APPENDIX-A

LIMITS OF TRANSLATABILITY

Limits of translatability have been discussed since the second century BC beginning with the translator's prologue to the apocryphal book of Ecclesiastics, which remarks in terms not unlike Wilss (1982; 164) that producing a version formally equivalent to the original in every detail is impossible. To this Monsignor Ronald Knox adds that while it is easy enough to remove specifically foreign elements from a translation, putting in a tone that is specifically English is extremely difficult.

The issue has been discussed from three often hostile points of view: linguistic, philosophical and literary. Linguistic discussions traditionally focus on equivalence in lexicon and discourse. It is not until the twentieth century that grammar is discussed independent of discourse. Philosophical discussions usually centre round truth conditions and equivalence in reference. Indeterminacy arguments of the type put forward by Quine urge that because meaning is such a subjective element and so culture-based the subjectivity of both author and translator severally limits accurate transfer of meaning. The third major group of approaches comes from the literary view of a text as a gestalt embedded in a culture or historical matrix; translatability is inherently limited by the coherence between the linguistic elements of the source text and its cultural matrix, and not by putative equivalence between text units. All three streams of discussion agree on three things. First, translation difficulties are specific to particular pairs of languages. Second, they lie on a cline from absolutely insurmountable to not difficult at all. Third, translatability is condi-
tioned more by what one must express in one language than by what one can express in the other.

If translation is viewed as an act of communication, these three approaches dovetail into each other. The issue is best treated under three heads; language as knowledge, language as behaviour language as art. These have been developed from Halliday and Martin (1981: 13-16)

Language as knowledge:

Language as knowledge covers the systems internal to language:

Lexicon, grammar and discourse.

Lexicon: The word as unit: The traditional classification of Lexicon as fully untranslatable, partly translatable and translatable, depends partly on similarities and differences in source and target language referents and partly on what happens to words when they are actualized in context.

Words whose referents are not common to source and target language societies are of course completely untranslatable. For example, words like 'parisincane', chitrahuti' and 'sandhya vandane' cannot be translated in English, which refer to cultural rites of Hindus. Physical settings can be untranslatable for ex 'snow' and 'ice' cannot be translated in many of the languages of tropical countries. A word in one language can cover two concepts the other keeps distinct, as in the difficulties of translating the Latin 'tempus' or the French 'temps' which mean either 'time or 'tense' in English an especially difficult problem when the writer plays with both senses in the same passage. The meaning of a word is at times to be determined in relation to a characteristic of the speaker or reference point.
The French poet, Yves Bonnefoy, and linguists influenced by Bally claim that lexicon varies systematically from one language to another. Languages like English on the ‘plan du reel’ prefer mediating their lexicon sensorially, and others on the ‘plan de l’entendement’ like French mediate intellectually. English lexicon therefore tends to the imaged and the concrete, while French tends to the abstract. French lexicon tends towards the simple and the general, while English goes to the particular: The French ‘bruit’ is best not left general in English, but differentiated by words like thump, buzz, screech, rustle. Such expressions can be found in a larger number in the Kannada lexicon.

Paradigmatic structures; The differences constituting paradigmatic structures are not the same from one language to another. In Latin ‘man’ as opposed to ‘woman’ is ‘vir’ but as opposed to ‘animal’ is ‘homo’. The same object will often be denoted from different points of view, deceptively similar in source and target languages. The Latin words for ‘married woman’ all denote her from culturally peculiar points of view; uxor ‘wife’ is the most neutral of them.

Much of what is said above is untranslatable because of obligatory semantic distinctions peculiar to a particular language. These usually depend on culturally peculiar differentiation in linguistic fields.

Collocations: Collocation is the arrangement of words in a way that they meaningfully co-occur with one another. Words are actualized as semantic or grammatical entities usually unambiguously. When collocation does not completely suppress polysemy translatability will be compromised or even become impossible. Its real basis is the total experience of the speech community that uses a particular language. No language can have
a fixed and limited set of collocations, as with the widening of its range of knowledge and experience its collocational range is bound to widen. Translation is a very vital means to widen it. It also widens the range of contextual features that language covers by bringing in varied kinds of foreign contexts which bring with them all their collocations. If an SL text refers to a foreign situation, we cannot expect to find in the TL, such normal collocation as are confined to local situation. They will sound strange and unusual only to one who is not familiar with the context of the foreign situation.

Writers some times create unusual collocations for aesthetic purposes - these collocational clashes cause a feeling of surprise and shock in the readers’ mind. But they are not instances of untranslatability.

Unusual ideas may be translated only through unusual collocations. When the foreign terms are either borrowed or adapted and become regular part of the language, the collocational untranslatability ceases to exist.

Collocations will stretch the meaning of a word to different lengths in different languages. ‘I met her three husbands ago’ is difficult in Kannada, as Kannada does not accept interpreting persons or things as extents of time. For this reason, metaphor, word play and idioms are constant problems.

When some inherent features of a lexical items in the source text is not matched in the target language but is essential to the message, some theorists consider that an absolute limit on translatability is reached. And from a formal point of view they are correct. Puns are a case in point, because the orthographic or phonological identity of two words with different meanings is an essential part of the message. They can only be translated
functionally, that is by a change of focus within the context as in: Is life worth living? That depends on the liver, the chance that another language will have a word meaning both ‘one who lives’ and ‘the bile secreting organ’ is rather remote so the translator must regard the context as the punning unit, not the word. There is always something lost and something added in such translations.

Grammar:

Languages have a varied repertoire of word classes, and mark them in different ways. Inflexional languages like Greek and Latin and Kannada ‘parts of speech’ is largely determined by flexion, while in languages like Maori ‘parts of speech’ depends very largely on the sentence slot in which a word appears, English has this liberty to some extent as in the following example:

> WET PAINT

> Please don’t!

In Kannada, or French, or German the word ‘wet must be unmistakably an adjective or a verb, and not carry the possibility of being either as it does here.

This is only one aspect of a wider issue; the ease with which a language can use derivational morphology and form what Saussure calls ‘motivated’ systems of lexicon.

Phrase and Sentence structure:

Knox’s point, that it is easier to remove the foreign flavour from a translation than to put in an English flavour, is taken up by Levenston (1971). His ‘overindulgence and ‘underrepresentation’ both interference types, were developed as a diagnostic tool in the
foreign language classroom, but like language learners, translators are prone to faults like choosing a formal structure over an informal, a verbose over a simple, and to underdifferentiate.

Sentence structure:

Jules Marouzeau laid it down that if one is to show how the thought progresses through the sentence, one must translate subordination. What seems reasonable length and complexity in Latin or German, will drag to an English or French reader. Marouzeau's principles causes difficulty when the grammar of clause coordination and subordination is markedly different from source target language. The points at issue are:

a) The relative linearity of a sentence. The Latinperiodic style, a 'circular style' which demands suspension of attention until the sentence is clinched with final element, was widely imitated in other languages at one time. Just as one of the arts of Latin prose is constructing a period with nested constructions that flow one from the other, so the essential art of the translator faced with Latin or Latinate prose lies in transforming the period into a linear sentence by untangling the nested constructions.

b) The balance between parataxis, hypotaxis and protaxis is always different from one language to the other. Nominal languages like French prefer to subordinate with phrases, verbal languages like English and German prefer clauses. The high preference English shows for parataxis (when contrasted with French) is related very closely to its logical implicitness.
c) The polysemy of conjunctions. Conjunctions both co-ordinating and subordinating, offer different possibilities, usually according to the pragmatics of the sentence, and for instance, can be adversative or even subordinating in sense, so that a translation into French or Latin may impose an interpretation on it.

Discourse:

Texts can combine a perfectly good grammatical structure with an unusual (unnatural) discourse structure. Naturalness depends on how firm a control is exercised over the reader's progress through the text. Discourse structures are limited by the different criteria for readability in source and target languages. Readability is determined by sentence length, sequence of information, and cohesion and coherence mechanisms.

Language as Behaviour: Pragmatics

Snell-Hornby (1988) argues that translatability is conditioned by the degree to which a text is embedded in its own culture. Some types of text are culture dependent; others like a scientific text, will be culture independent to a very large extent. Translatability depends on how far the target text can enter into the gestalt of the translator's society.

It is clear that a fact that is peculiar to the society of the source language text is untranslatable, even if it is explainable. The frequent old testament image of being rescued from a pit (cf. N.Zecharia 9, v.11) is based on the Eastern method of keeping prisoners secure by dropping them down a pit. Where the fact seems the same, social attitudes will limit translatability in a society which can require owners to have even cats on leash, it is difficult to have any idea of the desperate savagery of the pariah dogs of the middle east, and the final degradation of a beggar whose sores were clicked by dogs (Luke 16, v 21).
What one may say in a given situation varies from one language to another. Plinys’ groveling flattery before the Roman Emperor Trojan, sounds silly rather than flattering in English (Grant 1987; 86) formulas of thanks vary from the relative effusiveness of the North American English speaker to the silent look of a kannada speaker. In many languages there is no need for words like ‘thank you’. Formality and informality are vexed questions, as are what one may say in a given situation. The sentence from a German Muslim edition protests too much;

The edition attempts to restore what is presumably the original guise of the piece, and to make a musically significant piece playable by two melody instruments and a thorough bass.

Editorial bashfulness is not as well-developed in English; the above might better be:

This edition for two melody instruments and thorough bass seeks to reconstruct the original version of the interesting piece.

But the question remains whether this can even be said in English. This issue is how one approaches the receptor. Couching information, giving orders and making requests are all done in different ways in different languages depending on the desired effect.

Language as Art

Some see the ultimate test of translation as whether it fits into the gestalt of the target society with its close union of experience and perception (Snell -Hornby 1988:41ff). Others, like Bonnefoy (1962), would prefer a translation to achieve a balance between source and target language gestalts. He complains that French translators have lost the energy, the sense of reality, and the immediacy of Shakespeare through the nature of the linguistic tools
at their disposal (Bonnefoy 1962: 234)- This is also a sign of literacy convention: French translators will impose a Racinian abstractness on Shakespeare.

The same point is made by many applications of pragmatics to translation. That the possibility of keeping the first language meaning in translated text is limited by the expectations of the second language receptors. Marmaridou (1987), discusses the issue in relation to announcements by airlines to their passengers. Thus, ways of presenting meaning, and at times the meanings themselves, will be altered by the mind-set of translator and reader. Wilss (1982:169), classes the effects of translator’s conception under ‘individual style’.

There are limits on just how far literary form can be translated. From Jerome to Dante there are agonized discussions of what prose translation had done to the Book of Psalms. The question of whether verse should be translated into prose or at times prose into verse is particularly acute at the end of the twentieth century. The century has been a relatively unpoetic one, rather suspicious of the formal qualities of verse. It has been said, for instance, that the form most closely corresponding to the ancient epic poem is the modern prose novel.

Translators of texts set to music find themselves bound by the composer’s reaction to the original language; Wagner in French, for example, is as odd as Faure in German, the lie of the melody in each case is designed for the articulatory weight and the intonation patterns of the original language.
One can never reliably judge whether the English translation of Flabert's 'Madame Bovary' evokes the same response in the English reader's mind as it does in a Frenchman's mind. The relevant questions to be asked in connection with limits of translatability is whether it is possible to evoke the same response, aesthetic or other features, through transaction.

Different degrees of translatability can be determined on the basis of different degrees of interchangeability of the source language and target language texts in the same situation and the consequent differences of their function.

Linguistic Untranslatability:

According to Catford, translation fails or untranslatability occurs when it is impossible to build functionally relevant features of the situation into the contextual meaning of the TL text. It may be due to linguistic or cultural factors.

Although Roman Jackobson believes that all the cognitive experience and its classification is conveyable in any existing language, when it comes to the establishing equivalence at some formal level between the source language and the target language, text, one may have to face some amount of untranslatability.

Catford says,'In linguistic untranslatability, the functionally relevant features include some which are in fact formal features of the language of the SL text. If the translation has
formally corresponding feature, the text or the item is (relatively) untranslatable.*

He illustrates it with ambiguities that are sometimes functionally relevant features of the SL text. That is why it is nearly impossible to translate a book like ‘seven types of Ambiguity’ by Empson, especially the examples of different types of ambiguity he gives.

Catford takes into account only two sources of ambiguity - Shared exponense and polysemy. Ambiguity may also arise on account of differences of constituent structure as in the phrases, beautiful girl’s dress’ and ‘some more convincing evidence’.

Besides this oligosemy or the restriction of meaning may sometimes be a cause of untranslatability. It is untranslatable only when it is a functionally relevant feature of the situation.

Catford has discussed the lexical and grammatical untranslatability but has left out the idioms and fixed collocations and the phonological untranslatability. It is difficult to translate simple expression of English like ‘how do you do?’ or ‘Thank you’ into Kannada.

Untranslatability occurs, also in the cases of certain rhetorical devices like allusions, paradoxes etc., A modern poet creates different echoes in his poems by means of short extracts from different literary source as T S Eliot does in The waste Land. It is nearly impossible to translate them without destroying the echo.

Some times, untranslatability arises at the syntactic level, on account of there being no corresponding syntactic form in the TL to match that in the SL, in order to create the same response in the reader’s mind.

* A Linguistic Theory of Translation 1964
Cultural untranslatability:

Catford holds that when a situational feature functionally relevant for the SL text, is completely absent, from the culture of which the TL is a part, this may lead to cultural untranslatability. Incompatibility between different languages at the cultural level, has been pointed out by various linguists.

Ronald W. Langacker says, ‘... Language and culture are tightly intertwined. The most obvious instance is literature, oral and written, principles of literary, style, prosody and so on that are developed in terms of one language cannot always find satisfactory equivalents in a second. Words designating concepts specific to a given culture are likely to present a serious translation problems.

But he also says that ‘anything that can be said in one language can be said in any other though perhaps more clumsily’.

Although it is commonplace of linguistics that every language is a viable and efficient medium of communication in its own community the fact that translation from foreign language into the vernacular constantly demands a rapid expansion of its resources for it to be equal to an even increasing range of its conceptual frame and experience, should be given due recognition. thus if the TL is sufficiently alive to the task of adding to its resources and making suitable adjustments in order to represent unfamiliar areas of experience, it is unlikely that we may have to face so much the problem of cultural untranslatability.

Nida says, ‘Rather than being impressed by the impossibilities of translation, any one who is involved in the realities of translation, in a broad range of languages, is impressed that effective interlingual communication is always possible, despite seemingly enormous
differences in linguistic structures and cultural features. At least at the denotative level every bit of the SL text should be translatable, how so ever clumsily at certain places.

The real difficult arises with regard to connotative meaning that a certain culture associates with a certain linguistic item. Catford gives the example of ‘home’ and ‘democracy’ but he does not regard them as untranslatable, because their connotative meaning is functionally not relevant in most cases. Connotative meaning is not merely culture bound, but also so subjective in nature that it is mostly untranslatable ‘Dharma’ can be translated into English as ‘religion’ but the connotations that ‘Dharma’ has to a Hindu are more than what the word ‘religion’ can convey to a Christian. In fact, ‘Dharma’ has been accepted as a loan word in English. It is therefore proper to talk of cultural untranslatability not so much at the denotative but at the connotative level of meaning.

Collocational Untranslatability

Catford says, ‘To talk of cultural untranslatability, may be just another way of talking about collocational untranslatability. The impossibility of finding an equivalent collocation in the TLQ., he further defines collocational untranslatability as, ‘Untranslatability arising from the fact that any possible TL near equivalent of a given SL lexical item has a low probability of collocation with the TL equivalents of items in the SL text which collocate normally with the given SL items’.

He illustrates this with some examples from the Finnish and Japanese languages and says that their translation into English read strangely to an English reader unacquainted with finnish or Japanese institutions. They induce mild ‘cultural shock’ by the image of people lying about on hot beaches in a birch scented bathrooms, and of a hotel bathrobe which is worn in the street; He calls these cultural shocks’ as ‘collocational shocks’
Many Kannada poets have been translating English poems into Kannada. The reviews of these translations are being published in Kannada literary magazines like 'Mayura', 'Lankesh Pathrike', and 'Prajavani' Sunday supplements.

But all the while something seemed to be lacking in them. The critics concentrated only on the source text rather than on the translation. For example, T.P Ashoka, one of the renowned critics of the contemporary period, has reviewed the translation of W.B. Yeat's poems by Dr. N.s.Lakshminarayana bhatta, where not even a passing remark is made on the translator nor on the efficiency of the translation. When more efficient western critics have already written a lot about poets like Yeats and Shakespeare, I don't find any necessity of Indians writing critiques on them all over again their talent must be concentrated on the literature of Indian vernacular.

While analysing such criticism, I felt that there must be separate parameters for the translation literature which stand radically different from the criticism of creative literature.

The fundamentally essential link between translation theory and translation practice is the translation criticism. A translation can be assessed on the basis of the inefficiency of its referential and paradigmatic appropriateness. A critic has to see to what extent a translator can deviate from the meaning and spirit of the source text. There are absolute values of accuracy and economy. These values have to be re-examined at different cultural situations.

It is essential to mention our principles categorically in translation criticism simultaneously, the critic has to elucidate the principles of the translator. The method of translation have to
be absolutely semantic and relatively communicate. This idea may seem to be contradictory to those of Nobokov and Nida, but it is essential when translation is growing as an industry.

As Nida prophetically pointed out in 1964, translation can never be a science. It can grow only as a discipline. Translation criticism is most essential for the translation courses because first, it effortlessly improves our efficiency of translation. Secondly, it improves the power of comprehending both our mother tongue and the foreign language. Thirdly, it introduces us to all the possibilities of paradigmatic choices.

Academically, translation criticism plays a very significant role in the study of comparative literature and translation studies. As Nabokov pointed out many critics do not know anything about the source text or the translation. They assess the translation by certain vague principles like its smooth flow, naturality, readability, lack of or presence of interference and ambiguity in the translation, and do away with it. These aspects are not efficient parameters at all.

**Plan of criticism**: Any translation criticism must cover these five points to make it substantially comprehensive and complete. First, a brief analysis of the source text with a stress on its intentions and functional aspects. Secondly, the translator's interpretation of the purpose of the source text— with his translation method and readership. Thirdly, a comparison of the representative parts of the translation with its source text. Fourthly, assessment of the translation in a) the translator's point of view, b) the critic's point of view. Finally, if found essential, the text's position in the culture or the discipline of the target language.

A brief narration of the structure of the text will not make a criticism. the biography and other works of the source poet need not be mentioned unless it is very essential.
The text has to be seen from the point of view of the translator which is usually overlooked by the critic. The first English translation of Hitler's 'Mein Kempf' by captain E.S. Ducaule contained only a third of the original. He had deliberately omitted the most virulent anti-semantic passages.

Normally all translators undertranslate. Less particularised than the original—more so in its descriptive passages than in its narrative.

Source test poses many problems to the translator and it is essential to see how he solves them. The points must not be taken in the order of appearance in the text. They have to be dealt with under different heads—like the title, structure including cohesive devices shifts, metaphors, cultural words, proper names neologisms, untranslatable words, ambiguity, puns and sound effects.

A text has to be assessed in sections. In the process of criticism, it is easier to recognise a bad translation than to identify a felicitous answer.

Translation is called 'contextual recreation' as described by Jean Delsie. The translator has to go beyond the text to the sub-text i.e., he has to catch the connotations when denotations prove insufficient. Translations are never given the status of creative writing. But a lot of creativity is essential for translation also. Creativity comes into picture when a cultural word is neatly explained, when the sound effect or a colloquialism in one part of clause is compensated in another. Creative translation has three feature which the critic cannot afford to forget. a) a surface translation is not possible, b) the varieties are enormous and c) translation is what the writer meant rather than what he wrote.
In normal translation, equivalence is established by selecting TL forms that are relatable to approximately the same features of situation substance as those of the source language text.

The following figures give a more detailed picture of translation equivalence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Situational features</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>Ja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>prislá</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on foot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior event</td>
<td>with present consequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td></td>
<td>ot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my speaker's</td>
<td></td>
<td>male.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cousin</td>
<td>dvojurodnogo brata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this situation, a woman announces that she has just come from her (male) cousin. In English, her utterance takes the form I've come from my cousin. The situation in which this occurs has many features—the utterance occurs at a particular time in a particular place, the speaker is a particular person, with her own history and so on. But only a few features of the situation are immediately relevant that is to say, correlate with lexical or grammatical
forms of the English sentence. These are indicated in the figure by lines connecting words of the English text to labels for situational features to which these words are related which gives:

a) a speaker, which correlates with selection of the pronoun I ;
b) an event, not further analyzed here, but simply labeled ‘come’
c) The fact that this event occurred prior to the time of the utterance.
d) That it has some kind of consequence at that time; all of these— the coming, its prior occurrence and its present consequence of relevance correlating with the speaker’s selection of the verb form ‘have come’
e) a relation of separation from a point of origin labeled ‘from’
f) a possessive relationship involving the speaker, labeled ‘Speaker’s and
g) a ‘cousin’

When this English sentence is translated into Russian it reads as ‘ja prisla ot dvojurodnogo brata’. This is a perfectly good translation equivalent of the English sentence, but as the figure shows it is not relatable to the same set of situational features in the English sentence. The situational features relevant to the Russian text are:

a) a speaker correlating with selection of the pronoun ‘ja’
b) that the speaker is female; this is not relevant to the English text, but in Russian is obligatorily taken into account because it determines selection of the feminine form of the verb that is, prisia (as opposed to the masculine form prise)
c) the event labeled come as for English
d) that the speaker came on foot which obligatorily determines the selection of the ‘autoki-
netic' verb form prisla rather than the 'allokinetic form of priexala', came on a vehicle'

e) the event is explicitly spoken of as completed, hence the use of the perfective rather
than the imperfective verb form (for the English verb the idea of completion is
perhaps implied in the idea of consequence, but it is not explicit in Russian
perfective)

f) the point of origin relation determining selection of (+ genitive case of following
noun phrase); and

g) the male sex of the cousin, determining selection of brata rather than sestry, in the
Russian phrase (where English is indifferent to the sex of the cousin) Note that the
Russian does not explicitly indicate speaker's — this is taken for granted unless
relationship to another person is explicitly stated.

Finally, though it is not incorporated into the figure it should be noted that Russian uses an
analytic phrase, meaning second line brother, for male, cousin, that is brother related through
the grandfather, where English has the unified Lexicalized concept of cousin.

What the figure demonstrates is that translation equivalence does not necessarily mean
relationship to exactly the same set of situational features, indeed it practically never does
so. Of the eleven situational features mentioned in the figure only five — those underlined
— are selected as relevant by both languages and yet there is no doubt that the Russian text
is a perfectly good translation equivalent of the English text. Thus one cannot truly say that
the SL and TL texts express the same meaning. They have most of the same references and
they are inter changeable within the particular situation, but each represents a different and
language specific way of conceptualizing the event. Thus while the verb phrase ' have
come' means come + prior = present consequence', its Russian equivalent, 'prisla' means 'cone + on foot + prior + completed + female subject.

As Jackobson (1959:236 has cogently pointed out, 'Languages differ essentially in what they must convey and not in what they may convey' and this characteristic is of cardinal importance in translation.

One other point to note about equivalents is that, because translation equivalence is an empirical phenomenon, it is not something that is fixed and unvarying. If one compares any long translated source language text with the equivalents of particular words and grammatical categories change from time to time throughout the text. Thus in a French story of about 12,000 words, the preposition 'dans' occurs 128 times. The frequencies of occurrence of particular equivalents of 'dans' are: in 98; into 26; from 2 and about and inside 1 each. IT is clear from these figures that 'in' is the most probable translation equivalent of dans, but that other equivalents occur in particular contexts.
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