



2277 - 7881



RECREATING POETIC SYNTAX: SYNTACTICAL ISSUES IN TRANSLATING NARMAD'S SELECTED POEMS INTO ENGLISH

Dr. Amit R. Prajapati

Professor, Department of English, Veer Narmad South Gujarat University
Udhna-Magdalla Road, Surat

Abstract

Translation, whatsoever type of form it might be, is always challenging. When it comes to translating the poetic form, it carries itself beyond the lexical limits as the poetic meaning is very deeply rooted in its syntactic structure. No creative artist other than the poet can create or recreate the poem in an either creative or translational form. Jakobson rightly says, “. . . poetry by definition is untranslatable. Only creative transposition is possible: either intralingual transposition—from one poetic shape into another, or interlingual transposition—from one language into another” (Jakobson 1992: 151). In the same light, this research paper argues that recreating the poetic form in the translation of a poem is extraordinarily challenging since the creative poetry not only involves the poetic syntax nourished by grammar but also aestheticized syntactical involvement of grammar. The inverted sentence order of Gujarātī i.e., SVO is compared to that of English—SVO or SVC, is more flexible and different. Bhattacharya mentions, “The major problems of translation arise at the level of syntax rather than vocabulary, particularly when languages follow different word-order principles” (Bhattacharya 1987: 41). To attempt to translate such a poetic structure into modern English, that too of the 19th century Gujarātī used by Narmad, poses inevitable structural displacement for a translator. Compared to prose translation, the poetic translation is more compact, semantically dense, grammatically strict, decorated with figures of speech projecting tight cooperation between sound and words. It is argued that English translation of a Gujarātī poetry is not inferior to the stylistic problem but rather the core problem as what the poem does as a poem. Arguing being supported by linguists like Roman Jakobson, Nabokov, Walter Benjamin, Bholabhai Patel and others, the paper concludes that syntactical reproduction for the translation of a poem depends on, not the direct transfer of meaning, but on the creative transposition.

Keywords: Poetic Syntax, Narmad, Poetry, Grammar, Equivalence, Loss, Recreation

(1) Introduction:

Due to syntactical and metaphorical problems, the translation of poetry has been considered the most challenging one out of all literary genres. While translating the poem, the translator has to translate the meaning and the form both, both being inseparable from each other making the translation of poetry truly difficult one. The syntactical structure of the poem involves, above the interpretative level, sound, music, rhythm, figures of speech and so on along with perceptible and imperceptible ambiguity. The translation of poetry involves various issues embedded with the very process itself as “Poetry is what gets lost in translation” (Frost 1961: 16) as, according to Roman Jakobson, “Poetry by definition is untranslatable” and when one attempts to render it into a different language, “Only creative translation is possible” (Jakobson 1959: 151). However, many translators have translated poems and many will continue to do so as “Translation is formally impossible, but it is necessary” (Steiner 1998: 284).

(2) What is a Syntax?

In order to translate a poem, the most complicated genre to translate, the translator is required to not only know but also understand the complex structure involved in the art of poetry creation. The syntax, that brings words together in an acceptable meaningful universal form of the language, is always marked by certain linguistic and grammatical characteristics. The syntax, as a significant branch of linguistics, deals with the structure of each and every sentence. This structure leads to how the words are arranged, by their internal grammatical relationship, with one another. To simplify the meaning of the word ‘syntax’ is an arrangement of words in a given structure of a sentence. Retaining the similar syntax in the Target Language is must as it makes the combined forms of the words meaningful and acceptable grammatically universally.



2277 - 7881



Many linguists have defined syntax. To note among them a few, to Noam Chomsky, syntax is “the study of the principles and processes by which sentences are constructed in particular languages” (Chomsky 1957: 11), to Fromkin, syntax “determines how words are combined to form phrases and sentences” (Fromkin 2011: 124) and to Trask, syntax is “the branch of linguistics that studies the ways in which words combine to form sentences” (Trask 1993: 263). Similar to Trask, Radford argues, “Syntax is concerned with the structure of sentences and the systematic ways in which sentence structure is determined” (Radford 1997: 1) and to Leech, the syntax “deals with the formal relations between words in sentences” (Leech 1974: 17) Similar to Leech, Bloomfield defines syntax as, “the study of the construction of phrases and sentences out of words” (Bloomfield 1933: 170), to David Crystal, the syntax is “the study of how sentences are structured, and how constituents such as phrases and clauses are arranged within them” (Crystal 2008: 471) and to Comrie the syntax, “concerns the principles governing the combination of words into larger units” (Comrie 1989: 5). In nutshell, it can be noted that all these definitions of the syntax refer to the role of syntax in interpreting the text in a special way, as it is the syntax only that allows the meaningful combination of words and phrases into a sentence. Thus, the study of what the syntax is, makes the study of what makes the poem, to translate the poem as a poem only in the Target Language Text.

(3) Indispensability of the Poetic Syntax in Interpretation:

Linguistics studies ‘syntax’ as the generative force for arriving at the meaning of a sentence. It is the syntax that determines the meaning in a given circumstances governing the semantic relationship among the words and phrases. Therefore, while translating, if possible to remain as close as to the Source Language Text, it is must for the translator to retain the syntax in the Target Language Text similar to that of Source Language Text. Noam Chomsky rightly notes, “The meaning of a sentence is determined by its deep structure” (Chomsky 1965: 135) where syntactic structure is likely to produce different meanings even with the same words. Unlike Chomsky, Halliday emphasizes the role of grammar to play a significant role in the practice of interpretation. Of course, grammar cannot be separated from the syntax. Halliday maintains, “Grammar is the central processing unit of language, the place where meanings are created” (Halliday 1994: 15-16). Thus, Halliday here treats syntax as a type of meaning creating system which is inevitable to interpret. However, Halliday further clarifies that syntax cannot have and is not “an autonomous level of form” but rather it is, “a resource for making meaning in context” (Halliday 1994: 15-16).

Geoffrey Leech in his book *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry connecting syntax to literary interpretation* states that “Syntax contributes directly to meaning by controlling relationships between words and clauses, and hence plays a crucial role in interpretation” (Leech 1969: 19). The deviation of a text at syntactic level hampers the activity of translation. The meaning shapes itself within the syntax of the sentence structure. Ronald Carter states that syntactic choices depend on “how a reader processes and interprets a text” (Carter 2006: 10). Even Bloomfield emphasizes the interpretative part of the syntax stating that “The meaning of a linguistic form is determined by the relations it enters into with other forms” (Bloomfield 1933: 161). Thus, Bloomfield evidences that the meaning of the sentence rests on its syntactic arrangement rather than in isolation. Some of the Indian linguists have also contributed towards the role of syntax in interpretation of the text. Bimal Patel notes that, “Syntax provides the framework within which semantic interpretation becomes possible.” Further, stating Patel adds that “without syntactic organization, meaning remains indeterminate” (Patel 2008; 72).

(4) Syntax and Translation Studies: Interdependent Relationship:

Translation is not only a lexical substitution but also the reconstruction of the meaning in the possible similar syntactic pattern of the Target Language Text. The knowledge of the syntax allows a translator comfort to translate as all different languages have their own different syntactical pattern. On the basis of all the definitions and arguments made by various linguists, it can be clearly noted that for the translator the act of interpretation has to be significant for the translation activity to take place honestly. Basil Hatim and Ian Mason have rightly noted in their book *Discourse and the Translator*, “Since meaning is largely encoded in syntactic relations, translation is inevitably an act of syntactic interpretation” (Hatim 1990: 65). This definition of syntax by Basil Hatim acts stating that before the process of meaning transfer, the process of interpreting the text is inevitably significant. The translation of prose offers a type of ease to the translator to transfer the



2277 - 7881



syntax whereas that of poetry disrupts the comfort of the same being more complicated in the syntax itself. Poetry, by deviation of the syntax, creates meaning producing a challenge also for the translator simultaneously. While translating a poem, the translator not only translates, what the poet says but also how the structure of the poetic line makes it suitable to say so as Roman Jakobson rightly says, “languages differ essentially in what they *must* convey and not in what they *may* convey” (Jakobson 1992: 7). Talking about the structure of the Indian languages completely different from English, K. M. George notes, “Structural differences among Indian languages demand syntactic transformation rather than equivalence at word level” (George 1998:14). The very view of K. M. George has been strongly supported when Devy notes, “Indian languages think in syntax very differently from English, and translation must therefore invent syntactic bridges” (Devy 1999: 21).

The very attempt to translate results into the collision of grammar. All the languages of the world, do not have necessarily, the same codes of grammar. Sentence structure and arrangements of word order always hamper the activity of translation. The poet licensed as a creative artist exploits more the use of the semantically charged and changed grammatical structure. Therefore, one can argue that in the translation of poetry, only the creative transposition is possible. Rainer Schulte, in the “Introduction” to his book *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, writes, “As language itself is a translation, the act of recreating language through the reading process constitutes another form of translation” (Schulte 1992: 9). The awareness of syntactical pattern of the Target Language is must for the translator as Patnaik maintains on the significance of the syntax in the reconstruction of meaning in translation, “Meaning in language is not carried by words alone; it is also structured syntactically, and any change in syntactic pattern may result in a change of meaning” (Patnaik 2006: 112). Thus, it is inevitable for the translator to maintain the syntactic relations at any cost. Paniker adds relating syntax to literary translation, “Translation involves a reorganization of syntactic structures to suit the genius of the target language while retaining the spirit of the source text” (Paniker 1997: 89).

While establishing the relationship between translation and syntax, Devy connects the syntax with the cultural aspect of translation focusing that translation cannot be free from the cultural embodiment. He notes, “Languages differ not only in vocabulary but in their syntactic imagination, and translation must negotiate these differences creatively” (Devy 1993: 68). On the skill of the translator, Anand Mahananda says, “A translator needs to understand the syntactic system of both source and target languages in order to achieve functional equivalence” (Mahananada 2005: 57). Talking about the role of the syntax in translation, Sitanshu Yashaschandra Mehta notes, “The soul of the language rests in its sentence. If the sentence structure is distorted in translation, the nature of the text changes” (Mehta 1998: 52). This argument is solicited when Bholabhai Patel notes, “Translation is not a change of words solely but a process to reorganize the syntax of one language into another” (Patel 2001: 34).

To have the knowledge of syntax in translation is must. Since syntax is not independent, as it has been discussed here with the views of various linguists, the study of translation leads the transfer of meaning as well as the syntax of the Source Language Text into the Target Language Text. When translation involves the restructuring of the Source Language Text meaning into the Target Language Text, it has to be accepted that meaning is syntactically organized.

(5) Issues in Translating Narmad’s Selected Poems into English:

This research paper focuses on the issues through the examination of Narmad’s poetry by centring the questions like: While translating Narmad’s Gujarātī poems into English, what happens to the poetic syntax? Which syntactical features the are most vulnerable in poetry translation? Can the translator recreate the same poetic force? The syntactic problem of translation depending on the grammar due to the differences between the basic structures of both these languages produces many hurdles and hindrances in the path of the translator. It creates many issues beginning from the translation of the poetic form, syntactical organization of a sentence, omission of subject, a combination of many simple sentences into one in Gujarātī, the use of causative verbs, punctuations, tense, missing articles in Gujarātī, to the minimum of translating personal pronouns.



The primary problem of the poetry translator is to accept the challenges of the formal aspects of any poetry. Important to note here is that the poetic structure means the plan of a poem as a whole, the shape and the balance of the individual sentence of every line. Though the structure of a poem is very much affected by the sentence structure, it has no direct relationship with the sentence structure or grammar of a language. Thus, to retain the original structure of the Source Language Text in the Target Language Text means to maintain the original structure of each sentence along with its content. If the form is the body of the poem then the content is the soul of that body. Therefore, both are inseparable. The language-dependent content of any poem makes the translation of poetry more difficult. The change of language with different sort of vocabulary may affect the mood, the rhythm and the delivery of content in a translated poem.

Additionally, the aesthetic value dependent on the poetic structure is conveyed in words and sounds through the cognitive sense. These aesthetic values have no independent meanings but are hidden in the various meanings of a poem. Therefore, the translation into the Target Language Text leads to the fear of losing them. Similarly, the translator has to balance where the beauty of the poem lies. If the beauty of the poem lies on sounds and not on the semantic mood of a poem, the translator can never ignore it. A translator can neither be carried away with the free translation of a poem nor by word by-word translation of a poem. Holmes believes that translation of poetry “is sometimes possible, sometimes impossible, sometimes easy, sometimes difficult, sometimes a failure, sometimes an amazing success.” (Holmes 1988: 45). Though it is known that a poem with a highly complex structure, imagery, inter-textuality, ambiguity and complex totalities will have to sacrifice certain elements, while attempting the translation of Narmad’s poetry, the middle way has been accepted. It is attempted to be as much loyal to the Source Language Text as possible. In the translation of poetry, the first preference is given to the meaning, then form and then if possible, it is also attempted to retain rhyme and rhythm of the original poems.

Thus, in the light of these theories of translation, if Narmad’s poems are looked at, they sound more difficult in their poetic structure. All his poems do not have the same syntactical structure. In some poems like *Desh Tanu Hit Chāhvū* (Wish for the Nation’s Welfare), *Kharu te Kā na Kahevun* (Why not to Speak the Truth?), *Dāspanu Kahān Shudhi?* (Slavery, How much Long?), *Zānsha sha Khāvā Bhāi?* (Why to Suffer Taunts, Man?) and others, two *charans* (feet / a quarter of a verse) of every line are written together with a comma in between and semi-colon at the end of each line which gets completed in the next line after the fourth *charan* (foot). Thus, these two lines have one stanza. In a poem like *Swatantratā-Khari Himmat* (Freedom: A Genuine Courage), one line of a poem with its four feet has been divided into four separate lines, one following the other. On the other side, in a poem like *Jay Jay Garvi Gujarāt* (Hail! Hail! Great Gujarāt), Narmad has composed three shorter lines of one foot each without commas and then two longer lines with two feet each one having. Again, he repeats four shorter lines and then two longer lines. The first line of Narmad’s another poem *Koni Koni Chhe Gujarāt* (Whose Gujarāt?) is very short with one foot only whereas the second and the third line each has two feet. Again, the fourth, the fifth and the sixth lines of this poem are very short with only one foot in each of them. Thus, it is never easy to retain the same structure of each line of a poem in its English translation.

The stanza pattern of Gujarātī is very different from that of English. However, an attempt has been made to retain the same stanza pattern that has been provided by Narmad in each poem. However, it is never that much easy because the line of a Gujarātī poem, when translated into English, takes more space than that of the Source Language Text. Thus, the line usually turns out to be longer in English than it is in Gujarātī. It does not allow matching the stanza pattern in terms of number of lines or in terms of the length of lines in the Source Language Text. Gujarātī language has perhaps more compactness than English does. It is perhaps this compactness which creates pitfalls in the reproduction of the Source Language in the Target Language.

In case of certain poems, Narmad has given *tek* (main repeating line of a poem). This *tek* has been specially indicated by Narmad in some of his poems. The poems like *Bairā ne nā Jor Batāvo* (Do not Bully over Women), *Pet Bale pan Gām na Bālo* (Do not Divulge Domestic Dispute), *Ran to Dhirānu Dhirānu* (The Patient Wins the Battle), *Fari Jobaniun Āpe* (Gift me Youth Again), *Jāg ni Jivdā* (Awake the Soul), *Ā Shā Chhe Hāl Mārā* (What a Poor Plight I am in!) and *Nablā par nā Hāth Ugāmo* (Do not attack the Weak) have *tek* after the first line. However, the poems like *Surat* (Surat), *Kabirwad*



(Kabir, the Banyan Tree), *Shiyālā mā* (In Winter) and *Widhwāvreh* (Bereavement of a Widow) do not have *tek* anywhere in them at all.

There are certain poems in which not one word but the first foot itself is repeated by Narmad. Poems like *Deshtanu Hit Chāhvū, bhāi, Deshtanu Hit Chāhvū* (Wish for the Nation's Welfare, dear, Wish for the Nation's Welfare), *Radyā Kare Shun Valshe, bhāi, Radyā Kare Shun Valshe* (Crying will gain you Nothing, dear, Crying will Gain you Nothing), *Fari Jobaniun Āpe, Hari tu Fari Jobaniun Āpe* (Gift me Youth Again, oh! Lord, Gift me Youth Again), *Kharu te Kān na Kahevun, bhāi, Kharu te Kān na Kahevun* (Why not to Speak the Truth, dear, Why not to Speak the Truth?), *Dāspanu Kahān Shudhi, Karvu Dāspanu Kahān Shudhi?* (Slavery how much long, to remain enslaved how long?) and *Jay Jay Garvi Gujarāt, Jay Jay Garvi Gujarāt* (Hail! Hail! Great Gujarat) are the best examples of the repetition of the foot.

Keeping the untraditional style, Narmad has given refrains in some of his poems. In a poem *Nav Karsho Koi Shoka* (Never Mourn at All), the refrain is given having compressed at the end of each line. In poems *Bhanavā Vishe* (About Studying), *Vīr Purush te Kyān Chhei* (Bravery is Rare) and *Sānjni Shobhā to Rādiyāmli* (The Look of the Evening) the refrain is given after every two lines. In a poem *Chalo Chalo Juddh ne* (Come, Let's Join the Battle) the refrain is given after every three lines. *Bheno Tame Gnāna Vadhāro* (Women, You Enrich your Knowledge) is the example of having refrained after every four lines. In a poem *Sāhas Karvv Vishe* (About Being Adventurous), the first refrain is given after seven lines whereas the remaining refrains are given after every five lines. Moreover, there are also poems like *Samp Rākhvā Vishe* (About Being United) which have the refrains in them after every ten lines. The uneven number and tradition of giving refrains in poems disturb the form of the poem in the Target Language Text. Narmad has adjusted almost all the refrains at the end of a line. But while translating a poem with such refrains, it adds one more line for each refrain in a poem. When it is attempted to compress the refrain at the end of the same line in English, it lengthens the line and therefore it disturbs the whole balance of that poem.

According to the structuralist point of view, grammar is the study of the rules governing the use of a language. Each language has its own distinct grammar. Hence, for any translator, grammar becomes a matter of concern. Therefore, it is essential for any translator to have the knowledge of grammar of both the Target Language as well as the Source Language. While translating Narmad's grammar-oriented poems, the following few points need to be taken care of.

The transference of a sentence along with its meaning and poetic form from one language to another involves the change in the basic structure of a sentence. Along with the lexical problem, the second order of the problem lies in the syntactical differences between English and Gujarātī languages. Though the term "syntax" refers to the branch of grammar in which "words . . . are arranged to show connections of meaning within the sentence", the syntactical organization of Gujarātī and English is variable (Matthews 1981: 1). The word order of a sentence in English is SUBJECT + VERB + OBJECT which is very strictly maintained in all sorts of clauses and patterns of communications with an exception of the passive construction. As Gujarātī is highly inflexive in nature, the basic sentence structure SUBJECT + OBJECT + VERB very often varies to OBJECT + SUBJECT + VERB or OBJECT + VERB + SUBJECT. Therefore, the nature of Gujarātī language is more assimilative. This may result into the combination of many simpler sentences in Gujarātī than an English sentence can do. Thus, the more flexible nature of Gujarātī language while hampering the activity of translation forces the translator to make a lot of adjustments and compromises in order to reproduce the message of the Source Language Text in the Target Language Text.

Narmad out of his habit gives many prolix descriptions in his poems which run through a single line making it more complex due to much compressed information in it. For example, his poem *Jāg ni Jivda* (Awake the Soul) has many long and much compressed lines which disturb the length of the translated lines in the SL text. *Jot zānkhi thai, kumud ni kadi thai, kamal to khilvā māndshe jo; Bhakta sahu darshane, dodtā jāy ne, sakaljan hāt nij māndashe jo* (The flame fades, the bud of water-lily, will soon bloom into a flower fully; Devotees all rush to God's glimpse, and people other will open their shops daily) (Dave Vol. III 1994: 51, line no. 11 & 12). While attempting to translate such poems into English with a very rigid sentence pattern, the translator has to adopt an approach to edit in order to accomplish accuracy and integrity in the



semantic and the syntactic location of these poems. It may lead the translator to change the Passive Construction to the Active one or vice versa. For example, in a poem *Hā re Pyāri Ek Vinti Mane Āp* (O Beloved! Gift me a Ring), the active voice construction given in the second foot of the 8th line *vānk nathi kai tuj* has been passivized as “you can’t be blamed” (Dave Vol. IV 1995: 155). Sometimes, the noun has to be substituted by the verb, the adjective by the adverb and the noun by an adverb. For example, in a poem *Hun Ahiyān ne Tu Tahān* (I am Here and You are There), the word *vijogmā* used in the first foot of the 2nd line is a noun which has been made an adjective “lonely” in the translated version. In the same poem, in the first foot of the 7th line, the verb *dhiro thai* has been used which has been translated as an adverb “patiently” into English (Dave Vol. IV 1995: 176).

There are many examples of the inverted syntax in the poems of Narmad. For example, in a poem *Vartyu me Mandu Tāru* (I have Known you thoroughly), lines no. 8th and 9th read like *Mune kolvanti nāri, vachhodi te katāri; Mari te sāle kāri re*. In order to suit the syntax of English, after the internal change in the word order, it has been rendered into English as: “Separating me, you wounded with a dagger of disloyalty; That pricks me much noble woman, ho!” (Dave Vol. IV 1995: 151). Another example occurring in the 3rd and 4th lines of the poem *Prabhu Kadi Pāesh mā Pritadi* (Oh God, Don’t offer me a Cup of Love) is: *Bag jevo re hun thai rahyo, jalo lohi pie chhe jem; Prem piun chhu hun ghuntade, sukh pānch minit nahi em*. While translating this couplet into English, in order to have a suitable meaning, the 2nd foot of the 3rd line is interchanged with the 1st foot of the 4th line otherwise it might be misunderstood. Its English rendering is: “I come to be a callous crane, I drink love in draughts; Like the leech sucking blood, I live hardly happily for five minutes” (Dave Vol. IV 1995: 115).

While referring to change in the syntax of a sentence in Gujarātī, a poem *Prabhu Kadi Pāesh mā Pritadi* (Oh God, Don’t offer me a Cup of Love) offers the best example of the change in word order. In the second foot of the 1st line of a poem, Narmad says: *e bhāng pive nahi chen* with the word order of OBJECT + VERB + COMPLEMENT which is very common in the syntax of Gujarātī language. It has been rendered into English as “drinking that hemp gives no comforts” (Dave Vol. IV 1995: 115). A poem *Dāspanu kahān shudhi?* (Slavery how much Long?) exemplifies the complete inversion of the word order. In the 3rd line of the poem, Narmad says: *Mukkie mukkie māre, bakrā ne bahu lobhi*. The syntax of the line is: PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE + VERB + OBJECT + SUBJECT. Its English translation reads like: “The greedy beat the goat, to death with the fists” (Dave Vol. I 1993: 29). Another example is from the second foot of the 8th line in the poem *Nav Karsho koi Shoka* (Never Mourn at All) which reads like: *jivto chhaun hun dam thi*. The syntax is: VERB + SUBJECT + ADVERBIAL. It has been translated into English as “I live in high spirits” (Dave Vol. VI 1995: 88). Narmad has even composed a poem which reflects the example with a very inflexive type of syntax. In the 1st foot of the 7th line of a poem *Vidhwāvreh* (Bereavement of a Widow), Narmad says: *zat marvu hun bhalu kahun*. The word order is: ADVERB + VERB + SUBJECT + ADJECTIVE + VERB. In English it has been translated as “To die quickly is better” (Dave Vol. II 1994: 88). Thus, the flexible word order of Gujarātī allows the translator to struggle more.

Omission of the subject in a perfect Gujarātī sentence is very common as a grammatical characteristic feature. Gujarātī language being very much inflexive in nature, allows the use of subject anywhere in a sentence or even the omission of it is very often allowed without disturbing the semantic construction of the sentence. But due to its very strict sentence pattern, English does not allow the omission of the subject unless it is the second person imperative. Reaping the benefits out of this language pattern, almost many poetic lines in the poems of Narmad hardly have the Subject. For example, in poems like *Daglu Bharyun ke nā Hathu, nā hathvu* (Step Once Taken should not be Withdrawn, Never), *Vādal Fātvā Māndyu Have Chhe* (Clouds are Dispersing, Now), *Sahu Jan Hak Uthi Māngō* (All you Rise and Ask for the Right), *Paglā Bharvā Māndo Re* (Start Taking Steps), *Kadi nā Himmat Muko Re* (Never Lose Courage), *Zat Zat Chālo Jī* (Walk very quickly) Narmad omits the second person imperative pronoun / subject “you”. Wherever it is necessary, the missing subject is supplied by the translator.

Along with the omission of the subject, the translator even faces the problem of translating Gujarātī pronouns into English. The problem of personal pronouns is prominent especially in case of the second person pronouns. There are three second person pronouns of address in Gujarātī like *tamey, tu* and *āp*. The social status of a person determines the use of any



2277 - 7881



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

ISSN:2277-7881(Print); IMPACT FACTOR :9.014(2025); IC VALUE:5.16; ISI VALUE:2.286

PEER REVIEWED AND REFERRED INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

(Fulfilled Suggests Parametres of UGC by IJMER)

Volume:14, Issue:8(4), August, 2025

Scopus Review ID: A2B96D3ACF3FEA2A

Article Received: Reviewed : Accepted

Publisher: Sucharitha Publication, India

Online Copy of Article Publication Available : www.ijmer.in

one of them. *Tu* indicates a person younger in age or may be a person inferior in status or caste. *Tamey* can be used to denote either plural addressees or an elder person in age. *Āp* is normally used in the kingly discourses. So, it is very less active in the society. They will not find exact equivalences in English. However, the modern English “you” corresponds to Gujarātī *tu*, *tamey / tame*, and *āp* used by Narmad in certain poems as the second person pronouns. The possessive category of such pronouns is: *tāru*, *tāri*, *tāro*, *tamārun*, *tamāri*, *tamāro* which hold only one equivalent in English “your”. The examples occur as: *Dhik dhik dāspanu dāspanu*, *balyun tamārun shāpanu* (Fie! fie! slavery, fie! fie! your wisdom!), *Ā te shā tuj hāl*, “*Surat Sunāni Murat*” (Oh Surat! What a fall! “Once thou had golden surface”), *Bheno Tame Gnāna Vadhāro* (Women, you Enrich Your Knowledge) and *Sāmbhal Pyārā Mitra Tu* (Listen to me, Dear Friend). In order to select the best equivalent in English, first of all the translator has to understand the function of these pronouns in the sentence of the SL. However, the translation of these pronouns in English is also a problem because English has only one category of “you” which is used in singular and plural both.

Along with the omission of the subject, the issue of “tense” always makes the translator very tense because while translating a poem, the translator also translates a “tense”. The literary tense is a tense in which the narratives or poems are generally written. Generally, any literary text written by any author in any language has the factor of “tense” and this factor plays its role differently in different languages. Normally, it is the simple present tense in which the literary texts narrate the events of the past in English. Gujarātī literature refers to tense differently enabling translators to face difficulties. Though Gujarātī has the simple past tense as the narrative one, sometimes the writers out of enthusiasm, in order to make the narration livelier, use the simple present tense. However, a Gujarātī poem that uncertainly vacillates between the past and the present tenses perplexes the unaccustomed translator to such fluctuations. While translating a Gujarātī text, if the translator is not very much careful, the TL text may be robbed of its validity. The misuse of the tenses in translation may impair the message of the SL text. While translating Narmad’s poems, many issues related to tenses, their usage and aspect categories, which are discussed below, should be taken care of.

In a poem *Sāhas Karvā Vishe* (About Being Adventurous), in the 2nd foot of the very first line of the poem, Narmad sings *byugalo vāge* which is the indicative of the progressive tense. Hence, it has been translated as “the bugles are blowing”. In the 2nd line of the same poem, Narmad indicates the future through the present tense saying *fateh chhe āge*. Therefore, it has been translated as “victory is waiting”. In the last line of the same poem, Narmad says *Sāhase Narmadādesh, dukh sahu bhāge*. Here, Narmad refers to the possibility of driving away all grieves. However, to make it suitable in English, it has been rendered as “Adventure, says Narmad, drives away sorrows in line” making an inanimate object as the subject of a translated line (Dave Vol. I 1993: 42).

In the 2nd line of the poem *Sakhi Ruthyo Chhe Āj* (*Sakhi*, Loving *Shāmlo* is Displeased Today), Narmad refers to the assumption of the *Gopi* stating: *Hashe pātāl nā pet mā sho āmlo jo*. This should be translated with the help of the models like “must” or “may”. But instead of using the model auxiliaries, in order to match the tense of this line with the earlier one and focus on the surety of the beloved, it has been translated into the simple present tense as “Certainly, He hides some hurt in the heart of hearts, see” (Dave Vol. IV 1995: 89). In the 1st foot of the 12th line in a poem *Vatyu me Mandu Tāru Re* (I have Known You thoroughly), the poet says: *Vheri nākhe e āri, gujari vāto sambhāri*. In order to translate it into English, it has been converted into a conditional sentence and rendered as: “That saw of perfidy dissects, when I recall departed days” (Dave Vol. IV 1995: 151).

In the 6th line of the poem *Vidhwāvreh* (Bereavement of a Widow), Narmad narrates the event of the past in the present tense. He states: *Sharirsambandh karyo nathi, sāheli re mātra dharyo chhe hāth, kar sukhheli re*. As English is very strict in the use of the tense, in order to have the continuity of the flow, this line has been translated as: “We had no bodily pleasure, I merely married him, *Sāheli re!* O shower the rain of pleasure” (Dave Vol. II 1994: 88). Thus, along with these examples discussed here, there are many more examples which prove that Gujarātī language is very much flexible in the use of tenses.



The use of causative verbs creates a lot many problems for a translator translating from Gujarātī into English. English expresses actions directly performed by human beings. But the nature of Gujarātī language to omit the subject and express those actions that are not directly done by human beings but their bodily parts, makes the translation activity more difficult. Thus, the organ performs the action in Gujarātī. But actually, the human being causes the organ to perform some action. Gujarātī allows the verb inflection and thus gets the causal construction very easily done which cannot be done in English. Such causative constructions which consist of three elements express inducement to action. These three elements include- main causative verb, induced object and caused action. English normally expresses its causative construction through three verbs: get, have and make. The passive causative actions are also denoted by the same three verbs.

Narmad has used the causative sentence construction in some poems. The permission granted by Gujarātī to a bodily organ to perform the action may disturb the TL. "Get" in passive construction is very often used to express negative connotation. For example, in a poem *Chalo Chalo Juddha ne* (Come, Let's Join the Battle), in the 1st foot of the 3rd line, Narmad says: *re bandhāyā re bandhāyā* which has been rendered into English as "O we got caught, o we got caught" (Dave Vol. I 1993: 57). Another example of the causative verb occurs in the poem *Zānsā Shā Khāvā Bhāi?* (Why to Suffer Taunts, Man). Narmad writes in the 18th line: *Bhani gani ne tek rākhtā vali rakhāvī jāne; te jan jash nu bidu chāve, Narmad bol pramāne.* These lines read in English translation as: "Those who study and uphold honour, and make others uphold; Get the prize of fame, as says Narmad" (Dave Vol. I 1993: 29). The translator is not allowed to forget that the semantic scope of the English causative verb is much wider than that of Gujarātī. Therefore, the translator has to be more careful while choosing an appropriate equivalent from a big range of synonyms that express vivid degrees of causal relationship.

It has been very often observed that extra lingual items play a very vital role in the process of translation. Punctuations are one of them. It has been never easy to explain the significance of punctuation in written translation. While translating an SL text, the translator has to be more careful even in the translation of the minute details as the readers of the TL text not only read the content but also evaluate the form of translation. The accuracy, neatness, carefulness, the use of the language and efficiency of the translator are also assessed through the translated text. Even when a comma can decide vital things in a text, the role of punctuation becomes very essential. Gujarātī and English punctuations offer a fresh challenge to a translator as it functions based on different principles in both these languages.

In Gujarātī, the punctuation is dependent on the structure of a sentence. It means that specific structures like certain phrases, subordinate clauses etc. are separated in the sentence with the help of punctuation. Thus, the need-based rules regulate the punctuation in Gujarātī whereas English punctuation depends on intonation and semantics. The punctuation of comma in English separates the rhythmic group, an adverbial or a clause preceding the main clause. As it has been observed, in Narmad's poetic discourse, the use of "comma" depends differently on his poetic license and the structure of the poem. This comma is very much essential in the interpretation of the TL and this is reflected in the translation of Narmad's poems into English. For example, in the 4th line of the poem *Sāhas Karvā Vishe* (About Being Adventurous), Narmad says: *Shankā bhay to bahu roj, hām ne khāle.* In this line, Narmad uses comma after the word *roj* (every day). While translating this line into English, comma has been removed as it does not suit the syntax of an English sentence. Thus, this line has been translated into English as: "Doubt and fear discourage one every day" (Dave Vol. I 1993: 42). Narmad's poem *Jāgni Jivda* (Awake the Soul) is composed totally in twenty lines. Out of which each of fifteen lines has three commas whereas the remaining five lines have only two commas in each one. While translating this poem into English, it has been attempted to keep the same comma almost in all lines. But only in ten lines out of fifteen, three commas could be retained and the syntax of the other three lines did not permit to retain three commas (Dave Vol. III 1994: 51). In a Gujarātī language, normally the verb, for example, *katāri māri* (to kill with a dagger) goes together which has been separated by Narmad between lines 8th and 9th of the poem *Vartyu me Mandu Tāru Re* (I have Known You thoroughly) (Dave Vol. IV 1995: 151). Thus, Narmad has very successfully used his poetic license to use punctuations. But while translating such lines into English renders the translator helpless by forcing him to change the positions of punctuations at least somewhere.

Basically, English has three articles, out of which, "a" and "an" are indefinite articles whereas "the" is the definite article. Gujarātī language has a zero article. Instead of singular articles, Gujarātī language uses numerical figure to compensate the need of articles. Thus, it so happens that while translating Narmad's Gujarātī poems into English, the "zero"



articles of Gujarātī language are supplied with English articles and the numerical figures are dropped in English. This technique is known as “grammar composition” in English. It is a deliberate change of the grammatical category by any other means of grammar. This compensation takes place when some category of grammar does not exist in either the SL or the TL. Alver is of the opinion that those languages that “do not provide for both the definite article and the indefinite article in their grammatical structures, the introduction of the precept of ‘a true and fair view’ may well present formidable difficulties” (Alver 1997: 44). Thus, while translating Narmad’s poems, a true and fair view has been accepted to introduce the missing articles of the SL into the TL. It has been observed that Gujarātī uses the group nouns to suggest the mass of people which can be done by the use of simply an adjective in English. For example, in a poem *Hun Ahiyān ne Tu Tahān* (I am Here and You are There), Narmad says: *Juthā jan sukh bhogve, sāchā jan she dukh*. Narmad uses the words *Juthā jan* for “wicked people” whereas *sāchā jan* for “wise people” which can be managed in English simply by “the wicked” and “the wise” to represent the whole mass of people (Dave Vol. IV 1995: 176). In a poem *Hā Re Pyāri Ek Vinti Mane Āp* (O Beloved! Gift Me a Ring), Narmad writes: *udāsin tasvīr tāri*. The word *tasvīr* is singular and therefore it requires the use of an article in English. So, its English version is supplied an article which reads: “A gloomy picture of yours” (Dave Vol. IV 1995: 155). Thus, it proves that all those countable nouns used in singular in Gujarātī cannot be translated without articles in English which function as qualifiers in English.

(6) CONCLUSION:

There are always losses of rhyme, rhythm, cultural aspects, meaning etc. in the translation of poetry. According to Susan Bessnett, the translated poetry suffers the loss of “its sound-patterns, rhythms and wordplay” as the translated poem is “inevitably altered” (Bassnett 2002: 99), to Devy, “What is often lost in translation is not meaning but the cultural echo embedded in poetic syntax” (Devy 1993: 67), to Bholabhai Patel, “rhythm, metre, and cultural connotations of words suffer the greatest loss” in poetry translation, to Walter Benjamin, “Even the greatest translation is destined to lose contact with the changing meaning of the original” (Benjamin 1968: 73), to George Steiner, “There is no absolute guarantee that the full meaning of a poem can survive translation” (Steiner 1998: 295), to Panikar, “Poetry translation is a series of negotiated losses” (Panikar 2003: 42) and to Umberto Eco, “Translation is the art of failure” (Eco 2001: 4). These views offered by various linguists and critics have arrived at a commonality that while translating a poem, some kind of loss is inevitable. However, this thinking should not hamper the process of translation from continuing. The translation has to go on as it is necessary in the larger context of the society.

Though several problems always dovetail in the translation of poetry from any language into any, particularly from Gujarātī into English, the activity of translation bridges the cultures of two different regions or states or nations. Though the translation of poetry is “the clumsiest of literal translations”, says Nabokov it, “is a thousand times more useful than the prettiest paraphrase” (Nabokov 1955: 511). Though the loss in poetry translation is inevitable, Bassnett arguing about the significance of translation states, “All translation involves loss, but without translation there would be no access to other cultures” (Bassnett 2002: 44). The translation always benefits in one way or the other. Sometimes, the translation has survived the Source Language Text in the form of a Source Language Text. Devy says, “Translation survives not by achieving equivalence but by enabling circulation” (Devy 1999: 18). Thus, to conclude in the words of Bholabhai Patel, “an incomplete translation is better than silence” (Patel 2001: 29)

Works Cited

Alver, J., Alver, L., Bailey, D., Mackevicius, J. and Paupa, V. “Audit and audit governance as a problem in the Baltic States”, paper presented at the EIASM Workshop on Auditor Regulation in Europe, Copenhagen, 1997.

Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2002.

Benjamin, Walter. “The Task of the Translator.” *Illuminations*. Trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken, 1968.



Bhattacharya, Ramakrishna. *Studies in Translation*. Calcutta: Papyrus, 1987.

Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1933.

Carter, Ronald, and Michael McCarthy. *Cambridge Grammar of English*. Cambridge UP, 2006.

Chomsky, Noam. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton, 1957.

Chomsky, Noam. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press, 1965.

Comrie, Bernard. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Crystal, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2008,

Eco, Umberto. *Experiences in Translation*. Trans. Alastair McEwen. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Dave, Kavi Narmadashankar Lalshankar. *Narmakavita Vol. I*. Ed. Ramesh Shukla. Surat: Kavi Narmad Yugavart Trust, 1993.

----- *Narmakavita Vol. II*. (Ed.) Ramesh Shukla. Surat: Kavi Narmad Yugavart Trust, 1994.

----- *Narmakavita Vol III*. (Ed.) Ramesh Shukla. Surat: Kavi Narmad Yugavart Trust, 1994.

----- *Narmakavita Vol. IV*. (Ed.) Ramesh Shukla. Surat: Kavi Narmad Yugavart Trust, 1995.

Devy, G. N. *In Another Tongue: Essays on Indian English Literature*. London: Macmillan, 1993.

----- *Translation and Literary History*. Hyderabad: Orient BlackSwan, 1999.

Fromkin, Victoria, Robert Rodman, and Nina Hyams. *An Introduction to Language*. 9th ed.

Boston: Wadsworth, 2011.

George, K. M., ed. *Translation and Indian Literature*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1998.

Halliday, M. A. K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd ed., Edward Arnold, 1994.

Hatim, Basil, and Ian Mason. *Discourse and the Translator*. Longman, 1990.

Holmes, James S. *Translated Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988.

Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Leech, Geoffrey. *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. Longman, 1969.

Leech, Geoffrey. *Semantics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974.

Mahanand, Anand. *Translation: Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Creative Books, 2005.

Matthews, P. *Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Mehta, Sitantha Yashaschandra, *Sāhitya ane Anuvād*. Amdavad: Sahitya Akademi, 1998.



ISSN: 2277-7881 (Print); Impact Factor: 9.014 (2025); IC Value: 5.16; ISI Value: 2.286



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
ISSN: 2277-7881 (Print); Impact Factor: 9.014 (2025); IC Value: 5.16; ISI Value: 2.286

PEER REVIEWED AND REFERRED INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

(Fulfilled Suggests Parametres of UGC by IJMER)

Volume: 14, Issue: 8(4), August, 2025

Scopus Review ID: A2B96D3ACF3FEA2A

Article Received: Reviewed : Accepted

Publisher: Sucharitha Publication, India

Online Copy of Article Publication Available : www.ijmer.in

Nabokov, Vladimir. "Problems of Translation: *Onegin* in English." *Partisan Review* 22.4, 1955.

Paniker, K. Ayyappa. *Indian Literature: A Reader*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1997.

Patel, Bholabhai. *Anuvād: Siddhānt ane Vyavhār*. Amdavad: University Granth Nirmad Board, 2001.

Patel, Bimal N. *Structure and Meaning in Language*. Orient Blackswan, 2008.

Patnaik, B. N. *Language, Mind and Meaning*. New Delhi: Oxford UP, 2006.

Radford, Andrew. *Syntax: A Minimalist Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Schulte, Rainer and John Biguenet. "Introduction" In *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, University of Chicago Press, 1992

Steiner, George. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

Trask, R. L. *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. London: Routledge, 1993.