

EDITORIAL

This issue of *Translation Today* tables piquantly diverse fare...

To begin with, Amrita Joshi talks of the (un)translatability of what is called ‘concrete visual poetry’, which constitutes the ‘intermedium’ between verbal art and pictorial art. She argues that a visual poetic text may be capable of being translated into a piece of music, sculpture, painting and other fine arts. She draws upon the huge database that is available on this topic to make her points. Geetha’s piece is an interesting elucidation of the spiritual interpretation of Fitzgerald’s English translation of Omar Khayyam’s *Rubaiyat*, where Geetha perceives a seamless blending, or a traceless erasure, of the geographical, cultural and religious boundaries of India, England and Persia. Li Chong-Yue uses the ‘manipulation theory’ to discuss how ideology plays its role in the translation of Mao Zedong’s poems. In her article ‘The *Sangati* of Translation’, Preeti Nair shows how differential the transmission of culture could be as it travels from one Indian language into another language and the same travels from one Indian language into English. Archita Gupta’s essay on the translation of comic strips lays out the problematic, averring that illustrations facilitate and resist translation at the same time. Adewuni Salewu’s article defines the terminological dynamics of the words for interpreter and commentator in Yoruba and Arabic.

Ashes Gupta’s paper researches the questions of ‘the identity and authenticity of the voice/voices in a text type in translation’, of ‘translation as a paradox that seemingly perpetuates cultural imperialism and at the same time subverts such attempts by rendering total

translation impossible’, and of ‘whether translation is a mere linguistic ventriloquism’. English renderings of Kokborok texts constitute Ashes’ database. Anne Hardgrove shows how the translators’ pretranslatory ideas tell on her translation in terms of the examples of Burton’s English translation of the Sanskrit *Kamasutra* and Iyengar’s translation of the same text. Probal Dasgupta’s paper is a rarefied discussion of the problematic inhering in the thesis of technical or cognitive discourse being embedded in prose. Alladi Uma’s article is an exposition of the English translator’s anxieties vis-à-vis notions of the nation etc. In his intervention Sheriff talks about new paradigms of the translator’s invisibility, saying the translator’s invisibility was an import from the west into India, and a complicated relationship has emerged between the translator, the editor and the publishing house, which in concert with twentieth century phenomena like globalization, has made the translator’s task more demanding.

M. Sridhar’s article is a plea against homogenized and regional-flavour effacing English translations. In his article on drama text translation, Sue Che argues that a dramatic text is an incomplete entity, and in addition to speakability and performability the translator would do well to draw on the reading strategies of the reader to formulate his own reading strategies. The paper on machine translation in this issue lays out Corpus-based machine translation as opposed to Rule-based and Statistics-based machine translation systems. We need to keep abreast of what is happening in the MT academia even though some of which is wrong. For example, almost the same accuracy that is possible for human translation must be possible for the machine, and to say that a Domain-based MT system is more achievable than general MT systems is not right because, human languages don’t operate that way: What is domain-specific is the lexicon and not the linguistic

structure. These are myths prevalent in the MT academia which need to be demythified! We also have the features of interview with translators, this time with the reputed Bangla translator and critic Prof. Sukanta Chaudhuri, Book Review, Book Beat and a piece of actual translation. Happy reading!

P. P. Giridhar