

The Conceptual Framework of Translation: Issues and Challenges

Dr. Vibhuti Gaur

Associate Professor of English

IGNOU

Email: gaurvibhuti@gmail.com

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Keywords :

*Theorizing, techniques,
authenticity, folk
narratives, language,
untranslatibility*

ABSTRACT

After going into practice of translating folk narratives, I have recapitulated some important aspects in theorizing translation based on my experience like-what is translation, need of translating a piece in one language into a different language, the various types and techniques in the process of translation, the question of authenticity of the translated piece and the problem of untranslatibility.

In a sense, nothing is untranslatable;

but in another sense, everything is untranslatable;

translation is another word for the impossible.

Jacques Derrida, Monolingualism of the Other.

Translation is very difficult . . . but it is not impossible.

Octavio Paz, Translation: Literature and Letters

Translation is an act of presenting a text in a language other than the one in which it was originally written, in order to convey the meaning of the original text .It is a highly goal-oriented activity in which a translator modifies his/her technique as well as the end-product according to the needs of the user. This modification according to the needs gives rise to various types of translation like literal translation, conceptual translation, or abridged translation.

The need for translation arises when a person wishes to know something written in a language which he or she does not understand. This is the need of a reader. Alternatively, a writer might like to

communicate something to persons who do not know his/her language. This is the need of the writer. In this context, I have translated for people who are natives as well as non-natives. In either case, the lack of knowledge is a barrier to communication. Translation serves as a bridge in overcoming this barrier.

So the question arises is how does an ideal translation looks like?

It is generally believed that an ideal translation must reproduce the full sense of the original text, omitting nothing, adding nothing. Any deviation from this is considered something else but not translation. This is a kind of purist approach in in translation where the emphasis is on exact equivalence and on taking care of each word in the original.

Further it is also expected that a translation should not ignore the style of the original. To be able to communicate the meaning of the original text in a style similar to the original text makes translation quite a challenging test. For example, if we are translating from Haryanvi to English or vice versa, we find that the structure of both the languages is quite different. So how do we transfer the meaning in a style similar to that of the original?

But there are translations which fulfil this criterion excellently. In fact, these translations also make an excellent independent reading. It is also believed that a good translation should not read like a translation at all, but seem like an original text.

To be able to fulfil this tall order, a translator has to have, to begin with, an excellent knowledge of the language from which the translation is being made. S/he must fully understand its nuances and finer aspects. A translator ought to have equal facility in the language into which s/he is translating. S/he should be able to express all the ideas of the original writer from one language to another.

There is a need to distinguish between the language from which a translation is being made and the language into which the translation is being made with the help of two technical terms. The language from which the translation is being made is called source language (SL), Haryanvi in this context and the language into which the translation is being made is called target language or receptor language(TL), English in this case.

If a translation adequately communication the message of the original and is presented in a style similar to the original, it is expected that it will make an impression on its readers which is similar to the

impression made by the original on its reader. Finally, a translator may often have to make necessary adjustments in the form, content and style of the original text keeping in mind the objective of conveying the message faithfully.

Additionally, She may have to make more such adjustments keeping in view the nature, competence and the needs of the readers.

The encounter between two languages and hence culture is fraught with danger. In my case, unless the status between the Haryanvi language and the English language was recognized, a degree of misrepresentation was bound to occur.

In 1857, Edward Fitzgerald wrote the following in a letter to his friend E.B. Cowell on his translation of the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam: "It is an amusement to me to take what liberties I like with these Persians, who, (as I think) are not poets enough to frighten one from such excursions, and who really do want a little Art to shape them"(Edward, Fitzgerald 1901).

With such an attitude to the source language and its culture, one seriously wonders if justice was done to the original text. Yet Fitzgerald's translation was immensely successful and vastly popular, and has been translated in all major languages

The product approach and the process approach are the two different methodologies that are accessible for the study of translation. Prior translation exercises had solely addressed the final translated output. It attempted to respond to the following query: to what extent has TL counterparts replaced textual material in the SL? These days, focus has switched to the method, translators use, to create their work.

I used the process approach while translating Haryanvi folk narratives into English, which made it easier for me to comprehend the thought processes that went into creating the translated text as the final product. I had to go through the decoding, transmission, and recoding processes as a translator. During the translation process, I actually had to play three different roles: 1) reader, reading the original Haryanvi folktales; 2) acting as a bilingual and attempting to preserve the Haryanvi text's context while finding the exact English expression; and 3) acting as the writer of the translated text.

This meant that, in order for me to understand and comprehend the message as a reader and translate it into its structurally obvious forms of an English text as an effective writer, I had to first decode the original Haryanvi text.

"Decoding" describes the method of utilising analysis and interpretation to determine the message encoded in the text that needs to be translated. It lends the text a clear, understandable voice. Although analysing a text might be a challenging task, translation offers at least three distinct levels of meaning: grammatical, connotational, and cultural, socioeconomic.

The meaning of a linguistic structure is referred to as its grammatical meaning. It highlights the connections between a language's various parts. There are multiple meanings that a sentence can convey due to its structural (grammatically) ambiguity. In this situation, the ambiguous sentence's semantic interpretation can be found by connecting it to several grammatical structures. It is important for translators to keep in mind that the original storyteller may have intentionally left some uncertainty in the translation. Reproducing it in such a situation is the translator's responsibility. She/he may explain the original if there isn't a structurally equivalent confusing structure available in the target language. The connotative meaning highlights how language and the speaker's mental state are related. It contributes a meaning distinct from the expression's referential content.

The socio-cultural meaning highlights the connection between language and the socio-cultural presumptions that underpin all verbal expressions.

I was considering many interpretations while deciphering. Nonetheless, my primary focus was on understanding the text in its whole, without getting bogged down in theoretical semantics issues. As a practitioner, I also had to choose which of the several meaning variations ought to be taken into consideration.

The process of transmitting a message into a different language (TL) after decoding its source text in SL is referred to as "transfer." It calls for "bilingual competence," or the capacity to comprehend and express the same idea in two languages. To comprehend the message transference process, one must be aware of the following linguistic facts: It be remembered:

- a) The grammatical and lexical units of two languages (SL and TL) do not relate to each other exactly.
- b) Each language's grammatical and lexical organisation has unique characteristics.

I was initially unable to include or transfer over Haryanvi contextual meanings into the English text due to the aforementioned two circumstances. Then I established communicative values in the TL-text that are consistent with the message's communicative values as established in the SL-text. The ideal way was to translate these stories to establish the "functional equivalents" of their message in English after first understanding the "communicative value" of their expressions in Haryanvi. My main worry while transferring the referential content to the message was the information's structure. "Words and other linguistic units serve merely as vehicles for carrying the components of information"

The message's information was often redistributed in the English language during the transfer phase. Usually one observes the following kinds of redistribution:

Total Redistribution: This kind involves a total redistribution of the SL expression's referential content in the message.

Analytical Redistribution: This type involves spreading out the SL lexical unit's referential content among multiple TL lexical units.

Synthetic Redistribution: This sort of redistribution involves condensing referential content from multiple lexical items in the SL into a single TL item.

The transfer process implies that the translator does not implant or carry over SL meanings into the target language (TL) text. The 'substitution' of TL meanings for SL meanings actually occurs. Transfer of meaning from one language to another is also possible. Thus, the transfer process covers in its orbit instances of 'functional substitution' meaning transfer and total transfer of a linguistic unit.

This transfer process is variously named by different theorists of translation. Some have called it 'substitution process', some as 'inter-lingual transposition', and yet some as 'semiotic transformation.' Those involved with translation of literary texts view it as 'transcription.'

Exact translation proved unachievable when I tried "recoding," which is the process of creating a text in the target language (TL) with meanings close to the source text. Since an accurate translation is not achievable, the next step was to approximate the SL-text through recoding. Three dichotomies face the translator as a writer:

a) the cultures of the source and target languages;

- b) the grammatical and lexical differences between the two languages.
- c) The characters of the two authors, or the original text's author and the translator.

Semantic and communicative translations are the two main categories, depending on how much emphasis is placed on each of these dichotomies. When recoding semantically, there is a tendency in favour of the SL-text and the author of the original text. The translated text is more exact, literal and faithful to the original. It attempts to render it as close as the semantic and grammatical structures of the TL allow. It also tries to represent the elements of the original culture.

The TL and the readers of the translated text are favoured in communicative recoding. The translation is natural, idiomatic, and comparatively free. An endeavour is made to elicit from the reader an effect that is as near to that of the original as feasible. Its translucent style highlights the text's communicative aim.

The three prerequisites listed below assisted in improving the functionality of the recoding:

- a) honouring the original text's intended message,
- b) maintaining the primary purpose of the design or the original text;
- c) rendering in a language and style understandable to the intended audience.

These served as my general guidelines as I played the part of a writer. A text is always created with the reader in mind. The SL text must be rendered by the translator in a way that, in addition to matching the source material, makes the translation seem like a modern work by the translator (rather than the original). A translator usually chooses among the variety of target language expressions that are available the one that most closely resembles the source in terms of referential content and is understandable to the intended audience. Three different approaches can be used to make some cultural words unique to the SL. When reading comprehension of the sociocultural aspects of the text's meaning is assumed, the approximate expression will be good enough. But if the reader is to be imparted such information the translator will opt for either Expanded expression or Loan word (with foot-note).

I made an effort to evaluate the translation's validity or truth-value once it was done. First, I made sure that everyone had received the pertinent information. Second, it was ensured that no grammatical or usage restrictions were broken in the revised content. Finally, it was determined if certain paralinguistic elements—such as the text's overall communicative function, tone, and general context—had been

addressed. It will be declared that the translation has "truth-value" and authenticity if all of the aforementioned requirements have been met. Therefore, a translation's authenticity or truth value mostly depends on the author's original meaning and how well it is conveyed to the reader through translation. The translator's work is excessively difficult if the text is literary. Perceptions and attitudes, though realized through the use of words and sentences in one language, may fail to find their exact equivalents in another language without losing part of their original or intended impact.

However, this should not deter us from pursuing the profession of translation as a career. Other important terms are practice and patience. When translating, one attempts to convey the original text's meaning as closely as possible in the translated text (TL) (SL). In order to accomplish this, the translator typically writes a text for a readership whose language and culture are different from the writer's and the original text's readers. For a translator, this linguistic and cultural disparity poses a major challenge. Why? Considering that the translator must consider both the structure and content of the source text (SL) and the whole set of communicative elements inherent in the target language of translated text. The principle of equivalence is primarily based on the basic assumption that identical structures cannot exist between two languages.

It is difficult to identify a one-to-one correlation between the vocabulary, grammar, style, and other linguistic components of two languages. There are no precise correspondences between related linguistic objects across languages. However, every language possesses the ability to convey the meaning conveyed in a different language. A translator takes advantage of this ability to convey the same idea in languages with different grammatical and lexical systems. No one translates across languages. "A text created in a language is actually what one translates. Every paragraph is a spoken signal. A verbal sign is a single unit of expression (medium) and substance (meaning). Translation is creating, an equivalent of the original first in the target language, in terms of message and meaning and second in terms of expression and stylistic devices".

Equivalency is a complicated notion. It is multifaceted. Every situation presents a different set of challenges for a translator, such as:

- a) The translational equivalency problem.
- b) The issue of knowledge loss and meaning gain.

- c) The untranslatable problem.
- d) Techniques for addressing the untranslatable issues.

The translation process is referred to as unidirectional since the translation-act is only carried out in one direction, namely from SL to TL and from the original text into the creation of the translated text.

The production process is likewise subject to limitations because of this unidirectionality. "A translated text is not produced; instead, it is reproduced". To duplicate anything is to create a reasonably precise replica of it. In the realm of translation, this is neither desirable nor feasible due to a variety of different reasons, including:

-changes in the medium of expression, which has its own language, grammar, culture, and literary conventions;

-application of interpretation That is to say, a translated text is not only generated automatically. Instead, it is the result of reading the source material, which requires comprehension and interpretation; the translator's personality; and the needs of the audience. Every translator has a distinct group of readers to whom the translated material is distributed. The aforementioned makes it clear that a translator does more than just alter a linguistic object's appearance when they reproduce a text (text). However, a translator is expected to replicate a text that is identical to the source language in both form and substance.

Is it this resemblance that gives a bilingual reader a sense of identity between two unlike objects? Finding out what constitutes identity establishment between non-identical texts (SL and TL) would be an intriguing research project. These questions have answers based on the equivalency principle. The translation process involves replication, and the idea of "equivalency" is central to this process. A text is considered translated into the target language (TL) when it functions as a natural translation of the form and content of the original text.

What is meant by equivalency? Does that mean "same"? No, "identical" does not equate to "equivalent." When two or more objects are exactly the same in every way, they are referred to as identical. Equivalency is a phenomenon that can happen when two non-identical things exhibit similarities in terms of size, function, or value. Size, function, and value are attributes that can be applied to verbal things, such as words, sentences, and texts. Words, phrases, or syllable counts (also

known as syllabic weight) can be used to gauge their size. Semantic and grammatical aspects provide an explanation for their functional attributes. One can determine the value of linguistic items based on their communicative meaning.

When two verbal things exhibit identical semantic representations, they are considered to have equivalent meanings. True instances of equivalency in meaning are seen in synonymous expressions in languages. When two verbal objects exhibit comparable structural (functional) organisation, they are considered equal in grammar. When two verbal objects behave similarly in terms of how the message is intended to be understood in a given circumstance, they are considered to have identical communicative value. Two texts—the original and the translated—and two languages—SL and TL—are involved in the "translational equivalency" process. An equivalent translation (TL) text is one that possesses the same dimensions, grammatical or semantic representation, and/or communicative significance as the SL-text.

The phrase "translational equivalency" refers to an actual occurrence. Finding a translational equivalency in TL with the exact same size, purpose, and communicative value as the original SL-text is uncommon. On any one level of linguistic organisation, however, formal correlation between the two texts can be established. The technique of "formal correspondence" disregards the "text" as an organic whole. Additionally, it does not create a hierarchy or priority order among the several features that are involved in determining equivalency, such as the relative importance of size, grammatical structure, semantic representation, and communicative value.

The idea of "translational equivalency" and the "principle of equivalence" can be best understood and identified within the broader framework of linguistic theory and translation practice if one proceeds step-by-step from the conceptual to the operational aspect of these concepts.

1) Translation is the process of creating a text that is translationally equivalent (TL-text) to the source (SL-text). This implies that the entire TL-text needs to be rendered equal to the SL-text.

2) Text, as a verbal sign, consists of two interrelated parts: expression (means and medium) and content (meaning and message). As a verbal sign, content is what a text indicates and conveys (i.e., expression is the denoter). The dual relationship of content makes translation possible i.e. two expression as carrier of the same content.

3) Since meaning is a feature of language, it is inextricably linked to its spoken symbols.

Language to language transfer is not possible. It is impossible to make the meaning that is unique to a language and its presentation a shared characteristic of two verbal signs that belong to different languages (SL and TL). Aiming for the closest possible equivalency to elements that correspond to the expression and content aspects of the source text, translation efforts are made. However, in conflict situations, content takes precedence over expression. Their value can be altered during translation as long as it serves the purpose of reaching semantic equivalency.

No two languages have a vocabulary and grammar that are precisely alike. The main reason for loss and gain in the translation process is this lack of similarity between the two languages. It is possible to equate two terms from different languages based on communicative value, semantic representation, or grammatical function. However, during the translating process, a great deal of other aspects of the statement are either lost or have their distinctions diminished.

Under-translation (loss of information)

It occurs when the translational equivalent makes reference to the original text's generalised message concept. The amount of information content lost increases with message generalisation. Although synonyms have almost the same cognitive meaning, it's important to keep in mind that there are very few absolute synonyms in English. Synonyms can refer to the same thing or action, yet when they stand alone as words, they might mean different things. Words can mean multiple things. Cognitive meaning is defined as having its core in the intellectual or structurally functional aspects of an expression. On the other hand, it is known as social meaning when it is connected to interpersonal relationships, social contexts, or cultural values.

Translation loss occurs when words in target language (TL) fail to convey the socio-cultural meaning of expressions in source language (SL). Numerous socio-cultural events are carried out differently by members of different speech communities and in varied ways by members of the same speech community. A translator frequently reproduces the idea in a more generalised frame of reference in order to avoid transposing the cultural specifics of the target language onto the translated text.

Over translation (gain in style and information).

It happens when a more detailed feature of the original message is referenced in the translational equivalency. The gain in information content increases with the degree of particularisation in the message. One can approach the concept of "gain" in translation from a completely different angle. Since

the translator can occasionally clarify or enrich, a change in the translated object can improve its quality. Similar to polysemous words, polysemous words increase imprecision while improving communication effectiveness. The semantic range of verbal objects can be used to understand the idea of "loss and gain." Two words from different languages (SL and TL) can refer to the same thing.

Apart from above issues, there are issues of untranslatability as well.

It is defined as:

- a) The original text's linguistic and non-linguistic components that are missing from the target language and culture (TL).
- b) Not informing the reader of the translated text about the functionally significant parts of the original text.

So, there appears to be -

Linguistic Untranslatability Items pertaining to material culture, such as clothing, food, and utensils, and natural ecology, such as flora and animals, may be present in the living situations of speakers of one language (SL) but absent from speakers of another language (TL). Words Another example of deliberate ambiguity introduced into the source text through the use of polysemous words is lexical untranslatability.

Cultural Untranslatability Culture and language are deeply entwined. It is challenging to separate the two. Situational elements that are practically significant to the cultural artefact of a civilisation can be found in one language. Cultural traits that are functionally significant for the cause give rise to cultural untranslatability. The culture that the TL belongs to is devoid of any SL writing. It covers topics such as the cultural significance of an artefact, social structures unique to a particular culture, and conventions, traditions, and religious activities. Here are a few approaches to resolve the untranslatability issue that even I resorted to during my research: Periphrasis, often known as circumlocution or speaking indirectly. By using this approach, a translator attempts to communicate in the target language (TL) some aspects of the source culture through the use of rewording the untranslatable expressions. Loan Translation This is the method a translator uses to translate anything word for word, literally, while preserving the original expression's style and meaning. Even though this method produces a translation that is true to

the source language, it gives the target language an odd style. Substitution In reader-oriented communicative translation, this is the approach a translator takes. Its goal is to substitute the closest equivalents found in the TA for the untranslatable items. As a result, a great deal of information is lost during translation. Expressive Creation Using creative interpretation, the translator conveys the meaning of in translatable elements while demonstrating the values upheld by members of the source culture. Using this tactic, semantic elements with cultural motivations from Haryanvi and other Indian languages have permeated into English, significantly nativizing the language.

It is accurate to say that the substitution technique improves the flow, clarity, and is more straightforward, but it doesn't provide its readers with any kind of sociocultural knowledge about the SL. On the other hand, loan-translation and borrowing techniques bridge the lexical and cultural gaps, but they also result in a less fluid and concentrated target text. The inventive use of the periphrasis technique by a translator or when contextualised appropriately, expressive creativity can act as a transitional medium between strictly literal and completely free forms of translation.

Work Cited

Achebe, Chinua. *Morning Yet on Creation Days: Essays*, New York Anchor Press, 1975.

Akali Patrika, 11th October, 1949.

Anuvad, New Delhi: Bhartiya Anuvad Parishad.

Bassnett, Susan -McGuire. *Translation Studies*, London: Methuen, 1980.

Benjamin, Water. *The Task of the Translator, Illuminations*. ed. Hannah Amdht, London: Jonathan Cape, 1970.

Bhaba, Homi. *Signs taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a tree outside Delhi*. *Critical Inquiry*, 12.1(1985) 144-65.

Catford, J.C. *A Linguistic theory of Translation*, London: Oxford, 1965.

- Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*, Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Baltimore, MD and London, UK: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Speech and Phenomena, and Other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs*, trans. David B. Allison, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Fabian, Johannes. *Language and Colonial Power: The Appropriation of Swahili in the Former Belgian Congo 1880-1938*, University of California Press, 1986.
- Fanon, Franz. *The Wretched of the Earth*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1967.
- Finley, Ian. *Translating*, London: Teach Yourself Books, 1971.
- Fitzgerald, Edward. *Letters*, Vol. I and II. London: Macmillan, (1901) 320.
- Forster, Leonard. *Aspects of Translation*, London: Seeker and Warburg, 1958.
- Holmes, James, S. *Approaches to Translation Studies*, Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Levy, J. *The Art of Translation*, ed. Susan Bassnett McGuire, Prague, 1963.
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington. *English Education Act*, 1935.
- Newmark, P. *Approaches to Translation*, Oxford: Pergamon, 1981.
- Nida, E.A. *Towards a Science of translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964.
- Nida, E.A. and Charles R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Problem of Translation* in *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, eds. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Niranjana, Tejaswini. *Siting Translation History, Post-Structuralism and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press.



Ricoeur ,Paul. *On Translation*,Routledge,2006.

Savory, Theodore. *The Art of Translation* ,London: Jonathan Cape, 1957.

Steiner, T.R. *English Translation Theory.1650-1800* ,Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*, Pantheon Books,1978.