The question whether a translation should be literal or free is as old as translation itself. The argument in favour of the spirit and sense as against the letter or the word has been going on at least from the beginning of the first century B.C. The view that translation was impossible gained popularity when the cultural anthropologists suggested that language was culture bound. Walter Benjamin and Valdimir Nabokov who were considered the ‘literalists’ concluded that a translation must be as literal as possible. But in their argument the purpose of translation, the nature of readership, the type of text were not discussed.

Though several methods have been suggested for translation it is quite evident that a substantially good translation can not be produced by holding fast to any one of those methods. During the process of translation, depending on the type of the source language text, the translator resorts to the combination of these different methods.

Some of the methods mentioned by Peter Newmark, in his 'A Textbook of Translation' are given below:

**Word-for-word Translation:**

This is often demonstrated as interlinear translation, with the target language immediately the source language words. The source language word order is preserved and the words translated singly by their most common meanings, out of context. Cultural words are translated literally. The main use of word-for-word translation is either to understand the mechanics of the source language or to construe a difficult text as presentation process.
The mood also comes in the cohesive level. The nouns and the adjectives used throughout the text make a cohesion. The cohesion of such foregrounded elements gives the mood—positive or negative or neutral. The choice between words like pass away, and dead indicates the value of the person. This subtle difference in choice will make a translation good or bad.

After passing through all these minute details in the cohesive level, the level of naturalness has to be ensured. We must ensure whether the translation makes sense and if it reads naturally. This can be made out by disengaging ourselves from the source text, by reading the translation as though no original text existed. The naturalness has to be acquired by using most frequent syntactic structures, idioms and phrases and words that are likely to appear in that kind of stylistic context.

The heart of translation theory is translation problem and the translation theory broadly consists of a large number of generalities of translation problem. So, the translation problems shall be studies in the next chapter.
Literal translation:

The source language grammatical constructions are converted to their nearest target language equivalents but the lexical words are again translated singly, out of context. As a pre-translation process, this indicates the problems to be solved.

Faithful translation:

A faithful translation attempts to reproduce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the target language grammatical structures. It 'transfers' cultural words and preserves the degree of grammatical and lexical 'abnormality' (deviation from the source language norms) in the translation. It attempts to be completely faithful to the intentions and the text realization of the source language writer.

Semantic translation:

Semantic translation differs from 'faithful translation' only in as far as it must take more account of the aesthetic value of the source language text, compromising on the 'meaning' where appropriate so that no assonance, word-play or repetition jars in the finished version. Further, it may translate less important cultural words by culturally neutral third or functional terms but not by cultural equivalents. It may make other small concessions to the readership. The distinction between 'faithful' and 'semantic' translation is that the first is uncompromising and dogmatic, while the second is more flexible admits the creative exception to 100% fidelity and allows for the translator’s intuitive empathy with the original.

Adaptation:

This is the 'freest' form of translation. It is used mainly for plays (comedies) and poetry; the
themes, characters and plots are usually preserved, the source language culture converted to
the target language culture and the text is rewritten. The deplorable practice of having a play
or a poem literally translated and then rewritten by an established dramatist or poet has
produced many poor adaptations, but other adaptations have ‘rescued’ period plays.

Free translation:

Free translation produces the matter without the manner, or the content without the form of
the original. Usually it is a paraphrase much longer than the original. A so called ‘intralingual
translation’, often prolix and pretentious, and not translation at all.

Idiomatic translation:

Idiomatic translation reproduces the ‘message’ of the original but tends to distort nuances
of meaning by preferring colloquialisms and idioms where these do not exist in the original.

Communicative translation:

Communicative translation attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original
in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to
the reader.

There are other methods of translation also. Service translation is a translation from one’s
language of habitual use into another language. The term is not widely used but as the
practice is necessary in most countries, a term is required.

Plain prose translation of poems and poetic drama initiated by E.V.Rieu for Penguin books.
Usually stanzas become paragraphs, prose punctuation is introduced, original metaphors
and source language culture is retained, whilst no sound effects are reproduced. The reader
can appreciate the sense of the work without experiencing equivalent effect. Plain prose translation is often published in parallel with its original to which, after a careful word-for-word comparison, they provide ready and full access.

Information translation. This conveys all the information in a non-literary text some times rearranged in a more logical form of a paraphrase.

Cognitive translation reproduces the information in a source language text converting the source language grammar to its normal target language transpositions, normally reducing any figurative to literal language.

Academic translation. This type of translation, practised in some British Universities, reduces an original text to an ‘elegant’ idiomatic educated target language version which follows a literary register. It irons out the expressiveness of a writer with modish colloquialisms.

Literal translation is the first step in translation, and a good translator abandons a literal version only when it is plainly inexact or, in the case of a vocative or informative text, badly written. A good translator will always do his best to avoid translating word for word. Recreative translation is translating the thought behind the words, sometimes between the words, or translating the sub-text, is a procedure which some translation teachers regard as the heart of the central issue of translation. But the truth is the opposite. Interpret the sense, not the words.

J.C. Catford defines some broad types of translation in terms of the extent, level and rank of translation. *

*A linguistic Theory of Translation. (An essay in applied Linguistics) O.U.P Oxford 1965*
Full vs partial translation.

This distinction relates to the extent, in a syntagmatic sense, of source language text which is submitted to the translation process. By text we mean any stretch of language, spoken or written, which is under discussion. According to the circumstances a text may thus be a whole library of books, a single volume, a chapter, a paragraph, a sentence, a cause.... Etc. It may also be a fragment not coextensive with any formal literary or linguistic unit.

In a full translation the entire text is submitted to the translation process; that is, every part of the source language text is replaced by target language text material.

In a partial translation, some part or parts of the source language text are left untranslated; they are simply transferred to and incorporated in the target language text.

In literary translation it is not uncommon for some source language lexical items to be treated in this way, either because they are regarded as ‘Untranslatable’ or for the deliberate purpose of introducing ‘local colour’ into the target language text. This process of transferring source language lexical items into a target language text is more complex than appears at first sight, and it is only approximately true to say that they remain ‘untranslated’.

The distinction between full and partial translation is hardly a (linguistically) technical one.

Total vs. Restricted translation: This distinction relates to the levels of language involved in translation.

By total translation we mean what is most usually meant by translation. That is, translation in which all levels of the source language text are replaced by target language material. Strictly speaking, total translation is a misleading term, since, though total replacement is
involved it is not replacement by equivalents at all levels.

In total translation source language grammar and lexis are replaced by equivalent target language grammar and lexis. This replacement entails the replacement of source language phonology/graphology by target language phonology/graphology, but this is not normally replacement by target language equivalents, hence there is no translation, at this level. Total translation may best be defined as: replacement of source language grammar and lexis by equivalent target language grammar and lexis with consequential replacement of source language phonology/graphology by (non-equivalent) target language phonology/graphology.

By restricted translation Catford means: replacement of source language text material by equivalent target language textual material, at only one level, that is translation performed only at the phonological or at the graphological level, or at only one of the two levels of grammar and lexis.

Rank of translation: A third type of differentiation in translation relates to the rank in a grammatical hierarchy, at which translation equivalence is established.

In normal total translation the grammatical units between which translation equivalences are set up may be at any rank, and in a long text the ranks at which translation equivalence occur are constantly changing; at one point, the equivalence is sentence-to-sentence, at another, group to group, at another, word-to-word etc., not to mention formally 'shifted' or skewed equivalences.

It is possible, however to make a translation which is total but in which the selection of target language equivalents is deliberately confined to one rank (or a few ranks low in the
rank scale) in the hierarchy of grammatical units. We may call this rank-bound translation. The cruder attempts at machine translation are rank-bound in this sense, usually at word or morpheme rank. That is, they set up word-to-word or morpheme to morpheme equivalences, but not equivalences between high-rank such as the group, clause or sentence. In contrast with this, normal total translation in which equivalences shift freely up and down the rank scale may be termed unbounded translation.

In rank-bound translation, an attempt is made always to select target language equivalents at the same rank.

A free translation is always unbounded—equivalents shunt up and down the rank scale, but tend to be at the higher ranks—some times between larger units than the sentence. Word-for-word translation generally means what it says; i.e., essentially rank-bound at word rank. Literal translation lies between these extremes; it may start from a word-for-word translation, but make changes in conformity with target language grammar. One notable point is that literal translation like word-for-word, tends to remain lexically word-for-word i.e., to use the highest probability lexical equivalence for each lexical item. Lexical adaptation to target language collocational or idiomatic requirements seems to be characteristic of free translation, as in this example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source language text</th>
<th>It's raining cats and dogs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>word-for-word</td>
<td>adu mañe baruttide bekkugalu mattu näyigalu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literal</td>
<td>näyi bekkugalu mañe baruttive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free</td>
<td>mañe jöragi baruttide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Casagrade (1954) distinguishes four ‘ends’ of translation:

1) Pragmatic translation: It refers to the translation of a message with an interest in accuracy of the information that was meant to be conveyed in the source language form. Translator would have no concern other than getting the information across in the second language as in the translation of technical documents.

2) Aesthetical-poetic translation: It is a translation in which the translator takes into account the effect, emotion and feeling of an original language version, the aesthetic form, as in the translation of a sonnet, heroic couplet or a dramatic monologue, used by the original author as well as any information in the message.

3) Ethnographic translation: its purpose is to explicate the cultural context of the source and the second language versions. With this as their goal, translators have to be sensitive to the way words are used. (Ex. ‘yes’ as against ‘yea’ in America) and must know how the words fit into the cultures that use the source and target languages.

4) Linguistic translation: is concerned with equivalent meanings of the constituent morphemes of the second language and with grammatical form.

Savory (1959) recognizes and categorizes translation as:

1) Perfect translation: Translation of all purely informative statement such as are encountered by the traveller or are used by the advertiser comes under this category. The perfection of the translation is a result of the nature of the original message which is direct, unemotional and is made in plain words to which no intense associations are attached.
2) Adequate translation: is which is so satisfactorily in practice that a grumble at words and phrases here and there may be dismissed as a quibble. All translations made for the general reader who may use them without giving a thought to the fact that what he is reading was not originally written in his own language, fall into this category. Both in the original and in the translation the matter is more important than the manner. In most instances of this kind the readers may know little or nothing of the language of the original. This includes the translation of literature made by scholars for serious students and for all earnest readers who seek something more than mere entertainment.

3) Composite translation: It includes the translation of prose into prose, of poetry into prose, and of poetry into poetry. i.e., all translations of literature come under this. The translator neglecting the commercial value of the translation, spends a very long time on his work. A great quantity of translation is made, printed and published for the only reason that the translator has enjoyed the reading of some passage or poem, has felt the urge to try to render or express it in another language he knew. He just wishes to share his pleasure with others.

4) Scientific and technical translation: Here the first importance is to the matter. The manner is of no significance whatever. This type of translation is made solely for the intrinsic importance of the original work.

Vinay and Darbelnet: Depending on the nature of the difficulty, encountered Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), of Canadian translation Bureau, distinguished seven different methods of translation.
1. Word for word: example; over charge = surcharge

2. Copy: that is transposition of the construction in one language into the other. Ex. cold war: शिताल समारा

3. Loan: that is the incorporation in the language of a word taken from another language. Ex: miles 'maili'

4. Transposition: This is restitution of one part of a speech by another. Ex. Translating traduction

5. Modulation: this is taking account of difference in approach from one language into the other ex: sky scraper: gagana chumbi.

6. Equivalence: This is the translation of a concept by a similar concept; 'cock and bull stores' as kakamma gubbaamma kathe.

7. Adaptation: This is the restitution of a situation unknown to the target language by reference to an analogous situation; ex: quack; alalekai pandita

Catford (1965) has distinguished some broad categories of translation in terms of the extent, level and the ranks of translation.

1) Depending on the extent of source language text submitted to the translation process, translation can be full or partial.

2) Depending on the levels of language involved in translation, it can be total or restricted.

3) Depending on the rank in grammatical hierarchy, at which translation equivalence is established, translation can be rank-bound or rank-free.

Jakobson (1974) distinguished three types of translation;
1) Intralingual translation or rewording, that is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs in the same language.

2) Interlingual translation or translation proper, that is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of a different language.

3) Translation of the verbal signs by means of signs of non-verbal sign systems.

Nida: According to Nida (1974), there are two types based on the quality of translation, 1) formal correspondence; that is translation in which the features of the form of the source language text have been mechanically reproduced in the target language. 2) Dynamic equivalence: i.e., a translation in which the message of the original text has been so transported into the target language that the response of the receptors is essentially like that of the original receptors.

Lefevere (1975), classifies literary translation into six types;

1) Phonemic translation: It is a translation in which the translator has tried to capture the sound of the original at the expense of many of its other features.

2) Literal translation: It is a translation in which meaning of the source language text is considered most important and hence done on a principle of semantic equivalence.

3) Translation of verse into prose: This is the translation of one form into another.

4) Metrical translation: Translation preserves the meter of the source language text. It should be noted here, that this is possible only when the two languages have shared meters.

5) Rhyme translation: It is a translation in which it is thought that only rhyming verse in
the target language will do justice to the poetic value of the source language text.

6) Translation of verse into verse: It is a retention of the literary form of the source language text into the target language text.

House: considering the relation of the target language text both to the translator and to the translation receiver, House, (1977) classifies two types of translation.

1) Overt translation: In this translation the receiving reader knows that the text is a translation and recognizes that it is bound to the course culture.

2) Covert translation: All commercial, scientific and diplomatic translation come under this category. There is no difference between the source language text and target language text for the source language text is not bound to a specific culture. It is as if there were a single text in two language.

Peter Newmark: (1979) distinguishes eleven types of translation:

1) Communicative translation: it seeks to achieve the same effect on the reader of the source language and target language. Its quality can sometimes be even better than that of the original.

2) Semantic translation: It seeks to restore the exact meaning of the original. It follows the syntax and the vocabulary of the source to the point where they slightly distort, without, however, violating the standards of the target language text. Its quality may be lower than that of the original.

3) Information translation: It reproduces the referential contents but not the style nor the form. It extends from paraphrase to summary.
4) Formal translation: It reproduces the form without the contents.

5) Full prose translation: it reproduces the form, with out the formal sound effect, that accompanies the original text.

6) Inter linear translation: It is a word-for-word translation which takes no account of the context and preserves the word sequence of the source language.

7) Literal translation: It is a translation of all the words of the source text taking no account of the context but respecting the syntactic structure of the translation.

8) Stylistic translation: It is the rendering of the original which involves working at a high level of elegance in the target language.

9) Analytical translation: It transposes the structures and gives only the most normal meanings of the lexicon. Language learning is the first stage of a semantic translation.

10) Imitation: It is a partial translation.

11) Service translation: translation in what is for the translator an unusual language.

Literary translation: is much more complex and challenging than any other translation. Every literary text is linked to the literary and cultural tradition of the language in which it is written. Sentences in it are very intimately bound up with the very nature of the language and have their roots deep in the life and habits of the people. Words are very rich in their connotative meaning. In addition to the explicit meaning, a literary text contains implicit and suggested meaning, which is equally important. The translator has to be prepared for every possible meaning.

A literary translator has his responsibility both to his author and to his readers. On the
other hand, he has to be faithful to the original with respect to its form, meaning and style and spirit. He has to make sure that his translation is in conformity with the linguistic and literary tradition of the target language. Thus the responsibility of the translator working with a literary text is in many ways greater than that of any other translator. He seems as an agent through whom great works of literature pass through the linguistic and cultural barriers.

2.2.0 PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION

Because literature consists of conventional symbols, there exists in literature the problem of translation which does not exist in the other arts. When one seeks to make a work of literature available to a wider audience than that composed of only the native speakers of the language in which the work was written, the process of translation must be restored to and in the process a great deal of the work's original character is lost.

In a poem there are 1) sounds 2) the dictionary meanings of the words 3) the connotations of the words - The manifold associations that they evoke (sensory, intellectual and emotional) in the minds of the readers. The sounds are the least important of the three, and many a great poem as sheer sound is hardly ever pleasing. The finding of like dictionary meanings is usually a simple matter and when there is a word that has no rough equivalent in the other language, it may be simply retained in the original language. (for example, the Sanskrit word Dharma or yoga is retained in English translation of Sanskrit works). As for the associations that hover about a word, they may vary from one language to another, so that if a work translated rather literally, the associative values of the words are lost. Thus 'Kambi ķiju' in Kannada, if translated into English, literally, may mean 'cut the wire' though it is

* Encyclopedia Britanica Vol., 25 PP 698
literally correct, it is an unfaithful translation because it actually means 'take to heels'. Words can often be found in the second language that have a roughly equivalent associative value to the original, but these will usually not provide a literal translation; thus the translator is faced with the dilemma of being able to provide the literal meaning translation or a translation that renders the spirit or 'feel' of the original, but not both.

The task of the translator is the same whether the material is oral or written, but of course, translation between written text allows more time for stylistic adjustments and technical expertise. The main problems have been recognized since antiquity and were expressed by St.Jomes, translator of the famed Latin Bible, the Vulgate, form the Hebrew and Greek originals. Semantically, these problems relate to the adjustment of the literal and the literary translation of each word, as far as his is possible, and the production of a whole sentence or even a whole text that conveys as much of the meaning of the original as can be managed. These problems and conflicts arise because of factors already noticed in the use and functioning of language; languages do not operate in isolation but within and as a part of cultures, and cultures differ from each other in various ways, even between the languages of communities whose cultures are fairly closely allied, there is by no means a one-to-one relation of exact lexical equivalence between the items of their vocabularies.

In their lexical meanings, words acquire various overtones and associations that are not shared by the nearest corresponding words in other languages; this may vitiate a literal translation. The English author and theologian Roland Knox has pointed to the historical connections of the Greek 'Skandalon' "Stumbling block, trap, or snare" inadequately rendered by "offence", its usual New Testament translation. In modern times translators of the Bible into the languages of peoples culturally remote from Europe are well aware of the
difficulties of finding a lexical equivalent for ‘lamb’, when the intended readers, even if they have seen sheep and lambs, have no tradition of blood sacrifice for expiation nor long-hallowed associations of lambs with lovableness, innocence and apparent helplessness. The English word uncle has, for various reasons, a cozy and slightly comic set of associations. The Latin poet Virgil uses the words ‘Avunvulus Hector’ in a solemn heroic passage of the Aenied (Book III, line 343); to translate this by Uncle Hector gives us an entirely unsuitable flavour to the text.

The translation of poetry, especially into poetry, presents very special difficulties, and the better the original poem, the harder the translator’s task. This is because poetry is, in the first instance, carefully contrived to express exactly what the poet wants to say. Second, to achieve this end, the poet calls forth all the resources of the language in which he is writing, matching the choice or words, the order of words and grammatical constructions, as well as phonological features peculiar to the language in meter, perhaps supplemented by rhyme, assonance and alliteration. The available resources differ from language to language; English and German rely on stress-marked meters, but Latin and Greek used quantitative meters, contrasting long and short syllables, while French places approximately equal stress and length on each syllable. The translator must try to match the stylistic exploitation of the particular resources in the original language with comparable resources from his own. Because lexical grammatical and metrical considerations are all interrelated and interwoven in poetry, a satisfactory literary translation is usually very far from a literal word for word rendering. The more the poet relies on language form, the more embedded his verses are in that particular language, and the harder they are to translate adequately. This is especially true with lyrical poetry in several languages, with its wordplay, complex rhymes
and frequent assonances.

At the other end of the translator's spectrum, technical prose dealing with internationally agreed scientific subjects is probably the easiest type of material to translate; because cultural unification (in this respect), lexical correspondences, and stylistic similarities already exist in this type of usage in the languages most commonly involved, to a higher degree than in other fields of discourse.

Significantly, it is this last aspect of translation to which mechanical and computerized techniques are being applied with some prospects of limited success. Machine translation, whereby, ultimately, a text in one language could be fed into a machine to produce an accurate translation in another language without further human intervention, has been largely concentrated on the language of science and technology, with its restricted vocabulary and overall likeness of style, for both linguistic and economic reasons. Attempts at machine translation of literature have been made, but success in this field, especially in the translation of poetry, seems very remote at present.

Translation on the whole is an art, not a science. Guidance can be given and general principles can be taught, but after that it must be left to the individual's own feeling for the two languages concerned. Almost inevitably, in a translation of a work of literature something of the author's original intent must be lost; in those cases in which the translation is said to be a better work than the original, an opinion sometimes expressed about the English writer Edward Fitzgerald's "Translation" of *The Rubaiyat* of Omar Khayyam one is dealing with a new, though derived work, not just a translation. The Italian epigram remains justified; 'Traduttore traditore' "the translator is a traitor".
Catford says, in his concluding chapter of 'A linguistic theory of Translation' that the situational features of text can be distinguished in terms of linguistic relevance and functional relevance. For translation equivalence to occur, both source language and target language text must be relatable to the functionally relevant features of the situation. A decision, in any particular case, as to what is fundamentally relevant in this sense must in our present state of knowledge remain to some extent a matter of opinion. The total co-text will supply information which the translator will use in coming to a decision, but it is difficult to define functional relevance in general terms.

Translation fails— or untranslatability occurs— when it is impossible to build functionally relevant features of the situation into the contextual meaning of the target language text. Broadly speaking, the cases where this happens fall into two categories. Those where the difficulty is linguistic and those where it is cultural.

In linguistic untranslatability the functionally relevant features include some which are in fact formal features of the language of the source language text. If the target language has no formally corresponding feature, the text, or the item, is untranslatable.

Linguistic untranslatability occurs typically in cases where an ambiguity peculiar to the source language text is a functionally relative feature — ex. in source language puns. Ambiguities arise from two main sources, i) shared exponentence of two or more source language grammatical or lexical items, ii) polysomy of a source language item with no corresponding target language polysomy.

By shared exponentence we mean those cases where two or more distinct grammatical or lexical items are expounded in one and the same phonological or graphological form.
A grammatical example in English is the shared exponence of the two distinct morphemes’ (nominal) plural and (verbal) third person singular present, both of which are frequently expounded graphologically by -s, as in cats. In most cases, there is no ambiguity since the co-text indicates clearly which item is being expounded, and the translation equivalent is then not in doubt. But cases of ambiguity can arise, an example is ‘Time flies’. If this piece of text occurred in a normal conversation there would be no translation problem. The co-text could show whether the contextual meaning was, ‘how quickly time passes’ or something like ‘Make observations on the speed of flies’, and the appropriate translation equivalent would be obvious. But when the whole point of the text is to provide an example of ambiguity as it is in this paragraph, then translation is virtually impossible.

The word may have two or more meanings (or two or more items have the same exponent) and this may result in ambiguity. For example the word ‘bank’; it is the graphological exponent of two distinct lexical items in English. The second is polysomy one single item having more than one meaning. Strictly speaking, the term polysomy is misleading. It is not a case of one item having several meanings, but of one item having a wide range of specific situational features. In any given situation, only one out of this wide range of potentially, or linguistically, relevant features is functionally relevant.

In addition to ambiguity, due to shared exponence or to polysomy, another kind of linguistic untranslatability can occur. In this case it is not polysomy, but rather what might be called oligosemy which is the cause (restricted range of meaning).

* Considering total translation as a myth, it can be said that all translation problems arise out of establishing equivalence between the source text and the target text, and that all

translation types involve i) loss of meaning, ii) addition of meaning, iii) skewing of meaning.

The problem is to examine and understand why, where and how equivalence may be established. Translation process involves decoding and recoding the message which is shaped by the cultural factors.

In the process of translation, an attempt is made to preserve as far as possible, the invariant information with respect to the given system of reference. The translation of even single word involves problems of the semantic range and distribution of that term in the language, the syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships the word has with the other terms in the language, the social context of its use and the function it has at the level of discourse. Thus, the equivalence will have to be established on the linguistic level (on the levels of lexis and grammar), stylistic level and pragmatic level.

The task of the translator becomes not merely to faithfully translate but to interpret the text as well. The literary text may often belong to a period remote in time so that the significance of the text in its context may be totally lost. The problem becomes quite acute particularly in the case of poetry. The poem is an extremely complex artifice in which sounds, words, images etc., interact in forward and backward directions. Reading poetry itself is an act of creative interpretation. Re-encoding poetry itself is an act of creative interpretation. Re-encoding a poem in another language then becomes an act of ‘creative transposition’ in Jacobson’s words. The translator is engaged in the task of transposing of an alien aesthetic structure and personality into the key of his own personality and culture.

The translator has to consider the function of the text and how it is realized through the
devices including the names, choices of language, styles, tones adopted, shifts in the point of view etc. He has to establish equivalences having at least approximately the same function in the target language. For example, he may not be able to handle the text by a sentence by sentence translation. The sentences may not be translated at their face value but have to be interpreted first as component units in a complex overall structure and then an attempt has to be made at positing equivalences to the component units at the sentential level. Otherwise the translator may end up with either a mistranslation or a superficial rendering. He has to apprehend the functional value of each sentence, each device in relation to the whole work in the source language and then find in the target language equivalent sentences which will adequately render that function.

All the problems of translation arise because of the non coincidences, differing environments, different cultures and different individualities.

The problem may be broadly classified into two types— external and internal. The problems associated with language and culture may be considered external problems and the individuality related problems may be called internal problems. The latter problems shall be ignored as inconsequential.

The external problems may arise due to the syntagmatic and paradigmatic choices the translator has.

The basic and fundamental problem of translation lies in the level of comprehension of the source language text as an ordinary reader does, and then the expression of it in the target language. A student of literature or translation in the process of learning may be pardoned for his faulty comprehension or poor ability to express it in the target language. But a poet
translator of notable stature, whose translation get published, has no excuse. He cannot afford to make mistakes, at least at the comprehension level. Here are a couple of examples to show how the source text is wrongly comprehended.

The source text reads: ‘The prince ... has quite gone to dogs.

This is translated by D. Javeregowda, as:

‘Nāyīgala mēle haṇa pōlu māṭutiddāre. ’

In the Kannada rendering of the Adventures of Huckleberry Finn by K.S.Narasimha Swamy, the name of Huck’s guardian ‘Widow Douglas’ has been translated as ‘Vidhave’. The first name in the binomial nomenclature is mistaken to be an adjective.

Ka. Vem. Rajagopal, a noted Kannadawriter, has translated John Donne’s sonnet, ‘Death, be not proud’ without comprehending the source poem, as follows.

....

இங்கு பயிற்சியாளர் பாட்டு எஸ்தா ஆடிடு நோடு

சயபெசா பாசா ஸ்வே, நன்னனேந்து கமலாதிர் நினு

....

The lines three and four of the original make an embedded clause. The sentence is an apostrophe addressing poor death. ‘for’ is used as a conjunction meaning ‘because’. This is a logical connector to link lines one and two with three and four. The paraphrases of these lines in the original is: those people whom you think, you overthrow actually do not die. But the translator has failed to follow this. The other lines of the translation are also badly done, but this is the worst of all. The translator has failed to observe any cohesion between the

---

2. Mark Twain’s The adventures of Huckleberry Finn. Trans K.S. Narasimha Swamy, Sudarshana Prakashana, Tiptur.
lines. ‘Die not poor death’ has been taken in isolation. He understood it as, ‘let the death not die’. Obviously, the previous line also loses its meaning * as it is only a subordinate clause.

Such problems in comprehension may be due to the involved syntactic structures that overflow to the next line, or verbless clauses (in other poems) dominating the poem.

The other area of problem is finding equivalent terms. Though there is actually nothing like a ‘synonym’, because no word can be the exact synonym of the other, dictionaries and thesaurus give a list of them. Each word differs from its ‘synonym’ in terms of intensity, or magnitude or some such quality. When an exactly equal meaning word is not available within the lexis of a language, it becomes more difficult to find one in a different language. Certain words are culture bound and they can be used only as ‘loan words’ in the target language due to the unavailability of an equivalent term.

Certain idioms and phrases and proverbs are characteristic of a particular language. Some idioms may be commonly found in both in languages like ‘lion’s share’ — ‘simha pālu’, ‘bird’s-eye-view’ — ‘pakṣhi nōṭa’. But certain terms may not. In such cases, the method of assimilation has to be adopted. For example, ‘Achilles’ heel’ may be translated as ‘Duryōdhanaśa tode’, ‘Horn of plenty’ as ‘Akasaya pātre’. Such problems that come under the syntagmatic choices like cultural words, allusions, sound effects, proper names, and puns shall be discussed in the coming chapters. But, it is necessary to observe the internal structure of Kannada syntax and how it differs from the English syntax, which shall be discussed in the next chapter.

*Nanna Pāḍige Nānu - Kannada Sangha, Christ College, Bangalore, 1987*
LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF KANNADA

2.3. Free_Word_Order

The word order in English is almost rigid, whereas in Kannada it is freer. Kannada has a fairly rich system of surface case markers or post positions while English is poorly equipped. No matter in which position in the linear order of a sentence the object, in Kannada, is occupied, it is generally recognisable as such from the case markers that accompanies it. This is not generally possible with respect to the object in a sentence in English. In English the object has to be recognised from the more or less fixed position it occupies in a sentence.

It is usually said that the word order in Indian languages is largely a matter os stylistic choice. So, let us see how free is the ‘free word order’ in kannada. The word order is clearly an aspect of the surface structure of the syntax of languages. Until recently, within the transformational generative approach, there was not much interest in syntactic phenomena whose domain was the surface structure. Chomsky’s ‘Aspects of the Theory of Syntax’ postulated that deep structures give all the information required for determining the meaning of the sentences. In much of the work that was done within the framework of this model, the focus was primarily on the matters relating to the postulation of deep structures and to the formulation of transformational rules which mapped deep structures on the surface structures.

Consequently, matters relating to surface structure tended to receive inadequate attention.

But more recent formulations of the transformational generative model of syntax by chomsky*

* The newly developed G.B. Syntax by Chomsky in 1993 was not familiar when this was written.
and others have led to a revival of interest in surface structures. The so-called ‘extended standard theory’ of Chomsky postulates that surface structures contribute in a definite way to semantic interpretation. In the most recent formulation of the ‘extended standard theory’, Chomsky has suggested that perhaps all semantic information is determined by a somewhat enriched notion of surface structure. The free word order in Kannada has to be considered an integral and important aspect of its syntax because word order in Kannada is not simply a matter of aesthetic choice, if that is what we mean when we refer to the free word order in a matter of stylistic choice.

To see how free is the word order in the language, it seeks to determine what the formal constraints of word are, since it is obvious that there are limits beyond which word order is not free in Kannada.

Secondly, it is necessary to determine the functional correlates of word order. We should try to find out the extent possible how exactly this is done by word order. Let us take up the formal aspect. One of the earliest attempts to deal with free word order within the transformational model is to be found in Ross (1967). It has been noted in this study that in languages such as Latin, Russian and Czeh the word order of major constituents within a clause is free within certain limits. Ross suggested that to handle such cases of word order, we need in the grammar of these languages a certain kind of rule that he calls ‘the scrambling rule’. He further suggests that the scrambling rule must be placed in component of the grammar separate from the transformational component.

This is because the scrambling rule is in some respects unlike other transformational rules. Unlike the transformational rule, a scrambling rule can apply an indefinite number of times
to its own output;

Rāma | tana magalīge | Bēngāḷorīnda | ondu rēshime | śīreyannu kalūhisidānu
1    2            3           4            5

This means, 'Rama sent his daughter a silk sari from Bangalore'. The major constituents of the sentence are numbered. Now these major constituents except the one, numbered (5) can be scrambled freely as:

a) 1 3 2 4 5

b) 1 4 2 3 5

c) 2 1 3 4 5

d) 2 4 1 3 5 . . .

All the scrambling possibilities are not exhaustively given here. The only major constituent that does not participate in the scrambling is the constituent numbered (5). Notice that here the output of the rule becomes its input for the next application. Since the rules belonging to the transformational component proper do not permit this, Ross suggested the setting up of a separate component in the grammar called the stylistic component for rules of this kind.

Ross has also noted an important constraint on scrambling in the languages he was dealing with. He observes that the major constituents in a sentence are scrambled, subject to the restriction that they remain in the same clause. That is, if a sentence has more than one clause, say, S2, S2, S3, it is not possible to scramble any element which originates in S1 out of S1, into S2 or S3. The same holds good for the constituents which originate in S2 or S3 as well. This constraint holds good in Kannada also.
S1 (Rāmanu avanā gādiyannu nanage kottare)
     1  2  3  4

S2 (nānu nimma jotevalli pravāsakke baruttēne)
     5  6  7  8

(If Rama gives me his vehicle, I will come with you to the picnic)

The brackets that have been drawn there are not really correct since the entire subordinante clause S1 is a constituent of S2, but this is not crucial for the point under consideration.

It is possible to scramble the above sentences as follows:

a)  5 6 7 (1 2 3 4) 8
b)  6 5 7 (1 2 3 4) 8
c)  5 6 (1 2 3 4) 7 8

It is, of course, possible to scrambling the major constituents S1 in various ways, so long as they are not scrambled out of S1. Thus for example, it cannot be scrambled in any of the following ways:

a)  *5 1 2 6 7 3 4 8
b)  *1 2 5 6 7 3 4 8...

The reason why the strings indicated in the above examples are not possible is that in each of them the constituents of S1 are scrambled out of S1. This constraint is not violated in sentences in the previous set. The entire clause S1 is one of the major constituents of the sentence of which 5, 6, 7 and 8 are the other constituents.

Therefore, Ross’ observations that the major constituents of a sentence are scrambled sub-
ject to the constraint that must remain in the same clause, is valid for Kannada as well.

The advantages and disadvantages of the malliability of the target language syntax in the process of translation may be determined, keeping this in view.

2.3.1 Personal Pronouns.

Personal pronouns in Kannada fall in to two categories;

1) Forms which are independent morphemes. In this category first and second person pronouns are to be included. These forms are not susceptible to gender.

For example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I person</td>
<td>nānu</td>
<td>nāvu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II person</td>
<td>nīnu</td>
<td>nīvu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Forms which are the combination of demonstrative base plus pronominal suffix susceptible to gender. In this category, third person forms are to be included.

For example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>(sg) Avanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>(sg) Avālū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuter</td>
<td>(sg) adu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above forms of personal pronouns are declined like other nouns. The fundamental
difference between the first and the second person forms and the third person forms is that
the former are not susceptible to gender, while the latter are susceptible.

The first and second person forms given by our old grammarians are nān—nām; nīn—
nīm. In the first person plural we find an — ‘inclusive and exclusive’ feature that has not
been observed by any grammarian. In old Kannada, the forms belonging to these categories
are found. We have evidence to show that the two forms were used. The first person plural
inclusive pronoun was nam and exclusive pronoun was an.

The second person singular and plural forms were nin and nim respectively in old and are
ninu and nivu in modern Kannada.

The third person forms which are susceptible to gender have three forms in singular repre-
senting each of the masculine, feminine and neuter genders.

avanu — he (that he)

avalu — she (that she)

adu — it (that it)

The above pronouns show distance while the following pronouns indicate the proximity.

Ivanu — he (this he)

Ivalu — she (this she)

idu — it (this it)

Keshiraja, the greatest grammarian of Kannada, gives the third set of forms of intermediary
meaning:
uvanu — he
uvalu — she
udu — it

these words show the distance in between ‘this and ‘that’. But no such usage has been found in any of the writings unearthed so far. In the third person plural, we have only two categories, as against three in the singular. In the plural the distinction between human and non-human forms is made.

All human forms viz., Masculine and feminine form human plural and the rest non-human plural.

avaru — they (animate, distant)
avu — they (inanimate, distant)
ivaru — they (animate, proximate)
ivu — they (inanimate, proximate)

so far so good, but let us observe the following form of pronoun which indicates masculine and feminine genders, only in singular form, which is not to be found in English.

Here also there are two sets denoting distance and proximity.

āta — he īta — he
āke — she īke — she

Giving a closer look at the above mentioned forms of pronouns, like, ake, uke and ike, the composition of these forms can be explained. As in the case of other third person forms, a,
I and u perform the function of demonstratives.

Demonstrative (D1) + ke = ęke

Demonstrative (D2) + ke = ąke

But the 'ke' component may have to be left unexplained.

All other Indian languages, like Kannada use plural to show respect, though the person in question is in the singular form. A person is addressed to in a singular form if respect is not intended. The pronouns ata, ita, ake, ike, are used to show a little more respect than the singular pronoun show and a little less respect than the plural pronoun command.

2.3.2 Cases

The head of the nominal is always in the nominative case. It may have qualifying nouns in other cases, but the whole nominal phrase taking the case of the head noun, will form the subject;

ůrige bandavalu — she who has come to the village

ůrige barufale — will come for water

Here, 'bandavalu' is the head noun in moninative case. Its qualifier urige is dative. But the syntactic unit 'ůrige bandavalu' when taken as a subject is in the nominative.

The direct object is in the accusative case. Pronouns and the plural forming nouns ending in -a always take the accusative case suffix and the rest may or may not.

avanu hođeda — He beat (him)

huđuganannu kareda — (he) called the boy
Special use of the dative

The dative in addition to its normal use, also performs the following functions:

Nanage īju baruttade (nam)
Nanage ījalu (ijuvudakke) baruttade (dative)

Dative distinguished from accusative;

avanu hođedā (accusative)
avanige hođedā (dative)

Dative or instrumental

īūrinda āūrigē hattu mailu (instrumental)

īūrigū āūrigū hattu mailu (dative)

Dative is used in comparative degree with or without the particle ‘inta’ suffixed to the case:

avaniginta īvanu hiriya

When a noun or a pronoun is used as the subject of a verb it is said to be in the nominative case. When the noun or the pronoun is used as the object of a verb, it is said to be in the Accusative case. The noun that is changed to show the ownership or possession of something, is said to be in the possessive (or genetive) case. A noun used to name a person or thing addressed is in the vocative case. The noun in the direct object’s position is called the Dative case.

These cases have equivalent terms in Kannada grammar:

Nominative case — prathamā vibhakti — (u) - kartru kāraka
Accusative case — dwitiya — (annu) — karma karaka

Instrumental case — tritiya — (inda) —

Dative case — chaturti — (-ge)

Possessive case — sasti — (-a)

Though it is grammatical to use the first and the second (Nominative and Accusative) case endings, it is often not used in the colloquial language, as the conjunction ‘that’ is not used in the colloquial English. This is because it becomes very redundant and seems unnecessary.

ex. 7 (pustaka(vu) chennāgide

The prepositions used in English syntax take the post positions in Kannada.

The adjectives in English inflect for degrees. There are adjective inflections in Kannada, but they are not as systematic as in English.

Sanskrit has four types of inflections for degrees

a) the addition of ‘tara’ and ‘tama’ morphemes: ex: Uttama Uttama tara, uttama tama. b) by adding prefixes like, ‘ati’ and ‘sarva’, a superlative can be formed ex: ati + uttama atyuttama; sarva + uttama = sarvottama. c) superlatives can also be formed by the combination of an adjective and a prefix to anadjective: ex: śrēṣṭha + ati + śrēṣṭha śrēṣṭhatiśrēṣṭha d) by the repetition of the adjectives also an adjective in the superlative can be formed.

ex : uttama + uttama = uttamōttama

Since Kannada has been greatly influenced by Sanskrit, and has borrowed a lot from sanskrit,
all these four types of inflections are adopted in Kannada also.

Besides, the addition of the suffix ‘kintalu’ also makes an adjective inflection. This typically Kannada inflection brings it to the comparative degree. By adding prefixes like ‘innū, mattū’; ‘innāṣṭu’, ‘mattaṣṭu’ an adjective can be inflected for comparative degree.

2.3.3 Word Order:

We have already seen that the word order in Kannada is rather unrestricted. In qualifying phrases, the prepositional qualifiers can only precede the head noun, but not follow. The restriction stands in any type of sentences. The head noun can occur in any place in a sentence preceded by these items, if any. In other cases, we have seen the various qualifiers having unrestricted occurrence. But the immediate constituents are as close together as possible. The S, O, V, adverb and clauses can occur in any order in a sentence. Their qualifiers if any, precede them.

Muraṇiyav Ravige hosadāda pustakavannu kōdisidānu

1 2 3 4

this may be represented in these following orders;

2 1 3 4, 3 2 1 4, 3 1 2 4, 2 3 1 4 and 1 3 2 4

Thus we see a sort of freedom of occurrence of various items in a sentence.

2.3.4 Passive:

Though the syntax of Kannada permits the passive construction, they are not usually used. They look very unnatural and outlandish. So, usually a sentence with a passive construction in English is translated into Kannada in its non-passive form.
for example, The job was done

may be translated as:

Kelasa mādalpaṭṭitu (passive)

There is another way of expressing this passive:

Kelasa maḍalḥyitu

this is more frequently used, than the previous example. but the following translation is the most natural construction in Kannada, though the voice is changed:

Kelasa māḍide

Though we may find the verbless clauses, and nominal groups dominating the whole poetry, there cannot be a grammatical sentence in the normal English prose. But in Kannada, most of the stative verbs are deleted as redundant, in the sentence structure.

ex., idu pustaka — This book (this is a book)

avaru obba vidyarthi — he a student (he is a student)

So while translating from English, one need not use the stative verbs where it is normally not used. Such is the case in the use of articles also.

Kannada does not have articles. If the noun is in the singular form, its case ending also indicates its singularity and hence the necessity of articles does not arise. So, ‘This is a book’ need not be translated as, ‘idu ondu pustakavagide’ ‘idu pustaka’ is the normally used form.
CHAPTER TWO
In Kannada, sentences may be broadly classified into two types:

1. That which contains two noun phrases — the equative types:
   
   ex. Rāmu mēstru (Ram teacher)  

   1 2 1 2

   this pattern consists of two places and the essential constituents are noun phrases one as a subject and the other used as a complement.

2. That which contains a noun phrase and a verb phrase

   ex: Bassu bantu (Bus came)  

   1 2 1 2

The second type of sentences (NP + VP) may be further divided into two kinds:

1. That in which the verb phrase has the same person gender and number as the subject noun phrase has (NP + VP-1)

   ex: a va nu hāduttā ne III person, masculine singular  

   I ḍu le III person feminine singular  

   ru re III person plural masculine/feminine

   ii) That in which the VP does not agree with the subject NP in person gender, number (NP + VP -2)

   ex: Nanage jwara bandide (to me fever has come)

   In this sentence, the verb ‘bandide’ is III person neuter gender, singular number, thus agreeing with jwara and not with subject ‘nanage’ which is I personal pronoun.
Seven patterns can be recognised in the NP + VP (1) type.

1. Pattern with a simple intransitive phrase. The essential constituents are NP (s) and Vi

   ex: Sūrya mūlūgida (Sun set)

   1 2 1 2

2. Patterns with the verbs of ‘iru’ type, which contain adverbs of manner or place.

   ex: Magu muddāgi ide (child lovely is)
       magu toṭilalli ide (child in cradle is)

   These patterns consist of three places and the essential constituents are NP (S), adv of M/P and Vi

3. Patterns with verbs ‘agu’ type: this pattern has three essential constituents -

   NP (S) + NP (C) + Vi

   ex: Rāju huccha āda (Raju mad became)

   1 2 3 1 2 3

4) Patterns with simple transitive verbal, the VP containing a NP (O) with or without accusative suffix and a verbal. This pattern has three places, the constituents being

   NP (S) + NP (O) + Vt

   Ex: Amma aḍīge māṭuttāle
       mother food prepares

   1 2 3

   The verb pattern with transitive verb has four places with NP (S), VP containing two NPs (one with adative suffix -ge and the other NP (O) without an accusative suffix:

   NP + NP + NP + VP
vi) Pattern with Vt the VP containing two NP, one object without the accusative suffix and the other an adverbial noun phrase, constituting four places:

\[ NP (S) + NP (O) + \text{Adverbial (C)} + Vt \]

ex: \[ jana \ avanannu \ devarenudu \ pariganisuttare \]
people \ him \ as \ god \ consider

The basic sentence patterns in English are classified mainly on the basis of the kinds of verb phrase. Patterns with verb 'BE' have three places its constituents being NP (S) + Vbe and a complement, which can either be a noun phrase, or an adjective or an adverb. This is the most frequently used sentence. The seven basic sentences in are as follows:

1. NP + Vi + (adverb)
2. NP + Vt + NP + (adverb)
3. NP + Vt + NP + NP (adverb)
4. NP + be + (Adj/adv/NP)
5. NP + Vbecome + (NP/adj)
6. NP + V have + NP
7. NP + V taste + adj

These are the kernel sentences which are derived without the application of any optional transformational rules. The elements within the brackets are optional, thus the possible number of basic sentences by them are thirteen.
Let us now try to compare the basic sentence patterns of Kannada with that of English.

During the process of translation the (NP+NP) sentence pattern of Kannada can be substituted by the NP + V be + NP type

ex: nanu vidyarthi      NP + V be + NP (I am a student)

These two sentence patterns of Kannada and English are mutually translatable.

The factors which make the difference between them are:

1) Kannada has only two places with two NPs while English has three Np, VP and NP as constituents.

2) The complement NP in Kannada which is directly dominated by S becomes a complement NP dominated by VP which is dominated by S.

3) Though semantically the component NP in these patterns are equivalent, the pattern in English demands a verbal (a copula) to link its complement to the subject, while it is not necessary in Kannada.

4) The NP complement in Kannada is just a noun but its counterpart in English is a NP consisting of the indefinite article ‘a’ as the determiner and a noun. Kannada has an option to use an indefinite modifier (nanu obba vidyarthi).

5) The element of concord is another point of difference the two NPs usually agree with each other in person, number and gender. But agreement in person is not obligatory here.

The pattern (NP + Vi) is the same both in Kannada and English.

ex: Hakkigaḷu haṟuttave        Birds fly
This pattern has a greater correspondence than any other. The order in which the constituents occur is the same.

But a sentence like ‘viparīṭa māle bantu’ the literal translation of (NP + Vi) pattern is not accepted in English.

* very much rain came.

This is to be translated as: It rained heavily which again is in the pattern NP + Vi (adv of manner) ‘viparīṭa māle’ is the NP (S) in Kannada and Bantu the verbal. But these two are brought into the VP in English. But there cannot be English sentence without a NP, though semantically there is nothing inadequate in the sentence. ‘It’ appears to be a superfluity for a Kannada speaker.

NP + Adv (manner) + V (iru) of Kannada corresponds to NP + V be + adj of English.

Ex : Magu muddāgide The Child is lovely
NP + Adv(m) + (iru) NP + V be + Adj

Both the patterns have the complement as parts of VP. They differ in places they occupy in their respective VPs. In Kannada the complement precedes the verbal while in English it follows the verbal.

In Kannada there is a perfect agreement between the NP (S) and the verbal in person and number in all cases and person, gender and number in the case of third person singular subjects. In English, gender is not an element of concord between the verbal ad its subject. First person singular pronoun takes ‘am’ in the present tense but shares ‘was’ with III person singular pronouns in the past tense, while first person plural, II and III person plural
pronouns take ‘are’ and ‘were’ in common in the present tense and past tense respectively.

The adverbial in the sentence, ‘magu toṭṭilallide’ is ‘toṭṭilalli’. The noun toṭṭilu is made an adverbial by the -alli the locative suffix. It is English equivalent is a preposition ‘in’ and NP ‘the cradle’

NPs are adverbialised in Kannada by dative locative and ablative case suffixes (-ige, -alli and -inda respectively) or by post-position like hattira, olage.

Nine English prepositions share the semantic load of three Kannada cases as listed by Dr. A.K. Ramanujam. He says, “... The variety of uses for these cases in the daily idiom is bewildering and no system of semantic categories has yet been set up to take care of them”.

According to the comparative statement prepared by him, the English prepositions which function for the Kannada cases are:

- ablative (inda) - by, from, with, of, in
- dative (-ge) - at, by for, from, of to
- locative (-alli) - at among, in, of

This probably is one of the reasons which translation may prove confusing.

The Kannada pattern, NP + NP + V agu as in:

Mōhana dāktru āda

corresponds to the English pattern, Mohana became a doctor. (NP + V become + NP), and they are mutually translatable.

Translatability of certain expressions of this pattern certain nouns in Kannada become adjectives when translated into English:
In such cases, the Kannada pattern is transferred into English as (NP + Vbecome + Adj) The
‘Anvartha nāma’ or the name (nouns) based on the meanings become adjectives.

In comparing the structures of this Kannada sentence

\[
\text{nānu avanannu prāmāṇikanendu andukondiddēne}
\]

I consider him honest

The pattern of both the languages have four places with NP (S) and a VP consisting of an
O and C and a verbal with the verbal shifted to the first position in the English VP.

The constituent to be examined in these patterns is that objective compliment. In Kannada
the objective complement is adverbial. It is usually a NP, adverbialised by affixing adver-
bial participles, ‘āgi’ and ‘anta’ or post-positions ‘hāge’ and ‘ante’. But in English, it is
either a NP or an adjectival. The translators of Kannada into English, usually feel there is
something missing in the structure of the complement and one invariably finds ‘as’ prece-
ding the objective complement in these patterns, and hence the wrong usage;

* They appointed him as teacher.

A sentence of the type, ‘nōṇaṅḷāinda ṛōgaganḍa haraḍuttave’ does not structurally correspond
to any of the English basic patterns. However, this pattern is used to convey the passive
sense and thus is translatable into an English passive structure.

NP + V + by + NP  Diseases are spread by flies.

The traditionally recognised passive structure in Kannada has a passive marker ‘-alpaḍu’ in
its verbal:
Rogagaḷu noṇagalinda haradalpaduttave

This is a grammatical sentence. It is the traditional passive. However, passive transformations with the passive marker are utterly out of place in Kannada speech. Only rarely it is used in very formal writing.

The verbal should be transitive for a sentence to undergo a passive transformation.

The correlation between the patterns of English and patterns of Kannada syntax is very high and thus most of the patterns of Kannada and English can be translated. During the process of translation, of certain sentence patterns the translators either distort his source language or giving prominence to the meaning of utterance, sacrifices the pattern of the target language.

By the above contrastive study, we can infer that the pattern easiest to translate is (NP + Vi) which corresponds to the pattern of Kannada. The difficulty increases as the complexity of constituents increases.

The use of articles which are not an essential part of the NP structure and choice of prepositions and the word which is essential to English structure because of the absence of inflections to indicate the function and status of the words, offer problems in the translation of English patterns.

The following patterns are arranged in the ascending order of difficulty:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Kannada</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NP + NP</td>
<td>NP + Vbe + NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NP + Vi</td>
<td>NP + Vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NP + Adv (m) + V(uru)</td>
<td>NP + Vbe + Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NP + V adv (place) + V(uru)</td>
<td>NP + Vbe + Adv of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NP + NP + V (agu)</td>
<td>NP + V become + NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP + V become + Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NP + NP + Vt</td>
<td>NP + Vt + NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NP + NP (dative) + NP (acc) + Vt</td>
<td>NP + Vt + NP + NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NP + NP (acc) + Adv + Vt</td>
<td>NP + Vt + NP + NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NP + Vt + NP + Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NP (dat) + NP + V</td>
<td>NP + Vhave + NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NP (loc) + NP + V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NP (abl) + NP + V</td>
<td>no basic pattern to correspond in particular.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>