CHAPTER II

Translation Discourse vis-à-vis Translation in Assamese Poetry.

Translation was given credence to as an academic discipline proper towards the second half of the twentieth century. Before that translation was often relegated to a simple exercise of language learning. This gave rise to translation theories which for a long time debated on the central recurring theme of word for word and sense for sense translation. Susan Bassnett refers to it as a theme “emerging again and again with different degrees of emphasis in accordance with differing concepts of language and communication” (Bassnett 50). These theories may or may not help translation but it caters to the understanding of translation and the act of translating. Modern literary theory confers to the idea that after the text is being written or read, the work no longer belongs to the author but becomes the “ephemeral property of the minds that have received it through the intricate constructions of this historicity” (Pierre and Kar 104). As Roland Barthes puts it:

A text is made of multiple writings, drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialogue, parody, contestation but there is one place where this multiplicity is focused and that place is the reader, not as was hitherto said, the author. The reader is the space on which all the quotations that make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text’s unity lies not in its origin but in its destination. Yet this destination cannot any longer be personal the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author. (104.).

Historically, theory on translation consisted of the advisability of verbatim translation or what amount of latitude the translator could have. Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BC) Roman orator, politician and philosopher and Horace are considered the earliest theoreticians on translations. Cicero’s de Optima Genere Oratorium and Horace’s de Arte Poetica are often quoted as early models of translation theory. Cicero stated, “I did not hold as necessary to render word for word but I preserved, the general style and
face of the language”. (Munday 30) Horace in the main, had the same opinion though he focused on the translator as according to him a translation was accepted on the trustworthiness of the translator and not his following a verbatim translation. When Horace, for instance, speaks of a “faithful translator”, the person is predominant in his mind than the work it produces. Since translators in Horace’s understanding thrive on the trust their patron and their public put in them, translating “word for word” is inessential because their word is literally taken at face value. The Christian theoreticians like Augustine and Jerome followed Cicero. In *Letter to Pamachius* written probably between 405 and 410 Jerome acknowledged his indebtedness to Cicero. “I admit and confess most freely that I have not translated word for word in my translations of Greek texts but sense for sense, except in the case of the scriptures in which even the order of the words is a mystery. Cicero has been my teacher in this”. (Lefevere 48).

With the coming of the Reformation, the emphasis was on faithfulness in interpreting the text. Practically the translation work consisted of translation of the *Bible* and liturgical and religious books which is true of most literatures. The important contributors to the philological aspects of translation were Martin Luther (1530), Etienne Dolet (1540), Cowley (1656), Dryden (1680) and Alexander Pope (1715). But Luther’s influence superseded the rest of them for he directly and indirectly influenced so many *Bible* translations first in western Europe and later in other parts of the world. Religion has been the originator and driving force in the development of translations. As Susan Sontag states in the “The World as India”, The St. Jerome Lecture on Literary Translation:

The purpose of translation is to enlarge the readership of a book deemed to be important. It assumes that some books are discernibly better than other books, that literary merit exists in a pyramidal shape, and it is imperative for the works near the top to become available to as many as possible, which means to be widely translated and as frequently retranslated as is feasible. (Sontag 157).
And then she states:

At the top of the pyramid are the books regarded as scripture: indispensable or essential exoteric knowledge that, by definition, invites translation. (Probably the most linguistically influential translations have been translations of the Bible: Saint Jerome, Luther, Tyndale, the Authorized Version). Translation is then first of all making better known what deserves to be better known --- because it is improving, deepening, exalting; because it is an indispensable legacy from the past; because it is a contribution to knowledge sacred or other. (157)

Translation is often assumed to have originated with the Bible. In the western tradition the earliest record of a translation experience is probably the story of The Tower of Babel in the Old Testament. (Gen.11.1-9). The 1800s witnessed the missionary era of Bible translation. In the first wave the missionaries made efforts to spread the Gospel to the remotest parts of the world by translating the Bible into unknown tongues. During this period portions of Scripture were published in hundreds of languages worldwide and was made regionally available. In the process the target language was enriched. Just as in the Christian period translation was purely liturgical similarly in the fourteenth and fifteenth century in Assamese literature from Madhava Kandali to Madhav Dev the main reason behind the translation of the religious texts and epics was to propagate religion and epic. Colonization provided a great impetus to translation work as colonization brought with it proselytation. The missionaries made every effort to provide the people with the Bible in the local languages. The English missionaries before their arrival in Assam worked from Serampore near Kolkata in collaboration with an Assamese Pandit, Atmaram Sarma of Kaliabor (Nagaon District) and translated the whole Bible into Assamese and published it from Serampore in 1813. This was the first Assamese book in print. (B.K. Barua 104). In 1840 W. Robinson published an Assamese Grammar the first of its kind from Serampore. Even in Assam the American Baptist missionaries translated the Bible for evangelical purposes. In 1848 Nathan Brown translated the New Testament
into Assamese and Garney a Hebrew scholar produced his rendering of the *Old Testament* in 1899. William Ward was a poet and translator of many *Psalms*. Their works greatly enriched the target language. Upto recent times the main concern of the translators were to be more or less literal. They faced great syntax problems as a developing language lacked the grammatical and word structure of a well developed language. This is what makes us admire the achievements of translators like Madhava Kandali, Madhav Dev and several others. It is not easy to bring out “word for word” in most translations especially where philosophical, theological or liturgical matter is concerned where “sense for sense” translation would be advisable. Thus in the translation of the *Bible* although Jesus’s last outcry of anguish *My God, My God, why have you forsaken me?* (Mark 15.34) is translated but it is also retained in the original Aramaic which is considered as sacrosanct: *Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?* (Mark 15.34).

Several theories on translation have evolved because of the problems faced by the translators. Translation from Greek into Latin led to debates about ‘word-for-word’ versus ‘sense-for-sense’ approaches and about the pragmatics of domestication, strategies for interpretation and the impact of performance requirements. ‘Sense-for-sense’ translation was central to the approach developed by Cicero in the first century BCE and refined for sacred texts by St. Jerome in the fourth century CE. The Roman poet Horace turned the focus to the creative impact in the target language. In late antiquity and the medieval period Christian attitude to the religious and moral values to the texts reshaped transmission patterns.

In the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the response to Virgil by John Dryden (1631-1700) and to Homer by Alexander Pope (1688-1744) not only contributed to debates about the relationship between the source text and the target language but also became canonical literary works in their own right. Dryden’s literary translations directly influenced later poets such as Pope, Gray, Byron, Burns, Coleridge, Tennyson and Browning and in general all poets and authors of the time. Dryden preferred paraphrasing or following the principle of “sense-for-sense” translation instead of “metaphrase” (word-
for-word) and comes out in favour of “sense-for-sense” translation. Dryden’s translation of Virgil’s *Aeneid* (1697) was extensively excerpted in the commonplace books of poetry that shaped eighteenth century tastes. So pervading was its acceptance and influence that Bernard Shaw borrowed the title of his play *Arms and the Man* from the first line of Dryden’s translation of *Aeneid*: “Arms and the man I sing...”. Dryden’s work shows how a web of translation practices combines both “domesticating” and “foreignizing” elements and how categorizations of these can shift.

Modern interdisciplinary nature of translation studies has given rise to some theoretical statements on translation. Louis Kelly proposed three components of the theory of translation. According to him the components comprises “specification of function and goal; description and analysis of operations; and critical comment on relationships between goal and operations”. (Lawrence 4). According to him at different times emphasis may be on one or another but the three components are present in any theoretical discourse.

In a lecture entitled *On the Different Methods of Translating* (1813), the German philosopher and theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher followed Dryden but distinguished between scientific works and literary works “the more closely the translation follows the turns taken by the original, the more foreign it will seem to the reader” (4). For Schleiermacher, the cognitive effects of textual operations fulfilled cultural and political purposes.

In the Post-Romantic period translators like Friedrich Schleiermacher, F.W. Newman, Carlyle and William Morris pleaded for a separate sub-language for translation. Whereas Matthew Arnold wanted the translation to be committed to the source language, Edward Fitzgerald, well known for his naturalizing reconstruction of *The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* (1858) advocated a new target language. He made the famous remark that “it were better to have a live sparrow than a stuffed eagle”. (Bassnett 73). Translation has to be exotic and Frank Kermode emphasized this point when he
praised Omar’s *Rubaiyat* in Fitzgerald’s translation. Jatindranath Dowerah’s translation of Fitzgerald’s translation of Omar Khayam’s *Rubaiyat* as *Omar Tirtha* is also similarly guided. While replacing source language text by target language text it is obvious that meaning will be modified with degrees of loss and gain. Sankaradeva’s *Dasham* translation was done in this way. In the Vaishnava age Madhavdev, Bhattadev, Ram Saraswati and Ananta Kandali were also successful as translators by following this method. Ram Saraswati’s Assamese version of the *Ramayana* is not a literal translation of the original. Besides lengthy elaboration of the original episodes and descriptions like the early translators Ram Saraswati freely introduced incidents and stories which are not in the original text. Although Madhava Kandali translated from Valmiki’s *Ramayana* way back in the fourteenth century he made the translator visible by incorporating into his translation not only an inventory of birds and the flora of the region but in his colophons (bhonitas) he describes his role as a translator and dwells critically on the nature of the translation. In the concluding verses of the kiskindya-kanda (vv 3966-3969) he justifies his role as a translator in the following way:

I have summarized, in Assamese verses according to my ability, the *Ramayana* of Valmiki who composed it in various metres. Who can fully comprehend and express various shades of rasas depicted by Valmiki? Like birds flying according to the strength of their wings, the poet, for the edification and pleasure of the people, sometime exercises his imagination and sometimes illustrates the content of the original work. The *Ramayana* is not a revealed text; but it is a secular (laukika) work as such, the liberty taken by the poets in embellishing their works, should not be taken as an offence. (Sarma 259)

But Madhava Kandali also asserts his fidelity to the original content of the story and invites his readers and listeners to blame him if they find any discrepancy with the original. Navakanta Barua states the lack of any treatise incorporating Vaishnava literary critical theory:
Neither Sankardeva nor his disciples wrote anything about Rasa or Alankara theories as found in the Ujjala Nilamoni of Gaudiya Vaishnavism. The basic tenets can be culled from diverse comments strewn here and there. One of his younger contemporaries, Ananta Kandali wrote: “I know well how to write a sloka in Sanskrit. Yet I still compose in the pada verse/rhyme so that women and Sudras can taste the nectar of Bhakti”. This was a purely populist stance. (Barua 9)

Krishna Kanta Handiqui in his essay “Anubadar Katha” emphasized the social benefits of translations. In his article he gives examples of how Czech literature which was almost dead at a certain period of time revived because of translation. Translation from French, Italian, Latin, and Greek also enriched English literature in the beginning of the nineteenth century. Translation has a social role it develops languages, creates national literatures and inspires literary movements. Ultimately Krishna Kanta Handiqui underlines the pragmatics of translation than the dictates of theory. Thus even if the Vedas, Puranas, Upanishads would have not been translated we would have been deprived of Indian culture and heritage. As Susan Sontag states in “The World as India”: The St. Jerome Lecture on Literary Translation: “Translation is then first of all making better known what deserves to be better known-because it is improving, deepening, exalting ; because it is contribution to knowledge, sacred or other”. (Sontag 157)

With Assam coming under the British ruler after the Yandabu treaty of 1826, the Arunudoi a Baptist Mission publication from Sibsagar, brought in the first wave of western culture to Assam and spread the new light of education in Assamese society by enriching it with messages of modern science, sermons, biographical literature, stories, history and religious preachings. The same publication also helped in establishing a different idiom especially to prose which was colloquial and its purpose was communication.
In the 1960s autonomy became the catchword while after a decade functionalism was advocated. The predominance of “equivalence” and “functionalism” may overshadow the autonomy of translation in the discourse of the 1960s and 70s. In these discourses meaning is accorded a priority over form.

The history of translation theory can in fact be imagined as a set of changing relationships between the relative autonomy of the translated text or the translator’s actions, and other two concepts: equivalence and function. Equivalence has been understood as ‘accuracy’, ‘adequacy’, ‘correctness’, ‘correspondence’, “fidelity’, or ‘identity’, it is a variable notion of how the translation is connected to the foreign text. Function has been understood as the potentiality of the translated text to release diverse effects, beginning with the communication of information and the production of a response comparable to the one produced by the foreign text in its own culture. (Lawrence 5).

In 1963 George Mounin argues that equivalence was based on “universals” of language and culture. By shaping the universal to a local situation the literature on equivalence provide yardsticks to evaluate translation. By the end of the 1970s many typologies of equivalence were devised. In this period an important theoretical thrust was to draw a contrariness between pragmatic and formal equivalence. In pragmatic equivalence translation is concealed by communicating the foreign text according to values familiar in the receiving language and culture. Formal equivalence, on the contrary, by adhering to the cultural and linguistic values of the foreign text reveal the translation to be a translation. In the 1980s and 1990s, autonomy is limited by the dominance of functionalisms, and equivalence is rethought to embrace what were previously treated as shifts or deviations from the foreign text. In their *Theory and Practice of Translation* (1969), Nida and Taber stated that translators consider and analyze the source text, extricate its meaning and transfer that meaning into the target language. This process leads to a dynamic equivalence translation. Though this approach
was modified to insist upon the communicative functions of language and renamed functional equivalence translation, in both equivalence models meaning has priority over form.

The diverse linguistic, literary, cultural and social factors denote the changing importance of a particular theoretical concept by its autonomy, equivalence or function. A translation theory always rests on particular speculation about language use and for centuries the assumptions have fallen into two categories, instrumental and hermeneutic. It prescribes translation theories that reiterates the coherence of objective information and indite typologies of equivalence. Other theories speculate a hermeneutic concept of language as interpretation, comprising of thought and meaning, where meanings are formulated according to the changing cultural and social scenario. A hermeneutic concept of language leads to translation theories that gives prerogative to the rendition of creative values and hence describe the target-language inscription in the foreign text, perpetually interpreting it on the basis of social functions and effects.

The creative perspective of translation has been variously underlined by critics especially in the nineteenth century probably because of the proliferations of Romantic poetry. A key assumption in this development is the autonomy of translation, its status as a text in its own right. Walter Benjamin’s *The Task of the Translator*, is a seminal text on literary translation. A translation participates in the “afterlife” of the foreign text, but at the same time giving the original a continued life. It exists separately but in conjunction with the original. Benjamin writes, “It is the task of the translator to release in his own language that pure language which is under the spell of another, to liberate the language imprisoned in a work in his re-creation of the work. For the sake of pure language he breaks through decayed barriers of his own language” (Munday 253). Benjamin is resuscitating Schleiermacher’s notion of foreignizing translation, wherein the reader of the translated text is brought as close as possible to the foreign one through close renderings that transmutes the translating language. He quotes Rudolf Pannwitz
who considers translation as an experimental literary practice, allowing the target language to be tampered by the foreign language.

More conservative theorists vouch for a social function for translating. During the 1920s, the philologist Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff urged translators of classical literature to “spurn the letter and follow the spirit” thus asserting the significance of clarity and intelligibility. The Argentine writer Jorge Luis Borges, in his 1935 essay on the translators of the *Arabian Nights* shows that literary translations produce varying representations of the same foreign text and culture, and their “veracity” or degree of equivalence is always questionable, regardless of their impact or influence. (Lawrence 13). Fitzgerald’s *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* subscribes to this with its naturalizing reconstruction.

At the end of the 1930s, translation is regarded as a distinctive linguistic practice, “a literary genre apart,” as propounded by the Spanish philosopher Jose Ortega y Gasset, and others which allured the attention of leading writers and thinkers, literary critics and philologists. The “misery” of translation according to him is its impossibility, because of irreducible disparities which are not only linguistic but also cultural that spring from diverse mental pictures, from varied intellectual systems. The “splendor” of translation is how these differences are manipulated to enable the reader to move from his linguistic habits and necessitate him to move within those of the “foreign” author. For Ortega, translating is instrumental in challenging the complacencies of contemporary culture because it fosters a “historical consciousness” unlike mathematical and physical sciences. “We need the ancients precisely to the degree that they are dissimilar to us”, he states, so that translating can infuse a critical variance into the present.

The fundamental issue of translatability was given priority in translation theory during 1940-1950. Willard Van Orman Quine in his essay “Meaning and Translation” addresses the question about a basic semantic “indeterminacy.” Quine’s uncertainty of metaphysical reasons for language leads to more pragmatic views of translation wherein
the terms and values of the receiving culture dictates the foreign text to be rewritten. Vladimir Nabokov in his own translation of Pushkin’s novel in verse *Eugene Onegin* remarks, “The person who desires to turn a literary masterpiece into another language has only one duty to perform, and this is to reproduce with absolute exactitude the whole text and nothing but the text”. (France 92) He argued that despite all attempts neither formal mimesis nor equivalent poetry was possible, on the contrary a new poem will emerge. In this context Osip Mandelstern stated in the book *Osip Mandelstern Selected Poems* translated by Clarence Brown and W. S. Merwin: “Lowell does not translate into English, but into Lowell, Nabokov can be said to translate into literal English: it is Nabokov. Merwin has translated Mandelstam into Merwin. When one is speaking of writers of the stature of Lowell, Nabokov, and Merwin this strikes me as being the happiest of situations”. (26).

The single achievement of Roman Jakobson’s widely cited essay *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation* (1959) has introduced a semiotic reflection on translatability. Jakobson challenges empiricist semantics by conceiving of meaning, as a relation to a potentially endless chain of signs. He describes translation as a process of receding “which involves two equivalent messages in two different codes” thus emphasizing the two important aspects --- intersemiotic complexities and cross cultural factors which translators need to be aware of. (Lawrence 114). Reviving Schleiermacher’s notion of translation as bringing the domestic reader to the foreign text, Heidegger recommends a “poetizing” strategy that does “violence” to everyday language by relying on archaisms, which he submits to etymological interpretations.

Generalization of different theories has to take into account the absorbing capacity of the target language and even culture. Eugene Nida had this in mind when he in his book *Principles of Correspondence* spoke of functional equivalence. The response created by a translated text in a reader in today’s culture should be ‘essentially like’ the response of the ‘original receptors’. “How” language communicates is more stressed than “what” it communicates. He even suggests making changes in the text in order to create
that original response. Translations that intent to transmit just the content Nida terms “formal equivalence”. In these kind of translations one gets enthralled to the tendency of translating poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence and concept to concept. It allows the reader to understand as much of the source language context as possible. While the translation that intent to produce an equivalent effect on the reader as on the original receptor he called “dynamic equivalence. Dynamic equivalence is based on the principle of equivalent effect, ie. the relationship between receiver and message should aim at being alike as that between the original receivers and the source language message. It is a realm of conjecture and speculation. It neither furthers actual translation nor facilitate helpful theorizing.

To assess different theories it is also necessary to look at the source and receptor languages and cultures. Theories dealing with related languages and cultures have a perspective different from theories dealing with unrelated languages and cultures. Any translation whether literary, faithful or imaginative have to encounter losses, gains and changes. Related theoretical stance is the Polysystem theory proposed by Itamar Even Zohar and Gideon Toury which considers translation literature a system in itself, existing in varying relationships with original compositions. In literary systems they occupy “positions” whether “central” or “peripheral” and both perform literary “function” whether innovative or “conservatory”. The major theoretical difference between their work and early translation studies scholars is that their direction of thought about translation is antithetical to the early translation studies scholars. The translation theorists preceding them tended to look at one-to-one relationships and functional notions of equivalence. They give credence to the subjective ability of the translator to derive an equivalent text which in turn influences the literary and cultural conventions in a particular society. Polysystem theorists presume the opposite. They believe that the aesthetic presuppositions of the translator is dictated by the social norms and literary conventions in the receiving culture and thus influencing subsequent translation decisions. The innovativeness of Itamar-Even-Zohar’s work manifests by discerning actual translations within the larger sociological context. His work makes a significant
contribution not only to the field of translation theory, but to literary theory as well, as it set forth the importance of translation within the context of literary studies specifically and in the evolution of culture in general. He applies notions of translation equivalence and literary function yet does not pull out of history and advocates a translation model that transcends time. The importance of translation work in the study of literature and the evolution of culture is emphasized. Almost at the same decade George Steiner in his book *After Babel* proposed that language is not instrumental in communicating meaning, but constitutive in reconstructing it. It is the individual aspects of language “the privacies of individual usage” that resist interpretation and escape the universalizing concepts of linguistics.

In the 1990s Susan Bassnett in *Translation Studies*, voiced the common theoretical assumption of the period which hold there is relative autonomy in translation works. Translating is seen as enacting its own process of signification which answers to different linguistic and cultural contexts. This view recurs in translation tradition from antiquity onward, but now it is systematically, conceptualized according to the various discourses that characterize current academic disciplines. Some theorists of the time emphasized cultural transmission through translations. They theorize translation according to post-structuralist concepts of language, discourse and subjectivity of translations so as to articulate their relations to cultural difference, ideological contradictions and social change. The multiple translation theories of the twentieth century was an effort to give an institutional character to translation as Tejaswini Niranjana states in her book *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*:

Western writing on translation go back at least to the beginning of Judeo-Christian time. There never seems, however to have been much of an attempt to formulate a discipline or an institutional apparatus to regulate translators. Only in the present century (i.e. the 20th century) coinciding with but largely marked by, the rise of post-structuralism in literary studies - have there been efforts to give an institutional character to
translation through the publication of journals devoted to translation and the formation of professional organizations.(49-50).

In the Indian context discourse on translation is few and far between. In India Sanskrit was the source language from which several regional languages enriched themselves by translations. In the words of Navakanta Barua:

The unlettered Kabirdas put it succinctly in his own aphoristic idiom when he said that while Sanskrit was water preserved in a well, bhasa was just so much flowing water. Flowing waters change their course, mingle with other streams, change their diction, phonetic character, and such other things. (Barua 8).

The Indian literary tradition is full of rendering of Sanskrit texts into regional languages and the most frequently targeted texts were the *Mahabharata* of Vyasa and the *Ramayana* of Valmiki. The remarkable aspect of these translations is that they were meant to cater to the tastes of the target language. Because of this aspect we find several renderings of *Mahabharata* of Vyasa and *Ramayana* of Valmiki and some of them differ considerably from the original. These renderings were not considered as imitations because of the creative element inherent in them. When Kamban wrote *Ramayanam* in Tamil, he took all the liberty to make Valmiki’s *Ramayana* a Tamil classic. This free style translation was promoted by the features of the target language and the tastes of the target language readers. Madhav Dev took a similar stance. In one or two places of his translation of the *Ramayana* we find digressions from *Valmiki* (Goswami 44). Thus we have Sarala Das’ *The Mahbharata* in Oriya, Kasiram Das’ version in Bengali, Viswanath Satyanarayan’s in *Ramayana Kalpa Vrukshamu* in Telegu and C.Rajgopalacharis translations into English of both the epics. In Assam we have an Assamese version of *Mahabharata* episodes by Harihara Vipra and Kaviratna Sarasvati in the fourteenth century, a Tai *Ramayana* compiled by Sri, Birendra Kr. Gohain, *Sabin Aloon* (A Karbi Ramayana) which differs significantly from the original *Ramayana*. The theme and
setting of *Sabin Aloon* is Karbi Anglong and the Karbi society. As such the book depicts the social and cultural life of the Karbi people. The impression that we get from the multiple versions of the *Ramayana* during this period is that not only literal adherence to the original not insisted on, but that deviation was encouraged, tolerated and preferred. (60). Fitzgerald’s *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* in English subscribes to a similar view. As Frank Kermode puts it:

Where Omar asks for a loaf, a jug of wine, a sheep’s thigh and a pretty boy, Fitzgerald omits the meat, substitutes a ‘Thou’, and introduces a poetry book (which no Persian scholar would need) and a Bough, which is not a property of wilderness. When we see that the translator’s first prose shot said “a bit of mutton and moderate bottle of wine,” we become aware that, having left Persian poetry out Fitzgerald was putting English poetry in, and his changes obscurely touch the heart of a people which rarely reads verses and, rarely drinks wine. He is exotic without being foreign. (Das 106).

Down the centuries, every bhasa acquired its own *Ramayana* and its own *Mahabharata*, and in some cases more than one. As with the *Bible* in English, the new *Ramayanas* and *Mahabharatas* came to rank among the greatest literary works in their respective languages, and were in turn often translated into English. Most regional translators were not concerned with translation theories, and enrichment of their languages. They were concerned with making available the rich literary and cultural works of western languages. Translations from regional languages to regional languages promoted cultural exchange and nationalism.

With the success of the East India Company take over the control of India and the subsequent direct involvement of the crown in India a new class of employees emerged who needed to know English. The English also started to learn local languages, mainly Hindi and Urdu. Initially translations were made from Sanskrit, Tamil and Pali. Sir
William Jone’s translation of *Sacoontala* was published in 1789 from Calcutta. Nearly major works in Sanskrit and old Tamil, Pali and the Pakrits, have been translated into English. In 1837 after the East India Company decided English to be the official language, the English began to learn Indian languages. Thus was laid the foundation of translating, not from Sanskrit or Pali or Tamil, but from the bhasas, or the modern Indian languages. Due to the proficiency acquired by the Indians in English, translation was done from the Bhasas into English. The world wide recognition of such enterprise culminated in Rabindranath Tagore’s winning the Nobel Prize award for literature in 1913 for translating the *Gitanjali* into English by himself. *Gitanjali* remains possibly the most popular work of Indian Literature ever published in English translation. The noble prize award had great impact on the Indian translation works, for many local languages translated *Gitanjali*. Translation from regional languages to regional languages promoted cultural exchange and nationalism. In pre colonial times translations were made into regional languages mainly from the classics. With the spread of English and the colonial rule many English works were translated into the regional languages. Most regional translators were not concerned with translation theories, and enrichment of their languages. They were rather concerned with making the rich literary and cultural works of western languages known. To A.K. Ramanujan who was both a theorist and a translator, translation work was to achieve a communicative interaction between the two sets of languages and cultures and at the same time fulfil the translator’s desire to have a poem of his own using inputs of the source poem. In the parlance of George Steiner: “Over two thousand years of argument and precept, the beliefs and disagreements voiced about the nature of translation have been almost the same. Identical, familiar moves and refutations in debate recur, nearly without exception, from Cicero and Quintilian to the present day”. (Steiner 239).

The translation theorists most of the time reiterate on the same content of faithfulness versus beauty, “word-for-word” against “sense-for-sense” and so on. The translation theories are referred to by various terms like fidelity, translatability, equivalence, autonomy etc. The plethora of opinions subsumes under these counters. This
leads to the question of the creation of a third language in translation. If it affords more freedom to the translator the notion is welcomed for it reinstates translation not as rewriting but something original. The original is not the only determinant its priority is chronological.
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