

NEPALI ESL/EFL STUDENT TRANSLATORS' MANIPULATION OF SENTENCES AT THE TEXTUAL LEVEL

Bal Ram Adhikari

Department of English Education, Mahendra Ratna Campus, Tahachal, Tribhuvan University
balaramadhikari77@gmail.com

This paper analyzes English translations of Nepali short stories carried out by Nepali ESL/EFL student translators and examines the translators' manipulation of sentences across boundaries. The study adopted a product-oriented framework with a production task to elicit translation from 30 university translation students. The data were analyzed descriptively and discussed under three themes: sentence splitting, sentence joining and sentence-structure preserving. Findings show translators' tendency to preserve source-text sentence boundaries in target texts, with the minimum use of sentence-splitting and sentence-merging strategies to bring about shifts across sentence boundaries.

Keywords: manipulation, sentence joining, sentence-structure preserving, sentence splitting textual level

1. Introduction

As an act of communication across languages, translation involves re-expression or re-creation of the message encoded in one language in another language (House, 2016). This bilingually mediated communication oftentimes defies one-to-one semantic and syntactic correspondence between two languages (Levy, 2012; Reiss, 2012). The lack of inter-lingual correspondence is felt more acutely specifically when translating between syntactically different and culturally distant languages like Nepali and English (Adhikari, 2021). This condition forces the translator to reframe source language (SL) words and sentence structures in the target language (TL) to make the SL message more accessible to TL readers. The alterations carried out by the translator are called translation shifts that indicate departures from lexical and syntactic correspondence in working from the SL to the TL (Catford, 1965). As stated otherwise, translation shifts are linguistic changes enacted by translators in their attempt to reframe the SL message

according to TL structures (Munday, 2016). Acknowledged as inevitable features of translations due to incompatibilities between the languages, shifts occur at both lexical and syntactic levels (Palumbo, 2009). Most studies have focused on the analysis of strategies employed by translators to bring about lexical shifts, whereas shifts at the syntactic level have remained a less explored area in translation scholarship (Bassnett, 2014; Frankenberg-Garcia, 2019). Frankenberg-Garcia (2019) notes that most of the studies involving source language and target language parallel texts documented in the literature are "either purely lexical or constrained by sentence boundaries" (p. 1) The reason for this, as Bassnett (2014) posits, is principally because "semantic equivalence takes priority over syntactic equivalence" (p. 35) both in translation theory and practice. Moreover, most discussions on translation shifts have focused on intra-sentential shifts such as shifts in word order and shift from one part of speech to another (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2014; Munday, 2016). Hence, shifts across sentence boundaries at the textual level have received less attention in translation scholarship. For instance, previous studies such as Blanco (2009) examines the translation of stance adverbials from English into Spanish; Frankenberg-Garcia (2016) analyzes the translation of modal auxiliaries, and the studies carried out by Johansson (2007), Frankenberg-Garcia (2014) and Xiao and Dai (2014) are limited to the analysis of sub-sentential features across source and target texts. Taking account of this study gap, the present paper aims to analyze Nepali ESL/EFL student translators' manipulation of sentences at the textual level in the translation of Nepali literary texts into English. To this end, the paper sought to answer the following questions:

(a) To what extent do Nepali ESL/EFL student translators join sentences?

(b) To what extent do they split sentences? and

(c) To what extent do they preserve source-text sentence structures in translated texts (TTs)?

2. Syntactic manipulation at the textual level

Translators' skills and abilities are largely exhibited at the textual level, as one of their goals is to produce structurally cohesive and semantically coherent texts (Hatim & Munday, 2004). To achieve this goal, translators need not only to take account of structural incompatibilities between SL and TL (Shuttleworth & Cowie, 2014) but also to alter source-text sentences to make them compatible with TL structures. They need to employ different syntactic strategies accompanied by respective syntactic operations across sentence boundaries (Adhikari, 2021). Two such notable syntactic strategies operated at the textual level are sentence joining and sentence splitting which are marked for producing syntactic shifts beyond sentence levels (Frankenberg-Garcia, 2019). According to Frankenberg-Garcia (2019), "Translation shifts can transcend the level of the sentence. For example, sentences can be split or joined in translation, or there can be complex shifts that combine the two" (p.1).

Sentence joining and sentence splitting are taken as major translation strategies operated at the textual level. In translation, sentence joining is a strategy whereby two or more source-text sentences are rendered as a single sentence and its result is syntactic convergence. Sentence splitting (or diffusion), on the other hand, renders one source-text sentence as two or more (Kunilovskaya, 2018), leading to syntactic divergence.

Frankenberg-Garcia (2019) identifies six types of syntactic operations employed by translators to join source-text sentences in the TT. They include a) deletion of hard punctuation such as a full-stop, exclamation mark, and question mark; b) changing hard punctuation into soft punctuation such as a comma, semi-colon, and colon; c) removing capitalization; d) coordination i.e., joining two independent sentences with coordinating conjunctions; e) subordination, i.e., joining sentences with subordinating conjunctions; and f) major reformulation of two source-text sentences as a single sentence in the TT. Frankenberg-Garcia (2019) likewise discusses six types of syntactic

operations that translators might use to split source-text sentences in the TT, which operate in exact reverse of those used in sentence joining. They include a) insertion of hard punctuation i.e. splitting sentences by inserting hard punctuation; b) changing soft into hard punctuation; c) capitalization i.e. "changing words beginning with small letters into words beginning with capital letters" (p. 12); d) deleting coordinating conjunctions and rewriting independent clauses as simple sentences; e) deleting subordinate conjunctions and rewriting subordinate clauses as independent sentences; and f) reformulating source-text sentences that involves rewriting a single sentence as two separate sentences.

The strategies of sentence joining and sentence splitting ensure cohesion in the TT by subjecting source-sentence structures to TL text-producing convention, which further enhances its readability (Kunilovskaya, 2018). Cosme (2006) analyzed English-French bidirectional translation corpus and the analysis revealed coordination and subordination as two dominant syntactic strategies operated across source and target languages. This study also reported that these strategies differed with respect to languages, as French-English translations consisted of more shifts from coordination to subordination than French-English translations. Likewise, Noviyanti and Nugraha (2016) studied English-Indonesian translations by student translators and their analysis showed three types of syntactic shifts featured in student translations: word-into phrase shifts, phrase-into-clause shift, and clause-into-sentence shifts (in descending order). Clause-into-sentence shifts which involved splitting source-text clauses and rewriting them as independent sentences were the least observed phenomena in the sampled translated texts.

Contrary to syntactic shifts enacted through the strategies of sentence splitting and sentence joining, studies have also reported translators' resistance to these strategies with their strong tendency to preserve source-text sentence boundaries in the TT (Adhikari, 2021; Adhikari & Magarati, 2022; Bastola, 2017; Dhimal, 2023; Frankenberg-Garcia, 2019). Frankenberg-Garcia (2019), for instance, conducted the quantitative analysis of a bi-directional parallel corpus of

Portuguese and English fiction comprising over 90,000 source-text sentences and their translations. The study reported syntactic parallelism i.e., preservation of sentence boundaries dominating both sentence splitting and sentence joining. A similar finding has been reported in Adhikari and Magarati (2022) that an analysis of an English translation of a Nepali essay revealed strong structural parallelism between English-translated text and its Nepali counterpart. According to their study, the translator did not use sentence splitting and sentence joining to manipulate sentence structures. Recently, Dhimal (2023) analyzed the syntax of the English translation of a Nepali novel in comparison with its original and reported the translator's proclivity for structural parallelism.

Sentence-joining, sentence-splitting and sentence-structure-preserving translation strategies affect the translated text as product. Sentence-joining enacted through different syntactic operations such as coordination, subordination, and omission of punctuation results in syntactic simplification of text. Sentence splitting achieved through syntactic operations such as omission of subordination and coordination, and the addition of punctuation leads to complexification of text. Finally, syntactic parallelism attained through the preservation of sentence boundaries keeps structures of source-text and target-text intact. Sentence splitting and sentence joining exhibit a certain degree of departures between source-text sentence structure and target-text sentence structures, whereas preservation of sentence boundaries keeps sentence structures intact, demonstrating a higher level of syntactic fidelity to source-text sentence structures.

3. Methodology

The study adopted a product-oriented research framework for the description and explanation of English translation as product (Saldanha & O'Brien 2013) elicited from English-major M.Ed. students (termed Nepali ESL/EFL student translators in this study). In this study, the category of student translators refers to M.Ed. English students specializing in translation studies. Unlike experienced or published translators, they are novice translators without any publication to their credit. Altogether 30 student translators from a constituent campus of Tribhuvan University located in Kathmandu Metropolitan participated in

the study. A production task (Nunan, 2010) that required the selected student translators to translate Nepali short stories into English was used to elicit data. Three translators were assigned one story to translate; accordingly, there were 30 English translations of 10 source texts. To address the question of Nepali ESL/EFL student translators' tendency to manipulate sentences across boundaries, the first twenty source-text sentences and their corresponding English translations were extracted from each translated English text. The data constituted 600 source-text sentences and their English translations extracted from the total corpus of 30 translated short stories in English. This paper presents the analysis of only English translations of 300 source-text sentences extracted from five short stories. By using a comparative-descriptive approach (Saldanha & O'Brien, 2013), each English extract was compared with its source counterpart and described in terms of the number of sentences, and syntactic strategies, namely sentence joining, sentence splitting, and sentence-structure preserving. The results are presented both quantitatively through percentages and qualitatively through comparative analysis and discussion of some representative cases. The cases are cited as they existed in the corpus of student translations without any correction of grammatical errors and inaccuracies by the researcher.

4. Results and discussion

Table 1 summarizes the overall results obtained for sentence-joining, sentence-splitting, and sentence-structure preserving strategies used by Nepali ESL/EFL student translators in the translation of Nepali short stories into English.

Table 1. Overall Cases of Sentence-Joining, Sentence-Splitting, and Sentence-Structure Preserving Strategies

Syntactic strategies	No. of sentences	Percentage
Sentence joining	20	7.32
Sentence splitting	9	3.29
Sentence-structure preserving	244	89.37
Total	273	100

Table 1 shows the total number of sentences that were affected by shift-yielding strategies, namely

sentence joining and sentence splitting, and sentences whose syntactic boundaries remained unaffected because of the translators' use of the sentence-structure preserving strategy. Shift-yielding strategies brought about changes in syntactic boundaries by rendering compound or complex sentences as simple sentences and vice versa (Adhikari, 2021). Overall, the number of target-text sentences (i.e., 273) was slightly smaller than that of source-text sentences (i.e., 300). As shown in Table 1, the sentences formed through joining and splitting made up only a small proportion (11%) of the total sampled target-text sentences, whereas the sentences whose boundaries were preserved (89%) overwhelmingly dominated target texts. The sentences with intact syntactic boundaries were more than eight times the sentences with syntactic shifts. This finding broadly supports the work of previous studies that report Nepali-English translators' tendency to keep source sentence boundaries intact in English translations (see Adhikari & Magarati, 2022; Bastola, 2017; Dhimal, 2023). Moreover, English translated texts featured more cases of sentence joining than those of sentence splitting which shows syntactic convergence being prioritized over syntactic divergence.

4.1 Sentence joining

Sentence joining was found to be the second most frequently employed strategy by Nepali ESL/EFL student translators in the rendition of Nepali short stories into English (See Table 1 above). Only nine out of fifteen target texts featured the instances of sentence joining in which translators rendered two source-text sentences as a single sentence in the target language and the translators differed in the frequency of the use of this strategy. Table 2 presents the number of TTs containing the sentences that underwent joining and different syntactic operations.

Table 2. Sentence-joining Strategy and Operations

Target Text (TT)	No. of joined sentences	Syntactic operations
TT 1	4	Coordination (and); total merging
TT4	2	Subordination (although, whereas); coordination (but)
TT5	2	Comma (soft punctuation);

		coordination (but)
TT6	2	Coordination (and, but)
TT9	1	Coordination (neither ...nor)
TT10	3	Coordination (and); subordination (like as conjunction)
TT11	3	Coordination (and); semicolon; coordination (and)
TT13	2	Use of verbless sentence as an NP; subordination (so)
TT15	1	Subordination (that)
Total	20	

According to Table 2, coordination and subordination were the key syntactic operations that the nine student translators employed to render into English Nepali source-text sentences as compound and complex sentences. Additionally, two of them used soft punctuation i.e., comma and semicolon, and *like* as a subordinating conjunction to join sentences. Likewise, one of the translators (TT113) reduced a simple Nepali sentence as a verbless sentence and moved it to subject position, showing his ability to handle complex syntactic operation of sentence joining. Finally, TT1 exhibited a haphazard merging of source-text sentences in the target language. The translators showed more inclination towards coordination than subordination. In coordination, three common single-word coordinators, namely 'and', and 'but' were used, whereas other more complex single-word coordinators viz. 'or' and 'yet' did not feature in any of the translator's text. This indicates student translators' lack of confidence in forming the sentences that demand more complex syntactic operations in the formation of compound sentences. The analysis of translated texts also revealed the lack of variety in the use of multiword coordinators, as TT9 was the only text that contained a compound sentence with a multiword coordinator (neither...nor). None of the translators were found to use other multiword coordinators: 'both... and', 'and ...too' (for addition), 'either...or' (for alternatives), 'not only but also' (for concession) (Cowan, 2008).

As to subordination, the TTs exhibited the use of only five subordinators: 'although' (for concession), 'whereas' (contrast), 'so'; (for that reason), 'that' (for introducing a noun clause) and 'like' (for comparison) to render simple source-text sentences into complex sentences in English. As in

the case of coordinators, student translators failed to avail themselves of rich syntactic resources of subordination such 'as if', 'in order that/to', 'since', 'so that', 'unless', 'until', 'when', 'whether', and 'while' to bring variety in sentence constructions. Consider the representative cases of different types of syntactic operation employed by translators to join source-text sentences in the target text. The following extract is an example of coordination with the contrast marker 'but':

- (1) ST: *eka paṭaka runa khojeko thiyo. bhaena.*
 TT: Once, he tried to cry, but he couldn't. (TT4)

In the extract from (TT4), the translator rendered two simple source-text sentences as one compound sentence with the contrast coordinating conjunction 'but'. The second chunk in the ST is a subject-less single verb sentence and Nepali as a pro-drop language commonly makes use of subject-less sentences like this. In the translation of such sentences into English, we need to rewrite them with the appropriate explicit subject. The sentences thus formed can be presented as independent clauses or simple sentences. The translator of TT4 has opted for the first option in which the subject-less single-verb clause has been rewritten as an independent clause and combined with the preceding independent clause. Other two translators (TT5 & TT6) also used the same coordinator (*but*) to produce almost identical sentences in English as:

- (2) TT5: Once he tried to cry but could not.
 TT6: Once he tried to cry but he couldn't.

TT5 also contained an instance of combining source-text sentences through the conversion of hard punctuation (full stop) into soft punctuation (semicolon):

- (3) ST: *bhitra koṭhāmā choro mardai cha. sāyada, marisakyo holā.*
 TT: Son was about to die inside; maybe he died.

Here, two simple sentences are rendered as a single sentence through punctuation shifting (Frankenberg-Garcia, 2019), demoting a simple sentence to the status of an independent clause. Moreover, the translator has assigned an explicit subject (he) to the subject-less source-text sentence, as demanded by English syntax. The translator of (TT9) formed a compound sentence

by applying a correlative coordinator *neither...nor* to complex source-text sentences:

- (4) ST: *videśamā gaera bhāḍā mājhna cāhanna. paḍhna bhanera videśamai ghara banāera deśaprati kuṭhārāghāta garna cāhanna.*
 TT2: Neither do I want to wash dishes in the foreign land nor settle down there in the name of study and to betray the motherland.

Contrary to a common assumption that translators tend to simplify complex source-text sentences in the target text (Liu & Afzaal, 2021; Kruger & Rooy, 2012), this translator was found to render already structurally complex sentences by joining them through coordination. The target-text sentence reads more complex than the corresponding source-text sentence because the former embeds more clauses in a single sentence than the latter.

As mentioned above, the translators used a limited number of subordinators to join source-text sentences bringing about shifts in sentence boundaries. This might be because the use of subordinators is more challenging for student translators than that of coordinators. Previous studies (e.g. Adhikari, 2021; Frankenberg-Garcia 2019) have also reported translators' more inclination towards coordination than subordination. The following sentences demonstrate the strategy of subordination at work.

- (5) ST: *gharabharī ghuṅco cha. usalāi kehī thāhā chaina.*
 TT: Although his house is crowded, he is unaware of things around him. (TT2)

The translator rewrote two simple source-text sentences as a complex sentence converting the first simple source-text sentence into a concessive clause beginning with 'although'. In the source text, concession i.e., the oppositional semantic relationship between two sentences is only implied, expecting readers to work out it for themselves. In the English translation, this meaning is explicitly expressed, with the use of the subordinator. In some cases, the translators were found to replace the connector implied in the ST by a slightly different connector in the TT. Consider the following sentences from TT13:

- (6) ST: *tyati belā hātailē lekhnū parthyō. ataḥ dherai prati huna sakena |*
 TT: It used to be hand-written so there were only few copies. (TT13)

The translator's use of the subordinator 'so' to form a complex English sentence from source-text sentences demonstrates not only level-wise syntactic shift (simple to complex sentence), but the replacement of the discourse connector by a subordinator. The translator has successfully replaced the result discourse connector *atah* (hence), the first word of the second sentence, with 'so' to form a complex sentence, demoting the second sentence to a subordinate result clause. Besides, Translator 1's text (TT1) demonstrated haphazard merging of source-text sentences in the target language:

- (7) ST: *uḥnāsātha sabaiko manamā praśna uḥyo, 'peṭa kasari bharna ?' euṭāle arkāko manobhāva bujhe jasto garera sabai mukhāmukha garna thāle.*
 TT: As they woke up, all started thinking about getting food and looked at each other.

The ST consists of five clauses which are merged into three clauses in the TT. The merging of clauses has caused the TT to deviate from the ST both structurally and semantically. Structurally, the translator has merged the reporting and reported parts unsuccessfully and the deletion of the hypothetical clause (as if they read each other's minds) has caused not only structural deviation but also semantic distortion. The translator's failure to use appropriate conjunctions has resulted in a complex sentence with a string of subordinate clauses. Syntactic deviation and semantic distortion might have been resulted from the translator's sole focus on the gist of the source text and her lack of skills to re-express it in structurally complex sentences in English.

4.2 Sentence splitting

Only seven out of fifteen target texts featured instances of sentence joining. Sentence splitting was the least observed strategy employed by Nepali ESL/EFL student translators to translate complex source-text sentences as simple sentences in the TL, and the translators, as in the case of sentence joining, differed in frequency of the use of this strategy. Table 3 presents the number of TTs that contained the sentences formed through syntactic splitting and syntactic operations.

Table 3. Sentences That Underwent Sentence-splitting Strategy and Operations

Target text	Split sentences	Syntactic operations
TT1	1	Complex to simple sentence
TT2	1	Complex to simple sentence
TT3	2	Complex to simple sentence
TT5	1	Upgrading a word as a sentence
TT7	2	Complex to simple sentence; punctuation shift
TT9	1	Complex to simple sentence
TT 15	1	Compound to simple (Deletion of <i>and</i>)
Total	9	

As Table 3 shows, 7 out of 15 (nearly 50%) TTs contained cases of sentence splitting. However, the number of sentences that underwent splitting in these texts was extremely low, i.e. only 9 (3.29 %) out of 273 sentences. The texts evidenced four syntactic operations at work in splitting source-text sentences in the TT: from complex to simple, from compound to simple, punctuation shift and upgrading a word as a sentence. In what follows, the representative cases of different types of syntactic operations used in splitting source-text sentences in the TTs are presented:

- (8) ST: *kāma nabhaera ta ho ni netājyū ma tāpaikomā āeko.*
 TT1: Sir, I have no work. That's why I am here.

In this translation, the complex source-text sentence has been rewritten as two simple sentences in English. The simplification process involves two noticeable syntactic operations. First, the translator has extracted the causal adverbial clause (*kām nabhaera ta: not having work*) from the complex sentence and rewritten it as a simple sentence beginning with the connective structure *that's why*. The use of this connective structure appears to be strategically motivated as it has contributed to maintaining cohesion across split sentences. The second strategy involves a punctuation shift whereby the soft punctuation (i.e., comma) has been replaced by hard punctuation (i.e., full stop). The use of these operations has rendered the target-text sentences structurally and semantically simpler than their source counterparts. The following translation shows the upgrading of a *nipāt* (discourse particle) to a sentence position:

- (9) ST: *khaira, nacinnubhae pani kehī pharaka pardaina.*
 TT3: Don't worry. It makes no difference.

In this TT, the *nipāt* (*khair*: let it be) has been extracted from the sentence and promoted to a negative imperative sentence- 'Don't worry'. Although semantically slightly departed from the source text, the English translation conveys the essence of the source text. Moreover, the subordinate clause *nacinnubhae pani* (even if you don't recognize) has been replaced by the pronoun 'it', reducing the length of the sentence.

- (10) ST: *holā tara ke garnu, malāi ta dākṭarale jati orālo lāge pani huncha, tara ukālo lāgna hunna bhaneko cha.*
 TT: Perhaps so, but what can I do? The doctor tells me that I can go downwards as much as I like, but not upwards.

The source text is a complex compound sentence with four clauses, which has been split into two sentences in the TT. The first finite clause has been rewritten as a rhetorical question, whereas the clauses in the second part are joined by both subordinator and coordinator.

4.3 Sentence-structure preserving

All the sampled translations were overwhelmingly dominated by the sentence-structure preserving strategy, which made up 89.37 % of the total translated English sentences. Table 4 presents the total number of TTs and sentences therein whose boundaries were kept intact.

Table 4: Source-text Sentences with Their Boundaries Intact in TTs

Target text (TT)	Structure-preserved sentences
TT1	7
TT2	19
TT3	18
TT4	14
TT5	13
TT6	12
TT7	18
TT8	19
TT9	18
TT10	14
TT11	14
TT12	20
TT13	13
TT14	14
TT15	15
Total	244

As Table 4 shows, all the TTs were characterized by the heavy presence of sentences that did not undergo any noticeable shifts across sentence

boundaries. Each of the TTs except for TT 1 contained an overwhelming number of sentences with syntactic parallelism. For example, in most of the TTs, the sentence boundaries of more than 90% of source-text sentences were preserved, demonstrating student translators' heavy inclination to source-text structures. Student translators' tendency to preserve source-text sentence boundaries largely resonates with the findings of previous studies that also reported experienced translators' similar tendency (e.g. Adhikari, 2021; Adhikari & Magarati, 2022; Bastola, 2017; Frankenberg-Garcia, 2019). However, unlike experienced translators, most of the student translators in this study failed to demonstrate their ability to produce grammatically acceptable sentences through syntactic parallelism. The following translations substantiate this observation:

- (11) ST: *sūryako prathama kirāṇa parnāsātha pṛthvīkā pāprā upkejasto garera nadīkā kinārāmā ghumluñña parera sutekā cāra-pāṃca janā uṭhe.*
 TT: Four or five people got up who were sleeping in the bank of the river like the crust of earth severed up on the arrival of first rays of the sun. (TT1)

This translation demonstrates the translator's failed attempt to reproduce complex source sentences in the TL. The source-text sentence has a complex structure that strings together four dependent and one independent clauses. The translator has retained the complex structure in the TL, albeit with the reduction of the number of clauses from five to four. Apart from grammatical errors, for example, the wrong use of preposition (in the bank) and vague structure (like the crust severed up on the arrival of...), the TT is unacceptable because of the translator's failed attempt to reproduce the structurally complex sentence in English. Similarly, TT12 evidences the reproduction of the source-text sentence structure in the TL:

- (12) ST: *tyasa kāraṇa maile nai bhane- tapāñ aba umerakā dṛṣṭile orālo nai lāgeko ho.*
 TT: Therefore, I told him, due to the cause of age you are climbing down. (TT7)

The TT reads syntactically clumsy and semantically vague for two reasons. First, this translation shows the translator's incompetence in forming

grammatically correct sentences in English. Second, it also shows the translator's failure to re-express the source-text content in English through the complex structure. On the contrary, one translator of TT2 successfully maintained structural parallelism between source-text and target-text sentences:

- (13) ST: *ū roeko pani chaina, ū hāseko pani chaina.*
 TT: He has neither cried nor laughed.

Most of the target-text sentences with structural correspondence with their source counterparts had low acceptability in English. Such sentences exhibited inordinate infidelity towards source-text structures failing to conform to the target grammar system (Adhikari, 2020, 2021). This shows the student translators' inability to move away from the source grammar system in the (re)expression of source-text content in English as a target language.

5. Conclusion

The study found that Nepali ESL/EFL student translators used shift-yielding strategies: sentence joining and sentence splitting far less than the sentence-structure preserving. That is to say, shift-yielding strategies were applied to a small number of source-text sentences, affecting their syntactic boundaries. This finding contradicts the common understanding that the translated text is syntactically less complex than the non-translated text (Liu & Afzaal, 2021). Although not significant in quantity, sentence joining and sentence splitting brought about some sentence-boundary shifts leading to syntactic convergence and syntactic divergence respectively. In sentence joining, the use of coordinators was more frequent than that of subordinators. Accordingly, compound sentences outnumbered complex sentences in the sampled TTs, which confirmed Frankenberg-Garcia's (2019) study that also reported translators' tendency for coordination. All translated texts demonstrated the translators' extensive use of sentence-structure preserving strategy that led to structural parallelism between STs and TTs, and this tendency conforms to previous studies such as Adhikari and Magarati (2022). Although student translators' inclination to keep source-text sentence boundaries intact in TTs is also common among experienced translators, it should be handled skillfully to generate grammatically acceptable

sentences in the TL. It is because most of the translated sentences with their boundaries intact were structurally clumsy and semantically vague. These findings have implications for teaching and training of translation. Although sentence-joining, sentence-splitting and sentence-structure preserving strategies are equally viable in translation, producing coherent target texts through the structure-preserving strategy might be more challenging for novice translators. The reason is that in reproducing source-text sentences, they stick to source language structures and often fail to follow TL structures, as reported in this study. To mitigate this problem, novice translators should be first trained in the use of sentence-splitting strategy to break complex source-text sentences and sentence-joining strategy to join simple source-text sentences in the TL before they can translate source-text sentences maintaining structural fidelity to ST respecting the TL syntactic system.

References

- Adhikari, B. R. (2020). Assessment of student translators' texts from Nepali into English: Language quality and degree of task completion. *Translation Today*, 14(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.46623/tt/2020.14.1.ar1>
- Adhikari, B. R. (2021). *Process-product interface in literary translation from Nepali into English* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Tribhuvan University].
- Adhikari, B. R., & Magarati, S. L. (2022). Language of translated version of 'Abstract Thought: An Onion'. *English Language Teaching Perspectives*, 7(1-2), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.3126/eltp.v7i1-2.47400>
- Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation studies* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Bastola, G. (2017). Literalness in literary translation: A case of socrates' footsteps. *Nepalese Translation*, 1, 8-14.
- Blanco, M. P. (2009). Translating stance adverbials from English into Spanish: a corpus-based study. *International Journal of Translation*, 21(1-2), 41-56.
- Catford, J. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. Oxford University Press.
- Cosme, C. (2006). Clause combining across languages: A corpus-based study of English-French translation shifts. *Languages in*

- Contrast*, 6(1), 71-108. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lic.6.1.04cos>
- Cowan, R. (2008). *The teacher's grammar of English*. Cambridge.
- Dhimal, A. (2023). *Sentence level translation in Muglan* [Unpublished MPhil thesis]. Pokhara University.
- Frankenberg-Garcia, A. (2014). Understanding Portuguese translations with the help of Corpora. *Working with Portuguese corpora*, 161-176.
- Frankenberg-Garcia, A. (2016). A corpus study of loans in translated and non-translated texts. In G. C. Pastor & M. Seghiri (Eds.) *Corpus-based approaches to translation and interpreting: From theory to applications* (pp.19-42). Peter Lang.
- Frankenberg-Garcia, A. (2019). A corpus study of splitting and joining sentences in translation. *Corpora*, 14(1), 1-30. <https://doi.org/doi:10.3366/cor.2019.0159>
- Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced resource book*. Routledge.
- House, J. (2016). *Translation as communication across languages and cultures*. Routledge.
- Johansson, S. (2007). Seeing through multilingual corpora: On the use of corpora in contrastive studies. John Benjamins.
- Kruger, H., & Rooy, B. (2012). Register and the features of the translated language. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 13(1), 33-65. <https://doi.org/10.1556/Acr.13.2012.1.3>
- Kunilovskaya, M. A. (2018). Gains and pitfalls of sentence-splitting in translation. *Translation Journal*, 4-23. <https://translationjournal.net>
- Levy, J. (2012). Translation as a decision process. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *Translation studies reader* (3rd ed.) (pp. 148-159). Routledge.
- Liu, K., & Afzaal, M. (2021). Syntactic complexity in translated and non-translated texts: A corpus-based study of simplification. *Plos one*, 16(6). <https://doi.org/10.1371>
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Noviyanti, E. R., & Nugraha, L. E. (2016). Syntactic shifts in English-Indonesian translation (A case study of the fifth semester students of the English Department of State University of Semarang). *ELT Forum: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 1-5.
- Nunan, D. (2010). *Research methods in language learning* (1st South Indian ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Palumbo, G. (2009). *Key terms in translation studies*. Continuum International.
- Reiss, K. (2012). Type, kind and individuality of text: Decision making in translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (3rd ed., pp. 16-171). Routledge.
- Saldanha, G., & O'Brien, S. (2013). *Research methodologies in translation studies*. Routledge.
- Shuttleworth, M., & Cowie, M. (2014). *Dictionary of translation studies*. Routledge.
- Xiao, R., & Dai, G. (2014). Lexical and grammatical properties of translational Chinese: Translation universal hypotheses reevaluated from the Chinese perspective. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 10(1), 11-55.