Chapter VI

Translation Strategies of the Native Oriya Translators

6.1. Language, Translation, and Translation Strategy

Since translation deals with languages, it can be said that ‘a study of translation is a study of translation strategy’ and ‘a study of translation strategy is a study of metalinguistic functions of translation’. Translation covers the structural and functional mechanisms of languages. It reflects the chemistry of meta-linguistic composition and decomposition which take place between the source and target languages. When translation refers to the role of languages, it goes beyond the politics of translation and gives more importance to their constituents which perform interlinear communication between the two languages. That is why language is the most important tool in translation and as a result, translation is one of the most important tools for acquiring and transferring knowledge from one language to other.

Language is not only a representational expression of human communication but also a medium of cultural transmission. Needless to say, all human beings often use language for meta-linguistic functions in communication. All languages do not have the same linguistic features. They have similarities and also dissimilarities. It means each language has its own linguistic features. Since translation is a by-product of metalinguistic functions, a study of translation strategy is a study of metalinguistic mechanisms of languages. Let us discuss some points which will establish the reciprocal relationship between translation and language in relation to translation strategy.
Language performs a major role in expressing the thoughts and imaginations of a people through an illustrative form, i.e. literature. This might be a reason for understanding of language as a distinctive feature among others and it is a tool for discovering translation strategies. The question here is why language is a tool for discovering translation strategies. First, “language is purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions, and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols” (Sapir 1921: 08). It means that language is a medium of communication as well as a form of literary or cognitive operator. Since language is formulated with the multiple characteristics and functions of communication; it is obvious to be treated as a tool for discovering the metalinguistic elements of languages.

The medium of communication and its relation to translation is obviously a common and idiosyncratic quality of language. According to Steiner (1976: 45-47) “any model of communication is at the same time a model of translation, of a vertical or horizontal transfer of significance” and also “translation, properly understood, is a special case of the arc of communication which every successful speech–act closes within a given language. On the inter-lingual level, translation will pose concentrated, visibly intractable problems; but these same problems abound, at a more covert or conventional neglected level, intra-lingually. The model ‘sender to receiver’ which represents any semiological and semantic process is ontologically equivalent to the model ‘source language to receptor language used in the theory of translation’’. The interrelation or interconnection between language, communication, and translation is emphasized by Steiner who thinks “inside or between languages, human communication equals translation. A study of translation is a study of language” (ibid.). The above quotation
clearly proposes that any study of translation is a study of metalinguistic functions of translation. Catford (1965: 01) holds a similar view: “translation is an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another. Clearly, then, any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language a general linguistic theory”. Since translation deals with metalinguistic functions of the embedded texts, the study of translation strategy obviously carries the metalinguistic functions of languages. In order to find out the translation strategies of the native Oriya translators, these metalinguistic functions are considered as tools for analyzing and giving a proper shape to the study.

The aim of this chapter is to discuss the translation strategies of the native Oriya translators between 1876 and 1936. While dealing with the translations of native Oriya translators, it has been noticed that they have adopted several translation strategies for achieving their goals that can be grouped under two categories: micro translation strategies and macro translation strategies. As mentioned in the earlier chapter, micro translation strategy mainly covers the linguistic features of translation precisely dealing with the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects of translations. On the other hand, macro translation strategy focuses on the translators’ ideas of adaptation, deletion, and manipulation of converting an ST into a TT. Though there is a conceptual difference between micro and macro translation strategies in the practical sense macro strategies are the ultimate results of micro strategies. If the translators take the decisions for solving translation problems while reading the ST and also plan to adapt strategies before translating specific texts, it is considered a macro translation strategy. If these decisions take place on the spot while translating, they will be called micro translation strategies.
Translation strategy is a question of a translator’s decision. Since most of the literary texts are considered as meta-texts composed of several domain-specific forms and contents, the task of their translators is to consciously look for the equivalent effects and try to solve the problems by adopting different strategies. Various contexts and situations, textual and metatextual functions of literature and their equivalence problems motivate the translators to adopt certain translation strategies for making a proper translation. These lead the translators to apply the mini-max strategy so that equivalent effects can be created and translation fidelity can be achieved to the extent possible.

Since translation is a negotiation between two different linguistic, literary, and cultural texts, some textual materials from one language to another may or may not have natural equivalents in TT. In this context, translating extra-linguistic features, such as culture specific words, personal names, place names, religion specific words and expressions create problems. This situation can only be sorted out by translators either by accepting the transliteration approach or rejecting it. Rejecting transliteration is one way where the translator has to accommodate the SL items faithfully in TL, if possible; and the other way is to fix the SL items in TL through adopting transliteration. Translators often take this decision before translating a text; so it is called the macro translation strategy. Usually translators prefer transliteration strategy to semantic rendering of the personal names and place names in TL.

Though the present chapter deals with both the strategies, more importance has been given to the functions of language in micro translation strategies in the following sections.
6.2. Tradition of Oriya Prose Translation

The style of Oriya prose writing was developed and reformed during the colonial period. Though Oriya had a conventional prose style of writing, it had gained popularity before the colonization that was really reshaped by the influence of European Renaissance. The history of colonial Oriya literature is witnessed the dynamic story of Renaissance in the Oriya national life. It was a golden fate for Oriya language that “three men of genius ushered in the modern period in Oriya literature, working together round about 1866. This brilliant trio, with harmonious intellectual and spiritual affinities, and on excellent social terms with one another, is Fakirmohan Senapati, Radhanath Ray, and Madhusudan Rao” (Mansinha 1964: 167) expanded their literary efforts in searching for Oriya identity. They have been remembered as the trendsetters of modern Oriya literature and their literary specimens brought out a revolution in the spectrum of Oriya literature.

The position of translation, adaptation, and manipulation are found significantly in their literary writings. For examples: Phakirmohan Senapati’s *jibanacarita* (1866), Jaganmohan Lal’s *oDisā bijaya* (1876), Radhanath Ray’s *itāliya jubā* (1873), and Madhusudan Rao’s *praNayara adbhuta pariNāma, candra o tārā* (1873), and *buddha* are translated to Oriya. After a successful adaptation of foreign literary genres in Oriya, Oriya prose became popular and this prose style was followed by the pioneers of Oriya literature.

Though there are ample published Oriya prose texts, a few of them have been found suitable for interpreting history, religion, and an essence of moral teaching materials for pedagogical demands through translation. In this chapter, the data are obtained primarily from the Oriya translations of the available English texts.
One of the major historical texts on Orissa is *A Sketch of the History of Orissa (1803-1828)* published in 1874 by a British officer, G. Toynbee, and translated into Oriya by Jaganmohan Lal under the title *oDisā bijaya* in 1876 for school children. Social consciousness for children and their psychological and cultural development were significant in 19th century school education. One of the popular Oriya school teachers, Chandramohan Maharana, was the head master of Puri Zilla School and then Deputy School Inspector in Puri district of Orissa. He translated various texts to Oriya for the purpose of school education. For analyzing Chandramohan Maharana as translator and his principles of teaching, Ranganath Mishra, former Chief justice of the Supreme Court of India, made a statement on his father’s beloved teacher; “….the late Chandramohan Maharana – a very successful teacher. I did not have the privilege of seeing him but have heard a lot about him from my father late Pandit Godavaris Mishra whose teacher he was. When at the beginning of the century my father was in the Zila School at Puri, this celebrated teacher was the Head Master. Those were the years when the National Movement was gathering momentum. This Head Master was working in a Government High School, encouraged young Indian boys to develop feelings of patriotism. The impact of his personality fell on every student and the contact brought about transformation. Chandramohan Babu provided a living model for shaping human character and my father and his associates who entered public life within the province later owed their success to their association with him”( quoted in Giri 1991: xiii).

Maharana was a sincere and ideal teacher. He was particular about teaching of English grammar and pronunciation which has been mentioned by Pandit Godabarish Mishra. His five Oriya children short stories, such as *pimpuDi o jhiNTikā* (The Ant and the
Grasshopper), *lobhi kukura* (The Dog and the Shadow), *kāka o koki*, (The Fox and The Crow), *languLahina srugāLa* (The Fox without a Tail), *sinha o musika kathā* (The Lion and the Mouse) translated in 1917 from Aesop’s fables have been selected for this study.

Religion for social reformation was an ideal theme of literary imagination. Madhusudan Rao’s translated essay *buddha* (1873) taken from the collection of essays *Chips from a German Workshop: Essays on the Science of Religion* (1867) originally written by Max Muller can be taken into account in this category of literary translation.

During the peak of colonization, a group of women writers entered to the scene of modern Oriya literature and also became makers of modern Oriya literature. One of the most prominent women writers, Narmada Kar, translated Leo Tolstoy’s selected stories to Oriya continuously which were serialized around 1916-1917 in the famous Oriya literary journal, *Utkal Sahitya*, which was edited by her father Biswanath Kar. Here Narmada Kar’s Oriya stories titled *bandi* (1916) (A Prisoner in the Caucasus), *drusTilābha* (1916) (Esarhaddon, King of Assyria), *bibādabhanjana* (1916) (Little Girls Wiser than Men), *pariNāma* (1916) (Work, Death, and Sickness), and *daNDabidhāna* (1917) (Too Dear) have been selected and analysed in order to determine the translation strategies of the native Oriya translators.

### 6.3. Translation Strategies of Native Oriya Translators

History of Oriya translation is as old as Oriya literature. But the study of Oriya translations is very recent. Though there are a few research works carried out by Oriya scholars, the study of Oriya translation strategies has been somehow neglected. Only the historical perspectives of Oriya translation and their important role in the growth of Oriya literature have been discussed there.
Some leading Oriya scholars, namely Natabara Samantaray (1964), Khageswar Mohapatra (1982), and Chittaranjan Das (1988) have focused on the politics of Oriya translation. However, the study of Oriya translation is undertaken by other Oriya scholars like: Jatindra K. Nayak and Himansu S. Mohapatra’s “Translating against the Grain: the Case of an Oriya Adaptation of Charles Dickens’s a Tale of two Cities” (Meta, XLII, No-2, 1996), Paul St-Pierre’s “Translation as Writing Across Languages: Samuel Beckett and Fakir Mohan Senapati” (TTR, 1999.Vol-9, No-1), and “Translation in Orissa: Trends in Cultural Interaction” (2010), Panchanan Mohanty and Anand Mahanand’s “Translation as Manipulation: A Study of Tennyson’s Enoch Arden and Nilakantha’s Dāsa Nāeka” are noteworthy to outline the boundary of Oriya translation studies and its different facets.

6.3.1. Oriya Translation Strategies

There is no translation without strategy or without translation there is no value of a strategy. Almost no discourse on Oriya translation strategies was discussed by the Oriya scholars during the colonial period. For example, the editor of Utkal Dipika (13th February of 1869), Gaurishankar Ray, expressed his comments on the translation procedure of Jaganmohan Lala’s bhramabhanjana (translated from Thomas Parnell’s the Hermit). He focused on the readability and linguistic sensibility of the Oriya translation and discussed the translation strategies. He said, “But the translated text has been like this (faithful) because the translator has not considered word for word translation as a good translation strategy and has deliberately rejected it”. What it means is that the translator’s intention behind the translation was to make it translation using the sense for sense translation strategy rather than word for word.
The concept of translation strategy, as it is understood today, was actually undiscovered during the colonial period. There is evidence to prove this in taking editorial remarks of the editor of *Utkal Sahitya*, Pandita Biswanath Kar, who had written an editorial note titled *anukarana o anusaran* (imitation and adaptation). He explained:

> An imitation is always fallacious in human life and society. Intelligent men innovate new principles or styles in different subjects through various ways in different periods and different countries. On the other hand, the common people imitate that fashions according to their own talent and they create the new creations by which the wealth of common society develop. It is fact, if the creator does not have originality or personality over the subject then there is no fallacious will execute in imitation. Adaptation is superior to imitation, where the principle is only minimal; the degree of originality of creator is much more. Therefore, imitation is not considered fallacious at all. By virtue it can be said that there are many examples wherein an adaptation is placed in a way of new creation. It is an extensive story where both imitation and adaptation have essential role to liberate the human talent. It is not necessary to have a discussion here. When we begin to discuss literature leaving other things behind the obvious seems to be impossible. Today the beauty and wealth of Bengali literature would not have been possible if they had not adapted or imitated English literature to some extent. There are great men who have captured English language and literature and then they have created new literature by the authority of their originality. But in a creation of the new thought expression and new word Sanskrit literature and language style extremely helpful and excellent mode to them. Many Bengali literature propagators were found more excellent in both the subjects and many Bengali litterateurs have adapted them and in some cases the next generation litterateurs have surpassed them by their own perseverance. There also many low-grade so-called litterateurs who defectively imitated them and filled the treasury of Bengali literature with the millions of rubbish things. If the degree of imitation is more than that of adaptation and in imitation the degree of originality is minimal or nothing at all which is not appropriate. When we discuss the progress of the Utkal literature, we see the degree of imitation is fast day by day. Scarcely do we find the personality of the writers. In some cases there have been ill-attempts of picking up some phrases exactly from some great intellectual persons and proving it to be their own. On one hand, there is deficiency of transcendental thought and original writing, and on the other hand, there is excess growth of such filthy activity which, bring us much disappointment when we think of the future of Oriya literature. When we attempt to clarify this fact by viewing an instance, we have to say some bitter facts which might be very personal. So, we stay away from these for time being.

(1926: editorial note, Utkal Sahitya, my translation).

Kar’s observations on the Oriya translated literature underlines two major translation strategies such as ‘imitation’ and ‘adaptation’. As per his assessment, adaptation is superior to imitation. Though he has discussed only two types of translation strategies, there are other strategies which will be explored in this study.
The study of translation strategies of the native Oriya translators’ focuses on the syntactic, pragmatic, and semantic strategies which have been adopted by the Oriya translators.

6.4. Syntactic Translation Strategy

In a translation activity, there are materials which either fully match or mismatch between the two languages. Since languages differ syntactic changes will obviously take place in translation. According to Chesterman (1997: 94), syntactic strategies contain the following meta-languages of translation process operative systems: literal translation, loan, calque, transposition, unit shift, phrase structure change, clause structure change, sentence structure change, cohesion change, level shift, and scheme change. Syntactic strategies operate in translation by retaining as well as changing the structural units of both the languages including the above components. There are also a few more strategies which have been used by the native Oriya translators and these will be discussed below:

6.4.1. Literal Translation

Literal translation is a strategy wherein most translators try to make the TT as close as possible to the ST when a translator cannot use other strategies for specific reasons he/she adopts the literal translation strategy for solving translation problems. Let us consider some examples from Oriya.

Example-1

SL: There are also small guards at Saranagarh near Cuttack and Balaramgarhi near Balasore (Toynbee 1873/2005: 16)
The above examples show how the SL materials are translated closely to the TL literally. We notice that the literal translation strategy is often adopted by the native Oriya translators in various contexts. While translating culture-specific, religion specific, and subject-specific materials, like history and theology the literal strategy has been adopted by the native Oriya translators.

While translating informative materials, the literal translation strategy has been widely used by the native Oriya translators. The main focus of this strategy is to bridge the gap when comparable structural, lexical, and even phonological equivalences are available between the two languages. The following examples taken from the translations of the native Oriya translators are illustrative:
Example-4

SL: One day he received a letter from home (Tolstoy 1870/1994: 20)

TL: dine se gharu khaNDie ciThi pāilā (Kar 1916: 90)

GL: one day/ he/ form home/ one /letter/ got

Example-5

SL: It is not a large army, only sixty men in all…(Tolstoy 1897/1994: 256)

TL: rājyara sainya sankhyā adhika nuheM, kebaLa sāThie jaNa sainya (Kar 1917: 289)

GL: kingdom’s/ soldier /number/much/not/only/sixty/soldier

Example-6

SL: On that condition I am willing to go (Tolstoy 1897/1994: 260)

TL: kebaLa ehi sarttare mu jibi (Kar 1917: 292)

GL: only/this/on condition/ I / will go

If one follows the Oriya translations of the period under discussion closely, it can be said that the literal translation strategy is commonly adopted by most Oriya translators.

6.4.2. Lexical Borrowing or Loan

Borrowing or loan is a conventional process of linguistic adoption. We often borrow terms into our own language when there is no equivalent for a new object or a new concept of foreign language. For these reasons, borrowing is a common and simple strategy among others in translation (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958, Ivir 1987, Molina and Hurtado Albir 2002). Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 32) point out that “many borrowings enter a language through translation”. In fact, most translators adopt the same strategy for creating stylistic as well as semantic equivalence between two texts. On the other hand, borrowing retains the flavour of the SL culture in the TL culture by transferring words and
expressions form the ST to the TT. The main purpose of borrowing is to compensate for the lexical, cultural, textual, and literary materials of the ST which have no natural equivalents in the TT.

Borrowing is possible when a translator deals with the “source-culture items that have no counterpart in the target culture and for that reason no lexical label in the target language. The borrowed expression fills the lexical gap and assures cultural transference, provided that necessary cultural information has been transmitted, previously or simultaneously, in some other way (for instance, by means of a definition, by visual representation, through direct experience, etc). Since this is usually not the case, borrowing is either avoided or combined with some other procedure, such as definition or substitution, or is supplemented with the translator’s comments and explanations in the form of footnotes” (Ivir 1995: 138). Target language incompatibility is mainly responsible for adopting the borrowing translation strategy. In the following examples, the Oriya translators have used borrowing as a foreignizing strategy.

**Example-1**

SL: In these the native officers of Government took refuge. The troops were located in the bungalow of Mr. Becher, the Salt Agent. (Toynbee 1873/2005: 29)

TL: sethīre gabarnmeNTaṛa desiya karmacārimāne lucile o senāgaNa nimaki ejaNTa Bicara sähebanka koThire rahīLe (Lal 1876/2006: 79)

GL: in that/ government’s / local/officers/hid/ and /troops/ salt/ agents/ Becher Saheb/ bungalow/ stayed

**Example-2**
SL: King and Becher, Salt Agents, and Mr. Busby, the Collector of the pilgrim-tax. (Toynbee 1873/2005: 29)

TL: semānanka madhyare nimaki ejaNTa kiṅ sāheba o Bicara sāheba ebaṅ jātri tāksakalector Busbi sāheba thiLe (Lal 1876/2006: 79)

GL: among them/ salt/ Agents/ King and Becher Sahib/ and/ pilgrim/ tax collector/ Busbi Saheb/was

When the SL writer uses certain domain specific linguistic items like a register, it is normally borrowed from SL to TL. In the above examples, the SL units like agent, government, collector, and tax are retained in TT. In this context, we can quote of Hervey and Higgins (1992: 31), who point out: “a vital condition for cultural borrowing is that the textual context of the TT should make the meaning of the borrowed expression clear. Cultural borrowing will be most frequent in texts on history or social or political matters, where the simplest solution is to give a definition of terms like ‘taille’, ‘department’, or pre-Revolution ‘parliament’, and then to use the SL word in the TT”. In this situation the translator adopts the strategy of lexical borrowing not only for the meaning but also making the TT more readable. Chesterman (1997: 94) makes a similar statement on the loan or borrowing strategy which covers both “the borrowing of individual items and the borrowing of syntagma. Like the other strategies, it refers to a deliberate choice, not the unconscious influence of undesired interference”. Let us consider the above statements in the context of Oriya translations.
Example-3

SL: Among them Colonel Harcourt was not a little surprised to find two brass guns, nearly new, which bore the stamp of the Honorable East India Company (Toynbee 1873/2005: 13)

TL: Karnal harkaT se topa madhyare isT iNDiâ kampaninka mudrânkiTa duigoTi nutana pittaLa topa dekhi ati āscharjyānwita hele (Lal 1876/2006: 68).

GL: Colonel Harcourt/ that / gun/ East India Company/ stamping/ two/new/ brass/gun/ see/ was highly surprised

In this example, Colonel and East India Company have been adopted as these are the official designation of the British army and the name of a British company. Therefore, these are borrowed in Oriya.

Then, there are a few examples like kamisanara (commissioner), karnel (colonel), pāuNDara (pounder), gabharnar general (governor general), sibhil (civil), sTesan (station), sabDibhijan (sub-division), kaptān (captain), and lepHTneNTa (lieutenant) which are a result of the lexical borrowing strategy adopted by Jaganmohan Lal. As a result, lots of foreign words have been used in Oriya and they have been Oriyanized by the Oriya speakers.

6.4.3. Alterations

Alteration is a process of changing something which makes the original different from the target. In relation to translation, alteration is used as a technique wherein “the entire message must be subjected to a series of changes, “involving not only additions and subtractions, but also alterations, some of them relatively radical” (Nida 1964: 233).
According to Nida, alterations usually commence when the changes have to be made because of the incompatibilities between the two languages. So he argues that alteration can be treated under the following classes: (a) sounds, (b) categories, (c) word classes, (d) order of elements, (e) clause and sentence structures, (f) semantic problems involving single words, and (g) semantic problems involving exocentric expressions. Nida’s above criteria have been restructured by Molina and Hurtado (2002: 502) as follows: (1) changes due to problems caused by transliteration when a new word is introduced from the source language; (2) changes due to structural differences between the two languages, e.g. changes in word order, grammatical categories, etc; (3) changes due to semantic misfits, especially with idiomatic expressions. In the context of Oriya translations from English, alteration strategies can be located in the following levels, like grammatical alterations, clause alteration, pronoun alteration, sentence structure alteration, voice alteration, modulation, etc.

6.4.4. Grammatical Alteration

Grammatical alteration often arises between two different languages. Particularly, in Oriya translations the following strategies like number alteration, pronoun alteration, tense alteration, and modulation are prominent. The following examples can be cited to drive home the point.

Example-1

SL: The original plan of the campaign was that the force, after capturing Cuttack and leaving a sufficient number of troops to hold it. (Toynbee 1873/2005: 07)

TL: kaTaka karagata helā uttāre tahiMra rakshyārthe seThāre keteka senā rahibe ...(Lal 1876/2006: 64)
GL: Cuttack was captured after its for protection / there /some soldiers/ will stay

In this example, an adjectival phrase *a sufficient number (of troops)* has been altered into a quantifier adjective phrase, i.e. keteka (*senā*) in Oriya. Here, the English word *sufficient* is not an equivalent of keteka. In Oriya, keteka is a quantifier which can be used for English ‘some’. Again, an infinite verb phrase *to hold it* changed into *to save it* which is not semantically appropriate.

### 6.4.5. Number Alteration

English and Oriya both have two grammatical numbers such as singular and plural. There are some differences between them which occur according to their functions and positions of the nouns.

#### Example-1

SL: It was with the greatest difficulty that the *guns* and supplies could be dragged along

(Toynbee 1873/2005: 08)

TL: e jogu *topa* o khādya sāmagri āNibāre baDa kasTa helā (Lal 1876/2006: 65)

GL: it/for/artillery/and/food items/to bring/big/difficulty/ happened

#### Example-2

SL: The dhenkiyas, who are armed with *bows and arrows* and a sword, and perform all sorts of duties. (Toynbee 1873/2005: 22)

TL: Dhenkiā, emāne *dhamusara* o khaDga byabahāra ebaṅ sakaLa prakāra kārjya karuthile (Lal 1876/2006: 74)

GL: Dhenkiā/ these /bow-arrow/ and/sword/use/and/all sorts of work/were doing

In these examples, the SL plural number is changed into the singular number in Oriya.
6.4.6. Pronoun Alteration

English and Oriya both have different pronominal systems. Though Oriya has its own pronoun system, while translating English pronouns, some alterations are noticed in the native Oriya translations.

Example-1

SL: I quote the following extract from Mill’s History of British India (Toynbee 1873/2005: 12)


GL: I/ of Mr. Mill/ of India/ from history/ below written/ matter/ extracting

In this example, the SL pronoun I first person singular number changed into TL āmbhe i.e. first person plural number in Oriya.

Example-2

SL: on that condition I am willing to go (Tolstoy 1897/1994: 260)

TL: kebaLa ehi sarttare mu jibi (Kar 1917: 292)

GL: only/this/ on condition/ I / will go

Oriya has two categories of demonstrative pronouns like e/ehā/ehi (this or it) and se/tāhā/sehi (that). In this example, the English pronoun that is changed to ehi in Oriya that means ‘this.’ Also the SL tense has been changed in Oriya, i.e. the present has become the future.

Example-3

SL: They all went on quarrelling, (Tolstoy 1885/1994: 174)

TL: dui gharara purusamāne āsi madhya se bibādare joga dele (Kar 1916: 191)
GL: two/ family’s/ male persons/having come/also/that/in quarrel/joined

In this example, the SL pronoun *they* has been changed in Oriya to a noun phrase *dui gharara purusamâne* (male persons of two families).

**Example-4**

SL: *My horse is a good one: if the Tartans do attack me, I can gallop away.* (Tolstoy 1870/1994: 21)

TL: *tāra ghodâ bes dauDipāre, jadi paThâNamâne âsanti, tâhâ hele se paLâijâi pâriba.* (Kar 1916: 90)

GL: *his/ horse/ well/ can run/ if/ the Muslims/ came/ that/ became/ he/ can flee*

In this example, the SL pronoun *my* is changed to *târa* (his) in Oriya.

**6.4.7. Tense Alteration**

The following examples demonstrate the tense alterations in the Oriya.

**Example-1**

SL: *I shall mention one more incident* (Toynbee 1873/2005: 18)

TL: *āu goTie prasanga lekhuachu* (Lal 1876/2006: 72)

GL: *another/one/matter/are writing*

**Example-2**

SL: *I will take off my shoes and stockings, and you take off yours.* (Tolstoy 1885/1994: 173)

TL: *mu jepari lugâ Tekichi, sehipari lugâ tekiki dhar* (Kar 1916: 190)

GL: *I/ like/ cloth/ have lifted/ like that/ cloth/ having lifted/ hold*

In the above examples, the SL expressions contain the future tense whereas the TL expressions contain the present tense.
Example-3

SL: This was the rebellion of the Paiks (Toynbee 1873/2005: 21)

TL: ehā pāikanka bidroha aTai (Lal 1876/2006: 73)

GL: this foot/soldiers’/ revolution/is

Example-4

SL: He saw himself lying on a rich bed, besides a beautiful woman (Tolstoy 1903/1994: 263-264)

TL: se sundara sajyāre soichanti, jaNe parama sundari stri tānka nikaTare (Kar 1916: 122)

GL: he/beautiful/on bed/is sleeping/one/extremely/beautiful/woman/his/near

In example-3 and example-4, the translators have changed the SL past tense to the present tense in TL.

Example-5


TL: mo jhiaku tu mārilu kāhiMki? (Kar 1916: 191)

GL: my/to daughter/you/beat/why?

In this example the SL present continuous has changed to the past participle.

6.4.8. Modulation

Modulation is a translation procedure defined by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 247-248) as follows: It “articulates the contrast between two languages faced with the same situation but two different modes of thinking, by exposing this divergence in expression form”.
Example-1

SL: this is the last time that I see that city (Max Muller 1867: 216)

TL: e priya nagara āu mo nayana pathare paDibanaM (Rao 1873/2008: 227)

GL: this/ dear/ city/ again/ my/ eye /on way/ will not fall.

In this example, the SL message has been replaced in Oriya by an idiomatic and negative expression.

6.4.9. Lexical Creation

Lexical creation is considered as one of the important translation strategies in translation (Nida 1964, Ivir 1987). Lexical creation in the target language is possible though it is less frequently used than other strategies. It presents addition of a variety of features in the TT which are absent in the ST. In the translations of Oriya children’s literature especially the fables from English, the translators have used this strategy.

The main intention behind using this strategy is to domesticate the foreign elements in the TL. The examples are illustrative.

Example-1

SL: A lion was asleep in his den one day. (Aesop 1968: 137)

TL: grisma kāLara madhya bhāgare dinakare goTie simha aranya madhyare goTie baTabrukhya chāyāre sayana karithilā. sehi bruhyā muLare goTie khudra musikara biLa thilā. (Maharana 1917/1991: 157)

(Note: Italicised portions indicate lexical creation)

GL: of the midsummer/ in the middle part/ in one day/ a lion/ in the forest/ under the shade of a banyan tree/ was sleeping/that/ tree/under/foot/a small mouse hole/ was
The question is: why additions are made in the target language? First of all, the translator prefers to add the new information for domesticating the context. In order to achieve the purpose and readability the translator adopts the strategy of lexical creation. Lexical creation takes place in giving extra information about the local ecology, i.e. when and where the lion was found. It needs to be mentioned that this translation was meant for pedagogical purposes and children were its readers. To explain the content of the text, the translator has added extra information by adopting lexical the creation strategy to bring the reader to textual harmony with the context.

The above example, where the native Oriya translator has adopted this strategy in order to create a similar context in the target text. The following Oriya culture specific words, i.e. grisma kāLa (summer season) and baTabrukhya (banyan tree) have been added in the TT. In this case, the translation has freedom to change the SL culture specific nuances in TL. In this example, the translator has used a particular place where a lion can be found in the TL culture, i.e. baTabrukhya chāyare (under the shade of a banyan tree) against the SL culture specific word den.

**Example-2**

SL: Not long afterward the lion, while ranging the forest for his prey, was caught in the net which the hunters had set to catch him. He let out a roar that echoed through the forest. (Aesop 1968: 137)

TL: kichi kāla pare ekadā jytsnāmayi rajanire siṁhaTi sehi baTabrukhya muLare jāuM jāuM pāsare ābadha helā. se nānā prakāra garjana kari bahu jatna kale suddhā, āpaNāku sethiru mukta kari pārilā nāhiM. baNuāmāne brukshya muLare pāsa basāi tāhā sākhāre luci basithile. siṁha pāsare paDilā dekhi baNuāmāne tarusākhāru olhāi parāmarsha kale
“ehi siňhaku jibitābastāre nei rājānku bheTibā. semāne baTbruňkya muLare tāhāra pada prabhuti rajjudwārā druDuḥa bhābare bandhana kari khaNDie sagaDa aNdibāpāiM grāmaku gale je siňhaku tāhā upare thoī rājānka naaraku ghenijibe (Maharana 1917/1991: 157).

GL: some/time/after/once/at moonlit night/the lion/that/bunyan tree/at root/going/ in snare/was caught/. He/so much/roaring/a lot of effort/having put/also/, /himself/ from it/could not free/. The hunters/tree/at root/snare/ having set/ its branches/ hiding/had sat/. The lion/in snare/was caught/having seen/the hunters/from the branches of the tree/climbing down/discussed/, this/lion/alive/taking/to the king/shall gift/. They/bunyan tree/at root/its/leg, etc. /with rope/ tightly/ having tied/a cart/to bring/to village/went/so that/the lion/on it/keeping/the king’s/to palace/will take.

In this example, the italicized expressions demonstrate the lexical creations which are totally absent in the ST, i.e. the hunters’ brilliant tactics for catching the lion and the plan for taking the lion to the king’s palace have been added. The effect of lexical creation is domestication and it is required for creation of children’s literature in the target language. According to Puurtinen (1995), “CHILDREN’S LITERATURE also requires the recreation of the message according to the sociolinguistic needs of a different readership” (quoted in Bastin 2009: 04). The given examples from Oriya translations of Aesop’s fables show the evidence of definitional translation rather than deletion, paraphrase, and summarization. In Puurtien’s words, ‘the recreation of the message’ defines the essentiality of lexical creation that makes readability the most important criterion. That is why the native translators have adopted the lexical creation strategy for translating the fables to Oriya.
6.5. Semantic Strategies

Semantic strategies determine the semantic relations. Its main intention is to describe the lexical components of the translated text which refer to their lexical relations, especially synonymy and meronymy occur in Oriya translations.

6.5.1. Synonymy

Synonymy describes “one sense with several names” (Ullmann 1957: 108) and ‘sameness of meaning’ (Palmer 1976: 59). In translation, replacement of a word with another word conveying the same meaning is named as synonymy strategy. When the translators face textual repetitions with the same linguistic forms, they either delete or substitute those with synonymous words. In this situation, translators adopt this synonymy strategy for translating and bridging the semantic gap between the two texts.

There are a few examples which can be cited from Oriya:

Example-1

SL: The young Prince returned to the city without going to his park. (Max Muller 1867: 211)

TL: rājaputra sārathiku ratha pherāibāku ādesa dele (Rao 1873/2008: 225)

GL: the prince/to the charioteer/chariot/to return/ordered/.

Example-2

SL: The Prince turned his Chariot and returned to the city. (Max Muller 1867: 211)

TL: se rāthaku leuTāibā nimante sārathiku ādesa pradāna kale (Rao 1873/2008: 225)

GL: he/the chariot/for returning/to the charioteer/order/gave/.
Example-3

SL: The Prince turned his chariot and returned to the city (Max Muller 1867: 212)
TL: ehā kahi sidhārtha rājapādaku pratyāgamana kale. (Rao 1873/2008: 225)
GL: this/having said/Sidhartha/to the palace/returned/.

Example-4

SL: The young Prince turned his chariot and returned to the city. (Max Muller 1867: 213)
TL: jubarāja ratha leuTāibāpāiM sārathiku ādesa dele (Rao 1873/2008: 225)
GL: prince/the chariot/for returning/to the charioteer/ordered/.

In the given examples, the verb return is used in the SL text many times whereas in Oriya translation of the same verb is rendered as the following pherāibā, leuTāiba and pratyāgamana karibā in Oriya.

6.5.2. Meronymy

Meronymy describes a part-whole relationship between lexical items. According to Murphy (2006:539), “meronymy is often used to refer generally to the phenomenon of relatedness of expressions for wholes and parts”. Lyons (1977) suggests meronymmys can be divided into two types: ‘necessary’ and ‘optional’. Cruse (1986) has also classified meronymmys into two types, such as ‘canonical’ and ‘facilitative’. The essentiality of meronymy strategy in translation is to define semantic shifts from one level to another level. There are a few examples which can be taken from the Oriya translations.

Example-1

SL: The frock was splashed, and so were Akulya’s eyes and nose. (Tolstoy: 173)
TL: kādua pāNi chhiDiki kamaLāra deha o lugājāka paDilā (Kar: 190)
GL: mud/water/being splashed/ kamala’s/body/and/clothes/fell.

The example-1, the SL message contains particular body parts, ‘eyes’ and ‘nose’ whereas they have been changed in Oriya to their holonym i.e. body.

6.6. Pragmatic Strategies

Pragmatic strategies cause radical changes of the SL context taking the cultural background of the TL into consideration. According to Chesterman (1997: 107), “if syntactic strategies manipulate form, and semantic strategies manipulate meaning, pragmatic manipulate the message itself” due to various reasons. In order to manipulate the message, the translators often take decisions emphasizing the appropriate functions of message from the readers’ points of view. The major components of this strategy are: cultural filtering, information change, and partial translation and deletion. All these are found in the Oriya translations.

6.6.1. Cultural Filtering

Cultural filtering focuses on the translators’ intention for neutralization, domestication, adaptation, and manipulation. It describes the principles in which the SL items, particularly the culture-specific items, are translated as functional equivalents in the TT so that they conform to the TL norms (Chesterman1997: 108). For example, the kernel of wheat (Aesop: 16) has been translated into Oriya as cāuLa (rice) (Maharana: 94). The translator has changed the original food item considering the pragmatic aspects of the TL culture.
Example-2

SL: Colonel Harcourt halted only two days in the holy city (Toynbee 1873/2005: 08)

TL: karnel HärkaT sighra abasara hebā suparāmarsa jāNi srikhethrare kebaLa dui dina rahile. (Lal 1876/2006: 65)

GL: Colonel Harcourt/ quickly/ will halt/ good advise/ know/ sriketrae /only/two/days

In this example, the SL expression the holy city has been changed to srikhetra which is the mythological name of the modern temple town Puri.

Example-2

SL: It was an early Easter. Sledging was only just over; snow still lay in the yards; and water ran in streams down the village street. (Tolstoy 1885/1994: 173)

TL: durgāpuja samaya, khub barsā hoijāichi. goTie khyudra grāmare bilare, bāTa ghāTare pāNi jami jāiachi (Kar: 1916: 190)

GL:  durga’s worship/ time/ heavy/ rain fall has taken place/ one/small/ in village/ in field/ on road/ and the like/ water/has accumulated.

In this example, the SL message gives an idea about the Easter festival of the Christians whereas the Oriya translator has changed the original message in order to adapt it to the Oriya culture and converted it to Durgā worship.

Example-3

SL: The little one wore a blue frock, the other a yellow print and both had red kerchief on their heads. (Tolstoy 1885/1994: 173)

TL: kamaLa khanDe Doriā lugā pindhichi. Malikā haLadiā lugā (Kar 1916: 190)

GL: Kamala/ one/ stripe sari / has worn/. Malika/ yellow/ sari
In this example, the italicized parts of the ST are dropped in the TT and also ‘frock’ has been changed to *lugā* by the translator.

There are also many examples which help us to conceptualize the nature of domestication. The native Oriya translators not only adopted the culture-specific features from their own society, but also changed the place names and personal names to make them acceptable in the target culture. Pratibha Kar’s Oriya translations of Tolstoy’s stories titled *bandi* (A Prisoner in the Caucas), *drusTilābha* (Esarhaddon, King of Assyria), *bibādabhanjana* (Little Girls Wiser than Men), *pariNāma* (Work, Death, and Sickness), and *daNDabidhāna* (Too Dear) are completely changed in Oriya and they are examples of manipulation rather than translation proper. She has consistently changed the SL texts’ place names and personal names in Oriya.

The central characters of the story *bandi*, Zhilin has been changed in Oriya to *jagat simGha*, kostilin to karim khān and *dinā* to *meher*. The same trend is found in the story *drusTilābha*, Assynian King has become shyāmadeshara rāja, Esarhaddon and Lailie have been changed to *saiLendra* and *laLitendra*. In *bibādabhanjana*, the personal names ākulyā and malāshā have been changed to *kamaLā* and *mallikā*. In *daNDabidhāna*, a particular place near the borders of France and Italy has become mahesapura. These clearly demonstrate the idea of cultural filtering that is used for domesticating the ST materials.

**6.6.2. Information Change**

Information changes occur when the specified messages of SL are dropped or replaced into TL by other kinds of information.
Example-1

SL: Buddha first went to Vaisali and became the pupil of a famous Brahman who had gathered round him 300 disciples (Max Muller 1867: 213)

TL: budhadeba gruha tyāgakari baisāLi nāmaka nagarare upasthita hoi satasisya paribesTita jaNe bikhyāta paNDita nikaTaku gamanakale. (Rao 1873/2008: 226)

GL: budha/ home/ having left/ baisali/named/in city/ being present/ being thousand/ me/ famous/ wisemen/ to near/went

In this example, Buddha turns into Lord Buddha and Bhraman which is a particular caste changed into Oriya as paNDita means ‘a learned man’. Similarly, 300 disciples changed into Oriya as satasisya means hundreds of disciples. It clearly indicates how the SL information has changed in TL.

Example-2

SL: This is a legend current among the South American Indians (Tolstoy 1903/1994: 269)

TL: prācina asabhya jātimānanka madhayre nānā prakāra gaLpa pracaLita achi (Kar 1916: 225)

GL: ancient/ uncivilized/ castes/ among/ different/ types/ story/prevalent/ are

In this example the SL message is totally changed in TL. According to Orissan culture, the translator has replaced the SL legend of the South American Indians to ancient uncivilized castes in the TL.

6.6.3. Partial Translation and Deletion

Partial translation means a translation of parts from a whole text or paragraph or sentence. Deletion means to omit the SL materials in the TL. Problems like cultural
expressions, ambiguous expressions, and equivalence motivate the translators to use these strategies.

**Example-1**

SL: The troops therefore halted in *the mango* groves which lined the right or southern bank of the river…… (Toynbee 1873/2005: 09)

TL: sutarān sainya nadira dakshiNa kuLastha toTāre…… (Lal 1876/2006: 65)

GL: therefore/ troops/ river’s/ on the southern bank/ in the orchard……

In the above example, the word *mango* has been deleted in TL.

**Example-2**

SL: your father, *your* mother, all *your* relations, *all your* friends, will come to the same state; ( Max Muller 1867: 211)

TL: āpNanka pitāmātā, bandu-kuTumba samaste ehi dasāra adhina (Rao 1873/2008: 225)

GL: you/parents/ relatives/ all / this/ destiny’s / subordinate

The above examples are given for partial deletion of the SL text materials in the TL text to avoid repetition, emphasise the message, and make the translation more suitable to the TL readers. There are some examples which show deletion of the entire SL message in the TL.

**Example-5**

SL: They had just come from the Church (Tolstory 1885/1994: 173).

**Example-6**

SL: So he went to his Colonel, obtained leave of absence, said good bye to his comrades, stood the soldiers four pailfuls of vodka as farewell treat, and got ready to go (Tolstoy 1870/1994: 20).
The above two examples from Tolstoy’s stories translated by Narmada Kar into Oriya are entirely dropped. It shows that the SL materials were unacceptable for TL readers at that time.

The literary history of any language finds adaptation as a process of literary cannon formation. Now, the concept of adaptation is not only justified as a tool for literary cannon formation, but it has also been included in the part of a fuzzy meta-linguistic discourse of translation where translation strategy and translation evaluation overlap with each other. According to Bastin (2009: 03), “Adaption may be understood as a set of translative interventions which result in a text that is not generally accepted as a translation but is nevertheless recognized as representing a source text. As such, the term may embrace numerous vague notions such as appropriation, domestication, imitation, REWRITING, and so on”. The best known definition in that of Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995), who list adaptation as their seventh translation procedure: “adaptation is a procedure which can be used whenever the context referred to in the original text does not exist in the culture of the target text, thereby necessitating some form of re-creation”. Adaptation as a translation strategy has been commonly used in Oriya. This study demonstrates the Oriya translation strategies such as syntactic strategy, semantic strategy, and pragmatic strategy which have been adopted by the native Oriya translators.