Translator Trapped Between Text and Culture

Dr. S. Suganya

Assistant Professor, Department of English, Bharathiar University Post Graduate Extension Centre, Erode

Abstract: *Translation theory during these decades is subjugated by the elemental issue of translatability. Translation is the process of transferring the meaning of oral or written texts from one language into another. Translation is one of the central fields in building cultures. But this course of action may perhaps incorporate other facts and side effects in the procedure of the source text before the product of the target text which layman do not know about them. This differentiates bilinguals from specialized translators. This paper examines the main parts of the equation which are the language, civilization and the negotiable connection stuck between them within the field of socio-cultural translation. Consequently, language and culture are examined sideways as well as their relation to translation. On one hand, this paper focuses on analysing out the mode and the motive behind the invariable conclusions which the translator makes on the cultural sense based on the theories and writers opinions presented. Therefore, translators bear the responsibility of recreating the source language text in the target culture in a way which complies with the cultural beliefs of the objective language. For the descriptive point of view, Tory states that translation is an activity which 'inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions, i.e. at least two sets of norm-systems on each level'. (1995, p. 56) In addition, structuralisms emphasize the effects of translators' dogmas and their role in sustaining or altering the gist according to the cultural values of firm dominating culture. Cultural differences between languages may happen because of the differences in time, religions, moralities, etc.*
Keywords: *Translation, Language, Culture, Translator, Mediator,Bilingual.*

I. Introduction

Translation is one of the essential tool for handing over the human related issues such as culture and principle of one's own nation. It is used in various nations for enriching each other's thoughts, cultures, languages and so forth. In the process of translation, there have been always translational problems, particularly with the issue of culture and tradition. "Culture is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society" (Tyler, 1870 cited by Avruch, 1998, p. 8).

The barriers to translation as expected judged by either insuperable or negotiable, and translation methods are devised with exactitude. Opinions are shaped by disciplinary trends and vary widely, ranging between the extremes of philosophical cynicism and practical optimism. The translator's role involves in the response and creation of the message which puts forth the problem and how cultural meaning ought to be presented from and into different cultures to make sure united perceptive for two different 'worlds'. Snell-Hornby described the translator as an expert in intercultural communicative working in internationalized world. The problem here is the cultural elements which do not involve just the meaning of the item. This paper tries to express the role of translators in culture and how and why they continually make decisions about cultural issues.

Interpretation and a clear understanding of the source or the text must be initiated for a text to be translated from a foreign language into English or vice versa. Due to the misunderstanding or wrong perception of the text a great number of mistakes in translation might occur because translators do not fully identify with the text that they are supposed to transfer. It is because of the translator may not aware of a specific word or the semantics which can have a number of synonym for the same word. The text being in the form o a document, the misunderstanding of the tone or mood leads to the misinterpretation of the sentence. In some cases, the words have a clearly defined boundary of meaning.

A brief realistic introduction might be entitled for in this perspective. The English language has about four hundred and fifty thousand words, where as the other languages for example, the German and French languages hang on between two hundred and two hundred and fifty thousand words. This actuality immediately throws a different explanation on the treatment and training of the particular languages. When compared to English language, the words in French language are much more clearly defined in terms of the conceptual boundaries attributed to each word. The problem here for the translator is that in English language have eight or ten different adjectives to state the same thing, each adjective communicating a minor shade of meaning.

The process of making the original text is not in the hands of the translator, he may find himself in a complicated situation while translating, particularly from a cultural point of view. The translator may find rendering the text intimidating, belonging to another culture, especially when language itself is derisory for

translation. Therefore, he must go through the text challenging culture. Perhaps the most complex problem in the course of translating texts for translators is the translation of the words bound to culture. Since each language integrates with its speakers' culture and customs, the act of modifying them to another language is not as simple as it appears at first glance. Being bicultural has a higher concern than being bilingual in translation. In their view, translators must mediate between source and target cultures.

The progression of unlearning each time begins to interact with a text. Immediate and evidently innate tendency is to assume that the word appears on the page has the same prime meaning that the translator have in mind for that word. Quick look at a dictionary will tell that most words have developed an array of meanings throughout the centuries. Some words even die for a certain amount of time and then they are called back into life often generated by the need of the present moment. The present statistical status claims that a minimum of two words been added to the dictionary once in two hours. Thus, a priceless use for any translator is the constant use of dictionaries, not necessarily to learn new words, but to more fully comprehend the large spectrum of connotations and directions of meaning that might be at work in a particular word. The translator or an interpreter has to rebuild the movement that lies under the surface of a word.

Whatever carried something across the river or from one place to another, two things must be analysed and taken into account before initiating that is, about the condition of the nature and the effect of the landscape. These two major problems has to be encountered on the other side. The Mexican poet and essayist, Octavio Paz, pointed out that each language is a technique of considering, of interpreting the world in a particular way. Even though the form of natural phenomenon does not change from one country to the next, the way it interact with and interpret these phenomena is clearly different from one language to the next. In German language the moon happens to be "masculine", whereas in French it is feminine; in German the word for sun is feminine in French masculine, in tamil both the Sun and the Moon are masculine but the Moon is compared to portray a female. Thus, the French and the Germans do not see the same thing when they look at the moon or the sun. The same applies to human emotions. The emotion of love and hatred are probably present in all cultures, however, how the human react to and interpret these emotions differs greatly from one culture to the next. Thorough knowledge about the culture and the text provides a support to the translator. As previously noted, in the case that translation readers are not familiar with the original cultural word, the translator may provide the target text readers with an explanation.

Primarily from the cultural point of view, in the course of translation, translators may come across some words that are untranslatable due to the differences sandwiched between source and target languages. Exact equivalent terms or words which the original texts may consist of, and it is highly a burden for the translator to translate in the target language. As a result, in order to cover the existing cultural gaps they may have a tendency to employ some semantic revisions. By applying these alterations, they may add some additional information to the text for their readers who are new with those concepts. Thus, a translator is not an effortless bridge builder. As Cheung in his book states, a translator is a social actor who does not have to be tied down by the stereotypical image of a bridge-builder; however, he can presume some identities including, but not restricted to, that of the mediator, negotiator, ideological gate-keeper, activist, and so on (181).

The first step will be toward examining for selecting the cultural meaning and evaluate its degree between two different worlds, across language and culture, which are the main elements that the translator depends on through the process of translation to make the decision in choosing the proper words and phrases in the target text. This will be supported by the opinions from different authors from intercultural, perspective, communicative and sociological approaches. Then, the exchangeable relation between language and culture will be discussed with the explanation for 'intercultural' problems supported by some prominent examples of different languages and text genera. Also, the role of the translator as mediator between languages and cultures depends on how he or she form their texts and on what criteria.

Translation studies nowadays are concerned with the translated text and they no longer centred on the idea of faithfulness to the source text. A relevant issue is to know the fate of a literary work, what has been called the TT-orientated approach to translation, that is, the target text orientated approach to translation, which comes from a literary view of translations rather than a linguistic one. Barthes gives us a semiotic approach to meaning: words, he said, are no longer the pure form through which we can get to meaning, but they are objects themselves, with the trace of all the possible meanings, and their relation to other kinds of discourse.

Translators, pass on the message across boundaries through language which is always put together in words: pronouns, verbs, nouns etc. However, the problem with words is their ambiguity barely a few word can be forced into clearly defined intangible lines that would suggest the exact same thing to every person who comes in contact with the word. The words create different conceptual and emotional resonances in each one of citizen. Because of the flimsy nature of words, it can hardly ever take them at their face value. Therefore, it must consider the words on the page as an indication toward a situation, the situation behind the words that must be recreated. Meaning is, therefore, not something waiting to be expressed, but a horizon of semiotic production. The translated texts reveals that literatures which are constant have a tendency to imply their own codes on the

translated works, while those literary systems that are in crisis try to maintain the codes of the foreign texts to revitalize their culture and standard.

But translators are always more worried about the trends and style in the language they are translating into, and therefore a translation can always tell us a lot about the receiving literature at a certain time. The task of the translator consists in finding that intended effect i.e. intention upon the language into which he is translating which produces in it the resonance of the original. This is a main feature of translation which basically differentiates it from the poet's work, because the attempt of the latter is never fixed at the language as such, at its totality, but exclusively and directly at specific linguistic contextual aspects.

Unlike a work of literature, translation does not find itself in the centre of the language jungle but on the outside facing the wooded fold; it calls into it without entering, aiming at that single spot where the echo is able to give, in its own language, the echo of the work in the alien one. Not only does the aim of translation differ from that of a literary work, it intends language as a whole, taking an individual work in an alien language as a point of departure, but it is a different effort altogether. The intention of the poet is spontaneous, primary, graphic; that of the translator is derivative, ultimate, ideational. For the great motif of integrating many tongues into one true language is at work. This language is one in which the independent sentences, works of literature, critical judgments, will never communicate for they remain dependent on translation; but in it the languages themselves, supplemented and reconciled in their mode of signification, harmonize.

The task of the translator must be viewed in this shaft of light toward a solution seem to be all the more incomprehensible and dense. In fact, the predicament of developing the seed of pure language in a translation seems to be impenetrable, determinable in no resolution. If it is viewed negatively, this is actually the meaning of all the preceding problem. The traditional concepts in any discussion of translations are fidelity and license the freedom of faithful reproduction and, in its service, fidelity to the word. These ideas seem to be no longer serviceable to a theory that looks for other things in a translation than reproduction of meaning. Commitment and trustworthy in the translation of individual words can almost never fully reproduce the meaning they have in the original.

A real translation is obvious; it does not cover the original, does not black its light, but allows the pure language, as though emphasized by its own means to excel upon the original all the more fully. The translators primary element of literal rendering of the syntax may be achieved, above all, by a which proves words rather than sentences. Fidelity and freedom in translation have traditionally been regarded as conflicting tendencies. This deeper interpretation of the one apparently does not serve to reconcile the two; in fact, it seems to deny the other all justification.

In translation studies today, scholars compare texts and contexts, not languages, as it used to be done in the past, among other reasons, because linguists have not produced a general theory of translation. The discipline, from the linguistic point of view, is divided into two branches: one which is descriptive and theoretical and another one which is concerned with the teaching of translators. The descriptive studies included different fields of study: product-oriented, that is the narrative and evaluation of diverse translations of the same text, function orientated, studying the function of the translated text within the new literary context and process-orientated, concerned with the decision process on the part of the translator. Only if the sense of a linguistic creation may be associated with the information it conveys does some eventual, influential aspect stay on beyond all communication rather close and yet noticeably inaccessible, veiled or discernible, fragmented or powerful. In all language and linguistic creations there remains in addition to what can be suggested is something that cannot be corresponded; depending on the context in which it appears, it is something that symbolizes or something symbolized. It is the former only in the finite products of language, the latter in the evolving of the languages themselves.

Language works as a mechanism of communication between cultures; it is participating in presenting the cultural identity of each society. Merriam Webster in 2008 defined language as the method of words or signs that people use to express thoughts and feelings to each other. So, language is the device which people use to converse, but translators as a bilingual have two languages which belong to different cultures, each two different languages present two different cultural realities. Language is a guide to social reality which translation uses for moving from culture to another or from ancient to modern times. Language is not simply as a body of knowledge that anybody may know about, but it is crucial for social and cultural practice to know the correct use of the expressions in that culture. In addition to it, language is the reflection of a culture. Therefore, the process has four insights of sieves, physiological, cultural, individual and language for a professional translator, and affirms that language is the most imperative one because it helps to learn about other worlds.

The translator is the only one who is able to create a bond in the course of creating uniformity which can visualize both vibrant and still models. Moreover, language is essential to the cultural identity, because it reflects all communicative values, beliefs and customs which has its unique world in their language. There are many academic contributions which suggest the role of the translator as a cultural mediator and translation as a cultural activity. Literally the term mediate means to act as conciliator in bringing, effecting or communicating.

The above said line puts forward the role of the translator for being not only reforming what is mentioned in language X into language Y, but works as an representative or manager who acts as moderator between two worlds, cultures and tries to reconcile the communication barriers between them. The role of the translator as cultural mediator in the translation within the hypothetical milieu illustration. This is to stress that the translator has to reside in between in the same distance from the source and target cultures and not being prejudiced in their dogmas to choose their terms. Individualism, cultural meaning distance, ambiguity, masculinity or femininity and long or short term orientation are the main aspects that the translator has to keep in mind while in the study of foreign cultures.

While translating the text the translator have to be aware in the decision in terms to choose the correct cultural meaning from the consequences of both domestication and foreignization strategies that the translator adopts and aims to achieve the maximum level of equivalence within minimum efforts. To make it simple, in English the word 'Red' is used to denote specific colour while Hungarian have two words for this colour which is 'Vrs' dark red and 'Pivos' light red, the specific meaning connected with the shade of that colour. It is vital that translators to gauge their approach toward self-censorship through self- characterization.

The translators are not only functioning as mediators between cultures, but they also toil to prevail over those inappropriateness which stand in the approach of transforming meaning. The important duty of the translator for being a mediator implanted in control of cultural differences through the process of translation and selecting proper terms in order to ensure intercultural understanding of values, because of the diversity of language and cultures with respect for 'identity' and 'individuality'.

To conclude, the translator is always coupled to the inside movement of a word in relation to a similar, yet different movement in the other language. Translators, more than any other specialists, are equipped with the necessary tools to establish the interaction between cultures and, at the same time, they are keenly aware of the limitations of translation. Our contemporary world has become quite poor, since everyone want to lessen the whole thing into the nutshell with formulations and opinions. By its very nature, as already stated that the translators are always in between two places: the reality of the source-language and the possibilities of the receptor language. In the course of translation the translator opens the door for "dialogue". It must be the translator's utmost task in today's world in which nations and countries fall back in constructing walls among themselves rather than opening themselves to the foreignness of other cultures.

References

[1].   Baker, M. *In Other Words: A Course book on Translation*. London: Routledge. 1992. Print.
[2].   Mayoral, R., Kelly, D. & Gallardo, N. "Concept of Constrained Translation. Non-linguistic Perspectives of Translation". *Metajounal*, 33(3): p. 356-367. 1998. Print.
[3].   Needham, R. *Belief, Language and Experience.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.1972.Print.