THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TRANSLATION

Professor S. S. Deo
Former Dean, SACL & Head, ME&OFL
School Of Arts, Communication and Languages
H.N.B.Garhwal University
(A Central University)
Shrinagar Garhwal
Uttarakhand.

Monika Gupta Aggarwal
Research Scholar
Department of English, Modern European
And Other Foreign Languages
H.N.B. Garhwal University
(A Central University)
Shrinagar Garhwal
Uttarakhand.

Abstract

Ever since antiquity, innumerable number of theories for translation have been propounded irrespective of   the various methodologies adopted for real translation . 'A theory is a formal idea' which is concrete, objective and universal truth; it is abstract, and is also elemental, while an idea is drawn from the cosmos in a natural order, which is uninterrupted, unchanged for any other possibility. Plato also describes idea as ''The Ultimate reality''. As we propound 'a theory is a formal idea', a force running out of a natural situation providing the basis of a theory. Generally, a theory grows on the set rules of its application, which are never given to alterations in any time or place, irrespective of culture, country or language. Literature is always in plasma form or jelly like form, imbedded in emotions. So there cannot be any theory, which could be applied to a literary creation with success. Many theorists from Cicero, Marcus Fabius, John Dryden, Eugene A. Nida, Gaytri Chakravorty Spivak etc. to date have propounded their own theories for translation for various genres of literary creation. Whereas translations date back to antiquity, even before we started the history of English literature with success, where even the author or translator himself remains unknown, but the literary creation preserves, even today, as a masterpiece in itself for instance   **Junius** (paraphrases from Bible known as Caedmonian poems),**Beowulf ,Widsith**. Thus, any theory is incapable of translating a literature, which is in a plasma form, containing emotions and feelings. Instead, translation has to be made at random, keeping in view the form and content of the text for translation.

Eversince antiquity, the innumerable theories have emerged across the nations till the present era. A considerable number of the prominent theorists, including Marcus Tullius Cicero, Quintus Horatius Flaccus(Horace) ,Marcus Fabius Quintillianus (Quintilian), Augustine Jerome, John Dryden, Walter Benjamin, Eugene A. Nida, Freidrich Schleiermacher, George Steiner, Andre Lefevere, Eva Hoffman, Douglas Robinson, Lawrence Venuti, Susan Bassnett and many others in the modernity have presented theories in the varied areas of language, grammar, rhetoric, culture and the philosophy etc. in their own manners in the periphery of time, place and situation, before analyzing the practices of the theory of translation, it is necessary to understand the meaning and definition of theory with its practice in the translation of a literary text. 'A theory is a formal idea' wherein an idea itself, in plain and simple words, is a concrete, objective and universal truth. It should imply that an idea, which is concrete and universally true, is abstract and elemental. The idea is drawn from the natural order, in the process of cosmos, such that, it cannot be either splited or changed or interpreted for another possibility. If Plato describes idea as "the ultimate reality,"[1] he means a similar thing by conceptualizing that the "the idea takes shape from its original pattern."[2] This concept of idea as 'ultimate reality' embodies the notion of 'the ultimate truth', inadvertently, the truth of the ultimate element beyond which the shape could neither better nor alter in effect. It can be clarified that idea is absolute and, so, is unargumentative and impersonal, like a thought.

Since, we propound 'a theory as a formal idea', it would mean that the idea as a fore – running force out of a natural situation provides the basis for a theory. In order to access and analyse the theory and practice of translation, it would be desirable to quote and exemplify the theory with instances from the waves of happenings in the Universe. As the theory of addition grows on the set rules of application, for instance, two plus two is equal to four, never given to alteration in any time or place, illustrates an idea as universal, irrespective of a country, language, time and culture. The another theory of 'Gravitational Force', which is defined as "force attracting the body towards the centre of the earth"[3] and presented as $F=Mg^2$, wherein the idea as theory is again inherent in the process of nature .One more instance of theory as idea can be put as the best instance with the Newton's 'first law of Motion', stating that in any state of motion " A body cannot change its state itself",[4] unless collided with another object or particle. The law, among another things, tells of the universal truth that every material has a property "by the virtue of which it resists the change in its shape of rest or in its state of motion." [5] The idea implicit as theory to have called 'inertia' is the basic thing propounding the theory of 'the law of motion'.

Any literature is primarily in the form of an emotion objectifying it in the form of an idea wherein the former is always in the state of the plasma. To explain it, a better way is that 'emotion in plasma' is basically in a form quite inconsistent, and change shape from time to time like a jelly, which must better confirm to a plasma state of an object. Since emotion is the root of literature and out of which the idea emerges, the theory of literature could not be possible because the idea, which is concrete and the emotion surmounted upon feelings and impulses is always in the movable form. That is to say that there cannot be any theory of Translation so long the plasma emotion remains the stronghold to a literary creation. Obviously, the idea itself cannot be the basis for a literary creation or of literature because all things are never concrete in it. So, when we say that there is a theory of translation to a literature, it would imply that the translation is in fact not of literature but of the secondary meaning, implicit in it. It is a great

question whether in a translation of a literature we attempt to, translate the emotions, of the writer as the first meaning, or the idea which should be called the second meaning. Whether a translation is of the emotions or of the ideas, a theory in fact cannot be propounded about it, in any wake of life or situation wherefrom idea and emotion are taken consists of happening, cause and the effect in a physical way of action; the happening could carry cause and, so, a resultant, but in case of a translation of emotion, particularly, no theory can be created or applied to it. So the translation of a literature is an attempt to communicate a set of emotions, put and presented as a second meaning in the form of ideas, bearing the full description of the atmosphere of the translated literature. In light of the discussion, a translation is an honest attempt by a translator giving the best of things irrespective of a theory or the concrete calculation.

Cicero, the renowned orator, philosopher and statesman has also expressed similar attitude towards the concept of translation. In his **De Optimo Genere Oratorum,** he advocates free translation over word - for - word translation, saying that in his translation, "Into two most eloquent and most noble speeches"[6] he did not translate like a "a mere hack,"[7] but in the manner of an orator. His contention in stating that in translation he did not keep word for word, but " kept the force and the flavour of the passage;"[8] the force and the flavour he formally meant for time, space and atmosphere, which happen to be the spirit of literature. Instead of forging an objective type of theory, Cicero employs more creative kind of a process through his use of paraphrase and metaphrase as a tool to his practical translations.

Marcus Fabius ,the another Ciceronian philosopher and orator puts similar views in regard to translation. Appreciating and advising the preservation "of living tradition rather than only reproducing the earlier texts in translation,"[9] he draws for distinct lines between the "Metaphrasis or word - for - word translation and paraphrases or phrase - by- phrase translation."[10] It can be easily assessed that he also feels the problem of translating an 'emotion' in translation to an 'idea' to it.

Quintilian, in an exceeding order to the merit of the Greeks, is more thoughtful to say that "to invent is first order of time and holds the first place in merit,"[11] yet it is of "advantage to copy what has been invented with success."[12] His attempt is to show that translation is a kind of an imitation, a kind of a copy in which the original is more valuable. He assimilates the purpose of translation with a purpose or imitation. That is to say, according to him, imitation is also translation. Quintilian also advocates that a translation should not only be "a paraphrase but also a struggle and rivalry over the same meaning."[13] Here again, as discussed in the former pages, he speaks of superiority of emotion (primary meaning) over the idea (secondary meaning) in translation.

It is with St Augustine, to regard "translation a systematic undoing of the linguistic confusion following the destruction of the **Tower of Bable**."[14] His approach is to show problems of translation of the Hebrew and the Aramaic source text believing that the " translators at Alexandria were guided by the Holy Spirit."[15] Likewise, King Alfred, the famous King of Wessex, who translated **Gregory's Pastoral Care** from Latin to English, believed and propounded the notion of translating a text, "sometimes word - for - word, sometimes sense - for - sense"[16] kind of a translation. His overall intent of the principle of translation indicates a meaningful and complete presentation of translation of the text from one language to another language.

John Dryden, the famous critic and translator in the seventeen the century, has authoritatively marked the three different systems or theories as Metaphrase, Paraphrase and Imitation while translating some of the popular works of Homer, Horace, Juvenal, Ovid, Virgil, Chaucer and even Boccaccio. In his preface to **Ovid's Epistle** (1680), he announces that "All translations may be reduced to tripartite division of translation"[17] of the types of Metaphrase, Paraphrase and Imitation. Where Metaphrase connots the turning "of an author word - by - word or line - by - line"[18] the second way "paraphrase or translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not simply followed as his sense;"[19] the third way is that of "imitation where the translator assumes the liberty not only to vary from the words and sense but to forsake them both as he sees occasion and taking only some general hints from the original to run division on the ground as he pleases."[20]

The first way as given by Cicero and Quintilian, is the imitation part of translation. He means a copying to the best possibilities of the translator's understanding. It gives not a word - to - word in a sense - to - sense translation but copying at the leisure of the translator. If overall all the important translators up to Dryden be considered, along with the meaning of translation in a lithograph is "to transport, to transfer, from one to another, to change, to interpret to another language"[21] retaining the sense while the one returns anything into another language. Lexically translation is expressed in three ways, "first, expresses sense of in another language or in another form; second, be translatable ,third, interpret move or change especially from one person, place or condition to another."[22] First here means to change, convert, decode, elucidate, explain express, gloss, interpret, paraphrase, render, reword, spell out, transcribe while the third is to, construe , interpret, read, and understand.

Roman Jakobson, a literary theorist and a linguist, a key figure in the development of Russian Formalism and Czech Formalism in his essay on " On Linguistic Aspects Of Translation''[23] extends the significance of translation to include intralingual and intersemiotic translations. His simple concept is that a sign or a word weak in one text if replaced by a stronger sign or word in the translated text may provide better meaning, like Dryden's three ways of Metaphrase, Paraphrase and Imitation he also provided three ways.

Jakobson distinguishes in three ways of interpreting his verbal signs to be'' transmitted into another signs of same language, or into another non verbal sign system;"[24] in his ways of thinking " intralingual translation or rewarding is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of same language;''[25] it implies the distinction of signs by signs, on the same ''interlingual translation is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other signs of some other language;''[26] similarly Intersemiotic translation or transmutation is an interpretation of verbal sing by means of '' nonverbal sign systems .''[27]

Eugene A. Nida (1914 b.) a contemporary theologian expounds the theory of dynamic (functional) equivalence an approach which is designed to help the translator grasp the meaning and spirit of the original language text without being bound to its linguistic structure . He is akin to Cicero and Quintilian in his approach to observe that ''the total impact of translation is reasonably close to the original text;''[28] with no identity in details ,he points out the three basic factors of translation , that is ,nature of massage, purpose of author, proxy of translator and the type of audience.

He in his approach to modernism adds one more factor that is the audience. In his theory of formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence, he has separate contentions to be made in

119

regard to the form and content of a poem. The formal equivalence carries the original form and content of the text of the translation , the dynamic equivalence is based on the principle of equivalent effect .In this kind of the way of translation, the important factor is not the matching of the two languages but the effect it shows, that the massage in the two languages enjoys a nice relationship.

Gayatri chakravorty spivak a literary theorist, feminist, critic and a translator finds out that the actual works of translation, from one language to another, reveal more about the politics of exchange between the languages, cultures, countries and continents including different races and gender. She believes that '' translation is a version of inter textuality that comes to bear also with the same language.''[29]

No theory of translation can be substantial and specific in so far the translated text is not universal. It is true that there is always ; '' in the original (original text) a greater abruptness, a more interrupted   sequence,'' [30] such that the translator himself is to judge whether he could use the method of word- to- word or sense- to- sense translation. Critics like Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, John Dryden, Marcus Tuillus Cicero, Roman Jokobson consider things, in light of transnational works form the fourteen century with the modern one. All the theories made on the cultural, religious and the lingual background of living or visible author's atmosphere, but the translations (transnational) works done in historical works like the Bible ,the Hebrew Bible and Septuagaint   considered to be ''the greatest accomplishment in the field of translation''[31] a unique ''scholarly effort of hundreds of bilingual individuals consisting of identical versions by as many as seventy two translator.''[32] The translation of Bible into Latin by St Jerome, ''known as vulgate''[33] even preceded the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek language translations. It is still not known whether the translation of the Bible was made from the original language or the vulgate. Spivak is closer to the view that one Almighty created one human race but different language in the light of time, space contigem, culture , society and religion, had things been like her thinking of one God, one humanity and one culture there would have been no other languages, and so, there would be no need of translation but she throngs at the impossible probability as mankind is born and lives according to its own requirements.

But one more thing is that there cannot be a theory and the method of its application since the examples from the translation of **Bewolf** find traces neither of its translator nor its writer. The question is should the translation and making of its theory work only for literature and the translations done by Watt, Surrey, and Geoffery Chaucer or William Shakespeare's works including his essays, in drama are so '' astonishing that no one theory''[34] fits them and each of them ought to be studied separately. The sole fact in regard to translation ' theory and practice ' is that a work like this would be impossible , even in most literal translations   into an erotic language like English or French to '**'**reproduce the phrases ''[35] without either ''introducing connecting links''[36] or becoming '' unintelligible.''[37]   Notwithstanding the retinue with their theories in the translational works, the fact remains unattempted for the reason whether any of these would resolve the possibility of translating a literature in the plasma from, containing the raw emotions and the converted feelings. Instead, the translation has to be made at random keeping in view the ' form and content 'of a text for translation, which obviously represent the reality of both the original text and the translated one. The theory is a real part of a critical approach wherein the truth is the substance of translation.

Works Cited

1.Kumar, Satish, and Anupam Tayal. Ed . ''*History and Principals of Literary Criticism .Agra. Narain's Series.141*''.15. Print.

2.Ibid .15. Print .

3.Bhutani, Amar, and K.Kaur. ''*ArunDeep's:I.C.S.E. Physics Class10*.''Jalandhar.2016 .Print.

4. Ibid .7.Print.

5.Ibid..7 . Print.

6.Weissbort. Daniel, and Astradur. Eysteinsson.Ed. ''*Translation :Theory and Practice*.''Oxford University Press.2006.21.Print.

7. Ibid 21. Print.

8.Ibid.21.Print.

9.Ibid.24.Print.

10.Ibid.24.Print.

11.Ibid.25.Print.

12.Ibid.25.Print.

13.Ibid.25.Print.

14.Ibid.31.Print.

15.Ibid.31.Print.

16.Ibid.37.Print .

17 .Ibid.144.Print.

18.Ibid.144.Print.

19.Ibid.145.Print.

20.Ibid.145.Print.

21. Https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/translation.N.p.,n.d.Web.

22.Elliot.Julia, Anne Knight,and Chris Cowley.Ed . ''*Oxford Dictionary and Thesaurus*'':Oxford University Press.2006.819.Print.

23. Weissbort. Daniel, and.Astradur.Eysteinsson.Ed. ''*Translation :Theory and Practice*.''Oxford University Press.2006.330.Print.

24. Ibid.331.Print.

25.Ibid.331.Print.

26. Ibid.350.Print .

27. Ibid.350.Print.

28. . Ibid.350.Print.

29. Ibid.489.print.

30.Legouis.Emile,et'al. ''*History of English. Literature*.''Macmillian:India.2012.18.Print . 31. Weissbort. Daniel, and. Astradur. Eysteinsson. Ed. ''*Translation :Theory and Practice*.''Oxford University Press.200611.Print.

32.Ibid.28.Print.

33.Ibid.28.Print.

34. Legouis. Emile,et'al. ''*History of English. Literature*.''Macmillian:India.2012.420.Print.

35.Ibid.18.Print.

36.Ibid.18.Print.

37.Ibid.18.Print.