CHAPTER ONE

1
1.2 TRANSLATION HISTORY: ENGLISH

Translation is the art of rendering a work of one language into another. This art is as old as written literature. Fragmentary versions of the Sumerian Gilgamesh Epic (q.v.) have been found in four or five Asiatic languages of 2d. millennium BC. Indeed it may have been read in their own tongues by early Biblical authors and by the poet of the Iliad. The Greeks did not translate, for they viewed their neighbours as barbarians and were too busy exploiting their own genius; and the Romans translated little from the literature of Greek, since they were so impressed by the literature of Greek that every cultivated Roman learnt to read the language. *

The first important translation in the classical world was that of the Septuagint (q.v) for the dispersed jews had forgotten their ancestral language and required Greek Versions of their scriptures. They had, however, little sense of literature. Therefore they accepted a poor and archaic Greek, full of Semitic constructions. ‘The Olde World’ flavour of the first Bible translations has in fact continued through the years to bedevil all of the rest, not excluding the Authorized (or King James) version. For the religious, unlike the literary, have never given priority to standards of verbal excellence preferring the bare meaning, and the religious were translator’s first patrons.

The Romans followed Greek models, but did not translate; soon they imposed their language on the whole learned world. Until the Renaissance, no man was called educated unless he could read and write Latin, and no learned work could hope to be widely read unless it were written in Latin. King Alfred’s Anglo-Saxon versions of Bede’s Ecclesiastical History and Boethius Consolation of Philosophy show a premature develop-

* Encyclopedia Americana, Volume No. 27, Newyork, 1918.
1.1. **SCOPE OF THE THESIS**

The fundamental intention of this endeavour is to observe the different problems encountered in the process of translation. The problems of translation can be viewed at different levels. While dealing with the syntactic structure of Kannada, only the potentialities and limitations of the prosaic standard kannada are considered, while, the deviations of the poetic structures are ignored. Different theories and types of translations have been introduced, but the approach of the thesis has not restricted itself to any one of them in particular.

The thesis does not intend to study any individual translator or any single text in particular, though the translations of BMS, NSL and BCR are primarily made use of. As it becomes unwieldy to cover all the vital aspects of Kannada linguistic structures, only those aspects which are found to be relevant and manageable have been studied here. As this topic has a very large canvas and is relatively less explored, any effort to make a comparative study would prove inadequate. However, an effort to look into the translations in the perspectives of syntagmatic level and paradigmatic level has been made.

The different problems of lexical equivalence that arise while translating jargons, dialects and cultural words are analyzed at the paradigmatic level, with a specific reference to the translations of poetry from English into Kannada. At the syntagmatic level of the translation study, the different varieties of language and their stylistic deviances, where translation might prove challenging have been considered. The thesis also suggests a model for evaluating translation. The thesis does not take the reader into the maze of complicated jargons to make it appear very technical. This is a humble effort to put forth the impressionistic review of the problems of translation based on the linguistic analysis.
ment of national self-consciousness. No other king supposed that the vernacular of his subjects was a fit vehicle for serious writing and the church frowned on even partial adaptations of the standard Latin Bible, St. Jerome’s Vulgate (dating from about 384).

The first serious task of translation was undertaken by the Arabs, who, having conquered the Greek world, made Arabic versions of its great scientific and philosophic works. Since manuscripts of these scarcely existed in the west, some translations were made from Arabic into Latin during the Middle ages, chiefly at Cordoba, one of the few gaps in the iron curtain that had fallen between the Christian and Muslim worlds.

**Chaucer and Early English Prose**: Medieval translation into the vernacular begins with the emergence of the middle class rich enough to buy manuscripts and sufficient self-confident to do without an education in Latin grammar. The first English purveyor of fine translations was the first great English poet, Geoffrey Chaucer. By his time, both Italian and French had acquired status as languages fit for a literature of entertainment if not for learned works. The 14th century Englishman, whose language was still regarded barbarous in Western Europe, therefore required three foreign tongues, not one, if he were to read the fashionable writers of his day; Boethius in Latin, Giovanni Boccaccio in Italian, and the *Romane la rose* in French. Chaucer freely adapted Boccaccio in his *Knight’s tale* and *Troilus and Criseyde*, began a translation of the Roman, and did the whole of Boethius called “Grand translateur” by the French poet Eustache Deschamps, he founded an English poetic tradition on adaptations and translations. Most medieval literature was based on free adaptation, and since originality was not rated highly before the 19th century, the classical sources were habitually preferred to the vernacular. Indeed, the vulgar tongues contributed little but folk songs and ballads until the Arthurian and cognate legends became widely popular and some
plot infiltrations from *The Arabian Nights* had enriched the thematic material inherited from Ovid, Aesop, the Bible and its Apocrypha, and the tales of the saints.

The first great English translation was the Wyclif (Wycliffe) Bible (c. 1382), which however, displayed all the weaknesses of English prose, for a poetic style is generally formed before a prose one. It was not until the end of the next century that the great age of English prose translation began with Thomas Malory's *Le Morte Darthur*, a free adaptation of Arthurian romances. Malory's style is rich, and his prose rhythms vary. He uses his sources too boldly, however, to be a true translator. The first great monuments of Tudor translation, therefore, are the Tyndale New Testament (1525; rev 1534), which profoundly influenced the more famous Authorised version of 1611, and Lord Berner's magnificent rendering of Jean Froissart's *Chronicles* (2 Vols. 1523-25), with prose as picturesque and delicately modulated as Malory's.

**Renaissance and Elizabethan Translations**: Meanwhile, in Italy, particularly at Florence, a work of translation was proceeding that was to enrich the whole of western culture. A beginning had been made with the revival of Greek in Sicily. Petrarch and others had collected Greek manuscripts. But with the arrival of the Byzantine scholar and Georgius Gemistus Pletho at the court of Cosimo de' Medici shortly before the fall of Constantinople to the Turks (1453), a Latin translation of Plato's works was undertaken by Marsilio Ficino. This and Erasmus' Latin edition of the *New Testament*, which he compared with the original Greek, were two great achievements of the Renaissance scholarship and led to an entirely new attitude toward translation. Now, for the first time, readers demanded exactness of rendering, for religious and philosophical beliefs depended on the exact words that Jesus or Plato or Aristotle had used.
The literature of entertainment, however, continued to be satisfied with adaptations. The Pleiade (qv) in France and the first Tudor poets in England wrote variations on themes by Horace, Ovid, Petrarch, and modern Latin writers, founding a new poetic style on their borrowings. The great Elizabethan translators also made free use of these originals. Their purpose was to supply to the new public, created by the growth of a middle class and the development of printing, the type or work the original author would have written had he been a man of their day, writing in their tongue. The Plutarch Lives (1579) of Sir Thomas North, famous because Shakespeare used it as a source book and because it has a pleasingly rambling English, was translated not from the Greek but from a French version by Jacques Amyot. The Montaigne Essays (1603) of the Italian refugee John Florio, which still has a high reputation, is in fact loosely discursive where Montaigne is both subtle and taut. Philemon Holland, who translated the million and more words of Pliny's Natural History (1610) in a year, had a far greater respect for his text than either North or Florio. "Our Holland had the true knack of translating", wrote Thomas Fuller, who named him "the translator-general in his age", a title that he earned by translating not only Pliny, but Livy, Xenophon, Suetonius, and Plutarch's Moralia (1603). Holland, like all Elizabethans, wrote a slow moving prose which required more than twice the number of words of the original. Thomas Shelton's version of Don Quixote, the first part of which appeared in 1612, before Cervantes had published his second, has a similar exhuberance. Shelton's Spanish was imperfect, but where he failed to understand his author is generally invented a phrase which, if not exact, was just as good. The last of these great Elizabethans was Sir Thomas Urquhart, who actually wrote during the Commonwealth. His version of the first three books of Rabelais (1653, 1693) vastly expanded his French original without departing from its spirit. Shelton and Urquhart,
in fact, were alive to the problem of their authors' styles, as North, Florio and Holland were not. Truth to the original style was admittedly an easier achievement with a modern language than with an ancient one. It was almost ignored by George Chapman, whose *Iliad* (1611) and *Odyssey* (1616) are written in different meters, and by his predecessor Arthur Golding, whose *Ovid* (*Metamorphoses*, 1565-67) was one of Shakespeare's source books; but it is clearly important to Sir John Harrington, who fails to capture it in his *Orlando Furioso* (1591). Though he uses Lodovico Aristo's meter, he fails to appreciate his elegance and is often raw and provincial. Nevertheless it is possible to read his *Ariosto* for the story, an impossibility with Chapman. Edward Fairfax's *Torquato Tasso* (Godfrey of Bullogne, 1600, a translation of *Gerusalemme Liberata*) and sir Richard Franshawe's *Camoens the Lusiads*, (1655) not only convey the matter in the original meter, but are pretty faithful to the manner. Thus the Elizabethan period of translation, which in fact, overran the queen's lifetime by about 50 years, witnessed a considerable progress away from mere paraphrase toward an ideal of stylistic equivalence, but even to the last there was no feeling of a need for verbal accuracy.

**Augustans and Victorians**

The Restoration and the 18th century, conscious of a kinship with the age of classical Rome, took for granted their power of writing in a classical manner. Certainly, John Dryden's *Plutarch* (*Lives*, 5 vols. 1683-86) is truer to the original than North's and in the modern field, Charles Cotton's *Montaigne* (*Essays*, 1685) is preferable to Florio's. But when Dryden set out to make Virgil speak "in words such as he would probably have written if he were living and an Englishman" — a restatement of the Elizabethan ideal — he entirely forgot that the great Augustan was both subtle and concise. His translation frequently attains
nobility, but in the most leisurely and obvious rhymed couplets. Homer, too, suffers at the hands of Alexander Pope, who at the best produces a well-polished reflection of the "Wild Paradise" which he thought it his business to reduce to order. Dryden’s Aeneid (1697) and Pope’s Iliad (1715-20) and Odyssey (1725-26) are elegant poems for the library; they have not the force of the national epics they imitate.

Though these translations were signed by Dryden and Pope, they were in fact works of collaboration. The English Augustan style was so uniform that one hand could not be distinguished from another. Moreover, translation was now becoming an industry which, though badly paid, never lacked recruits. Peter Motteux, a Huguenot refugee who completed Urquhart’s Rabelais and retranslated Don Quixote (1700-03), was the first of the new Grub street practitioners, whose watch word was ease of reading. Whereas Shelton’s Quixote is longer than Cervantes’, that of Motteux is shorter. Anything that he did not understand, or that he though might bore his reader, he unscrupulously omitted. This was the rule throughout the 18th century, which assumed that its own work a day style was the best and that writers of a less polite age should be pruned and lopped to their level. For scholarship, they cared no more than their predecessors. Tobias Smollett took his Quixote (2 vols, 1755) from the French; the poet Thomas Gray published poems from the Welsh and the Norse, which he could have known only imperfectly; and when James Macpherson produced his Fingal (1762), and Temora (1763), half the world believed that he had translated the legendary poet Ossian. In fact his poems owed something to Gaelic fragments, but were mainly of his own composition.

The 19th century set new standards of style and accuracy in translation. In the matter of accuracy, “the text, the whole text, and nothing but the text”, with the exception of any
Rao, Govinda Pai and Hatti angadi Narayana Rao borrowed new themes from English but presented them in the old forms.

This was a transient stage and that soon gave way to the new forms. M.Govida Pai proclaimed to give up the initial rhyme in his poems and this was a very significant step which was trendsetting.

The theme and the content of Kannada poetry written so far were connected with the epics and spiritual life. The series of English translations into Kannada influenced in the Change of subject like national, social and such secular topics. The length of the poem was also remarkably reduced.

Hattiangadi Narayana was the first person to translate poems from English in a large scale and publish an anthology of translations. He published *Angla Kavithavali* which was also called *Anglakavitha sara*, in 1919. He made minor changes in traditional metrical patterns and used them. He did not give up initial rhyme. Besides his translations S.G.Narasimha Charya wrote independent poems which were influenced by to source poems of his translations in terms of theme and temperament.

Govinda Pai created forms new to Kannada poetry and he was the first to write a sonnet in Kannada.

B.M. Sri.Kanthaih made a revolutionary change in the subject, language and meter of Kannada poetry. Even the independent poems composed by the followers of B.M.Sri. were influenced by the choice of the poetic style, topic and the narrative technique and presentation.

The period between 1920 and 30 was called the period of development, as the period prior
bawdy passages and the addition of many explanatory footnotes became accepted policy. The victorians’ stylistic practices, however, render most of their translations unreadable today, their aim was to remind the reader on every page that he was reading “a classic” written in a foreign tongue and generally in another age. Thomas Carlyle’s *Goethe* is English written as German; the vocabulary is Teutonic and the constructions Germanically cumbrous. Sir Richard Francis Burton’s *Arbian Nights* (16 vols., 1885-88) is full of pseudo-Arabic convolutions. Even Robert Browning, who claimed to be “literal at every cost”, indulged in peculiar archaisms in his version of *The Agememnon of Aeschylus* (1877), and William Morris, in *Beowulf* (1895), which he translated with the aid of A J Wyatt wrote English as it might have been if it had developed straight from the Saxon and there had been no Norman conquest. By contrast, the outstanding Victorian translation, Edward Fitzgerald’s *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayam* (1859) attains its Oriental flavour chiefly by the use of Persian names and by discreet Biblical echoes, and it succeeds as a poem in its own right with very little basis in the Persian.

**The Twentieth Century:**

The cult of archaism was broken in 1871 by the Oxford scholar Benjamin Jowett, who translated Plato into simple decent language, thus setting an example that was not generally followed until well into the 20th century, when the whole question of style as put aside and plain accuracy became the criterion. As in the age of Elizabeth I, translators were now providing for a new educated public, though its training was generally scientific rather than literary. Such works as E.V Rieu’s *Odyssey* (1946) set out to translate plainly and word for word into prose that could be read without resort to footnotes. The new paper back transla-
tions prefer prose to verse, and approximate meters to close imitations, even when rendering the great poems of the past. They do not view their authors with the reverence of the Victorians and let them kick up their heels when they will. Bayard Taylor’s otherwise reputable 19 century Faust (2 vols., 1870-71) fails where Goethe writes light heartedly in doggerel: his American translator calls him gently to order, where modern writers point or even underline the contrast. Light heartedness indeed sometimes tempts the translator too far, as when Robert Graves makes Lucan faintly absurd in the duller passages of the Pharsalia (1957). Criticism by parody is, however, as much a fault as the 18th century’s criticism by omission. Our present age demands the whole of the meaning, even when, as in the case of Jackson Kinght’s Aeneid (1956). This involves a considerably expanded text to account for the multiple layers of meaning in every line of Latin.

Scientific translation is the aim of age that would reduce all activities to techniques. It is impossible, however, to imagine a literary translation machine less complex than the human brain itself, with all its knowledge, reading, and discrimination. Literary translation is never a matter of word for word equivalences. The meaning of a paragraph, with all the associations that it had for its author, must be rendered and if this is done, the sentences will probably bear only a loose resemblance to those of the original. French or Spanish constructions can often be exactly matched in English. German generally needs recasting. Latin, Sanskrit and Russian require varying degrees of expansion, which are all presently beyond the capacity of anything but a trained human mind.

The plain prose method has not entirely prevailed in the last half century. Outstanding verse translations such as, in the United States, Leonard Bacon’s Lusiads (1950) and Dudley Fitt’s and Robert Fitzgerald’s Aristophanes and Sophocies and in England, Arthur Waley’s,
Chinese poems recreated poetry as poetry, all but Bacon’s work employing modern meters and rhythms. First-class work has been done also on both sides of the Atlantic, in contemporary literature, where the complexities are often greater than in well-annotated work of the past. Here C.K. Scott Moncreiff’s *Proust* and H.T. Lowe-Porter’s versions of Thomas Mann stand prominent. Certain translations of theoretical writers such as Carl Jung, Sigmund Freud and Soren A Kierkegaard, which demand of their translator a profound knowledge of the subject as well as a linguistic skill have been of a very high order also. General standards of taste and accuracy have in fact greatly risen both in Britain and in United States during the present century, though it seems to be becoming increasingly difficult to suit both English-reading publics with a single version of the same book.
1.3 A BRIEF HISTORY OF KANNADA TRANSLATIONS

The vast literature of Kannada has been enriched by the translation of literature from various languages. In the earlier ages the source had mainly been Sanskrit. English was the first foreign language to be translated into Kannada. This was made possible by the introduction of the language when the Britishers invaded India. The advent of the Britishers brought forth into our country their religion, culture and literature.

In order to propagate their religion, the Christian missionaries translated their religious books into the Indian vernacular. Reverend William Kerie translated The Bible into Kannada in the prose form.

It is essential to note that it was not just the transformation of the language, but it was the transformation of the form of literature too. Prose was the target language form the translators chose. The reason for this is not only it is easier to translate into prose, but also that their intention was to make their translations easily intelligible to the common man, and thereby help them in converting the Indians into Christianity. These were the first attempts to translate English literature into Kannada. Then the plays of Shakespeare were translated into Kannada in the form of tales.

The prose form of the Bible in Kannada by William Kerie is the first known translation of Kannada from English.

As a preliminary spade-work to facilitate the task of translations, Reverend Reeve compiled the first ever known English-Kannada dictionary in 1818. Mogling Vigal translated many stanzas of Bunyan's 'Pilgrim's Progress' in 1847 and published it in collaboration with B.L Rice in 1849. The first person to introduce Shakespeare to Kannada readers was
Channabasappa, who wrote the tales of Shakespearean plays *Comedy of Errors* and *Macbeth* into Kannada.

In the last decade of the 19th century the translation activity was in its full swing. Many plays were translated into Kannada. M.L. Srikantha Gowda recreated Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* in Kannada as *Pratapa Rudra Deva* (1895), *Midsummer Night’s Dream* as *Pramiliarjunaya*. He has also translated Henry Fielding’s ‘A silican Summer’ as *Kanya Vitantu* and Maria Edgeworth’s *Little Merchants* as *Chikka Banajigaru*.

Though these translations are not individually dated, they are all written in the last decade of 19th century.

Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* was the first novel to be translated into Kannada by S.V. Krishna Swamy Iyengar in 1857. One of the most significant translations of prose that followed was Thomas Day’s *Sandford and Martin* by M.S Puttanna as *Sumathi Hagu Madana Kumarara Charitre*. The same translator’s *Hemachandra Raja Vilasa* is the Kannada rendering of *King Lear*.

These translations may be called adaptations. Adaptation is the freest form of translation. The types and methods of translations shall be discussed in the following chapter. The theme, character and plot of the original are usually preserved, but the cultural context is made to suit the target language.

Translating the other tongue into the mother tongue is easier than translating a text in the mother tongue of the writer into a foreign language. It needs a remarkable knowledge of both the languages for such an endeavour.

Mogling Vigal being an English Christian missionary, learnt Kannda and translated Bunyan’s
Pilgrim's Progress into Kannada. He has followed the metrical patterns of the traditional poetical style. Some of the stanzas of his poem are in Bhamini Shatpadi and others are in Chaupadi.¹

At about the same period, the missionaries published Geeta Pustakagalu which included a few German poems translated into Kannada. These poems have initial and end rhymes. ²

Kannada poetry, is basically characterised by the initial rhyme. The end rhyme that we find in the modern Kannada poetry is an influence of English poetic style. The sermons translated by the Christian missionaries are free from the traditional poetical style of Kannada, and the rhyme is found in abundance.

The Christian missionaries continued to translate poetry from the last decade of the 19th century to the first two decades of 20th century. This was the spark that lit the flame of Navodaya sahitya.

Kannada poetry was infested with several fallacies during the period when translations were being done from Sanskrit. The metrical forms, rhyme scheme and the theme were all archaic and monotonous. Poetry was rejuvenated by the fresh blood of new metrical patterns, new theme and rhyme schemes that were inspired by the English poetry.

There was a lot of hesitation to accept the new forms and to give up the traditional meters. Most of the translations of poetry that were made in the early twentieth Century continued to follow the obsolete patterns. Poet-translators like S.G. Narasimhacharya, Panje Mangesh

1. Shatpadi A six line stanza pattern invented by Raghavanka of 13th Century.
   Bhamini On of the six types of Shatpadies which has 14 syllables in a line.
   Chaupadi A stanza pattern with four lines; One of the 7 types of “Akkara” form. It has a pause and internal rhyme as special features.
2. Sankshipta Kannada Sahitya Charithre; M. Mariyappa Bhatta, Karnataka Govt., 1983.
Rao, Govinda Pai and Hatti angadi Narayana Rao borrowed new themes from English but presented them in the old forms.

This was a transient stage and that soon gave way to the new forms. M.Govida Pai proclaimed to give up the initial rhyme in his poems and this was a very significant step which was trendsetting.

The theme and the content of Kannada poetry written so far were connected with the epics and spiritual life. The series of English translations into Kannada influenced in the change of subject like national, social and such secular topics. The length of the poem was also remarkably reduced.

Hattiangadi Narayana was the first person to translate poems from English in a large scale and publish an anthology of translations. He published Angla Kavithavali which was also called Anglakavitha sara, in 1919. He made minor changes in traditional metrical patterns and used them. He did not give up initial rhyme. Besides his translations S.G.Narasimha Charya wrote independent poems which were influenced by the source poems of his translations in terms of theme and temperament.

Govinda Pai created forms new to Kannada poetry and he was the first to write a sonnet in Kannada.

B.M. Sri.Kanthaih made a revolutionary change in the subject, language and meter of Kannada poetry. Even the independent poems composed by the followers of B.M.Sri. were influenced by the choice of the poetic style, topic and the narrative technique and presentation.

The period between 1920 and 30 was called the period of development, as the period prior
to this was called the period of inception. After the age of development was the age of achievement.

All the forms of lyrics in Kannada were derived from English. The narrative verse, the philosophical poems, satires also found a place in Kannada literature through translations. ‘Pragatha’ is inspired by ‘ode’. Masti Venkatesha Iyengar’s *Navaratriya Kathana Kavyagalu* was modelled on Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*. Matthew Arnold’s *Soharb Rustum* was translated by L.Gundappa. Masti used ‘sarala/ lalitha’ ragale in 1924 which was an imitation of Blank Verse, unknown to Kannada. Kuvemp brought the ‘Mahachandassu’ as an equivalent of Milton’s Grand Style. He has acknowledged Homer, Virgil, Dante and Milton in his epic *Ramayana Darshanam*. The other less significant translations are as follows:

Daniel Defoe’s

- Robinson Crusoe as *Crusoena Vrutanta* by Krshanswamy Iyengar in 1854

Shakespeare’s

- *Othello* as *Raghvendra Rao nataka* by Churmuri 1885
- *Tempest* as *Chadnamarutha* by Karanataka Granthamala, Mysore 1893
- *Othello* as *Surasena Charitre* by Basappa Sastry and Subba Rao in 1895
- *Taming of the Shrew* as *Gayyaliyannu Sadhumaduvike* by Bellave Somanathaiah 1897 (A translation from Telugu Text, by Veereshalinga panthulu)
Oliver Goldsmith’s *She stoops to conquer* as *Pati Vashikarana* by kerur Vasudevacharya (1866-1921)

Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice* as *Venisu Nagarada Vanija* by B. Venkatacharya in 1906

Oliver Goldsmith’s *Vicar of Wakefield* as *Primrose Vijaya* by Govida raja Iyngar in 1915.

The translation after 1930 till date became an industry as the print medium and publication developed rapidly. However the pioneers in the translation field mentioned above paved a very comfortable path for the following translators.
1.4 THEORIES OF TRANSLATION

Any field of knowledge has theories. Translation also has several theories and some of the theories are contradicting to the other theories.

Savory T.H., in his *The Art of Translation* gives these contrasting pairs of theories:

i) A translation should give the words of SL.
   A translation should give the sense of the SL.

ii) Translation should read like an original text.
    Translation should read like a translation.

iii) Translation should reflect the original style
     Translation should include the style of the translator.

iv) Translation should read like a contemporary to the source text.
    Translation should read like a contemporary to the translator.

v) Translator may or may not add anything to the source text.
    Translator must not add or delete anything from the source text.

vi) Poetry must be translated into prose form
    Poetry must be translated into the form of poetry alone.

When one looks at such contrasting statements one wonders if there is anything in common at all. When we look at these pairs of statements closely, we realize that they are not theories of translation but problems encountered in translation.

The theories of translation lie in answering these three questions put forth by Savory:

i) What does the author say?
ii) What does he mean?

iii) How does he say it?

So, any statement that accounts for the subject, style and quality of a text may be called a theory.

The famous German poet and dramatist Goethe opines that

‘There are two great maxims of translation, either turn the foreign author into a native author or induce the reader to go out to the author’s foreignness’.

This means that there should be no room for any artificiality in the style, content and presentation. But all the texts cannot be so easily translated as said above. Several factors like social, cultural and the limitation of the language make the translation difficult or impossible.

For example, there are several words and terms in the Indian vernacular to represent the kinship terms. But in English, such words very limited. Whereas the words describing the colours are numerous in English while there are very few in Indian languages.

Alexander Frazer Tyler’s theory is as follows:

i) The translation should give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work.

ii) The style and manner of writing in a translation should be of the same character with that of the original.

iii) A translation should have all the ease of the original composition.

To achieve the first intention, it is essential to have a thorough knowledge of the source
language and the subject. A good translator must be able to identify the style of the source text. In order to influence the reader of the source text, the translation must be equally efficient as the source text. It is very difficult to retain faithfully, both the manner and matter of presentation.

Savory classified translation theories as under:

i) Faithfulness

ii) Intention and

iii) Contemporariness

The very elementary thing that a translator has to follow is the faithfulness to the original. This enables him, every moment, to remember that he is not the original writer and that he is only presenting the feelings and thoughts of a different writer in another language.

Savory says that the original reads like an original hence the translation of it should read like a translation.

The impact that the original text had made on its contemporary readers, should be equal to the impact of the translation on the contemporary readers. This obviously means that language used by the translator must not be the same as that is used by the source text writer.

Postgate’s theory of translation seems to be more satisfying

i) Principle of fidelity

ii) Principle of commensurateness

iii) Principle of pleasure of reading
iv) Principle of compensation  
v) Principle of originalness  

**Principle of Fidelity:**

By general consent, though not by universal practice, the prime merit of translation proper is faithfulness and he is the best translator whose work is nearest to his original.  
What is first and most needful is that the translation should be correct and the thoughts should be rendered by their corresponding words, not falsified or mutilated or amplified by extraneous matter.  

Almost all the translators of Homer strongly believe in the principle of fidelity. Newman says, "the translator's first duty is a historical one— to be faithful".

G. Rosetti opines: "the work of the translator (and with all humility be it spoken) is one of some self-denial. Often he would avail himself of any special grace of his own idiom and epoch, if only his will belonged to him; often would some cadence serve him but for his author's structure— some structure but for his author's cadence—.. now he would slight the matter for the music and now the music for the matter, but no— he must deal with each alike. Some times too a flaw in the work galls him and he would feign remove it, doing for the poet that which his age denied him, but no— it is not in the bond."

Swanvik's theory says: "it is, I believe, universally recognised that a translation ought as possible to reflect the original and that any wilful or unacknowledged deviation from it is tantamount to breach of trust".

Lord Curzon had warned the translators that, the translator should remember that the work
is not primarily his but that of another man of whose ideas he is merely a vehicle and an interpreter.

William Cowper one of the several translators of Homer’s works stressed on the point that he has been very faithful to the original, “My chief boast is that I have adhered closely to the original”.

It is true that the value and importance of the translation is directly proportional to the close adherence of it to the original text.

But the translator must not be faithful only to the source language but also to the target language. So the translator should be faithful to the substance and the form of the source and not to the word of the source text alone.

T.H.Varen says, “The latitude allowed to a translator must be sufficient, but not more than sufficient, it must be minimum which will suffice to make the translation idiomatic and natural in the language into which it is made”.

So, a translation should be as faithful as it can and as free as it must be.

**Principle of the Pleasure of the Reader**:  
The same amount of pleasure that a translator experiences while reading the source text must be derived by the reader of the translation.

Dryden says, “After all a translator is to make his author appear as charmingly as he possibly can, provided he maintains his character and makes him not unlike himself.”

One must not go out of one’s way to make the translation attractive. Because the pleasure is relative, Prof.Fillimore says, “A faithful translator is in duty bound to be faithfully in absurdity.”
The problem of capturing the spirit, thought and form of the source text does not arise in the science and humanities. But in translating poetry, it becomes very difficult to make it commensurable. To bring the cadence, meter, and all the other poetic qualities along with the spirit of the source text in the translation is not an easy task. This principle demands a confluence of these characters. The translation must neither be a paraphrase or an epitomization of the source text.

**Principle of Compensation:**

It is desirable to bring in all the features of the original into the translation, but it may not be possible always.

Poetry is of so subtle a spirit that in passing out of one language into another, it will evaporate and if a new spirit be not added in the transfusion, there will remain nothing but a caput mortuum.

What to compensate and where to compensate is the problem. The principle of fidelity forbids adding anything to the source text. It may not be possible to bring the initial, end or the internal rhyme as found in the source text into the translation. Such loopholes are to be compensated by making the translation look as natural as possible.

**Principle of Originalness:**

At no level should the reader feel that he is reading a translation. This is possible only when the translator has mastery over both the languages and its idiomatic usages. If not the translation becomes very unnatural or affected. The translation should appear as if it has
been written by the original writer in the target language.

Peter Newmark's theory of translation begins with choosing a method of approach. While translating a piece of literature these four levels must be kept in mind:

i) The source text level, the level of language where we began and which we continually go back to.

ii) The referential level, the level of object and events real or imaginary which we progressively have to visualize and build up and which is an essential part first of comprehension and then of the reproduction process.

iii) The cohesive level, which is more general and grammatical which traces the train of thought, the feeling tone and the various presuppositions of the source language text. This level encompasses both comprehension and reproduction; it presents an overall picture to which we may have to adjust the language level.

iv) The level of naturalness of common language appropriate to the writer or the speaker in a certain situation. Again this is a generalized level which constitutes a band within which the translator works unless he is translating an authoritative text, in which case he feels the level of naturalness as a point of reference to determine the deviation if any between the author's level he is pursuing and the natural level.

Finally there is the revision procedure. The above theories designed to be a continuous link between translation theory and practice.
Besides giving this frame work, Peternewmark diagrammatically shows how naturalness can be acquired at every level—grammatical and lexical:

Three Language Functions

Expressive
Informative
Vocative

Translation Theory

Semantic
Communicative

Frame of Reference

Problem
Contextual Factors

Translation Procedures

Theory of Translating

Textual/Referential/Cohesive/Natural Levels
The textual level: As soon as the translator reads a sentence in the source text, he intuitively makes certain conversions. The source language grammar (clauses and groups) in to their ready target language equivalents and the lexical equivalents into the sense that appears immediately appropriate in the context of the sentence.

This is the level of the literal translation. So a part of the mind may be on the text level while the other is elsewhere.

The referential level: The sentences must not be looked at in isolation. The translator must see the intention, what is it in aid of. The jargons must be pierced, to penetrate the fog of words.

If there is an ambiguity in a sentence, or if it is abstract the translator must try to dig out the meaning and visualize it. If he fails to do that, then, he has to supplement the linguistic level with the referential level. Then the gap between the words and object becomes clear.

The referential and the textual levels go hand in hand. The polysemous words and structures that we have used vaguely in the first draft can be solved at the referential level. All the loose ends, are set right when a referential picture is built up in mind.

The cohesive level: This is the third level that links the first and second levels. The sentences have to be connected into an organic whole by the help of connective words like conjunctions enumerations, reiterations, definite articles, general words, referential synonyms and punctuation marks. Usually sentences link from known information to the unknown (new information) which makes propositions, oppositions, continuations or conclusions. Thus the structure follows the train of thought that determines the direction in the text.