Madan M. Sarma

Translating Shakespeare
Intervention and Universals in Translation

1 Introduction: Intervention and Universals

As any translation of a given text is essentially a reading and a rewriting, or "a new reading" and "a new writing" (St.-Pierre 2005: xiv), the very process of translation involves some kind of conscious or unconscious intervention on the part of the translator. The term *intervention* is used here to refer to translation decisions made deliberately "on the basis of textual effects, cultural values, social functions that trans-lations possess in target situations" (Venuti 2003: 249). Translators try to communicate to the target language (TL) readers an interpretation of the source text (ST) through what Venuti refers to as "contextual effects" that take into account the readers' cognitive environment, reducing the processing effort and resisting the structures and discourses of the TL and its culture. The translator's re-writing is an instance of inter-vention (in the target text [TT]) that aims at removing or lessening the effects of linguistic or cultural dislocation.

Intervention seems to be more natural if the context of production and reception of the ST and that of the TT happen to be very different. Intervention, at least in some kinds and genres of texts, may be caused by ideological positioning that has a specific idea of the real – the real meaning or interpretation of the SL text. It entails some responsibilty on the part of the translator as s/he is expected to arrive at a valid, and culturally acceptable interpretation. Interventionist procedures may take the forms of explanations, parenthetical additions and substitution.

It is possible that certain features, processes and strategies of translation may be universal regardless of the language-pair or the types of texts involved. Universals in translation are often defined as those features which typically occur in translated texts rather than non-translated texts, and which are not dependent on the specific language-pairs involved (Baker 1993: 243, Mauranen 2006: 93). A number of hypotheses or assumptions about these features have been made. The most notable and identifiable features include explicitation, disambiguation, simplification, conventionalization or normalization, and reduction or removal of repetition. For gaining insight into universal features one has to depend on an analysis of a corpus of translations of the same texts or similar texts, a subcorpus consisting of comparable untranslated texts of the TL, and translations belonging to different genres and involving different SLs but the same TL.

If we believe (as does Noam Chomsky 1984) in certain universal linguistic prin-ciples that pertain to the core of any language, we may assume that both universals

trans-kom   http://www.trans-kom.eu

trans-kom ist eine wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für Translation und Fachkommunikation.

and local interventions are likely to be involved in the translation process. The psychic unity of mankind which is reflected in what Chomsky terms "core grammar" (Chomsky 1984: 1-16) may account for such universals, whereas the variations in perception and in ideology that are reflected in the peripheral grammar(s) may necessitate subtle intervention.

It is possible that although the linguistic elements and devices used by different languages are different, similar semantic referents and schemata may be evoked by source and translated texts. (Highly culture-specific texts produced in unfamiliar religious and philosophical contexts, as in some Indian Vedic or neo-Vaishnavite quasi-literary texts, are, however, exceptions.)

It seems that while translating a text, especially a literary work deeply embedded in cultural contexts, we try to recreate the semantic content so as to evoke schemata that are similar to those evoked by the ST. At the same time, we make an effort to give an idea of the stylistic features, and the attitudes and worldviews that are embedded in the unique linguistic ordering of the ST. At the time of finalizing the translated version of a literary text, deep processing of the TL at the cognitive level may, therefore, become imperative.

This paper is an attempt to address some of these issues, especially the nature and type of universals and interventions in the process of translation. The corpus for this study includes the following:

- three different Assamese translations, in blank verse, of William Shakespeare's play *Hamlet* by Ajit Barua (Shakespeare tr. Barua 2000-2003), Kirtykamal Bhuyan (Shakespeare tr. Bhuyan 2004) and myself (Shakespeare tr. Sarma 2006a)
- an Assamese translation, in blank verse, of Shakespeare's play *Macbeth* by myself (Shakespeare tr. Sarma 2006b)
- an Assamese translation of A. P. J. Abdul Kalam's English autobiography *Wings of Fire* (Kalam 1999) by Suresh Sharma (Kalam tr. Sharma 2007)
- an Assamese translation of Anita Inder Singh's *Partition of India* (Singh 2006) by myself (Singh tr. Sarma 2007)
- a portion of an ongoing Assamese translation of Dharamvir Bharati's modernist Hindi novella *Suraj Ka Satwa Ghoda* (Bharati 1952) by myself
- *Ali Domozat*, an Assamese play by Mahendra Barthakur, a contemporary dramatist (Barthakur 2002)

The total number of words is around a hundred thousand.

2 Intervention in Literary Translation: an Illustration

A literary text may be embedded in a specific cultural context. However, any alienness of culture as explicitly or implicitly foregrounded in a literary text (e.g., *Don Quixote, One Hundred Years of Solitude, Madame Bovary* etc.) may not be completely beyond the understanding of a community that, in everyday life, encounters a rich diversity of cultural practices and linguistic behaviour. Given the existence of an essentially

comparable human nature and the universally acknowledged capacity of the human mind to accommodate a great diversity of cultural-environmental contexts, human experiences, emotions and feelings across cultures cannot be considered entirely disparate and unfathomable. Cultural and linguistic communities invariably find adequate linguistic resources to capture all possible human experiences. Theoretically, then, there cannot be too many culture-specific linguistic expressions without some kind of functional equivalent in another cultural or linguistic context; some problem seems to arise out of ambiguous words that have time- and context-specific meanings, and of idiosyncratic syntactic and lexical patterns and coinages.

In the translation of the texts that are categorised as literary, the loss of some literary features or some shift from the source may be natural but the translated version may contain some unique features that result from the translator's attempts to retain or recreate the literary effects of the original. Cook's comment on the translation of literary texts seems to be relevant here:

> Literariness will reside at times in the unique linguistic choice, at times in the fictional world. Thus, in practice, some literary features are lost in translation; others survive through well-chosen equivalents; others are unique to the translation; others are in the story itself. (Cook 1994: 98)

My own experience of translating two plays of Shakespeare, namely, *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* which form part of the corpus, on which this study is based, seems to support such a contention.

An explanation of the analyst's use of his/her translations as a part of the corpus may not be out of place here. Given that the focus of this study has been on the process of translation and that the same translator (myself) happens to have translated both *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* in blank verse, and around the same time translated a work belonging to a different genre, it was thought that the processes could be observed more systematically in different works of a single translator. Again, observations made on the basis of such analyses are backed by evidence provided by other/parallel translations of the same source text. Moreover, there was no attempt to judge the relative merit or quality of the three different Assamese translations of *Hamlet* or the degree of their closeness to the SL text.

Shakespeare's plays written nearly four centuries ago have linguistic and cultural features, some of which might have disappeared long ago. Yet numerous adaptations and rewritings of Shakespeare plays in Assamese since 1888 indicate that some kind of familiarity of experiences, feelings and emotions expressed through the content, and to be sure, a little strangeness of the atmosphere as well as the content might have been appealing to the new readers from an entirely different culture. In the following we will look at several types of such "interventions" in the original ST to accommodate the new readers.

2.1   Retaining Foreignness

A modern translator of a Shakespeare play needs to be aware of a number of problems that arise in translating (not adapting or domesticating as most early translators did) a literary text produced in an alien culture. In such a text contextual clues may not be

readily available to the average non-native reader, certain expressions in the text may evoke what is implicit and what the native speaker intuitively knows. As T. R. S. Sharma notes, "A context not fully internalized in the text, but that surrounds the text and is often suggested by a key word or an image, this semiotics of culture that envelops the text, is often lost in translation" (Sharma 2004: 150). For example, in the following extract from *Hamlet* the word *nothing* can be easily replaced by an appropriate functional-linguistic equivalent such as *eko nai, eko nahoi* in the TL, Assamese, but the problem arises from the ambiguity created by the not so explicitly stated context of the word.

Ophelia:	What is, my Lord?	(*Hamlet* 3.2.115)
Hamlet:	No thing.	

No equivalent can bring out the connotations of the English word *no thing* (*thing* was commonly used to refer to the sexual organ of either a man or a woman) in this context. So some kind of explanatory note needs to be added, foregrounding, not obliterating, the foreignness and cultural distance.

Another example is the pun intended by the word *son* (son/sun), and the contrast between *kin* and *kind* in the following extracts from the same play:

Hamlet (aside):	A little more than kin, and less kind	(*Hamlet* 1.2.65)
Hamlet (to Claudius):	Not so my Lord, I am too much i'th'sun	(*Hamlet* 1.2.67)
Hamlet (to Polonius):	Let her not walk in the sun	(*Hamlet* 2.2.186)

In such cases the translator's strategy may involve the incorporation of a brief note on the implications of the expressions. In any translation of literary texts that abound in puns, and culturally embedded words and linguistic innovations by the author, simple semantic transfer is likely to take away the flavour and the complex allusions of the original. For example, while translating into English an Assamese poem by a leading contemporary poet I consciously avoided using the available English equivalent of a key word *been* in the original:

Assamese:	*Pāsar parā bhagā been*	(Phukan 1994: 60)
	Ekhane māte	
English:	A broken *been*	
	calls out from behind	

been is a one-stringed folk instrument played mostly by poor wandering minstrels, *the boragees*, a breed fast disappearing from the land. Any functional equivalent such as English *lute* or Sanskrit *veena* cannot capture the resonance, the essential inter-textuality of the original word. Its alienness had to be foregrounded, and explained in a brief explanatory note at the end. As Venuti says, "An inscription of the foreign context in which the text first emerged" (Venuti 2000: 473) is a must if the flavour of the original is to be retained. In translating Shakespeare some attempt to do so was apparent.

2.2 Continuous Adjustment

In literary texts, but more specifically, in dramatic texts, continuous adjustment in the construction of the TL text seems inevitable, especially if one hopes to retain some trace of the major linguistic and stylistic features of the original. This adjustment happens both at the levels of content/meaning/message and linguistic and rhetorical features in which the message in encoded. For example, a translator of Shakespeare has to make adjustments in the use of blank verse, and also in the use of contemporary idiom of the TL. In the case of a play the performability of the translated version has to be kept in mind. So the translator has to pare what in the translated version appears to be less essential for retaining the core meaning as well as the meaning potential of the original.

While translating Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* adjustments had to be made in the choice of words/phrases indicating deictic relations in the two languages – English and Assamese. The TL cultural and linguistic norms demanded making deictic relations conveyed by the pronouns in the SL text explicit in the TL. In Assamese the pronoun *you* may mean *toi* (a form of address that can be both derogatory and intimate depending upon the context), *tumi* (meant for equals, friends, and close relations), and *āpuni* (honorific, meant for formal, distant adresses). So Hamlet addresses Claudius, Gertrude, Polonius and Horatio as *āpuni* but Marcellus, Laertis and Ophelia as *tumi*. Again Horatio, Marcellus etc. address Hamlet as *āpuni*. During angry verbal exchanges one may replace *tumi* or *āpuni* with *toi*. *Thou* in *Hamlet* was translated either as *toi* or as *tumi* , never as *āpuni* . The two clowns address each other as *thou* and also as *you*; both are translated as *tumi*. *Thou* used by Laertes during an angry exchange was translated as *toi*.

> SL: The devil take thy soul.   (*Hamlet* 5.1.243)
>
> TL: *tor ātmā pixāse niyak*.

But *thy* in Hamlet's reply "[T]hou prayest not well" was translated as *tomar* (from *tumi*).

This kind of adjustment needs to be made by observing the tone, context, occasion, position, and mood or mental state of the speaker as implied by the words/ dialogue. An element of explicitation seems to be involved in this case if, following Baker, we look at explicitation as the tendency in translations to "spell things out rather than leave them implicit" (Baker 1996: 180). However, the translator's choice of personal pronouns involves more than *spelling things out*. In Assamese the choice among *toi*, *tumi* and *āpuni* is not simply a linguistic one; it has cultural ramifications. The same person can be addressed by another as *tumi* under usual/normal circumstances but as *toi* in intimate situation, emphasizing closeness to the speaker. As the translator deliberately resorts to some form of re-contextualization in the TL text some kind of intervention appears to have taken place in such a case.

2.3 Rhetorical Adaptation

Another example of adjustment is noticed in choosing the right registers and idioms with a view to simulating the rhythm and retaining the rhetorical resonance of the original.

There are broadly three categories of words in Assamese: words loaned from Sanskrit, retaining its spelling and most of its original meanings (*tatsama* words), words borrowed from Sanskrit but almost unrecognisably transformed according to the norms of the grammar of Assamese (*tadbhava* words), and words borrowed from other Indian and non-Indian languages and accepted by Assamese speakers (*school*, *office*, *table*, *chair*, etc.). Now in translating a text written in contemporary English a translator would naturally use more *tadbhava* than *tatsama* words, whereas in translating Shakespeare it may be necessary to use more *tatsama* words in order to retain the *rasa* (tone, ambience, effect, or what T. R. S. Sharma terms "the inner rhetoricity") of the original. Such words came to be used in Hamlet's soliloquies and in the play within the play. As Sharma shows, "in a fictional text, the context is often internalized, and can be glimpsed in the use of the *alamkāras"* (*alamkāra-s* literally means 'ornaments' but here it means 'rhetorical devices'), that is "the figure of thought, in a cluster of images" (Sharma 2004: 150). For example, the following extract from *Hamlet* can be cited:

Francisco:	Not a mouse stirring.	(*Hamlet* 1.1.9)
Literal translation:	*nigani etāio lar-sar karā nāi*	
	'even a mouse has not moved'	
Acceptable but inaccurate translation:	*kato pāt ekhilāo larā nāi*	
	'nowhere a leaf has moved'	

A literal translation of this phrase results in an idiomatical violation. The translator has to see what will be usually said in a similar context in the TL, and s/he may have a number of choices.

On the other hand, in the case of the phrase *a piece of him* in the following extract literal translation and some adjustment such as addition of an extra word may convey the sense of the original:

| Bernardo: | What, is Horatio there? | (*Hamlet* 1.1.16-17) |
| Horatio: | A piece of him. | |

The words spoken by Horatio have been translated as: *erā* 'well'/'yes', *teor* 'his'/'of him', *edukharihe* 'a piece only'. The addition of an extra word *erā* and a suffix -*he* (only) appears to be necessary for following the TL idiom.

2.4 Elucidation and Expansion

Sometimes it may be necessary to resort to elucidation or expansion of an original expression, particulary when a single, acceptable and easily comprehensible equivalent is not available in the TL. This is a likely candidate for a universal. Two examples can be cited from the translation of *Hamlet*:

SL:	the posy of a ring			
TL:	*āngathit*	*katā*	*ādarsha*	*bākya*
	'ring + LOCATIVE	cut	model/ideal	sentence'
SL:	arras			
TL:	*karukārya-khasita*	*pardā*		
	'decoration-engraved	curtain'		

In the first example, the word *posy* was explained as a sentence/statement containing an ideal/message and engraved/etched on a ring. In the second case, *arras* was explained as a curtain/screen made of tapestry with pictorial design.

2.5 Choosing Equivalents

It is interesting to note that there are occasions when the availability of a number of TL options/equivalents rather than non-availability induces the translator to use different words for a single SL word in different contexts. Assamese equivalents of some common English words found in *Hamlet* can be cited as examples:

1. little: *kam, alap, naomān, xaru, akanmān, dhanisthāmān...*
2. great: *mahat, mahān, dāngar, bar, birāt, prakānda...*
3. world: *prithivi, dharani, medini, baxumati, baxudhā, dharā, dharitri...*
4. hot (referring to temperature): *tapat, garam,tapta, uttapta...*
5. blood: *tez, xonit,rakta, rudhir...*
6. quake/shake: *kap*; shook/shaken: *kampita, prakampita*
7. time/moment: *xamay, par, prahar, kshan, muhurta...*
8. heart: *hridoy, antar, mon, marmasthal, antaratmā, kalizā...*

Some of these are borrowings from Sanskrit, some are not. Some might have come originally from other Indian languages.

When I looked at my translation of Shakespeare I found a rationale behind choosing a particular TL word. Some examples:

SL:	Tis now the very bewitching time of the night	(*Hamlet* 3.2.377)
TL:	*eyai nixār xei xanmohini kshan .*	
	'this night of that bewitching moment'	

Xanmohini and *kshan* are both tatsama words and I chose *kshan* (not any other equivalent such as *par*) not simply because it sounded nice but because both contain *yuktaksharas* or consonant clusters. Any other word in place of *kshan* would have an adverse effect on the rhythmic flow of the line. In order to make the effect dramatic, the verb is omitted, as it can be done in an existential-type sentence in Assamese.

SL:	when churchyard yawn, and hell itself breathes out	(*Hamlet* 3.2.378)
	contagion to the world	
TL:	*zi kshanat girzār kabarsthāne niswāx eri*	
	xangkramita kare dharani	
	'at which moment church of graveyard exhaling	
	contagion does world'	

Zi kshanat 'at which time/moment, when' could have been replaced with *zetiā* 'when' and *dharani* with another word but again the choice was dictated by stylistic/rhetorical considerations; the rhythm of the line demanded a word with an -ee sound at the end. *Dharani* sounded more natural than *medini* or *dharitri*.

> SL: Now could I drink hot blood. (*Hamlet* 3.2.379)
>
> TL: *etiyāi kariba pāriloheten pān tapta rudhir.*
>
> 'now could have drunk hot blood'

The *tatsama* word *tapta* (meaning 'hot') was used to create the effect of anger/ harshness. And the normal intonation of the language demanded a word with more than two syllables. So *rudhir* (meaning 'blood') was chosen. Interestingly, two other translators chose two different equivalents of 'blood' in this context. In the following a more frequently used synonym *tez* is used:

> SL: Macbeth: Make thick my blood. (*Macbeth* 1.5.41)
>
> TL: *gārha kari diya mor tez.*
>
> 'thick make my blood'
>
> SL: O heart, lose not thy nature. (*Hamlet* 3.2.382)
>
> TL: *Hridoy mor, neheruābi swābhāvik maram-bethā.*
>
> 'heart mine, don't lose natural affection and empathy'

The usual equivalent of nature is *prakriti* or *swabhāv*. But in this context it has the meaning of *swābhāvik dharma*, natural characteristics. *Maram-betha* (literally, 'affection and empathy') is more idiomatic, colloquial and explanatory.

3 Universal Features

An analysis of the translated texts in my corpus shows the presence of some features considered to be universal.

3.1 Explicitation

> One of the assumed universal features of translation is explicitation. It involves making explicit or transparent what is implicit or implied in the SL text by means of specificlinguistic devices.The procedures adopted for explicitation include the use of interjection to express clearly the progress of the character's thoughts, expansion of condensed passages, addition of modifiers, quantifiers and conjunctions to achieve greater transparency, addition of extra information, incorporation of explanations, repetition of previously mentioned details for clarification, disambiguation of pronouns with precise forms of identification and additional background information, etc. (Laviosa-Braithwaite 1998: 289)

Some of the manifestations of explicitation were noticed in texts translated from English and Hindi. The use of interjection to clearly express the character's feelings was noticed in the following extract:

SL: I cannot but remember such things were   (*Macbeth* 4.3.224-25)
        That were most precious to me.

TL: *mor bābe āpurugiyā zi*
        'my for precious that/what'
        Tākto noxowarākoi nowāro thākiba
        'that without recalling cannot remain'

To in *tākto* above is an interjection. It would have been more natural to use (in a non-translated target text) *nuxuwari* 'not remembering'/'not recalling' than *noxowarakoi* 'without remembering'/'without recalling'. An adverb -*koi* was used, apparently, to make it more explicit.

The same feature was noticed in a translation from Hindi:

SL (Hindi):   *samai beetne kitnee der lagti hain*.   (Bharati 1952: 26)
                'How fast time passes.'

TL (Assamese):   *xamai pār hoboloino kata par lāge!*

An additional word, *no* (*hoboloi* +*no*), an interjection, and the sign of exclamation are added to the SL version, thus expanding the TT. The Hindi expression *samai beetne* can be expressed by *xamai pār hoboloi* ; *no* is added to *hoboloi* to foreground the speaker's feeling about the passage of time.

Another type of explicitation leading to explanatory paraphrase of certain SL expressions was noticed in the translation of *Hamlet* :

SL: Nature is fine in love,   (*Hamlet* 4.5.160-162)

TL: *preme parixilita kare prakriti āmār*
        'love refined makes nature our'

The expression *preme parixilita kare prakriti āmār* is an instance of explanatory paraphrase of the original, *nature is fine in love*, which is paraphrased as *love refines our nature*.

Use of extra words to add extra information than provided by the SL text can be noticed in the following:

SL: But I must also feel it as a man.   (*Macbeth* 4.3.224)

TL: *kintu puruxar darei moi*
        'but man like I'
        Ei dukh anubhav kariba lāgiba
        'this grief feel do must'

Here an extra word *dukh*, an equivalent of 'grief', is added for greater transparency.

The working of the same process is observed in the following extract where para-phrasing of *strange*, *initiate* and *deed* makes the SL text transparent:

SL: My strange and self abuse   (*Macbeth* 3.4.141-143)

Is the initiate fear that wants hard use.

We are yet but young in deed

TL: *Mor adbhut bhāvanā āru ātma-banchanā*

'my strange thought and self-abuse'

Kathor abhgjyatā-biheen na-xikārur bhoi.

'hard experience-less novice's fear'

Aparādh karāt āmi etiyāo

'crime doing in we still/yet'

Kesā hoiye āso

'green/inexperiened happen exist'

Some attempt at rhetorical adjustment could also be at work here. For example, the translator apparently tried to balance the two noun phrases *mor adbhut bhāvanā* and *āru ātma-banchanā* in the terms of sound. The figurative use of *young* is sought to be conveyed by the figurative use of *kesā* (literally, 'unripe').

3.2   Normalization and Conventionalization

Normalization, another universal feature of translation, may result from "the tendency of translations to modify the textual relations in the source text in favor of more habitual options in the target language lingistic repertoire"(Mauranen 2006: 96).

The following extract from *Hamlet* was apparently modified/restructured to suit the usual TL string:

That I am guiltless of your father's death,   (*Hamlet* 4.5.146-148)

And am most sensibly in grief for it

It shall as level to your judgement pierece

As day does to your eye

These lines were modified by the translator as:

That I am guiltless of your father's death,

and that this death has deeply grieved me (given me deep grief)

this fact shall be (as) clear to your judgement

as the daylight (pierces) (to) your eyes.

The translation of the modified version can be shown as follows:

SL: That I am guiltless of your father's death,

TL: *moi ze* 'that' *tomār pitrir mrityur khetrat nirdox*

SL: And am most sensibly in grief for it

TL: *āru* 'and' *ze* 'that' *ei mriyuwe* 'this death' *dise mok gabhir xok* 'gives me deep grief'

SL: It shall as level ...

TL: *xei kathā* 'that thing/fact'

The same phenomenon was observed in a translation from Hindi:

SL (Hindi): *koi pushto se unkā pariwār yahā basā huwā thā, we apne bhāi aur bhābhi ke saath rahte the*. (Bharati 1952: 26)

'From several generations their family has been living here, he lived with his brother and sister-in-law.'

This sentence was broken into two separate sentences and then one of them was normalized by inserting two extra words *ek sang*, equivalent to the Assamese word *ekelage* 'together':

SL (Hindi): *koi pushto se unkā pariwār yahā basā huwā thā*.

'Their family has been living here for several generations.'

we apne bhāi aur bhābhi ke saath ek sang rahte the.

'He has been living with his brother and sister-in law.'

TL (Assamese): *keibātāo puruxar parā teoloke iyāte baxabāx kari āhisil*.

teo kakāyek āru nabouwekar xoite ekelage bāx karisil.

In the following example normalization involves some adjustment in the sentence structure.

SL (Hindi): *bhāi aur bhābhi kā tabādalā ho gayā thā aur we pure ghar me akele rahte the*. (Bharati 1952: 26)

'His brother and sister-in-law got transferred and he lived in the entire house alone.'

This was normalized as:

SL (Hindi): *bhāi aur bhābhi ke tabādalā ho zāne par usko pure ghar pe akele rahnā parā*.

TL (Assamese): *kakāyek āru nabouwek badali hoi golot gotei ghartot teo akale thākibalagiyā hol*.

'His brother and sister-in-law having got transferred he had to stay/live in the entire house alone.'

These do not seem to be instances of simplification; the information/content load remains the same in both the original and the normalized versions. The third (normal-ized) sentence is syntactically more complex than the original SL sentence. However, one may recall that "[C]onventionalization hypothesis bears some affinities to the simplification hypothesis: both quote the great lexical frequencies of frequent items as evidence in support of their claims" (Mauranen 2006: 96).

3.3   Simplification

Simplification can be described as the tendency of translated texts to contain simplified language compared to the SL text. Sara Laviosa-Braithwaite (1998) mentions three types of simplification identified in translated texts – lexical, syntactic and stylistic. Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1983: 119) define lexical simplification as the process and/or result of making do with less words. Some of the manifestations of simpli-fication are: use of paraphrase to reduce the cultural gap between SL and TL, use of superordinate where there are no corresponding hyponyms in TL; use of modern, colloquial, simple synonym, and simplification of the complex syntax by replacing non-

finite clauses with finite ones. Stylistic simplification involves breaking up long sentences, replacing elaborate phraseology with shorter collocations, and omission and avoidance of repetition.

Breaking up a long sentence into several shorter ones is a common simplification strategy, mostly to be found in translation of prose:

SL: They met me in the day of success, and I have learned by the perfect'st report

        they have more in them than mortal knowledge.   (*Macbeth* 1.5.1)

This was broken into two and then translated into the TL:

TL: āmi xāphalya arzār dināi teoloke mok lag pāle.

        'they met me on the day success was earned'

        moi ekebāre xathikbhāve zāniba pāriso ze mānaviya gyānatkoi adhik gyānar

        adhikāri teolok

        'I've come to know very well that they have more than human knowledge'

The analysis of this small corpus seems to point towards the presence of what may be regarded as universal features in the translated texts. It appears that it is not easy to avoid some kind of overlapping in the use of terms like normalization, explicitation and simplification. A study of the translations of Shakespeare shows that intervention, if any, is rather subtle. It also indicates that a competent translator successfully transforms intervention into what could be called naturalization in the sense of proximity to the SL.

References: Corpus

Bharati, Dharamvir (1952): *Suraj ka Satwan Ghoda*. New Delhi: Bharatiya Jnanpith Prakashan

Barthakur, Mahendra (2002) "Ali Domozat." Mahendra Barthakur: *Mahendra Barthakurar Nirbasita Natak.* Guwahati: Bibi Barthakur, 251-272

Kalam, A. P. J. Abdul (1999): *Wings of Fire. An Autobiography*. Hyderabad: Universities Press

Kalam, A. P. J. Abdul (2007): *Agnir Deuka*. Translated into Assamese by Suresh Sharma. Guwahati: Jyoti Prakashan

Phukan, Nilamoni (1994): *Xagartalir Xangkha*. Guwahati: Lawyer's Book Stall

Shakespeare, William (1997a): *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. Stephen Greenblatt (ed.): *The Norton Shakespeare.* New York/London: Norton, 1659-1759

Shakespeare, William (2000-2003): "Hamletar Tragedy." Translated into Assamese by Ajit Barua. *Goriyoshi*. Guwahati: Sahitya Prakash (serialized)

Shakespeare, William (2004): *Hamlet.* Translated into Assamese by Kirtykamal Bhuyan. Guwahati: Bani Mandir

Shakespeare, William (2006a): *Hamlet*. Translated into Assamese by Madan Sarma. Guwahati: Publication Board, Assam

Shakespeare, William (1997b): *The Tragedy of Macbeth*. Stephen Greenblatt (ed.): *The Norton Shakespeare*. New York/London: Norton, 2555-2618

Shakespeare, William (2006b): *Macbeth*. Translated into Assamese by Madan Sarma. Guwahati: Publication Board, Assam

Singh, Anita Inder (2006): *The Partition of India*. New Delhi: National Book Trust

Singh, Anita Inder (2007): *Bharatar Bibhazan*. Translated into Assamese by Madan Sarma. New Delhi: National Book Trust, India

References: Scholarly Works

Baker, Mona (1992): *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation.* London/New York: Routledge

Baker, Mona (1993): "Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications." Mona Baker, Gill Francis, Elena Tognini-Bonelli (eds): *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 233-250

Baker, Mona (1996): "Corpus-based Translation Studies: The Challenges That Lie Ahead." Harold Somers (ed.): *Terminology, LSP and Translation: Studies in Language Engineering in Honour of Juan C. Sager*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 175-187

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana (1986): "Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation." Juliane House, Shoshana Blum-Kulka (eds): *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition.* Tübingen: Narr, 17-35 – reprinted in: Lawrence Venuti (ed.) (2000): *The Translation Studies Reader.* London/New York: Routledge, 298-313

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana; Eddie A. Levenston (1983): "Universals of Lexical Simplification." Claus Færch; Gabriele Kasper (eds): *Strategies in Interlanguage Ccmmunication*. London/New York: Longman, 119-139

Chomsky, Noam (1984): *Lectures on Government and Binding*. (Studies in Generative Grammar 9.) Dordrecht/Cinnaminson: Foris

Cook, Guy (1994): *Discourse and Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Laviosa-Braithwaite, Sara (1998): "Universals in Translation." Mona Baker (ed.): *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge, 288-291

Mauranen, Anna (2006): "Translation Universals." Keith Brown (ed.): *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 13. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 93-100

Sharma, T. R. S. (2004): "Translating Literary Texts through Indian Poetics: A Phenomenological Study." *Translation Today* 1 [1]: 146-153 [Mysore: CIIL]

St.-Pierre, Paul (2005): "Introduction." Paul St.-Pierre, Prafulla C. Kar (eds): *In Translation: Reflections, Refractions, and Transformations.* Delhi: Pencraft International, ix-xvii

Venuti, Lawrence (2000): "Translation, Community, Utopia." Lawrence Venuti (ed.): *The Translation Studies Reader*. London/New York: Routledge, 465-488

Venuti, Lawrence (2003): "Translating Derrida on Translation: Relevance and Disciplinary Resistance." *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 16 [2]: 237-262

Author

Madan M. Sarma is currently Professor and Head of the Department of English and Foreign Languages at Tezpur University, Tezpur, Assam, India. His areas of interest are critical theory, fiction, applied linguistics and translation studies. He is an eminent creative writer and critic in Assamese and also a translator.

E-mail: madansarma@sify.com, mms@tezu.ernet.in