

PRINCIPLES OF TRANSLATION VERSUS ORIGINALITY OF THE TARGETED TEXTS

Dr. Parul Mishra

Associate Professor
Amity School of Languages
Amity University Campus
Jaipur (Rajasthan)

Abstract

A published translation is a paradoxical object. It is a substitute for an existing, original text, and yet it is a text in its own right. It is commonly perceived as being the same as the text it replaces, yet is inevitably and irreducibly different. It is a result of a period of decision making on the part of the translator that has been interrupted at appoint which, while not arbitrary, is always questionable and it elicits reactions that range from polarized judgments-sometimes of praise more often of condemnation-to total indifference, It happens in the case when the fact that the text is a translation is totally ignored. The present paper attempts to explore the originality status of the text after translation, not to judge, but to see where the originality stands after the translational choices have been made. There are many important issues raised after stating this aim. The issues taken are terminology, style, source; the critic's interpretative position. The act of translation never leads to predictable outcome. One of the purposes of translation criticism is to examine those outcomes with a view to understanding what happened during the translating process. We still know very little of the cognitive processes that take place, and can only speculate on the priorities and hence the strategies and indeed the feelings that inspired a translator to act in one way rather than another.

Key Words: 1.Translation 2.Paradox 3.Originality 4. Translator 5.Terminology 6.Strategies 7.Speculation 8.Cognitive 9.Condemnation 10.Criticism

Translation studies- relating both to questions of theory and practice-represent a growing body of work which, in recent times, has received insightful inputs from scholars working in various educational streams- linguistics, semiotics, culture studies, literary theory, psychology etc. While translating a text the translator keeps in mind the originality and tries endearingly not to sway his creation from the original one. There are many typical aspects used by the translator for the authenticity of his work. He keeps in mind the psychology, the thought, language, literature, history....And what comes then... is it the real work, the authentic one, or it is interpretations of the translator. We are here talking of translations done by literary writers and not the translators of some political, social, religious leader.

Problems in translation: What is translation? To quote Nabakov,

.....A poet's pale and glaring head,
A parrot's screech, a monkey's chatter,
And profanation of the dead
Reflected words can only shiver
Like elongated lights that twist
In the black mirror of a river
Between the city and the mist
This is my task; a poet's patience
And scholastic passion blent-
Dove-dropping on your monument

Translation can be claimed as old as language; it would not be wrong to state that it is as old as the contact of language to strange presenter. It is no doubt an ancient craft still its ways are rather mysterious and it would not be wrong to conclude that still people fail giving the exact definition of what translation is- is it interpretation; is it one's own creation in the loved language, is it the love for the work been preferred for translation? Meetham and Hudson take it the following way: "Translation is the replacement of a representation of a text in one language by a representation of an equivalent text in a second language. Texts in different languages can be equivalent in different degrees (fully or partially different) in respect of different levels of representation (context, semantics, grammar, lexis, etc.) and at different ranks (word- for-word, phrase – for-phrase, and sentence- for- sentence). Therefore the term equivalent needs to be focused on for a detailed explanation. (34)

Does equivalence exists, even between individual words in the same language? And since in an absolute sense, equivalence is impossible. Can we then go on saying that translation is nothing but equivalence? Which just stated above is impossible. This shows there is something erroneous in the insistence of equivalence theory in relation to translation. There is now significant concurrence among students reading linguistics, psychology and critics that the traditional views of the 'original text' and the reader's response to that are primarily flawed. Md. Q.R Al-Zoubi and Bhargava quote in their study of misconceptions of Literary Translation- "Deconstructionists, Norrison & Benjamin, of the time assert that, in effect, the 'original texts' is lost in the process of reading, decomposed into a personal and non-linguistic representation in the mind of the reader. If this is the case, then the result will be an interpretation of the reader's mind in terms of his understanding of the text, his conception of the topic read. Whatever he represents as his translated work will be a presentation of his intellectual level. Not only this, the work would also have to face constraints of language and other dimensions related to it."(69) I would like to quote something relevant as per my understanding--we know that there is no word such as AAP in English. The Hindu epics are translated –for gods also **you** is used for devils also **you** is used. How can we be assured that Fitzgerald while translating Bhagwad-Geeta or any Indian artists translating Biblical stories have the same bent of mind? Same reverence for lords and deities! It is tough to explain. Again we need to be clarified on the equivalence theory. What equivalence do we find in the translation of Tulsidasji's Ramcharitmanas and Valmiki Ramayana?. The Hindi literary artists say that Goswami Tulsidas wrote Ramayana with a thought of preserving the decaying language Sanskrit and decided to write in a very simple, colloquial language which could be understood by all commoners. Keeping the thought in mind that the readers should be able to understand an epic story Goswami Tulsidas ji must have done

changes in the words and phrases. But it is often quoted that Gosami Tulsidas Ramayana is different from that of Valmiki Ramayana. If it was a translation was equivalence followed by the famous Hindu poet. Tradition even says that it was not a translated work but just the praise of lord Rama's chivalry or Goswami ji's love for lord Rama which he expressed through his Creation, Ramcharit manas.

My attempt in saying this is that originality is sacrificed in translated works for the sake of readers. It is also observed that the translated version became so popular that the original text got subsided. To quote more clearly I would mention the lines of Goswami Tulsidas ji where he says-

प्रभु भल कीन्ह मोहि सिख दीन्हिं।
मरजादा पुनि तुम्हरी कीन्हिं॥
ढोल गवाँर शूद्र पशु नारी।
सकल ताड़ना के अधिकारी॥

Nowhere does the sage Valmiki quotes this in any rhyme and reason in his Ramayana. The chaupai says: Lord it is so kind of you that, you taught me lesson, for this again I pay reverence to you."The Drummer, The illiterate, the lower caste, the animal and women hold the right to be torched". **Or** the other way round that the word tarhna means taaran i.e. uddhar or in a sense enlightenment. What would have been their response or understanding of Rama's Character! Did he treat the mentioned ones in a different manner or alike. Here again the originality is mystified.

The other example can be of interpretations of Bhagwad Geeta- Bhagwadgita has got lot many schools and has various interpretations. The target audience who holds no straight looming to the original text entirely depends on the translation to get a clue of the original work and its writer. Translators should have a sense of interlingual synonymy. Along with this they have also to make efforts against incredible persuasion to perk up, augment and recover the original. Unfortunately, this does not encompass the range of translation. Therefore, a translator must always avoid to be the editor of the book; he needs to be authentic, yet pleasant-sounding and imaginative. Doing in depth analysis of the ideologies of translating both prose and poetry, we arrive to a conclusion of problems involved in translation process. Since in a good majority of cases translation is not a amalgamated procedure, the duality is a constraint for it. In Aristotelian terms translation is a verisimilitude not mirror image of a reflection.

It has been observed that Bible translations in the ancient times saw the use of lingua franca all over Europe. In such cases translations were also used as a bludgeon against the inflexible way of life, rampant in church practices as well as in the surfacing of new nation states. John Wycliffe was the first to translate Bible into English (1380-84); in the prologue to the second Bible Wycliffe measured assessments of preceding versions to institute an original text, moreover, collaboration with scholars concerning complex meanings of words and grammatical structures were mandatory steps in the process of translation. These steps were considered as the extensive charts acknowledged by translators in other languages. Some of the translators even wished to bring into being an obtainable and artistically gratifying style in the target language text.

The supposition of translation by itself creates a fascinating sphere of much hypothetical contest within the wider domain of translation studies. The field of translation consists of an intersection of linguistics, stylistics, critical, theoretical and creative observance in intricate and curious ways. Literary translations commonly raise questions essential to both language and

linguistics, on the one hand, and to extensive literary and cultural concerns on the other. They play a good part in extending the range of linguistic studies moreover by their own ability they perhaps find a definite position in literary studies. They emphasize on remarkable influence as was observed by the translations of the Bible and by the works of Homer, Dante, Shakespeare and so on.

According to Lefevere, a translation theorist, rewriters create the images of a writer, work, period, genre, sometimes even a whole literature. He also stresses that a writer's work gains exposure and achieves influence mainly through misunderstanding and misconceptions created by rewriters (234). Translation is a text comprised of refractions and it manipulates messages to project a certain image in the service of certain ideological constraints. According to Lefevere, this fact is apparent in the passages where translators insert in their translations—"passages that are most emphatically not in the original" (42). When the translation is governed by a socially and culturally influential institution, it has a greater effect on the social mores and the identity-forming process of the target society.

The paper squabbles that if equivalence is the quintessence of translation, non-equivalence comprises uniformly authentic perception in the translation process. The inspiration for this condition is that languages articulate or classify the world in a different way. Culler supports it saying, "Languages do not simply name existing categories, they articulate their own" (21). Furthermore, the practice of non-equivalence in translation is talked about and corroborated by facts and examples in the process of translating from Arabic into English. This kind of translation is been rarely discussed in research work aligning with equivalence. Lot many scholars doing research have spoken about equivalence in translation done chiefly from English into Arabic (Ghazala). The Arabic and the English language belongs to two diverse cultures and therefore, present ample confirmation for the option of translating what is sometimes referred to as "untranslatable" due to non-equivalence or lack of equivalence. For example, Baker in her Course book on Translation says, "Arabic is rich in culture-specific terms and concepts that have no equivalents in English. Yet, these terms can be translated into English using one of the strategies suggested for translating non-equivalence to convey their conceptual and cultural meanings to the English speaking readers" (274)

In the cases discussed above, it can be discussed that equivalence or doing translation by means of equivalence is not the essence of the best translation. Not only this, it even fails to design a significant illustration of the source text (ST) into the target text (ST). In a judicious way doing translation without using equivalence theory is more convincing in comparison to the use of equivalence technique; the translation will be equally artistic as expected by the reader or the author. In following this novel way of translation, the doctrine of Non-equivalence becomes more appropriate than equivalence. To quote it differently, "non-equivalence" becomes more equivalent than "equivalence." It is an improved approach in these cases. A deeper study of equivalence theory and the use of non-equivalence becomes quite valid to talk about non-equivalence and its relevance in translating culture-specific provisos and perceptions including idioms, metaphors and proverbs.

Another chief aspect to deal with the constraints of translations is the intercultural context. The translation authenticity does not essentially call for the literal transfer or transposition of the same word and sound, but it is undoubtedly obligatory to fabricate a multifarious excellence of stylistic and semantic comparison in conventionality with the artistic intent of the original text. The most basic obstacle for the translation would be "the fundamentally different structures of the languages of the original and of the target language.

Pramod Talgeri says, It is of course very difficult to reproduce a linguistic expression in its exact completeness by means of another expression. The context is the referential framework within which meaning takes its contours. So long as the words describe only outward experiences, which may be very unfamiliar, it may not be very difficult for the translator to translate them in the target language., since it calls for no more than an extension of our experience into new elements of outward perception. But it would be rather intriguing if the familiar elements are reorganized and put into a totally different context.”(86)

I would conclude saying that the act of translation is not less than Herculean task. Culturally specific passages are a challenging task for translators. There is therefore a tendency to avoid them and rush into the story line. Translation is an art not artistry or artfulness. The reader expects the translation to be the original. We as readers forget that even god is unable to make to people, originally same. Even the twins carry some or the other peculiar thing which differs them from each other. Many a times we think that translation is at its best a poor reproduction of the original work. This cannot be totally denied because to some extent the originality suffers existence, but it is also to be reminded that it’s an ancient art, art through which epic and their myths are living. The whole world agrees that Tolstoy was a giant story teller and Rabindra Nath Tagore is a great poet but how many of us have read Tolstoy in Russian and Tagore in Bengali. We read the translated versions. It is rarely found that translated version and original text receiving same praise. The world of art & literature is full of translations; translation can be called as an act of love – For the language, for the story, for the writer whom the translator wants to be read and known by all. It can be called perspective and approach of the reader that he feels the loss of originality or a carbon copy of the source text.

Works Cited

- Al.Zoubi, Md.Q.R and Bhargava, Rajul Some Constraints, Problems and Misconceptions in Literary Translation. Creative. New Delhi.1999.
- Ghazala, Hasan. Tarjamatul Mustalahatil Islamiati. Saudi Arabia. 2002
- Hasan, Ghazala. Essays in Translation and Stylistics Dar El-Ilm Lilmalayin, Beirut 2000
- J. Culler. Saussure Collins, Glagow 1976
- Lefevere, A. *Translation - History, Culture: A Sourcebook*, New York: Routledge.1992
- Lefevere, A. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London/New York: Routledge. 1992
- Mary. Snell-Hornby Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach John Benjamin. Amsterdam. 1988
- Meetham, A. R and R.A. Hudson. Encyclopedia in Linguistics, Information and control,Oxford.Pergamon. 1969
- Mona Baker (Ed.), *Other Words: a Coursebook on Translation*, Routledge, London (1992)
- Nabakav. V. Eugene Onegin, Princeton: Princeton 1975
- Talgeri, Pramod. *Intercultural Hermeneutics and literary translation*.Creative. New Delhi. 1999.