INTRODUCTION

Chapter-I

THEORIES AND PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION

The history of translation dates from 3000 B.C., the period of old Egyptian Kingdom. It has its basis on the inscriptions in two languages belonging to that period found in the area. Much later, in 300 B.C., it became an important factor in the west when the Romance found translation an efficient vehicle for absorbing the Greek cultural elements.

The twentieth century has been called the 'age of translation'. This development began in the nineteenth century. Though translation was mainly a one-way means of communication, prominent men of letters and, to a lesser degree, philosophers and scientists, had to communicate with readers abroad. Commercial negotiation was conducted in the language of the dominant nation, and so was diplomacy. But now international agreements between state, public and private organisations are translated for all interested parties, whether or not the signatories understand each other's languages. The setting up of a new
international body, the constitution of an independent state, the formation of a multinational company, are so prevalent as to give translation, enhanced political importance. The exponential increase in technology, the attempt to bring it to developing countries, the simultaneous publication of the same book in various languages, the increase in world communication, have correspondingly increased requirements. "UNESCO, which up to 1970 published an Index Translationum recorded a 4½ fold increase since 1948, with translations into German nearly twice as many as into Russian, the second most numerous. 1. Scientific, technical and medical journals are translated wholesale in the USA and USSR. The EEC now employs 1600 translators. In 1967, 80,000 scientific journals were being translated annually. Some 'international' writers immediately sell more widely in translation than in the original, whilst others in Italy and the smaller European countries, depend for a living on the translation of their works as well as their own translations. The translation of literature in the 'minor languages, particularly in the developing countries, is much neglected.

In relation to the volume of translation, little was written about it. The wider aspects were ignored; translation's contribution to the development of national languages, its relation to meaning, thought and the language universals. It was mainly discussed in terms of the conflict between free and literal translation, and the contradiction between its inherent impossibility and its absolute necessity. Cicero first championed sense against words and said a translator must be either an interpreter or a rhetorician. Early essays are those of St. Jerome, Luther, Dryden — all favouring colloquial and natural renderings. Tytler wrote the first significant book on translation in 1790, stating that "a good translation is one in which the merit of the original work is so completely transfused into another language as to be as distinctly apprehended and as strongly felt by a native of the country to which the language belongs as it is by those who speak the language of the original work"(Peter New mark 4) In the nineteenth century, the important essays and references by Goethe, Humboldt, Novalis, Schleiermacher, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche inclined towards more literal translation methods, while Matthew Arnold favoured a simple, direct and noble style for translating Homer. In the twentieth century, Croce, Gasset and Valery questioned the possibility of adequate
translation, particularly of poetry. Benjamin saw translation filling in the gaps in meaning in a universal language. He recommended literal translation of syntax as well as words: "The sentence is a wall blocking out the language of the original, whilst word for word translation is the arcade." (Peter Newmark 4)

Language is a type of patterned human behaviour. It is a way perhaps the most important way, in which human beings interact in social situations. Language behaviour is externalized or manifested in some kind of bodily activity on the part of performer, and presupposes the existence of at least one other human participant in the situation, addressee. This behaviour may be spoken medium or written medium.

Translation studies is indeed a discipline in its own right, not merely a minor branch of comparative literary study, nor yet a specific area of linguistics, but a vastly complex field with many far reaching sub divisions. "What is generally understood as translation involves the rendering of SL text into TL so as to ensure that (1) the surface meaning of the two will be approximately similar
and (2) the structure of the SL will be preserved as closely as closely as possible but not so closely that the TL structures will be seriously distorted"^2.

Knowledge of languages is important, but it has no direct bearing on literary understanding. The Nobel Committee awarded Tagore the 1913 Nobel prize for literature on the basis of the translation of Gitanjali, of course, rendered by the poet himself. At any rate, it was a translation from the original Bengali. There are numerous practical problems in translating literature, when such 'translations are going to be used by readers in a different country. It is certainly not easy to appreciate a western author placing him in the historical context and evaluating him aesthetically in the broader context of English or any other Western literature.

A translator has to accept one of the two equations as the basis for his activity. One equation is A-B = Nearer to the original. Here 'A' indicates the original and 'B' indicates the degrees of loss. The second equation
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is $A-B+C$ = Sepetated quite away from the original. Here 'C' means the things added by the translator. The translator of the literary work generally goes in for the latter. But he must have the necessary training to keep a control on the second equation if at all he accepts it. This can be done by analysis of the textual material of one language (SL) and semantic analysis of referential and connotative meaning and restructuring it into equivalent textual material of another language (TL).

In *Translation Studies* (1980), Susan Bassnett McGuire gives a detailed discussion on the translation of literary texts. She makes a survey of translators and translation theories historically. Her conclusion seems to be that translation can never be perfect: "There can no more be the ultimate translation than there can be the ultimate poem or the ultimate novel and any assessment of a translation can only be made by taking into account both the process of creating it and its function in a given context" (Bassnett McGuire 9).

There has been a different notion in the fifties. The fact that the translator himself ought to be or rather is a creative genius and he is in no way inferior to the
original author was a major theory of the period. Earlier translation was considered something similar to pouring old wine into new bottles. But Renato Poggioli rejected this theory in his article "The Added Artifice". He held the view that a person can never empty a bottle into another without distilling it. So he expressed his idea that translation was like pouring new wine into old bottle. He explains the same thus "thus translator, himself is a living vessel saturated with a form of fluid or sparkling spirit which he cannot hold any longer in check; that when the spirit is about to fizzle or the liquid to overflow, he pours it into the most suitable of all containers available to him, although he neither owns the container nor has he moulded it with his own hands." \(^1\).

Translation may be also defined as the replacement of the textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL). It may be either full translation or partial translation. In total translation SL grammar and lexis are replaced by equivalent TL grammar and lexis. Restricted translation is replacement of SL material by equivalent TL textual material at only on level.

Renato Poggioli, "The Added Artipices".  
\(^1\) On Translation (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1959) 140.
It is generally agreed that meaning is important in translation particularly in total translation. An SL text has an SL meaning and a TL text has a TL meaning. A Russian text for instance, has a Russian meaning and an equivalent English text has an English meaning.

Translation is made possible by an equivalence in thought that lies behind its different verbal expressions. No doubt, this equivalence is traceable to the fact that men of all nations belong to the same species. When an English man is thinking of a woman whom he describes as 'my mother' another will be thinking of 'ma mere' or of 'meine Mutter' or of 'my madre' or "ente Amma" or 'Mera Mam' and among normal people this though will be very similar and will recall the same memories of tenderness, loving care and maternal pride. In consequence 'my mother' can be perfectly translated by anyone of these alternatives just given.

"Some times a word that may be quite familiar in one language may not have equivalent terms in
another"¹. a) when customs are different eg.: The habit of five 'o' clock tea was introduced by the English to the French, whose languages, had no word for such a meal. It accordingly became known as 'Le five 'O' cloque' b) when idioms and idiomatic phrases provide clearcut difficulties. c) Proverbial expressions may find it difficult. d) when symbols are translated.

No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. Language, then is the heart within the body of culture, and it is the interaction between the two that results in the continuation of life energy. Just as the surgeon operating on the heart, cannot neglect the body, the translator treating the text in isolation from the culture does so at his peril,

Since complete equivalence cannot take place in any of these categories, Jakobson declares that all poetic art is therefore technically untranslatable."¹

Only creative transposition is possible either intralingual transposition - from one poetic shape to another, or interlingual transposition - from one language into another, or finally intersemantic transposition - from one system of signs into another, eq: from verbal art into music, dance, cinema or painting.

The emphasis always in translation is on the reader or listener, and the translator must tackle the SL text in such a way that the TL version will correspond to SL version. Hence Albercht Neubert's view that Shakespeare's Sonnet 'Shall I compare thee to a Summer's day?' cannot be semantically translated into a language where summers are unpleasant just as the concept of God the Father, cannot be translated into a language where the diety is female. The translator cannot be the author of the SL text, but as the author of the TL text, he has a clear responsibility to the TL readers.

The translation of idioms takes us further in considering the question of meaning and translation,
for idioms, like puns, are culture bound. The SL phrase is replaced by a TL phrase that serves the same purpose and the TL culture, and the process here involves the substitution of SL sign for TL sign. Since a metaphor in the SL is a new piece of performance, it can clearly have no counterpart. Popovic distinguishes four types of translation equivalence? (Bassnett McGuire 25)

1. Linguistic equivalence - word for word translation.
2. Paradigmatic translation - when elements of grammar which popovic sees as being a higher category than textual equivalence.
3. Stylistic equivalence - where there is functional equivalence of elements.
4. Textual equivalence - equivalence of form and shape.

It is an established fact in translation studies that if a dozen translators tackle the same poem they will produce a dozen different versions. And yet somewhere in those dozen versions there will be what popovic calls the 'invariant core' of the original poem. Transformations or variants are those changes
which do not modify the core of meaning but influence the expressive form. What is often seen as 'lost' from the SL text may be replaced in the TL context. Some terms may have different meanings eq: 'Good' includes desirable food, killing enemies, putting fire to one's wife to teach her a lesson etc. 'Bad' includes rotten fruit, murdering a person of same band etc. according to the mentality.

There are two types of untranslatability, according to Catford: linguistic and cultural. On the linguistic level, untranslatability occurs when there is no lexical or syntactical substitute in the TL for SL item. Linguistic untranslatability is due to difference in the SL and the TL, where as cultural untranslatability is due to the absence in the TL culture of a relevant situational feature for the SL text. Popovic quotes an example of the different concepts of the term 'bathroom' in an English, Finish, or Japanese context, where both the object and the use made of that object are not at all alike.
A diagram of the communicative relationship in the process of translation shows that the translator is both receiver and emitter, the end and the beginning of two separate but linked chains of communication: - Author - Text - Receiver - Translator - Text - Receiver. Every text is unique as no text or translation is original. But there is another view that all texts are original because every translation is distinctive. Every translation, up to a certain point, is invention and as such it constitutes a unique text.

Susan Bassnett - McGuire, stresses the practical aspects of literary translation. "The translator who makes no attempt to understand the how behind the translation process is like the driver of Rolls who has no idea what makes the ecar move. Likewise, the mechanic who spends a lifetime taking engines apart but never goes out for a drive in the country is a fitting image for the dry academecian who examines the 'how' at the expense of 'what is'. (Bassnett - McGuire 76) So we should learn the practical aspects of literary translation.
The approach of a literacy translator to the work, apart from purely artistic consideration is influenced to a considerable degree by his relationship with the author of the book to be translated on the one hand, and the publisher, the critics and the public on the other hand. The approach depends on the following variables.

1. The complexity of the subject matter.
2. The time available
3. The purpose for which translation is needed and
4. The availability of translations.

In the inaugural address on the occasion of the opening of the 4th FTT Congress, Mr. Zlatko Goigan says that translations help in the creation of a world literature and to certain extent are literary creators themselves, without whose assistance a general human culture would be unthinkable. The translators are literary middlemen and are like the symbols of peace and humanity.

Eugene A. Nida in his book *Toward a Science of Translating* says there are certain basic requirements to be observed by the Translator. 1) The first and most obvious requirement of any translator is that he has a satisfactory knowledge of the source language. He must understand not only the obvious content of the message, but also the subtleties of meaning, the significant emotive values of words, and the stylistic features which determine the "flavour and feel" of the message. 2) Knowledge of the resources of the source language as well as complete control of the receptor language is equally important. A certain amount of data on the source-language message can usually be secured from dictionaries, commentaries, and technical treatises, but there is no substitute for thorough mastery of the receptor language. Certainly the most numerous and serious errors made by translators arise primarily from their lack of thorough knowledge of the receptor language. 3) The translator must have a thorough acquaintance with the subject matter concerned. 4) He should have a truly empathetic spirit for the original author with that of the good actor, able to "feel" his part. He has to interpret the language of movement and gesture, of voice, of
facial expression: in a word, he must translate them into visible and audible human emotion, he must impersonate the characters. Similarly, the translator must have the gift of mimicry, the capacity to act the author's part, impersonating his demeanor, speech, and ways, with the utmost verisimilitude. 5) He should not translate, if he does not admire, and if possible a natural affinity should exist between translator and translated. But a translator must be content to be like his author, for it is not his business to try to excel him. 6) He should have a capacity for literary expression.

In short no translation will be of any value unless it gives at least some of the joy to the reader that was given by its original. In translating the most Bible, most outstanding translators have also insisted upon a further requirement, namely a devout recognition of dependence upon divine grace. This element has been repeatedly noted in the attitudes of such translators as Jerome, Wycliffe, Luther, and Tyndale, and it (divine grace) is expressly set forth as a prerequisite by Frederick C. Grant. In this regard
Eugene A. Nida says: "The translator should, not only make use of the best scientific philology and exegesis, but also invoke and rely upon divine grace for the fulfilment of his task."  

The effectiveness of a translation appears to be determined by three different sets of variables, or dimensions of variations. First, there is the dimension of knowledge does the translation exhibit adequate understanding of the cultures of both the author of the original and the intended audience of the translation? Second, there is the dimension of purpose, does the translation succeed in achieving the purpose defined for it by the translator (A separate but related question is whether that purpose is or is not a worthy one.) Third, there is a dimension that I shall call, somewhat reluctantly intuition: is the translation satisfying?

There is wide but not universal agreement that the main aim of the translator is to produce as nearly as possible the same effect on his readers as was produced on the readers of the original. The principle is variously referred to as the principle of similar
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or equivalent response or effect, or of functional or dynamic equivalence. It bypasses and supersedes the nineteenth-century controversy about whether translation should incline towards the source or the target language, and the consequent faithful versus beautiful, literal versus free, form versus content disputes. The principle demands a considerable imaginative or intuitive effect from the translator, since he must not identify himself with the reader of the original, but must empathize with him, recognizing that he may have reactions and sympathies alien to his own. The principle allows for a wide range of translation styles: if the writer of the original has deviated from the language norms of the type of text he has written whether it is an advertisement, a report or a literary work. One could expect the translation to do likewise. A poem or a story in such a case would retain the flavour of the original, and might perhaps read like a translation.

Secondly, a non-literary next relating to an aspect of the culture familiar to the first reader but not to the target language reader is unlikely to
produce equivalent effect: Particularly, if originally intended only for the first reader. The translator, therefore say, in translating the laws of a source-language country, cannot 'bend' the text towards the second reader.

Thirdly, there is the artistic work with a strong local flavour which may also be rooted in a particular historical period. The themes will consist of comments on human character and behaviour—universals, applicable to the reader of the translation, and therefore subject to the equivalent-effect principle. On the other hand, the work may describe a culture remote from the second reader's experience, which the translator wants to introduce to him not as the original reader, who took or takes it for granted, but as something strange with its own special interest. In the case of Bible, the translator decides on equivalent effect—the nearer he can bring the human truth and the connotations to the reader, the more immediately he is like to transmit its religious and moral message.
Information translation, ranging from brief abstracts through summaries to complete reproduction of content without form; plain prose translation (as in Penguins) to guide one to the original, whose language should always be a little familiar; interlinear translation, which shows the mechanics of the original, formal translation, for nonsense poetry (Morgenstern) and nursery rhymes, where the meaning and the scenario, not the tone, can be ignored; academic translation, for converting a text to a standard literary style, a combination of transliteration, translation and paraphrase for texts concerned with the source language, where the metalingual (Jakobson, 1960) function predominates. Translation theory, however, is not concerned with restricted translation. Whilst principles have been, and will be, proposed for dealing with recurrent problems ('translation rules'), a general theory cannot propose a single method (e.g. dynamic equivalence), but must be concerned with the full range of text-types and their corresponding translation criteria, as well as the major variables involved. (Peter Newmark 12).

The translator's task is essentially a difficult and often a thankless one. He is severely criticised if he makes a mistake, but only faintly praised when he succeeds, for often it is assumed that anyone who knows two languages ought to do as well as the translator who has laboured to produce
a text. But even if his work is rarely rewarded by has the praise of others, the task itself--its own rewards, for, successful translating involves one of the most complex intellectual challenges known to mankind. Moreover, in our present world the need for extensive, accurate and effective communication between those using different languages give the translator a position of new strategic importance.

The foregoing remarks are intended to introduce the example of Huckleberry Finn as a translated text with an international appeal that cuts across cultural barriers.

Much has been justifiably claimed for Huckleberry Finn. Earnest Hemingway asserted that all modern American literature comes from one book by Mark Twain called Huckleberry Finn. Willam Faulkner praised Twain for being the father of writing of Sherwood Anderson, who fathered the rural writers of Faulkner's time. T.S. Eliot praised Mark Twain for bringing the American language up to date, and Malcolm Cowley claimed that Mark Twain created the dominant language of American
fiction. All these claims have some truth, since Mark Twain did for the Western humorous vernacular what Chaucer did for the peasant speech of England. He made a literary and spoken language out of it that took over many of the words and phrases of the whole nation.

Yet the glorification of Mark Twain's achievement marched hand in hand with growing American nationalism in writing. Mark Twain invented and made popular in England itself an alternative version of English. American writers who came after him found their inspiration in Mark Twain. As Mark Twain defeated the King and the Duke through the Folkaways of Missiosippi river, so he defeated the crowned heads of English letters through the vivid and powerful language of the American people.

Marks Twain's work is a panorama of the West in all its variety. He has observed everything; landscape, environments, physical characteristics of

the inhabitants ways of life, customs, beliefs, superstitions etc. Through him we know the little Missouri town, asleep on the banks of the river, with its houses surrounded by its circle of wooded hills terminating near the Mississippi in cliffs pierced by caves.

The river with its rapids and its half submerged legs feared by the navigators, the wooden isles etc are described in his works. We follow him into the isolated areas described in *Huckleberry Finn*.

Mark Twain appeals to readers internationality, A survey by Robert M. Rodney enumerates as many as 5344 editions of Mark Twain's works that have been published between 1967 and 1976 in 55 countries and 73 languages. Of these 1169 have been American and 4175 foreign editions. In addition, 64 collected works have appeared, 32 of them in the U.S.A, and an equal number abroad in nine countries and 6 languages. The most popular work is *Tom Sawyer* with a total of 1291

international editions, 155 being domestic and 1136 foreign editions in 46 countries and 57 languages. In contrast, Mark Twain's masterpiece *Huckberry Finn* has come out in 841 international editions only, including 145 domestic and 696 foreign in 47 countries and 53 languages.

Of these foreign countries Germany leads with 95 editions, followed by Britain (63) USSR (53) Sweden (36) Spain (32) Italy (26) France (25) Yugoslavia (25) in several languages Argentina (21) Czechoslovakia (20) Austria (14) Brazil (14) Denmark (16) Hungary (14) India (11) Netherlands (12) Poland (13) Switzerland (11) and Norway (10). Countries with French editions include Albania, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chili, China, Columbia, Cuba, Egypt, Greece, Hongkong, Indonussia, Iran, Isreal, Korea, Malaysia, Newzealand, Portugal, Rumania, S. America, Taiwan, Thailand and Turkey.

All these figures indicate Mark Twain is quite popular outside the English speaking countries as well. In these parts of the world he is largely read in translations. Moreover, the number of editions brought
out in the leading English speaking country of Britain falls between those in Germany and U.S.S.R. Also countries like Africa with native English speakers, appear to have brought out fewer editions than India. This is inspite of the fact that the survey has not been thorough in its coverage of Afro Asian countries and languages as pointed out by Carl Dolmetsch "1."

"Mark Twain's fiction deals with freedom, responsibility, vice, hypocrisy, Chauvinism and many of the questions that trouble our mind even today. No wonder then that his influence has been pervasive enough for him to be regarded as a novelist's novelist" 2. Stephen Crane's *Henry Fleming*, Sherwood Anderson's *George Willard*, Earnest Hemingway's, Nick Adams, William Faulkner's *Ike Mc Caslin*, Thomas Wolfe's *Eugene Grant*, F. Scott Fitzgerald's *Nick Carraway*, James T Farrell's *Studs Lonigan*, J.D. Salinger's *Holden Caulfield* and Saul Bellow's *Augie March* are all avatars of Mark Twain's *Huck Finn* the


archetypal adolescent explorer of the nature of American Society, drawn on the figure of the young picaro in world literature but modernized and Americanised "for effective artistic" use in the twentieth century."

1 But it is also a fact that Mark Twain was more outgoing than most writers, a celebrity who performed on the stage, dramatizing for his audiences what could not be confined to the page with the result that his efforts to communicate the humour and pathos of life have been compared to the legendary achievements of Charlie Chaplin, there being 'Certain fundamental affinities' between them as popular mythmakers'. "The anarchic dream expresses the recurrent longing of society for regeneration, along with the protest of the disincarnated against entrenched privilege and something of the 'pure fool' forever seeking the unattainable grail of happiness, love and goodness is to be sensed in Chaplin's filmic creature as well as Mark Twain's imaginary child." 2 Expressing this view, Glauco Cambon observes that it is this


sense of the fable that made both Twain and Chaplin popular in Russia.

Russia is the only foreign country where _Huck Finn_ has been filmed. Mos film studios of Moscow released the film in 1973.

Mark Twain's nostalgia for the past helped him produce some of his best books. He lives in American letters as a great artist the writer whom William Dean Howells called "The Lincoln of our Literature".

Mark Twain's international influences on literature and humanity as a whole has earned him a place in the hearts of people of all age groups in the entire world. Due to the importance of Mark Twain's translations in India and the world as well as in Kerala I made up my mind to select the topic "Mark Twain in Malayalam! A study of Translation Across Cultures and Literatures with Reference to _Huckleberry Finn_" as the topic of my study. My hypothesis is that true translation should be a replica of the original without omitting even the minutest detail. The
translator should be able to convey the same ideas and messages meant by the original author. The theme, characterisations and episodes should not be interpreted according to the whim and fancy of the translator.

Mark Twain's famous works *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, *Prince and Pauper* and *the Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* have been translated into Malayalam by different translators. But *A.H.F* is the only novel which has been translated more or less satisfactorily. In chaste Malayalam, we have a translation by none other than the veteran, versatile and prolific writer Dr. Sukumar Azheekode. So I am concentrating my study on the various translations of *A.H.F.* Though three persons have attempted this venture, only Sukumar Azheekode has successfully done the job. The others K. Thayat and A. Vijayan have only abridged and retold translations. Azheekode's *H.F.V* is included in several important bibliographies. I have included two chapters in this study to show how far these three translators have succeeded in translating *A.H.F.*