

Rewriting the Village: A Postcolonial Analysis of Translation Strategies in *Gamperaliya*

Rathnapala J.P.I.T., Li Chongyue and Chandrawansa K.D.J

School of Foreign Languages/ Jiangsu University

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.905000307>

Received: 06 May 2025; Accepted: 11 May 2025; Published: 12 June 2025

ABSTRACT

This paper explores how translation serves as a negotiation between the colonizer and colonized by examining the English translation of the Sinhala novel *Gamperaliya* (1944) by Martin Wickramasinghe, translated jointly into English as *Uprooted* (2009) by two Sri Lankan translators, Lakshmi De Silva and Ranga Wickramasinghe. Guided by a postcolonial framework and drawing on Lawrence Venuti's concepts of Foreignization and domestication, the study addresses the following two research questions: 1) what translation strategies are employed in rendering *Gamperaliya* into English? and 2) how do these strategies reflect, reinforce or distort the power dynamics between the source and target cultures? The study adopts a qualitative approach followed by a comparative textual analysis of selected sentences and phrases from the source and target texts. Findings reveal that the prevalent approach employed for the translation is domestication, often resulting in cultural assimilation and a loss in cultural sensitivity of the source culture. However, the use of foreignization in certain cases underscores a deliberate attempt to challenge or resist colonial dominance by highlighting the 'otherness' of Sri Lankan culture. Although, it is hard to create a perfect translation and some degree of cultural loss is inevitable in any translation process, the findings reveal that strategic decisions of the translators significantly influence on representing the colonized culture, particularly in relation to postcolonial identity, power dynamics and cultural preservation. Thus, this study contributes to the issues related to postcolonial translation within the Sri Lankan context and provides insights into the complications of translating marginalized literatures into dominant languages.

Keywords — Postcolonial Translation theory, Foreignization and Domestication, Power Relation, *Gamperaliya*

Abbreviations

ST – Source Text

TT – Target Text

INTRODUCTION

Translation is the process of transferring language and culture from source text to the target text placing a significant responsibility on the translator to ensure fidelity to the original (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1998). Deviating from the early idea that translation is merely a linguistic act transferring the meaning of a text into another language emphasizing that it should closely resemble the original, to the view that translation is an interaction between two cultures making the translators active participants in the process, translation has broadened its scope to the external background including culture, politics, economics and history. According to Bassnett and Lefevere (1998), understanding translation involves examining the reasons behind selecting certain texts for translation, the role of the translator and the way that the translated text will be received in the target culture. This shift of perspective with the influence of the 'cultural turn' in translation has had a major impact on understanding literature, culture and the role of translation, especially in postcolonial contexts.

The relationship between language and power structures of societies in particular cultures has gained significant attention, especially where the legacy of colonialism continues to shape linguistic hierarchies and cultural perceptions consequent to the evolution of the translation field with the cultural turn. Since language functions

as a tool of both oppression and resistance, translation texts in postcolonial contexts are begun to be viewed as literary pieces which adhere or resist these power dynamics. In this regard, translation emerges as a significant aspect for examining the construction and transmission of cultural narratives across linguistic boundaries.

Sinhala novel, '*Gamperaliya*' (1944) is the first novel of a trilogy, written by Martin Wickramasinghe, one of the pioneers of the modern Sinhala novel, literary criticism and cultural anthropology. According to the UNESCO Index Translationum statistics (2019), Martin Wickramasinghe is the most translated author in Sri Lanka, whose works have been translated into many languages. '*Gamperaliya*' has been translated into several languages including English and Russian, demonstrating its popularity among readers not only in Sri Lanka, but in other countries as well. Its English translation, titled '*Uprooted*' was completed jointly by two Sri Lankan translators- Lakshmi De Silva and Ranga Wickramasinghe (the son of the original author). The novel centers the theme of the destruction of traditional village life under the pressure of modernization and the impact of colonialism in the early 20th century Sri Lanka. It is embedded with sensitive cultural implications of the Southern province of Sri Lanka; which has imposed a burden on both translators to acquire a deep understanding of linguistic, historical, cultural implications of the source culture during the translation process. Given that both translators are Sri Lankan and having substantial knowledge of both the source and target cultures, the study explores the way they mediate between two cultures in hegemonic language. It further examines the extent which their translation choices preserve or diminish the source culture within the deeper ideological negotiations with colonial legacies.

Despite the prominence of Martin Wickramasinghe in Sri Lankan literature, his translations have not been examined through a postcolonial lens, particularly in relation to how the act of translation negotiate between power relations and cultural identity. This creates a critical gap in Sri Lankan translation literature, where there is notable absence of scholarly engagement with postcolonial implications in the translation of Sri Lankan literature into dominant languages. To address this gap, the study adopts postcolonial framework to '*Uprooted*' guided by the following research questions.

1. What translation strategies are employed in rendering *Gamperaliya* into English?
2. How do these strategies reflect, reinforce or distort the power dynamics between the source and target cultures?

Theoretical Framework

Post-colonialism

Post-colonialism is a critical framework which examines the cultural, political, and social legacies of colonialism and imperialism which interrogates the ways in which colonial histories persistently influence or shape contemporary identities and power structures. The term postcolonial is problematic because the prefix '*post*' suggests two meanings, a temporal one ('after colonialism') and ideological one (of displacement). However, Ashcroft et al, in their work '*Empire's Writing Back*', define post-colonialism as something that encompasses all cultural features that have been shaped by the process of imperialism, starting with the period of colonization and extending to the present day. It includes examining the European conquest, the deliberate manipulation involved in it, and the subsequent responses of the affected individuals at various stages of this process.

"We use the term 'post-colonial', however, to cover all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day. This is because there is a continuity of preoccupations throughout the historical process initiated by European imperial aggression. We also suggest that it is most appropriate as the term for the new cross-cultural criticism which has emerged in recent years and for the discourse through which this is constituted". (Ashcroft et al., 2002)

Edward Said, the pioneer of post-colonial studies, emphasizes the Western representation of the 'Orient', as a form of control and dominance through the concept of '*Orientalism*'. He argues against Eurocentrism, in which Europe represents themselves as the center of power and superior to all other cultures, while making themselves 'a role model' for the inferior or the third world cultures. In this regard, non-westerners internalize the notion of

themselves as the ‘inferior other’, reflecting power dynamic between the Orient and the Occident which is defined by dominance and a complex hegemony, manifesting in a series of mutually exclusive dichotomies such as center/periphery, colonizer/colonized, and civilized/primitive.

Other key figures of post-colonial studies further expanded on these ideas. Gayatri Spivak proposes the notion of ‘subaltern’ in her influential essay ‘*Can Subaltern Speak?*’ (1988), which focuses on the suppression of marginalized voices in colonial discourse, emphasizing the difficulty in representing those who are socially and politically excluded. She interrogates on how Eurocentric scholars often speak for subaltern, and end up supporting the very power structures they seek to oppose. This raises critical concerns about who has the authority to represent whom, and under what conditions. Meanwhile, Homi Bhabha (1994), put forward the concept of ‘hybridity’ which posits that colonialism created spaces of cultural amalgamation. He claims that identity in postcolonial context is neither exclusively colonial nor indigenous, but rather a mixture of both.

Postcolonial literary works, therefore, serve as a crucial platform for Third World communities to give voice to their experiences of oppression and resistance by sharing their history of subjugation along with their distinct identities against imperialism. Despite the fact that imperial powers have historically controlled colonized literature by restricting the ability to voice their identities, with the development of independent literature, the need of colonized nations to challenge colonial power structures through the power of language has been recognized as a turning point in post-colonialism.

Post-colonial Translation

Postcolonial translation emphasizes the power relations present in the translation process, investigating how translations can function as acts of resistance against imperial narratives, enabling the subaltern and marginalized voices to be heard (Bandia, 2021). The theoretical framework of postcolonial translation underscores its function as a medium for cultural negotiation, in which power dynamics and cultural identities are challenged and redefined.

The conventional idea that the translation is inferior to the original text, which was widespread during colonial periods, has been challenged by Maria Tymoczko in her essay ‘*Pot-colonial Writing and Literary Translation*’ (1998). According to her argument, ‘translation is not just swapping words between two languages, but transmitting a whole culture with its complexities’. Both postcolonial writing and translation strive to represent the original source culture, even though it is impossible to achieve the perfect equivalence. Instead, both require interpretation, in which choices and judgments are unavoidable, rendering objectivity unachievable. Hence, the ‘perfect’ or a ‘flawless’ translation of a particular culture is impossible especially in postcolonial contexts (Bassnett & Trivedi, 1999).

Gayatri Spivak in her influential essay ‘The Politics of Translation’ (2021), discusses the ideological implications of translating Third World Literature into English and the resulting distortion. Through the notion of epistemic violence, she further states how the voice of the subaltern or marginalized communities has been silenced through the act of translation. Spivak uses the term ‘translationese’ to refer to the translations which erase the identity of less powerful cultures and individuals. Central to postcolonial discourse, she describes rhetoric as values working in silence between and around words’ which undermines language ‘logic’ in post-structuralism. She believes that translators must comprehend non-western voices, especially feminine and background to capture distinct perspectives since a translation impacts on empowering or resisting hegemony.

‘Resistant Translation’ is a strategy used in post-colonial translation, where translation serves as a tool to establish colonial narratives and validate the cultural identity of the colonized (Bassnett & Trivedi, 1999). This strategy resists the hegemony of the colonial cultural paradigms by underlying the distinctions between the source and target cultures, rather homogenizing or eliminating them over. Hence, resistance translation was born as a form of cultural activism that redefined the act of translation to confront colonial relationships of power and to speak for cultural differences. As a result of conventional translation practice imposed in the cultural and linguistic frameworks, the marginalized third world cultures are misinterpreted through the biased lens of the translator. Since, ‘Representation’- the act of speaking for the marginalized and ‘Re-presentation’- the act of

speaking of the marginalized are two different scenarios, the role of the translator should involve critical engagement, deep transference of knowledge and resistance to colonial power structures.

Tejaswani Niranjana, (1992) in her work *“Siting Translation: History, Post-structuralism, and the colonial Context”* challenges traditional translation practices for their Eurocentric assumptions, arguing that translation has often served as a tool of colonial domination; therefore, she insists for a rethinking of translation practices that recognize and resist these colonial hegemonies. Similarly, in the essay ‘The Politics of Translation’, Spivak (2001) suggests that the translator’s role is to create a deep connection between the original text and its translation, maintaining the integrity of the source text while being acutely aware of the power dynamics involved. Thus, unequal distribution of power relations between the source text and the target text has been a central issue in postcolonial translation theory.

Foreignization and Domestication

Foreignization and Domestication, are two opposing strategies central to post-colonial translation theory. Translators use either or both strategies when rendering texts from one language to another. These concepts, popularized by Lawrence Venuti, refer to the degree to which a translation either retains the foreignness of the source text or adapts it to the cultural norms of the target audience.

According to Venuti (1995), the act of Foreignization sends the reader abroad by giving value to the linguistic and cultural distinctions that are present in foreign texts. He introduces foreignization as the highly desirable translation strategy and in the current context of the global situation, it is necessary to have a strategic cultural intervention aimed at correcting the unequal cultural exchanges between predominantly English-speaking hegemonic countries and the rest of the world (Venuti, 1995). In postcolonial translation, foreignization can be recognized as a means of resisting and affirming the identity of ‘the self’ in former colonized nations. The postcolonial translator is obliged to resist the hegemonic cultures in order to preserve the values of the source culture from the manipulation of target cultural norms. From Venuti’s point of view, *‘foreignizing translation in English can be a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations’* (p.20). Therefore, foreignization helps the postcolonial translator to challenge the dominant influence of imperialism by preserving the foreignness or the otherness of the source text.

Central to Venuti’s idea of foreignization, the notion of visibility has been introduced as a method of resistance by highlighting the translators’ presence through their interactive and mediation function in the translation process. Venuti challenges this idea of fluency, in which the transparency in translation is promoted by viewing the translator as subordinate to the original author. He believes that visibility subverts the dominance in fluency by enhancing visibility of the translator in order to challenge and transform the conditions under which translation is theorized and practiced today (Venuti, 1995, p.17).

In contrast, domestication adheres to the cultural norms and established standards of the target language; consists of modifying or eliminating cultural references of the source text which are foreign to the target readers resulting in the loss of cultural distinctiveness and the homogenization of diverse cultural voices (Venuti, 1995). Venuti presents domestication as an *‘ethnocentric reduction of the foreign texts to receive cultural values’*, which demands the translator to act as an invisible agent. In Anglo-American contexts, domestication has been considered as the dominant translation approach influenced by the cultural and economic concerns, viewing fluency equated with quality. Venuti criticizes this idea and highlights how fluency creates ‘an illusion of transparency’ which promotes cultural dominance of English-speaking nations. Postcolonial translators resist the domestication of the source cultures by being visible in the translation process to preserve the values of the source culture.

Recent studies of post-colonial translation explore the extent to which the translation practices have either perpetuated or resisted colonial power dynamics and how different translation strategies impact the representation and reception of literary texts. In the Indonesian context, Wedhowari (2023), in her study on the *‘This Earth of Mankind’*, the English translation of an Indonesian novel *‘Bumi Manusia’*, indicates that the stark imbalance between target and source languages, the failure of the translation to adequately represent Indonesian

culture, with the significant loss of cultural information, omissions and biased interpretations, ultimately perpetuates another form of colonial dominance. Another study conducted by Hu and Shi (2015) on translating Chinese literary work into English by Buck and Saphiro, reveals that the strategy of resistance against cultural imperialism has been used during the translation and ended up with a successful translation without omitting cultural nuances of the source language. Therefore, both studies highlight that empowering the hegemonic language may lead to a loss in translation, while preserving the foreignness in the text protects the source culture values.

In postcolonial translation, the choice between foreignization and domestication is particularly significant, where the cultural distinctiveness and power relations plays a major role in the narrative and determines the identity of the subaltern. Given the ideological weight of these approaches and their potential impact on the target audience, translators must thoroughly contemplate the consequences of their decisions. Hence, translating texts such as '*Gamperaliya*' should be undertaken with a critical understanding of these dynamics, in order to guarantee the preservation of the cultural authenticity of the original work while assuring its relevance to the contemporary target reception.

METHODOLOGY

The main objectives of the study are to identify the strategy used by the translators in the translation process, how they represent Sri Lankan culture in the dominant English language and the representation of power dynamics in the light of post-colonial translation theory. In order to respond to these research questions, the research applies postcolonial translation theory as the framework of the study and uses Venuti's translation strategies of foreignization and domestication to evaluate the choices of the translators during the translation process. The study adopts the qualitative approach.

Data Collection

The study is based on comparative textual analysis using both primary and secondary data sources. Primary data were collected by comparatively reading the Sri Lankan Sinhala novel, '*Gamperaliya*' by Martin Wickramasinghe and its English translation '*Uprooted*', by Lakshmi De Silva and Ranga Wickramasinghe. The novel was selected for this study due to its literal and cultural prominence in Sri Lankan literature and its thematic relevance to postcolonial transformation. The 51st edition of the source novel and 7th edition of the English translation were used in the process. Secondary data were collected by referring to journal articles, dictionaries, web articles and books. The Cambridge Dictionary (2020) was used to refer to the English translation of the book title.

Data Sampling

All the data were selected in phrases and sentences based on two specific criteria.

1. The presence of culture specific terms- The sentences and phrases should consist of cultural elements such as kinship terms, idiomatic expressions, caste references or religious terminology.
2. Evidence of postcolonial power dynamics- The sentences should represent power dynamics such as injustice to the source text or resistance to imperialism in translation.

Each selected sentence or phrase was examined using Venuti's translation strategies of domestication (adapting to the target culture norms) and foreignization (preserving the source culture elements). The results are shown in a table, followed by the discussion section. Then, the researcher examines the translation strategies and their dominant influence exerted over the text through the lens of postcolonial translation theory in the broader context of translation studies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Overview of the Findings

The primary data were selected from eleven sentences which depict the power imbalance within the language, after employing Venuti's translation strategies. The culture embedded sentences which indicate power imbalances and postcolonial traces have been identified and put into the following table.

Table I - Results

Source Text + Page Number	Target Text + Page Number	Translation Strategy
Gamperaliya	Uprooted	Domestication
"Vedeha Rajuta anushasana kala senakaya men, ek daiwajnayek Kaisaruwatteta anushasana kaleya"(44)	"Do not go ahead with this proposal' was the oracular advice of one of the astrologers whose opinion was sought by Kaisaruwatte"(64)	Domestication
"Umba kiyana eka newei karanne" (14)	"You are not following the instructions I gave you"(37)	Domestication
"daiver gohin balala enakan oba wadiwela inna"(169)	"You'd better stay here in the car"(220)	Domestication
"bola"(149)	"you"(195)	Domestication
"Manalayage kudamma keewaya"(160)	"Remarked an aunt of the bridegroom"(211)	Domestication
"Nandage bappage pawule ganu udawiya"(136)	"The women-folk of Nanda's paternal uncle's household"(180)	Domestication
Source Text+Page Number	Target Text + Page Number	Strategy
"Esala Pura Pasaloswaka dina"(112)	"On the day before the Esella Full Moon,"(150)	Domestication
"Pali pata kiyaweemen danaya sangika kota e danayehi anusas warnana kaleya"(137)	"Matara Hamine, there by sanctifying the food laid on the mat before them for consumption only by the Bikkus"(181)	Domestication
Source Text + Page Number	Target Text + Page Number	Translation Strategy
"Gal Palena Boru"(82)	"Rock splitting lies"(112)	Foreignization
"Githela vidagenā nagina idikatu thuda men"(101)	"like a needle piercing through butter"(137)	Foreignization
"Panchi Kelinawa"(5)	"...to play Panchi. Each of the players of two groups alternately took turns to toss seven lead-filled little cowries held in the hollow of half of a small polished coconut shell onto the polished convex surface"(13)	Foreignization

The study focuses on identifying and categorizing the translation strategies employed in converting the source text to the target language, with specific emphasis on culture embedded terms which indicate power imbalances and post-colonial implications. The analyzed results aim to identify the primary translation strategies employed by the translators, classified either domestication or foreignization, shown in table one.

The results indicate domestication as the dominant translation strategy, as demonstrated by various examples of culture embedded terms being modified to enhance the accessibility for the target audience. For example, the term ‘*Nandage Bappage Pawule udawiya*’ has been translated as “*The women-folk of Nanda’s paternal uncle’s household*” diminishing the cultural specificity of the source culture during the efforts of translators to make it accessible to the target readers. Foreignization has been applied in some cases as a strategy of resistant to the dominant culture. The term ‘*Gal Palene Boru*’ was translated as ‘Rock splitting lies’ whereas ‘*Panchi Kelinawa*’ was preserved with comprehensive explanation.

The texts presented above clearly indicate the presence of postcolonial elements in the translation text. A detailed analysis of each text is provided in the following discussion section under the subtopics of ‘The impact of domestication on cultural authenticity’ and ‘Foreignization as resistance to imperialism and cultural preservation’.

The Impact of Domestication on Cultural Authenticity

Table Ii – Example I

ST	TT	Translation Strategy
Gamperaliya	Uprooted	Domestication Strategy

The translated title of the novel is one of the issues that the researcher has identified as an exploitation of Sri Lankan culture when translating into the hegemonic language; English. When translating titles, there are two main options: either to keep the original meaning of the source titles as they are such as using literal translation, or to manipulate the translated titles using various approaches driven by diverse motivations, including adaptation, transposition, substitution, explication, and paraphrasing (Darwish & Sayaaheen, 2019; Viezzi, 2013). However, when translating the title of the original novel ‘*Gamperaliya*’ into ‘*Uprooted*’, the two translators have manipulated the title by offering different views to the interpretation of the text, according to Viezzi (2013) model of manipulating translated book titles.

The original Sinhala title of the source text ‘*Gamperaliya*’ carries the simple and the literal meaning of ‘revolution of the village’. However, there is a rationale behind the simple meaning which indicates the social and cultural changes happening in rural life of the Southern province in the early 20th century Sri Lanka, due to the modernization and the impact of colonialism. The novel ‘*Gamperaliya*’ serves as a microcosm of how a traditional rural culture could be gradually replaced by an urban culture during that time due to the impact of Western missionary education and British imperialism. The two translators have used the title ‘*Uprooted*’ which interprets the original title erroneously and gives it a different meaning. According to the Cambridge dictionary (2020), the word ‘uprooted’ means ‘to pull a plant including its roots out of the ground’ or ‘to remove a person from their home or usual environment’, which conveys a different meaning from the source title. The title of the source text has been manipulated by the two translators during the translation process which results in moving the target reader towards a different direction from the source title meaning. The translators’ decision of the translation of the title using a different meaning can be related to translators’ own understanding of the text or they want to employ a title which can be easily understood by the target audience despite its cultural and social implications.

However, the translators’ decision to translate the title rendering a different meaning domesticates the translated title, which has resulted in the target reader getting a contrasting interpretation or a viewpoint of the source text and culture even without starting reading the book. As a result, alterations to the connotations of the source language acknowledge that even minor changes in meaning can impact the interpretation and the reception of the work. The concept of ‘subaltern’ presented by Spivak makes this more complicated, emphasizing that the inherent changes of translating the historically marginalized or silenced voices, disregard source culture by adhering to the hegemony. In postcolonial theory, the term ‘subaltern’ refers to the groups which are socially, politically and geographically outside of hegemonic power structures, and remain voiceless within the center (Spivak, 1994). She argues that when translators try to represent subaltern voices, they may unintentionally support the same power structures they are trying to resist as the translations often follow the dominant rules of

the target cultures. In this context, the English title ‘Uprooted’ does not convey the exact meaning and the significance of the source text title associated with the values in source culture, unintentionally supporting the hegemony by suppressing the subaltern voice.

Table Iii – Example Ii

ST	TT	Translation Strategy
“Vedeha Rajuta anushasana kala senakaya men, ek daiwajnayek Kaisaruwatteta anushasana kaleya”(44)	“Do not go ahead with this proposal’ was the oracular advice of one of the astrologers whose opinion was sought by Kaisaruwatte” (64)	Domestication (Omission)

Proverbs are culturally bounded beliefs and values unique to certain cultures, which give knowledge and deep understanding about the ‘cultural other’. Translating proverbs in postcolonial contexts is challenging since geographical place and displacement create a gap leading to linguistic displacement. Since translating proverbs and other linguistic variations are crucial to understanding the complexities of identity formation in postcolonial settings, cultural knowledge and cultural identity markers of source culture should be preserved during the proverb translation. (Jegade, 2012).

As seen in the second example, the above proverb of the source culture has been omitted when translating it to the hegemonic English language. The meaning of the above proverb is unique to the cultural and religious setting of Sri Lanka which is closely related to Buddhism. The literal meaning of the proverb is ‘as if King Vedeha, getting advice from his royal advisor, Senaka’. This proverb has been taken from the Ummagga Jataka story, the longest story of *The Jataka Stories Book*, which contains stories about the incarnations of ‘Gautama Buddha’ as the ‘Bodhisatta’. ‘Senaka’ was a royal advisor to king Vedeha, who repeatedly offered impractical, illogical and unwise counsel. He was unable to think beyond conventional wisdom, often resorting to the same outdated advice that lacked reasoning and practical applicability. The writer employs this proverb in this context to create a sarcastic tone with the verb ‘*Anushasana Kaleya*’ which is typically associated with highly respectable figures such as religious leaders. The aforementioned proverb is used in the source text to highlight the futility of the marriage advice given by an astrologist, which Nanda’s father accepts without question. However, the nuanced sense of irony and critique is absent in the translated work.

The two translators have erased that proverb by simply translating the rest of the sentence in order to fit the expectations of the target reader by adopting a more domesticated method of ‘omission’. When a text is domesticated, cultural nuances of the source text may disappear, leading to a translation that reflects the values of the colonizer rather than the colonized (Niranjana, 1992). In this context, the Sri Lankan culture constructed with Buddhism and history has been distorted by the two translators by employing a more colonial narrative. It was the belief of the hegemonic colonizers that translations from marginalized nations should adhere to the expectations of the target culture by focusing on sense rather than the form. Therefore, the translators have not been circumspect when navigating strategies employed in order to not to resemble their translation as a tool of imperialism.

Table Iv– Example Iii

ST	TT	Translation Strategy
“Umba kiyana eka nemei karanne”(14)	“The Muhandiram’s voice was sharp with anger..... You are not following the instructions I gave you”(37)	Domestication (Using Equivalent)
“daiver gohin balala enakan oba wadiwela inna”(169)	“You’d better stay here in the car”(220)	Domestication (Using Equivalent)

“bola”(149)	“you”(195)	Domestication (Using Equivalent)
“manalayage kudamma kiiwaya”(160)	“Remarked an aunt of the bridegroom”(211)	Domestication (Using Equivalent)
“Nandage bappage pawule ganu udawiya”(136)	“The women-folk of Nanda’s paternal uncle’s household”(180)	Domestication (Using Equivalent)

Sinhala language is deeply intertwined with the caste system and religious-social environment of Sri Lanka resulting in differences in addressing people from different social classes. In this example, Sinhala words, ‘*Umba*’, ‘*Oba*’ and ‘*bola*’, are used in three different contexts, having three different meanings, which have been translated as ‘you’. In Sinhala language, the way people use ‘you’ is different depending on the social class, relationship between the speakers, or dialects. In the first sentence, ‘*Umba*’ is used to address a person who is below the social class of the speaker, and at the same time to show the anger of the speaker towards the receiver. In the second example, ‘*oba*’ is used to address a person with respect usually in formal situations. The word ‘*bola*’, in the third example is a dialectical word used in Southern province, especially in rural contexts to address someone familiar to themselves. Despite conveying the real cultural sensitivity of each term or adding any explanatory notes to describe these terms, the two translators have translated all these terms as ‘you’. When translating culture embedded words such as these from source languages to the hegemonic English language, translators should consider adding footnotes, in text descriptions or translator notes to protect the cultural sensitivity to the source culture.

In Sri Lankan culture, there is a specific kinship terminology to address family members and relations of both maternal and paternal sides, which can be considered as a significant cultural aspect of the society. However, the two translators have ignored the cultural sense and homogenized the kinship terms adhering to the norms of the hegemonic target language during the translation. Translating the term ‘*Kudamma*’ referring to mother’s younger sister as an ‘*aunt*’ and the term ‘*Bappa*’ referring to father’s younger brother, as an ‘*uncle*’, fails to convey the exact meaning in the source language which results in a significant cultural loss. According to Karpińska, (2016) a failure to effectively transmit kinship terms can distort the social structures they represent, which is particularly relevant in postcolonial contexts where cultural hegemony plays a significant role. Therefore, a translation should foster diverse perspectives rather than only focusing on seamlessly transferring the meaning of a text or assimilate the text in order to make the translated version easily understood by the hegemonic language reader.

Table V– Example Iv

ST	TT	Traslation Strategy
“Esala Pura Pasaloswaka dina Piyal gamata paminiy...”(112)	“On the day before the Esala full moon, Piyal returned from Colombo”(150)	Domestication (Using Equivalent)
“Pali pata kiyaweemen danaya sangika kota e danayehi anusas warnana kaleya”(137)	“Matara Hamine, there by sanctifying the food laid on the mat before them for consumption only by the Bikkus”(181)	Domestication (Using Equivalent)

‘Esella Full Moon’ is a religious and a national holiday in Sri Lanka which is celebrated by Buddhists to commemorate the Bodisatta’s leaving from home to become an ascetic. Buddhists in Sri Lanka visit temples and engage in religious activities on that day, similar to other full moon days, which come once in every month. This might have been translated here more literally as ‘*Esella full moon*’, but without explanation or appropriate footnote, the reader is left to assume that this day has no particular religious or cultural significance and is taken merely as an ordinary day like any other.

In the next sentence, the word ‘*danaya*’ which carries the meaning of alms has been translated as food, which is a mistranslation of the word. On the same page, the translation of the word ‘*Sanghika danaya*’, which means

‘alms offered to the Buddhist clergy’, as ‘*alms giving*’ creates confusion among the target readers about the source culture. As a result of the close connection between Sri Lankan culture and Buddhism, the religious context in Sri Lanka employs specific vocabulary or religious terminology to honor the religion. Since the food offerings given to Buddhist monks are known as ‘*danaya*’, the word ‘food’ instead of using the religious word ‘*danaya*’ or ‘*alms*’, fails to capture the religious essence of the Sri Lankan culture.

When translating a text which is full of cultural and historical influences, maintaining source culture and these characteristics in the translated work is a significant responsibility of translators. The goal of the postcolonial translation should not be merely generating the linguistic features of the source language or to guarantee the fluency of the translation in the target reception, but preserving the deep impact and subtle nuances emerging from the historical and cultural context of the source culture. Therefore, failure to preserve those aspects in the translation, leads to a manipulation of the source culture values which is a significant departure from the cultural intent of the original text.

Foreignization as a Resistance to Imperialism and Cultural Preservation

Foreignization translation strategy can be used as resistance against imperialism and ethnocentrism in order to assert the identity of the periphery and resist colonialist stereotypes. There are several places where the strategy of foreignization has been applied in the translation in order to preserve the Sri Lankan cultural nuances.

Table Vi– Example V

ST	TT	Strategy
“Gal Palena Boru”(pg:82)	“Rock splitting lies”(112)	Foreignization (literal translation)
“Githela vidagena nagina idikatu thuda men”(101)	“like a needle piercing through butter”(137)	Foreignization (literal translation)

The above examples depict the endeavor of the two translators to preserve the cultural sensitivity of the above metaphor and simile, using the literal translation method. This method is an appropriate technique when translating proverbs particularly when they are not deeply embedded with complex cultural nuances. Taking the target reader towards the source text by using foreignization, the above texts have been ‘hybridized’, by giving a more localized sense with an appropriate reception to the target readers. In this way, adopting more localized terms; translators can reject assimilation and challenges to the hegemonic norms in translation.

These instances suggest the translation as a challenging and a difficult process which makes the translator’s task more complicated especially in the postcolonial contexts where the translators must navigate between the cultural and language aspects associated with power structures in hegemonic and subaltern cultures. This delineates the in-between space or the hybrid space, which is experienced by post-colonial writers and translators, a zone that is discomfiting yet indispensable. This is a liminal space where the translators navigate between source and target languages by creating hybrid meanings. The role of the translator in this space is not neutral, as his endeavor to bring the nuances and complexities of the source language determines how the world sees the identities and power structures embedded within the source culture. Therefore, this situation forces translators to critically examine their own understanding of the language and the cultural elements of the colonized, insisting to generate innovative creations while expanding cultural and linguistic perspectives, which can be considered as another form of resistance against the hegemonic cultures of the colonizer.

Table Vii– Example Vi

ST	TT	Strategy
“Panchi Kelinawa”(5)	“...to play Panchi. Each of the players of two groups alternately took turns to toss seven lead-filled little cowries held in the hollow of half of a small polished coconut shell onto the polished convex surface”(13)	Foreignization (annotation)

The next term '*Panchi kelinawa*' in Sinhala language has been translated as '*to play panchi*' in English and the translators have further given an explanation of that game using the method of annotation. The description of "*Each of the players of two groups alternately took turns to toss seven lead-filled little cowries held in the hollow of half of a small polished coconut shell onto the polished convex surface...*" gives a culturally faithful image for the western reader about the way '*panchi*' is played using coconut shells and cowries. '*Panchi*' is a traditional Sri Lankan game played during the Sinhala and Tamil new year celebrations as a custom, which has been passed down through generations. The effort of the two translators to convey the meaning of this cultural aspect without manipulating the cultural essence is a perfect example of preserving the cultural otherness in Sri Lankan culture. Distinguishing the otherness of the source text either with explanatory notes or using untranslatable words, underlines the diversity of the cultures by challenging the expectations of the target audience, while demolishing the rigid identities of the hegemonic cultures.

Anthony Appiah adopts the idea of 'thick description' from anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1993) to introduce the notion of 'thick translation'. It is a method that involves both literal translation and annotations or footnotes which can be seen in culturally and linguistically rich contexts. This method resists assimilation of the target culture norms and preserve the 'cultural otherness' of the source text. Therefore, translators can employ this method as a successful application when translating culturally rich texts in postcolonial contexts.

LIMITATIONS

The study is subject to several limitations that may influence the scope and applicability of its findings. First, its focus on a single text may limit the generalizability of the findings across other Sri Lankan literary translations. Future research could focus on multiple literary texts. Second, the analysis is restricted to sentence-level comparisons, potentially overlooking structural dynamics. Finally, while the research engages with prominent and influential postcolonial theoretical perspectives, it does not incorporate alternative theoretical lenses such as feminist or intersectional perspectives, which could enrich future research.

CONCLUSIONS

Application of postcolonial translation theory to the comparative study of the Sinhala novel *Gamperaliya* and its English translation *Uprooted* is fundamentally challenging due to the complex interactions between cultural, linguistic and ideological elements in Sri Lankan culture, which have been shaped by the influence of British colonialism. The role of the translator, particularly the balance between the need to preserve the original text and to adapt the translation to the target culture, becomes more than mere change from one language to another. However, translators can use strategies such as foreignization and domestication with the aim of reducing loss and compensating for what is missing in translation.

The analysis demonstrates that the two translators favour domestication over foreignization when presenting Sri Lankan culture in hegemonic English language. Since domestication tends to fit the norms of the target audience, the two translators have rewritten the village culture during the translation process according to the expectations of the target readers. Therefore, the translated novel shows meaning alterations, misinterpretations and generalization of the unique cultural elements in Sri Lankan culture, resulting in the loss of cultural sensitivity. Even though there are several occasions where the translators have employed foreignization, resisting imperialism, it is largely insufficient to counterbalance the domestication.

Translation emphasizes the translator's task to accurately and respectfully articulate the identity of marginalized cultures. This study confirms that postcolonial translation is a political act of negotiating culture, power dynamics and ideology rather than simply transferring cultural and language elements. The analysis demonstrates that whether the choices made by the translators are conscious or not, it determines the broad postcolonial concerns about power, identity and resistance.

Thus, translating a culturally rich novel like *Gamperaliya*, requires a complex and thick translation approach that engages with multiple voices and perspectives- employing glossaries and notes to preserve the cultural integrity of the original text while making it resonate with the contemporary, global audience.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Sincere gratitude is extended to professor Li Chongyue for his guidance and encouragement throughout the research.

REFERENCES

1. Appiah, K. A. (1993). Thick translation. *Callaloo*, 16(4), 808–819.
2. Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2002). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
3. Bandia, P. F. (2012). Postcolonial literary heteroglossia: A challenge for homogenizing translation. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 20(4), 419–431.
4. Bandia, P. F. (2021). *Postcolonialism and translation: The dialectic between theory and practice*. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies*, 2.
5. Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (Eds.). (1998). *Constructing cultures: Essays on literary translation*. *Multilingual Matters*.
6. Bassnett, S., & Trivedi, H. (Eds.). (1999). *Post-colonial translation: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
7. Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
8. Cambridge University Press. (2020). *Cambridge Dictionary*.
9. Darwish, I., & Sayaaheen, B. (2019). Manipulating titles in translation. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 9(3), 239–245.
10. Hu, W., & Shi, Z. (2015). A postcolonial perspective on the cultural translation strategies: A case study of the English version of *Shuihuzhuan* (All Men Are Brothers). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(3), 581–586.
11. Jegede, O. (2012). Proverbial space and the dialectics of place and displacement in Sade Adeniran's *Imagine This*. *African Research Review*, 6(1), 275–286.
12. Karpińska, P. (2016). Postcolonial tendencies in translation in the light of centre-periphery pre-conceptual image schema. *Journal of Education, Culture and Society*, 7(2), 328–339.
13. Niranjana, T. (1992). *Siting translation: History, post-structuralism, and the colonial context*. University of California Press.
14. Spivak, G. C. (1994). Can the subaltern speak? In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A reader* (pp. 66–111). Longman.
15. Spivak, G. C. (2001). The politics of translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 369–388). Routledge.
16. Tymoczko, M. (1999). Post-colonial writing and literary translation. In S. Bassnett & H. Trivedi (Eds.), *Post-colonial translation: Theory and practice* (pp. 19–40). Routledge.
17. UNESCO. (2019). *Index Translationum: World bibliography of translation*.
18. Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.
19. Viezzi, M. (2013). Titles and translation. In VAKKI Publications (Vol. 2, pp. 374–384). University of Vaasa.
20. Wedhowerti, W. (2023). Postcolonial trace in the translation of *Bumi Manusia*. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan Sastra*, 7(2), 274–284.
21. Williams, P., & Chrisman, L. (Eds.). (1994). *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A reader*. Longman.