

Summary of the Minor Research Project entitled,
Interlingual and Intercultural Transfer in Vinda Karandikar's Self-Translations: A Study

The present study is centered round the empirical data of a large body of STs and TTs of especially Vinda Karandikar, the prominent Marathi modern poet, critic and a translator. The study has advantaged the researcher to examine the data of STs and TTs of not only Karandikar but also poets like Arun Kolatkar, Dilip Chitre and Vilas Sarang, the poet-translators who worked during the post-1960 era. . The STs are varied and wear complexities and subtle features of their respective periods. Primarily, three paradigms have been presented viz. the self-translation, the texts of 1960's marking distinctive periods of the modern Marathi poetry.

Many theorists have overemphasized the translation processes alone. But the literary translation primarily refers to the transfer of cultural aspects of texts. Nevertheless, text is the central issue in the translation studies. Both the text situations source and target define the translation processes. There is also a general agreement among the theorists that there could not be a single translation process. One could argue that there could be as many translation processes as there could be varied number of translation situations. There are four important components in translation: intersection of a translation situation, the competence of a translator, the ST and the TT as a product of translation. It is also possible to predict that translation situations could have destructive impact on cultural values that the STs possess. Again, the varied translation situations determine the translation strategies. There could be yet more ambiguities and paradoxes in self-translation situations. A self-translator can claim greater freedom than a translator proper can. Therefore, it would be difficult to criticize a self-translated work for not being faithful to the original. It should invite criticism not as a translation, *but as a text*. The other sources of ambiances and paradoxes again come from the fact whether we view translation as a process or a result. The other important source of ambiguity is that translation is still a young discipline. It has competing paradigms with imprecise, dynamic and overlapping concept systems. One more

source of ambiguity is the text-bound-nature of translation. Every translation (product) is the result of a process (translation). It begins with a dynamic configuration of source text, translation situation, and translating competence. All translations may have some common properties but in their particularities, each translation is *always different*. A translator's choices are strategic and his realizations of textual possibilities of a particular ST emerge from already existing or not existing wider ranges of text-possibilities. This is an inherent dynamism of a translation situation. The present study therefore has reconsidered ambiguities and paradoxes of the TTs with a view to understand them and remove or validate these ambiguities and paradoxes while discussing numerous variables.

Although translation would appear to be a single process, it would refer to a set of situation-specific processes. Both similarities and differences are distinguishing factors in translation. These equally participate in determining a set of translation strategies. In the new research area of translation studies today, the empirical data study has been considered as a more valid domain. The study is directed towards such an objective. Several factors such as diverse contents of STs, authors' intentions, readers' needs and expectations, linguistic and cultural differences influence translation situations. Besides, linguistic and cultural aspects of the TTs, principles of equivalence, fidelity to the original (source) texts, the degree of acceptability in the TL, equivalence of culture-specificity, achievement of coherence and cohesion in the TTs are considered. The study has concentrated on seemingly incompatible and divergent properties transferred in the TTs. Translation being simultaneously a process and a result, the success or failure of a product is evaluated. The details examine how the translators have responded to the demands of the translation situations. The translator has always a choice to make. Therefore, the study has found out the appropriateness, inappropriateness, acceptability, and unacceptability of the TTs based on the translation processes.

One of the goals attained in the study is the examination of cultural differences in linguistic and conceptual systems and describe the translation variables. The attempt is to study real translation practice and translation reality that really exists. This is done in order to describe the influence of cultural,

linguistic and textual aspects of the processes and results of translation. Translation is a young science overlapping with a cluster of perspectives. There are no any unified approaches to the study of translation. Practitioners and scholars construct far-fetched and isolated understandings of translation. Many of these are non-empirical. Translation is essentially a textual process. It is in a sense retextualization of the STs. It starts with the ST and ends with a TT. Therefore, translation variables are textual variables. The text is considered here as the primary object of the study. The study has attempted a rigorous observation and empirical description of how this retextualization is accomplished. It seeks to identify regularities and irregularities in the results of the translation. The findings of the study are based on the following language variables:

- Linguistic systems of the source (Marathi) and target (English) languages
- The textual specificities of the source and target texts
- Cultural, social and communicative differences
- The translation situations, intentions, purposes, and needs of the target audience
- The extent and organization of shared knowledge
- Contents of the STs and their transfer in the TTs
- The acceptability constraints on the TTs
- Destruction of value system of STs
- Textuality, intertextuality and textness of the texts
- Semantic and communicative deviations in the TTs

The findings of the study based on the above variables have been given below on important STs and TTs. Overlapping is obviously unavoidable, and the variables mentioned may not necessarily be applied to each of the text considered.

Vinda Karandikar as a Self-Translator:

As a self-translator, Karandikar's preferences are for literal translation and they have adversely affected his TTs. Consequently, the destructive impact of the literal strategy has been traced at many places in Karandikar's self-translations. Karandikar does not seem to have taken the cognizance of the Western growth and developments in the literary translation theory. He appears to stick to the

traditional method of “Literal Translation”. He does not seek necessary freedom that a literary self-translator requires to take. Karandikar does not prefer to achieve a gain when losses occur. However, Karandikar as a translator is aware of “area of current correct usage” of the TL. His competence for “area of tolerance” and “an area of possible usage” show his capabilities of varying degrees of assimilation of linguistic and cultural items transferred in the translated texts. Nevertheless, he does not seem to take his own insights overwhelmingly in his practice. He sees such possibilities as “occasional” occurrences.

Overinsistence on the literalism has brought about ungrammatical structures in the TTs. For instance, the passive construction in the TT “Timelessness is reached” is an unintelligible construct for the target audience. It is an illustration of how the textuality of the ST is imposed upon the TT by the force of the literal strategic situation. It is a problem of intertextuality in the theory and practice of translation. Another recurring distortion found in Karandikar’s self-translation situation is the syntactic imposition of the ST on the TT. This is the result of the insistence on the process of literalism. Karandikar could have avoided it by employing other strategies. On the other hand, he comes out with best results when he is unaware of the strategies other than literal. There are as well numerous language variables such as semantic, communicative, functional, and pragmatic where Karandikar is found involved in several distortions and deviations in his TTs. Karandikar largely follows the literal strategy avoiding varied strategies such as shifts, transposition, explication, borrowing in order to achieve equivalence. He at times follows such approaches as pragmatic, functional, and communicative translations to achieve a number of possible solutions.

Chitre’s few translations of Karandikar’s poems have been included. A comparative analysis manifests that Chitre’s translations are more acceptable, effective and valid than Karandikar’s translation. There are equally several translation situations where Karandikar’s self-translations are valid and more acceptable as well as compared to Chitre’s translations in some of specific

translation situations. The comparative method of analysis provides an effective tool of examining language variables more competently.

In spite of the fact that Karandikar's self-translations suffer from the *tyranny of literal translation*, several of his translation situations are competent and valid when he employs strategies effectively other than the single literal strategy.

Conclusive Remarks:

The data and the observations made on the transfer of the STs into the TTs. Some of the translations by Dilip Chitre of Karandikar's poems have been considered as a comparative tool to examine Karandikar's self-translations. The main problems investigated was the problem of self-translation. The study does not make any claim of a theory. The theoretical preliminaries made in the separate chapter mark the idea that the researcher is aware of the translation theory. Every translation situation is a challenging situation. It involves several linguistic, cultural, social, regional and local complexes and subtle considerations. A text is a product of several such factors. Therefore, translation theory or theoretical considerations do not work all the time. At times, translation situations are beyond the reach of a theory. Translation Studies is still a young science. It is interdisciplinary. Possibilities of many approaches cannot be neglected. The theoretical insights have obviously advantaged and several of them have been used in the study.

In conclusion, Vinda Karandikar as a self-translator has many constraints. His insistence on literalism has affected his translations. If Karandikar, as a self-translator would have followed and enjoyed a little "liberal policy" like Kolatkar, he would have achieved better products. Nevertheless, several of his self-translation-situations have emerged brilliantly.

Karandikar had been a prolific translator and this is surprising that he does not seem to have any access to the recent theoretical developments of translation studies. The awareness of translation theory does play a pivotal role in the translation practice. It is true that the practicing translators are generally not aware of the translation theory. This is perhaps because of the fact that the modern

translation theory is very young science still. Kolatkar, Sarang and Chitre have been translation scholars. Their translations have therefore been better than the self-translations of Karandikar. The knowledge and the awareness of the theory definitely advantages translation.

The findings of the study in the nutshell form are as follows:

- Literary translations of foreign texts or vice versa enrich the literary traditions of a speech community. They not only fuel the literary excellence but also provide tools of novel ideas, cultural and social changes and warnings of impending nuisances and menaces.
- The transfer of STs always begins at the linguistic level and then it shifts to other levels.
- There are possibilities of imposition of the ST syntax, semantic constraints (poetic diction), tone, and style in the transfer. For effective transfer, a translator should pay attention to such linguistic items and transfer the STs corresponding to the syntax, and semantic constraints of the target language.
- Theoretical insights are useful for effective translation of literary texts; however, theory may not always work to understand especially the transfer of complex and subtle poetry texts.
- Texts produced by female and transferred by male or vice versa present several problems in the transfer. A male transferring a female text for example must pay attention to linguistic, psychological, cultural and such other aspects of a text.
- A self-translator may enjoy freedom in transferring his own texts, but the maximum freedom of a self-translator might divert the TT as a meta-text.
- Transfer of culture-specificity of a ST often involves higher degree of untranslatability.
- Expressive values of TTs depend on the communicative transfer. The target audience for whom the translations are done must be taken into account in the transfer.

- There are more losses in the transfer than gains when the texts wear more native / foreign elements / items and the translatability of the text is under the pressures of constraints.
- The competence of a translator plays a pivotal role in the transfer. The more competent a translator, the better and effective transfer is expected. Nevertheless, this may not happen in some cases. Chitre's transfers are curvy, discursive and involve in several abstractions.
- The degrees of translatability of even untranslatable texts are always dormant in the unconscious competence of a translator. In other words, no text could be untranslatable, though the translation criticism often alarms the message of untranslatability especially of poetry texts.