certain very specific Marathi cultural experiences to Gujarati readers as we are told that the original text is not a foreign text but from neighbouring household. Hence the common threads of ‘Indianness’ remain intact without disturbing the beauty of regional literature.
Comparative translation can be celebrated well in a multilingual culture because it gives diversified cultural resource to be explored through translation. It would not be exaggeration if one were to argue that Indian culture can be best grasped through ‘translation’. It is a tool that has been used to penetrate in a heterogeneous world without homogenizing it. It is indeed charming to look at how one translates an idiom from Marathi to Hindi and how the same idiom gets translated into English in which such concept does not exist; and how one translates it into Gujarati with the cultural integrity on the one hand and regional colour on the other. Comparison is not only among the processes of translation but also among the impacts of and in languages.

Challenges and Possibilities

Every new idea brings with it a set of challenges and possibilities; the idea of Comparative Translation is not an exception. We will look at the challenges and possibilities simultaneously.

1. First is the disciplinary challenge i.e. it depends heavily on two disciplines: Comparative Literature and Translation Studies, which obviously means that there are chances of it getting carried away by one of the two. Moreover, are we going to apply theories available in both the disciplines or blend them or generate its unique one? We will seek to discuss that. Though adjectival form ‘comparative’ denotes to a/n ‘framework’/‘approach’/‘perspective’/method. Hence translation would be looked at from a comparative framework/perspective which, though it would make ‘translation’ a ‘subject’ (if we use scientific terminology) in an experiment rather than a process. Generally comparative literature looks at
translated texts as resource for comparison but we wish to scrutinise the process called ‘translation’ here, especially focussing on comparison. Politically, it might hint towards a U-turn in manipulating the process of translation in order to make comparative literature a stronger discipline than translation studies, i.e. comparative literature telling translation studies how to translate.

Interestingly, CT leads a way for creating a new discipline which can be termed as *Translation as Criticism*. It would be a kind of critique on the select literary work through translation in order to translate, translator has to read and interpret and in doing so one is always putting text under critical scrutiny. Besides, it would be self-critical, analysing various ways in which translation as a process is carried out through comparison.

2. Secondly, it might also sound as if it were going back to the very stereotyped approach to translation in which one always complains about translation being inferior to the original text, asks questions on ‘authentic’ translation and ‘representation’ in translation etc. This challenge is more visible when we look at the contemporary translation theories wherein translation is to be looked at from target culture-language rather than the source one because, as they argue, the very motivation of translating a text is the fact that the readers are not familiar with the ‘source’ language. So in all practical senses, they would never have read the text unless translated (in whatever degree of authenticity). CT goes back to that same ‘process oriented’ translation and tries to dictate some terms to the translator.
However, it opens up new possibility of comparing two processes that affected the idea of ‘original’ and ‘translated’ one. It asks a new set of questions to the translator community: what happened to the original text when it got translated into more than one or two languages? How did you come across the same text and decided to translate it? What are the similarities and differences in the way in which readers of your language receive the text? Does it change/polarize their existing experience of the source language/literature/culture? What happens to the road for linguistic and literary mobility?

3. Third challenge is more serious in nature. For CT observes translated texts finished products- and tries to critique them which is why the critique might be taken as value-judgements on the parts of the respective translators. It might sound normative and prescriptive also. Considering the diversified range of languages, each time CT has to alter its method which might question its methodological authenticity as it may not be exhaustive. So in a way it will not be helpful in the re-translation of the same translated text.

However, there is a possibility also; given new translators read more and more CT. It might help them develop their sense of translation. There is bigger room for creativity, for CT is not uniformly applicable method/theory. So every time it has to be fresh without compromising credibility. Comparing translation of two forms, styles, tones etc. especially when they have various other modes in their respective languages, how charming it is to look at these processes full of vicissitudes.
4. CT depends totally on the proficiency levels of Comparative Translator for his/her language proficiency would influence his/her approach and critique during the comparison. One cannot afford to be ill-equipped in any of the languages s/he is comparing. If this be so, it would be disservice to all the four disciplines: Comparative Literature, Translation Studies, Comparative Translation, and Translation as Criticism.

Again the same can be turned into a possibility. Doing comparative translation is an opportunity to improve upon our multilingual proficiency. It allows us to study structures and stylistic features of languages which otherwise we would not do.

That CT, confronted with all these challenges and possibilities, is on its way to enter in academic study and research. More challenges and possibilities would come with more and more practices of CT.

4. Literary Translation as a Category

We need to consider ‘translation’ as complementary entity than mere substitute to “original” text. Translating a literary text is a real challenge for multiple reasons; (a) complex nature and process of translation along with the persistent burden of ‘authenticity’ on the translator, (b) readers’ consciousness, though not all the time, of translated text being inferior to the original work, and (c) hermeneutics and translation i.e., issues pertaining to the interpretation of ‘translated text’. For translation of a literary text heavily depends on what one primarily understands as literature or all those aspects applied to ‘literature’ can be easily applied to a literary
translation. Scholars have been dictating terms for normative ‘Dos’ and ‘Donts’ for literary translation. In fact, history of the practice of translation is as old as literary creation for authors while travelling, translated what they wrote and what others did.

With the academia, literary translation is considered to be the highest type of translation due to love for liberal humanistic literature that prevails. For quite a long time, translators were under heavy burden of “keeping the originality” intact so much so that every now and then people challenged translators and translations. However, the nobility of purpose behind translating a literary text, allowed importing and exporting of literary culture. It is seen as a bridge:

"Literary translation bridges the delicate emotional connections between cultures and languages and furthers the understanding of human beings across national borders. In the act of literary translation the soul of another culture becomes transparent, and the translator recreates the refined sensibilities of foreign countries and their people through the linguistic, musical, rhythmic, and visual possibilities of the new language."^{15}

Literary translators, in addition to dealing with the difficulties inherent to translations of all fields, must consider the aesthetic aspects of the text, its beauty and style, as well as its marks (lexical, grammatical, or phonological), keeping in mind that one language’s stylistic marks can be drastically different from another’s.

**Characteristics of Literary Translation**

Nothing can dictate normative terms to art, not even art itself, as art celebrates liberation from given frames and boundaries. That is why literary translation as an artistic activity cannot have definite characteristics of literary translation.

The standard view is that literary translation represents a distinctive kind of translating because it is concerned with a distinctive kind of text. The theory of text types, which seeks to classify texts according to their functions and features, duly places literary texts in a class of their own. The fact however that text typologies do not agree on what to contrast literary
texts with-technical, pragmatic, ordinary?-suggests that what distinguishes literary from other texts may not be entirely obvious. And if there is no agreement on what makes literature distinctive, it may be equally hard to decide on what grounds literary translation should be awarded its own niche.16

However, on the basis of what is available as actual literary translation, we can deduce some very general characteristics, as observations only and not as prescriptions.

A. Literary translation is literature per se

B. It is aesthetic behaviour

C. It is a political swing between two language cultures

There is yet another interesting viewpoint to be considered. As it is believed, “just as translation commonly refers to inter-lingual translation, and ‘literature’ and ‘literary’ tend to imply ‘aesthetic purpose’ and that is why “together with a degree of durability and the presence of intended stylistic effects, so ‘literary translation’ is read as conventionally distinguished from ‘technical translation’.”17

Language, Creativity and Literary Translation

All forms of art appeal to us due to inseparable elements of intention and medium. Liberal humanists would believe in the former whereas the formalists and structuralists would argue for the latter. Translation, as an art, falls prey due to these two elements only, for while some would say the intention of translating a text is ‘political’ and some others would argue that linguistic balance has to be maintained in the interest of good translation. However, translation as an art has benefit of having ‘creativity’ as intention along with ‘language’ as medium. It is a soft terrain where language has to be used creatively; where one language has to happily take
along the consciousness of being original on the one hand and “other” on the other. If such be the case, then translation is nothing but creative transplantation of meaning and style in a different language body.

When we try to understand the inter-dependent relationship among language, creativity and literary translation, we are actually talking about the means, manner and goal respectively. A translator is not a technician who knows only structures and cogs of the linguistic mechanism but an artist who juxtaposes opposites and who knows what need not be used to generate desired impact. In such a context, a translator has to be poet (writer, playwright etc.) and meta-poet also as s/he knows not only the making of poetry i.e. understanding poetry but also making poetry out of poetry in a different language. Translation as an artistic process assumes understanding of ‘translatability’ between languages. Literary translation is finding the suggestive beauty in source language culture and transforming it and by doing so creating new kind of (double) suggestive beauty. Considering target culture readership, translator employs various strategies in order to bring about aesthetic experience. If creative use of language with definite intention is literature, translation is decoding that creative use and intention in order to encode it again for the same purpose: aesthetic pleasure. All the aspects which are applied to a good literary work can be directly applied to good literary translation; the only difference is that the literary translator is conscious of it.

There is another interesting issue to be addressed and that is, where do all these categories meet? Is it in the mind of writer-translator only? It is clearly not so, for they meet at the space called ‘interpretive community’. (discussed below)
**Literary Translations in the Age of Non-literary World**

Literary translation becomes special and more appealing because of the non-literary context that surrounds it. Present day world lives all the colours of capitalism and so the exploitation at every level of power mechanism. A central question is what kind of sense does literary translation make in such a perplexed and perplexing world? The response apparently is that Literary translation becomes vital agent in the transmission of various cultural systems. The process of Globalization is itself process of translation. There are potential modes by which Globalization/capitalism is affecting our lives; food, clothing, popular media etc. Consciously or unconsciously translation is “used” as a device in the fulfilment of larger goals of Globalization. For instance, the way cinema reaches to every corner of the world through dubbing-translation and the course of domestication and foreignization of cultures keeps on blurring the geographical boundaries. Consumerism has come with an assumption: everything can be sold and bought and every place can be market with the help of translation.

The question that, then arises: Where do we feature literature in such a capitalist context firstly and literary translation secondly? Literature still holds a very powerful sway as an institution in any given society. It preserves and passes on what a culture does at a given point of time. Besides, it has also been looked as a political behaviour, Dalit Literature, Black Literature, Feminist Literature to name a few. Is literary translation, then, also a political behaviour besides being a creative act? The answer to that obviously appears to be: Literary translation makes it possible to understand comparative accounts of various cultural processes aesthetically. Readers
across the world still want to participate into making mutual translatability of literary works: both canonical and popular. Capitalist world also encourages literary translation for its own sweet reasons; as in movies, music, advertisement etc.

*Literary Translation as Representation*

For past few years academia has observed momentous shift in scholarly concerns raising provocative questions regarding the politics of representation, especially that of culture. Representation of culture also requires creative and interpretative mode of writing and translation being such an act becomes crucial for multiple reasons:

1. When a text gets translated into another language, a new purpose is added to its existing one (many times it gets replaced), and it is only because of adding-purpose, making literary translation becomes re-presentation.

2. What is it that gets translated? Besides a number of features, it is the ‘choice’ of the text which is translated. The process of translation is the process of choices. A translator while selecting a text from a source culture, s/he chooses to represent a group, class, caste, family, individual, ideology etc.

3. It also affects entire process of canonization of literature in a given culture. For example, the canonical category called ‘Great Literature of the World’ is possible due to literary translation which means literary translation is the maker of literary historiography. There are many great authors belonging to different language-cultures of the world who remained unnoticed because of the translation that unfortunately could not reach them. There are several categories like Dalit, Black, and Feminist literatures that became powerful because the translation projects occurred at the same time in different languages across the country and globe.
4. A language is fortunate if it generates more and more translation because literary translations represent the source language on one hand and, in doing so, it enriches the target language and culture on the other.

5. We need to take into account ‘misrepresentation’ along with ‘representation’. Literary translation today has many such examples when a text mockingly misrepresents a culture or does not represent it at all. Though we cannot accuse a translator for this, as readers’ understanding and context in which s/he reads. For example, how does an Indian reader read *Crime and Punishment* in translation without understanding those aspects of native Russian culture?

5. **Translator as Individual**

*Becoming a Translator*

It is a popular book that targets the students and teachers of translation and those who are interested in translation studies. The book provides guidance to practising translators as well as teachers. It comes with an approach of amalgamating theory with practice. *Becoming a Translator* deals with a wide range of theoretical perspectives of translation as well as the profession. In chapter 1, Robinson introduces two perspectives of looking at translation- internal and external. The reader considers translation as a text and the translator as an experience of translating, i.e. the process. In this chapter he widely deals with the external view, as to how the reader influences the process of translation.

In chapter 2, the focus is the internal view or the translator’s perspective. Here Robinson deals with all the minute issues related to the process of translation from routine of a translator to the qualities required to become a good translator. He also
addresses the issues of reliability, ethics and income. He gives a sound advice of enjoying the job of translating in order to take it to new heights.

In chapter 3, Robinson focuses on the process of translation where he deals with the concept of the translator ‘shuttling’ between a conscious analytical being to a mind that works automatically, out of instinct. Both these phenomenon enhance the work and make the job enjoyable. With the help of the examples of the American philosopher and semiotician Charles Sanders Pierce and Karl Weick he helps us to see the process of translation as cyclical, where instinct is followed by conscious decision making generated out of experience.

Chapter 4 tells us how translators initially depend on their intuitions and then use the experience of cultures, languages, and subject and linguistic resources in order to translate, as intuitions can mislead them. He concludes the chapter by stating that rules and theories are of no use without intuition and professional practice of translation. In the subsequent chapter he stresses upon the role of social interaction in the process of translation. According to Robinson, the more a translator understands the life of a common man the more s/he will be able to translate the different ideas, concepts, situations and circumstances that confront him/her in the form of text. He establishes strong connections between translation and linguistics. However, he states that translation has become more of a social activity than linguistic. After which he makes the translators aware of the problems that we can face if we depend too much on our intuition as no culture can be equal to or synonymous to some other culture. He advises the translator to learn more about cultures and become well versed with them in order to lend it in the translation in a better manner. Finally he
states that when a translator’s instinct/intuition alerts him/her about any problem, s/he goes back to lexes, syntax and rules and other such things but take recourse of intuitional solution when it comes to decision making.

**Translator as a Social Entity**

A translator is an individual as well as part of many groups and communities. S/he belongs to a family, a caste, a region, a country, many languages and has many academic affiliations. S/he is a social animal, who follows social norms, codes of conduct but s/he is simultaneously a person who knows and belongs to more than one social community and, hence, has responsibilities towards all of the languages in which s/he translates.

In the world of literature, there are four very specific entities: Author, Text, Reader and Critic. What, then, is the entity called the translator? There are two answers to this question: everywhere because, functionally, s/he has to perform roles of above mentioned categories, and nowhere because one cannot accuse a translator of not performing any of the roles. Even so, there are some expectations that translator herself/himself, original authors, readers, academicians, intellectuals, fellow translators and society by and large have from the translators. They are (a) being honest to the original text, (b) service of the two languages, (c) observing ethics of translation, (d) proper representation etc. Being a social entity, directly or indirectly, knowingly or unknowingly, s/he fulfils these expectations. Not only these, in fact the quality of translation depends on the social background along with translator’s ideological inclination that is why we have translators who translate for a group of people in the society, Dalit Translators, Feminist Translators etc.
The question of authenticity springs from socio-cultural routes of language and translators have grappled with them. It is in the hands of the translator to decide what would go out from the source language-culture and what would come from the target language-culture. Thus, in a way, translators are image makers of their society into the minds of the target language-society and they are also mind-shapers of their own society by deciding upon what would come to their siblings.

Translation looked at from its impact on society, tends to fall into hands of variety of people. For example, there are popular texts which get translated immediately whereas so many canonical texts are still awaiting translation and translators. Due to lack of translations in disciplines related to science, students in many regional cultures have to depend on books written in English. In such a situation, knowledge becomes hegemony of a language and translator has moral responsibility to liberate that knowledge. Is it not a great social service? Translator as social entity is a social worker here. Gandhi is another such example. He translated *Unto This Last* by John Ruskin and brought to India the concept of *Sarvodaya*, rise of the lowest of the low, which is still prevalent in many forms.

**Commitments of a Translator**

A translator is torn between his/her commitments towards the source culture/language as well as the target culture/language. S/he needs to be faithful to the text/subtext as well as to one’s creative freedom. A translator tries to stick to all of these at some point or the other during the process of translation. S/he tries to please one and all, as well as satisfy his/her urge for creativity and giving his/her best
for the better understanding of the text. The translator is also committed to the author as s/he trusts the translator with the representation of his/her text.

The issue of commitment comes to fore in more from the source language-culture rather than the target one because in any which way ‘translated text’ is indeed a gain for the target culture. Hence, a translator has consciousness of what a text would do in the target language readership and her/his prime commitment lies there only. First and foremost, translator has to be committed to the reasons why s/he is translating? Why a given text only? All other commitment would be committed to this primary commitment.

**Translators within a Translator**

It is evident from reading on and practice of translation that whenever a translator translates it is not the first word/sentence that is the final translation. There are many options available for every sentence and word to be translated and the translator chooses only one but we cannot say that it is the appropriate one. His/her choice depends on many factors like the target reader, the source texts language and set-up, the subtext, etc. There exists one translator who represents all these factors in every translator. Out of all these the most powerful one wins. The question, then is what defines or is behind that power?

It seems to the self-awareness of an individual that prevails at all the stages of decision making procedures. A poet is aware that s/he is composing a poem so s/he indulges into making her/his composition better and better each time. The same is the case with a painter, dramatist, dancer and a translator. A translator bifurcates
herself/himself into two languages and decides what serves the purpose and what
does not. It is a continuous process of selection and elimination. A translator goes
under various transformations at various levels: creative, emotional, intellectual,
linguistic, social etc. Honestly, it is pretty difficult to say whether translator
translates or s/he gets translated during the process, or even both. It is the process of
harmonizing so many and various types of translators within the translator. It is a
war within.

*Translator in the source/target culture: Translational Diaspora*

There is a tendency to talk about an author with reference to his/her nation, when we
talk of the issues dealt in his/her text. Where does a translator actually belong to? Is
it to the source culture or to the target culture? A translator knows and belongs to
many cultures and languages simultaneously. S/he lives and leads a diasporic life
and that is why it is fortunate to be translator as s/he lives many times and at many
places through languages. However, this ‘betweenness’ is a diasporic space for a
translator where s/he dwells for creative and linguistic speculations. Translation is
linguistic commutation. One does not leave one’s home but reaches a new home.

6. **Is Translator an Accountable Agent?**

_Yes, but how?_

A translator transfers a text of one language culture to some other and, in doing so,
has in mind the target reader, who may or may not be familiar to the source culture
and language. Generally translated texts are read by readers who do not know the
source language. Of course, and quite naturally, every concept, idea, thought and
feeling cannot be translated into the target language purely as there are certain things
that are culture and language specific. It requires a translator to try his/her best to deliver the text with all its specificity of style, theme, reason, logic, argument, etc. as authors do not generally take pains to learn some other language and translate their text. It is these translators who provide a helping hand in spreading knowledge, and helping the vast readership that craves for different types of works. We can depend on translators as first and foremost they are doing a service to the readers. They are the ones who understand and do something about the valuable works of a language so that it reaches a larger audience. The translators understand and appreciate the idea of globalization and are the most ancient community who practised it when nobody else did.

**No, but how?**

Translators are basically creators; they create a text. Every translated text is a new work, which is created from an existing one, but with certain new features added to it. Talking about literary translation, the translators may not render a text word for word. There might be additions and subtractions. One cannot judge the author on the basis of translation, as the translator exercises his/her creative freedom while translating concepts that are difficult, new or culture-specific.

**Translation and Criticism**

Considering one of the most neglected area of scholarly research, translation and criticism is decisive aspect that shapes literary theory. In any given literary tradition, criticism plays key role in observing various nuances of literary historiography. Translation and criticism has, further, two features: translation of critical texts and translation as criticism. First area deals with how to translate a critical text, for a
translator has to be familiar not only with language, literary sense but whole history of ideas that has given birth to a critical text. Besides, it is dialogue between two critical traditions. For instance, the English translation of Natyashashtra, is an Indian theoretical contribution to the field of dramaturgy and poetics to the Western critical traditions. Similarly, English translation of Of Grammatology is a unique contribution for all those scholars who do not know French but English. It is also a dialogue among regional critical traditions; as in a Gujarati critical text translated into Hindi, or a Marathi critical text translated in Hindi would generate a common space where such regional critical tides meet the main Sanskrit critical tradition in India, when translated into English, with its Western counter parts.

When we look at translation as criticism, we are dealing with the historical and political aspects of literature. Sometimes translation of literary text opens up a fresh sphere of research in the criticism of/on that language. Translation is believed to be a process of rigorous introspection, linguistic, literary and interpretative, the project of translation becomes critical. If translation is interpretation and re-writing of a new text, then it tends to be a critical activity along with being a creative one. Though it heavily depends on the ideological positioning of the translator; as categories called Feminist translator, Dalit translator, Tribal translator etc. are but more of critical activities than translation per se. In all such political categories, translation is ‘used’ as a tool in order to achieve some critical goal. What makes it even more fascinating is the choice of the text from the source language as that would be the first towards critical movement.
Translation as a Service to Readership and Culture

When one translates, it is a great service to the readership and culture of the language one is translating into. For rendering a text into a different language is to provide what is worth reading in source language and culture. It is in this way that the language and culture gets richer. Even literature also gets benefited by translation, for it gives an author a chance to read from various languages so that s/he does not repeat either matter or manner and his/her creative sense gets better. We always need good translators who can tell us what is happening in the other culture groups as everything cannot be preserved and passed on in newspaper or research data. Literary translation attempts to reach at those aspects/meanings of the text that unfold deep psychological processes at the cultural level.

It is impossible for a human being to experience all that we experience but literature makes it possible to simulate other experience. Translation makes it even more available. Readers across the globe today live different types of life through reading translation. How interesting it is to read Tom Jones for Indian readers who practically have no experience of what it is to be a picaro! In the same way, what would an American reader feel when s/he read Sanskara. Translator is a visitor in a foreign land and when s/he returns, s/he tries to tell his/her fellow country men and women what s/he felt and saw in that land. Though that would be second hand experience but would otherwise be impossible for us to experience even a slice of it. It is a service indeed.

7. Reader Response and the Concept of Interpretive Community

Criticism and Reader Response Theory
The importance of reader has been recognised since the classical ages. Literary theory and criticism stresses the importance of reader since its very conception, for instance, Plato banished poets from his Republic as the role a reader’s response plays in interpreting poetry which it seemed to take into account. He knew the amount of impact that can be created on a reader’s mind and how his/her interpretation would shape the society or vice versa. On the other hand Aristotle recognised the capacity of a reader to respond to certain stimuli given by the work of art and stressed on its importance in removing or purging harmful emotions from a reader/audience. In the history of literary criticism, Longinus was the first person to discuss critically reader-consciousness for writers. In order to attain sublime experience of art writers/poets must pour in five ingredients namely

(1)“full-blooded” or robust ideas (sometimes expressed by translators as “grandeur of thought”); (2) the inspiration of “vehement emotion”; (3) the proper construction of figures – both figures of thought and figures of speech; (4) nobility of phrase, which includes diction and the use of metaphor; and (5) the general effect of dignity and elevation.\(^9\)

The idea of Rasa as a whole given by Bharatmuni in Indian aesthetic/critical tradition presumes the presence of certain emotions present in the reader/audience that are portrayed in a work of art and finding the reflection of one’s emotions or identifying one’s emotions with that of the actors on stage the reader becomes sahрадay.

**Reader-Response Theory and Interpretive Community**

Reader-Response theory came as a reaction against Formalism and New Criticism, but the traits of reader-response can be seen in the works of Virginia Woolf, Louise Rosenblatt and Wayne Booth. Reader-response theory finds its roots in hermeneutics
and phenomenology with special reference to the works of Edmund Husserl. Wolfgang Iser was a prominent critic who focused on the role of reader in interpreting and creating the meaning of a text. He stressed on the idea of how readers create a text through active participation by reading and negotiated it with the help of phenomenology of reading. He draws on the works of Gadamer and Roman Ingarden, who have worked on the idea of cognition which helps us understand literary works. Iser presented his ideas about reader-response in a lecture on “The Affective Structure of Text” in 1970. His major works include *The Implied Reader* (1972) and *The Act of Reading* (1976). In his seminal works he stress on the importance of reader and his activities while reading. The meaning/interpretation of a text is the merger of the creativity of the author with that of the reader. If the text provides the reader with all the necessary information and leaves nothing for his/her imagination, then the reader might feel disappointed as there remains no scope for his/her imagination to work. Every good work of literature has ‘gaps’ in it that are filled by the reader. These gaps provide the reader with a chance of interpreting them in his/her own way and developing an understanding or enjoying the resultant experiences.

Iser also states that one could not term every reader as appropriate and vice versa, as every text uses literary devices to control the interpretation of the reader. Every text has something more to it than the written word and that comes into existence after reading. While reading, a reader goes through the processes of anticipation and retrospection which result into creation of meaning and these are what help him/her find the multiple meanings of the text.
After reading every text, a reader tries to reorganise it along the sequence of events that take place. In this manner s/he recreates it, so a reader also becomes the creator of a text.

Every fictional structure, according to Iser, is two-sided: it is both “verbal” and “affective.” The verbal structure of effects embodied in the text “guides the [reader’s] reaction and prevents it from being arbitrary”; the affective aspect is the realization in the reader’s response of a meaning that has been “prestructured by the language of the text.”

The meaning of a text, according to Iser, is relative. It changes with every reader, with every generation. The meaning of a text is produced by the consciousness of the reader in Iser’s opinion.

Manifesto of Interpretive Community

In reader response another important theorist worth considering is Stanley Fish, who introduced the idea of ‘interpretive communities’. He tried to locate the text in a situation, in circumstances or more precisely in communities, especially literary. He introduced this concept in his well-known essay “Interpreting the Variorum”. He developed this idea in his book Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities (1980). He tries to locate the meaning in the stereotypes or protocols of an institution to which a reader belongs. Fish uses this concept to try to ward off all the allegations that in reader-response, it seems to be anything that goes as meaning.

Fish argues that readers, or at least competent readers, belong to “interpretive communities” which are “made up of those who share interpretive strategies not for reading (in the conventional sense) but for writing texts, for constituting their properties and assigning their intentions. These strategies, he points out, exist prior to the act of reading and therefore “determine the shape of what is read.”
According to Fish, it is impossible to interpret a text out of its context. Apart from the language and its structures on the page, the practices of a literary institute or community influence the interpretation of a text.

The notion of inter-subjectivity on which Fish’s idea of “interpretive communities” rests goes back of course at least as far as Hegel; it is developed by neo-Hegelian philosophers, hermeneutic scholars, and sociologists, as well as thinkers such as Nietzsche and Bergson. Fish is effectively applying a well-known and previously extensively articulated insight to the act of reading. The same applies to his claim that facts do not exist independently of, or prior to, the interpretations and viewpoints that construct them as such.22

**Translation as Reading**

Translator is a reader, who reads and interprets the text before s/he translates it. The reader-translator interprets according to his/her acquired knowledge of the source culture and language. Translation is said to be the afterlife of any text. Reading gives life/meaning to any text. Hence translation is a type of reading. It is an interpretation of the translator. A translator reads a text many times before translating it. S/he tries to draw an appropriate meaning from the text after going through a lot of thinking, reflection etc and making choices from the many alternatives available.

**Translator as a part of Interpretive Community**

Interpretive community consists of the academic, literary, religious, spiritual and intellectual institutions to which a person belongs. A translator, who is primarily a reader, belongs to one or many such communities and hence what s/he reads is interpreted with the effect of the influence of these interpretive communities. As a student, academician or a common man our interpretation of a text depends on the norms and principles by which we are influenced. It is also the translator’s experience that designs the meaning of the text. It is the education, opinion, concerns and linguistic competence of a translator that makes him/her select a text for
translation and in its interpretation. All these aspects quite apparently are institutions or communities in themselves.

8. Select texts within the framework

**Shaher Mein Curfew in Hindi**

*Shaher Mein Curfew* is a novel in Hindi by Vibhuti Narain Rai which is based on the theme of Hindu-Muslim riot in Allahabad in 1980. Rai talks about the prejudices prevalent in the Hindu dominated police which leads to victimization of Muslims. This novel has been translated into more than ten languages. In this piece of research we will be dealing with its English translation by C M Naim and Marathi translation by Sharyu Pednekar.

**Kosala in Marathi**

*Kosala* by Bhalchandra Nemade is a novel about life. It is a journey of a young man, especially about his college days. It deals with the life of a rural Maharashtrian boy who comes to city for further studies. The peculiarity of this novel is its unusual and experimentative language. *Kosla* is translated into many languages, but we will be dealing with its English translation by Sudhakar Marathe and Gujarati translation by Usha Sheth.

**Tatvamasi in Gujarati**

*Tatvamasi* by Dhruv Bhatt is a Gujarati novel which deals with the wanderings and explorations of an NRI, who comes to India with the purpose of studying and improving the lives of the tribals living on the banks of the river, Narmada. It has been translated into English by Anjani Narvane and into Hindi by Dr. Ranjana Argade.
Thus the introductory chapter attempts to have bird’s eye view on some of the fundamental issues dealing with translation studies in general and comparative translation in particular. Ideas espoused here may be well understood if taken as complementary to their practical applications in the chapters to follow.
Research Design

Aim
To examine the nature and scope of translator’s creativity and the influence of her/his interpretive community on the resultant target text with regard to selected translations and also try to provide alternative translation as and when the need be.

Objectives
1. To select texts those are translated in at least one language.
2. To study the translations with reference to the original work.
3. To compare the meanings of the texts translated.
4. To apply practical notions of reader-response theory; interpretive community.
5. To identify and appreciate the role of translator’s creativity whether it enriches the meaning.
6. To advocate in favour of liberty of translator’s creativity and reducing the burden of authenticity or appropriateness.

Rationale
The research we have so far in the area of translation emphasises the translation techniques, expectations of target reader, authentic representation of the creative vision of the author etc however the task of translator as a creative mind is less focused. Hence the relevance of the present research lies in its being inclusive wherein the dogmatic issues, as mentioned above, would be (re)discussed with special reference to reduction of the expected “authentication” and supporting the creative faculty of the translator with regard to her/his interpretive community. We
would take close look at the translated works and try to negotiate the subordinate status of translator.

**Research Questions**

1. How to minimise the burden of authenticity/appropriateness of translator?

2. What is the influence of interpretive community on the creative process of translation?

3. To what extent can the variations in meaning be allowed in such authenticity-free translations, if any?

**Research Tools/Methodology**

Research methodologies/approaches selected for present research are,

(i) Textual Analysis

(ii) Comparative Study

(iii) Comparative Translation
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