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PROBLEMS IN TRANSLATING STYLISTIC DEVICES

The word "stylistic" is employed in this study to describe those intra-language features which are systematic and distinctive and at the same time bound by context and convention; the more extended aspects of discourse that are now subsumed under the discipline "stylistics" are not germane to the present discussion. In this limited sense, the stylistic features of a poem are variations from the normal use of language, which even when they vary, do conform to a system and conventional use. This applies squarely to the poems of Cankâm literary tradition. We do not have any other texts that existed along with these poems. Hence the stylistic features of these poems have to be studied with the literary system that one could only evolve out of these poems and with tolkâppiyam, the grammatical treatise.

While talking about these stylistic features tolkâppiyar formulates a broad category called "marapu" roughly meaning convention. First he emphasizes that the primary duty of poetry is to adhere to the usage of the society. This is defined in the following verse

vazhakkânu enappâTuvatu uyarndtôr marRRe:
nikazhcci avarkâT Taika lâna
tol 1592
This has been interpreted by later commentators as usage that is classified into "conventional usage" and "poetic usage". Endorsing this interpretation of the commentators Periakaruppan draws our attention to the following verse in tolkappiyam:

marapunilai tirital ceyyuT killai

tol. 1590

which means in poetry there is no deviation from tradition. He asserts that tolkappiyam by the concept of "marapu" explains only the special preformance of the words in the hands of the poets on the lines of conventional and poetic usage. Hence a translator or a reader has to keep in mind that the use of a word, either as a lexeme or a morpheme or in the syntax in the poems, is bound by the poetic and conventional usage and conveys the same meaning in the entire corpus whenever it occurs.

This part of the discussion analyses the problems that a translator is confronted with because of these stylistic features. These features refer, as David Crystal says, to "any bit of speech or writing that may be singled out from language and

discussed — a particular word, morpheme, sentence, structural relationship etc...." Based on this classification the present study examines the problems posed by their features of style under (i) lexical, (ii) morphological and (iii) syntactical categories.

I. LEXICAL FEATURES:

A poem is not just a juxtaposition of words but is made of word combinations. By word combinations is meant that the poet chooses the word, the particular usage of the word for the context and the words that go along with it and builds a structure that brings out the emotion and experience he wants to present. The poem is thus a structured pattern in which the words are conditioned to have spatial relationships amongst themselves. William Chisholm in his analysis of a poem calls these relationships "lexical manipulations". The response of a reader to a poem is based on his reaction to these lexical manipulations. For a full response the reader has to be aware of these lexemes and its uses which arise out of poetic and conventional usage. Thus the lexemes form the basis of the type of interaction that the poem can have with others. They constitute the basic and primary units on which the translator devotes attention.

---


Since there exists a very wide gap between the Tamil of ancient times and that of today, the words used in Cangkam poems need to be interpreted for the modern reader in the context of these poems. The only treatise that helps the translator, as already pointed out, is tolkappiyam. Hence it becomes imperative for the translator to have a sound knowledge of the entire corpus of Cangkam literature as well as the whole of tolkappiyam. An analysis of the translations under study shows what kinds of problems the translators have had with the lexemes of the poems of KuRundtokai.

A common problem is with regard to the multiplicity of concepts a word stands for and the particular sense in which it is used in a particular context. The Cangkam poets, whose poetic themes are well defined and confined within the traditional poetic framework, make use of this multiplicity of meanings of the words in bringing variety to their presentations achieving poetic excellence.

A typical example of such a word is "aNangku" which is used in poem 204. The first two lines run as follows:

\[
\text{ka:nang ka:ma menpa ka:mam} \\
aNangkum piNiyu manRe: n}\text{dinaippin}
\]

K 204, ii-iii.

The hero is addressed by his friend in these lines. He says that others speak ill of his love; it is neither grief nor sadness.
Ramanujan's translation of the lines is as follows:

Love, love,
they say,
Love
is no disease,
no evil goddess.

AKR:PLW, 24, i-v.

Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden give the following translation:

Love, love . . .
they always talk about love:
but love is neither devil nor disease.

Pillai & Ludden, 42. i-iii.

Both the translations use "disease" for "piNi" though the order of the words is changed in Ramanujan's translation; there is a difference in translating the word "aNangku". This word has been used in poems 136 and 163. Poem 136 is by the same poet and the same lines occur as initial lines but it is an address of the hero to his friend. On all these three occasions this word is used to provide the meaning of "grief." Though there are possibilities for other interpretations, the contexts demand only this meaning. It is to be noted that Ramanujan while translating the same lines in poem 136 by the same author uses "new grief" (AKR:IL, 60) as the equivalence of the word "aNangku". The inconsistency may have crept in because the translator has followed different editorial notes while translating these two poems. He seems to have overlooked the connotation involved in the use of this word here in the particular context.
Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden provide the equivalence "evil goddess" for "aNangku". This may be acceptable in certain contexts in the poems of akandamnu:Ru" and naRRiNai anthologies but not in KuRundtokai where this particular lexeme has been used only with the meaning of "grief". The error is obviously due to the translators' failure to make a global note of the instances of occurrence of the word in the entire KuRundtokai anthology, carrying the same connotation.

A similar situation arises in the translation of poem 124 with reference to the word "inna:“. This poem is spoken by the friend of the heroine to the hero. The following is the source text:

\[
\]

K 124.

When the hero refuses to take the heroine while he goes in search of wealth because the desert will not be pleasant, her friend retorts by asking him whether her house would be pleasant while he is not present. The word "inna:" here stands for "unpleasantness". The word does not acquire the sense of "absence" in any of the poems in the KuRundtokai anthology. This word is used in nine more poems -- 55, 181, 202, 206, 266, 274, 314, 363, 397 and in all these contexts it carries the meaning of "unpleasantness".

Though the lexeme does also have the meaning "absence" it is not used in that context anywhere in the collection. Hence while Ramanujan produces the following translation:

You say that the wasteland you have to pass through is absence itself;

AKR:IL, 56, i-iii.

the word "absence" in the place of "inna:ž" is inappropriate. It is to be noted that for the same word he gives "evil" as the equivalence in poem 202. Again the problem here is due to the availability of a multiplicity of meanings for the word and the uniform significance it carries throughout this anthology.

Sometimes the poems employ a lexeme that carries multiple meanings of which each could go with the adjacent words. Contexts like this will certainly pose a problem since it will be difficult to find out such equivalences which will carry the multiple layers of meaning in the target language. An example occurs in the translation of poem 6 where the first line runs as follows:

naLLen RanRe: yà:mañg collavind

K 6, i.

The word "ndaL" is used here with three meanings embedded in it. As an adjective it means the "density" of night; as a noun it means the hum that is present in utter darkness and silence; again
as an adjective it means "mid of night". Here all these three attributes can be present in the single use of the word collocating with "yasamam" in the source text. An equivalence to such a lexeme with all its multiple meanings in the target language is a rarity. It is to be noted here that each translator has provided equivalence to bring out only one of the attributes described above. Ramanujan's translation has the following line:

The still drone of the time.

Hart gives the following:

The night is half gone

Shanmugam Pillai & Ludden provide the following:

At midnight

It shows the absence of such equivalence in the target language and the inability of the translator to invoke all the meanings of the lexeme in his translation.

There are many other instances of such words with multiple meanings which the poets use to signify more than one connotation in the context. The poet achieves poetic excellence by using such lexemes with multiple meanings each one revealing an exciting message. A fine example poem is 370 of KuRundtokai.
The last two lines contain the problematic word. The relevant lines are:

....... .... ..... 
villaka viraliR porundtiyavan 
nallakagn cetri norumarung kiname:

K 370, iv-v.

This is spoken by the courtesan to the friend of the heroine as a retort to the heroine who had stated that the courtesan was not capable of letting the hero remain in his lady's house. The retort may be interpreted in the following ways:

(a) When we lie together we are like the fingers that grasp the bow; when he reaches his home (where his wife resides) I am alone and with a single body.

(b) When I am with him in the pond we are two bodies; but when I am close to the good chest of the hero they feel like one body.

The crux of the interpretation is in the lexeme "ndallakam" especially "akam" which means (i) home or (ii) chest or heart. Taking it as "home" leads to the first interpretation given above while the meaning "chest" or "heart" takes us to the second interpretation. The translators instead of indicating the two have brought out only one meaning. Ramanujan's translation is based upon the first interpretation.

................
He goes home,
I too am late.
with a single body.

AKR:PLW, 102, ix-xi.
Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden follow the second interpretation in their translation:

\[
\text{when I join the chest of that man, as to his fingers are held tight together in grasping the bow we are one body.}
\]

Pillai & Ludden, 260, viii-x.

The pun on the word "akam" to signify these two senses in the source text is missing in both translations. If only one sense could be given in the rendering, the other interpretation could have been mentioned at least in the end-notes.

A clue to identify the appropriate semantic component out of the different layers meaning of a word may be found in the context of the poem itself. An example is the use of the word "kuzhaiya" in poem 393 of KuRundtokai. The source text has the following opening lines:

\[
\text{mayangu malark kostai kuzhaiya makizhndan} \\
\text{... ... .... .... .... ..}
\]

K 393, i.

The translation by Ramanujan is:

\[
\text{So few, really} \\
\text{were the days} \\
\text{your lover crushed your garland} \\
\text{..................}
\]

AKR:PLW, 26, i-iii.
Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden’s translation runs as follows:

The days when that man
has held you close, making
your garland of many flowers
fade: .. .. .. ..
   .. .. .. .. .. ..

Pillai & Ludden, 95, i-iv.

The word "kuzhaiya" has one referential meaning "fade" which is rarely used. But in this poem where the context speaks of the pressing or crushing of the flowers in the garland of the heroine while the hero embraces the lady, the word is used only in the sense "crushing". If it is "fading" it happens even without the lovers' meeting and the sense has no relevance to the context at all. So the translator has to single out the appropriate meaning from the context itself.

Since the language of these poems is so vastly different from modern Tamil, even some words involving gender differentiation pose problems to the translators. Though not vitally contributing to the thematic content of the poems, the change in the gender often ends up in producing an incomplete translation. The word "iralai" refers to the "male deer", the "stag". In poem 220 to indicate the coming of the season the heroine refers to the "male deer". The lines in the source text are:

pazhamazhaik kalitta putuppuna varakin
iralai meyndta kuRaittalaip pasvai

K 220, i-ii.
The following are the corresponding lines in the three translations:

Ramanujan:

The rains, already old,
have brought new leaf upon the fields.
The grass spears are trimmed and blunted
by the deer.

AKR:IL, 67, i-iv.

Hart:

The millet flourishing from an old rain
has been harvested.
Only its stems are left,
grazed over and chewed to stubble by stags.

HART:PTA, 70, i-iii.

Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden:

Pillai & Ludden, 217, ix-xii.

While the equivalence provided by Ramanujan viz."deer" is generic
Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden employ two words to make the generic
word gender-specific. Hart has provided the exact equivalent viz.
"stag". This may not be crucial to the appreciation of the poem,
but when an exact equivalence is available, it should be adopted.
When the same problem presents itself in poem 153 the translators
have used the proper equivalences. There is a reference to a male
monkey in the second line of the poem.
"kalai" is the word that refers to the male monkey. Ramanujan provides "male ape" (AKR:IL, 64.) and Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden provide "male monkey" (Pillai & Ludden, 110.) as equivalents. The specific reference to the sex of the monkey shows the concern of the translators to employ exact equivalents. In the absence of a popular gender-specific word in the target language for "kalai", they have at least used a gender specific adjective.

A similar problem is confronted in the translation of poem 394 where a reference to a female elephant is specifically used along with its calf. The line in the source text is:

muzhandta: LirumpiTik kayndtalaik kuzhavi

The word "piTi" refers to the female elephant. Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden bring out the exact equivalent.

The soft-headed calf of the black female elephant, with feet like drums

Ramanujan fails to bring it out

The drum-footed black elephant's calf

Pillai & Ludden, 82, i-ii.
The equivalence he provides is "elephant" and the reference to the gender is missing. In the source text the reference to the female elephant contributes to the scenic setting since the reference is to the beautiful calf of the elephant playing with the children of the gypsy women and the mentioning of the calf along with the female elephant and the children along with the gypsy women bring a balanced structure. Though the meaning is not distorted a certain nuance of style is lost in the two translations provided by Ramanujan.

Yet another type of problem of lexis arises when a translator is influenced by the change in the semantic components of the lexeme occurring at a later period of the language development. An instance is the translation of poem 28. The poem deserves to be quoted in full as it brings out an interesting problem connected with the lexical features. Following is the source text in full:

muTTu ve:nko Rarkku ve:nkol
Otren yanumoir peRRi meslii:T
Ta:ə vollenak kuruven kol
alamara lacaivaLi yalaippa ven
uyavuno: yaRiya:tu tugncu mu:rkke:

K 28

This is the monologue of the heroine to her friend. While her friend is worried over the delay in the return of the hero who has gone to earn wealth the heroine says that the people of the village sleep well unaware of her grief. She goes to the extent of saying that she feels like showing her opposition to it by shrieking and howling.
The different translations are:

Ramanujan:

Shall I charge like a bull
against this sleepy town,
or try beating it with sticks.
or cry wolf
till it is filled with cries
of Ah's and Oh's?

It knows nothing, and sleeps
through all my agony, my sleeplessness,
and the swirls of this swaying south wind.

O what shall I do
to this dump of a town!

AKR:IL, 31.

Hart:

Shall I attack these people, shall I strike this?
I do not know.
Or shall I find some reason and cry out
to this city that sleeps
not knowing my suffering
while the moving wind swirls
and pulls me to and fro.

Hart, 53.

Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden:

Shall I beat against them
or attack them
or go screaming at them.
"OH!" and "AH" ?
I just don't know what to do
and cannot decide:
while the swirling warm south wind
torments me
this village sleeps.
ignorant of my love sickness.

Pillai & Ludden 400.

The problem is posed by the "muTTuven". This is used in the poem
to provide the meaning "expressing one's personal grudge"; in
Cangkam tradition it also has the meaning of moving the body.

Regarding the use of this word as part of the poetic conventions tokaappiyam has the following verse.

\[ \text{varaiviTai vaitta ka\-lattu varundtinum} \\
\text{vairiya na\-viTai vandton muTTinum} \]

tol., 1058.

This may be summarised as: "When the hero is away on his journey to amass wealth it is customary for the heroine to be sad over his absence; when he does not return at the promised period she will show her indignance". The word "muTTinum" refers to "showing indignance and the same poetic convention is employed in poem 28. But Ramanujan’s translation has taken on the modern meaning of the word viz. "charging like a bull". There is no indication in the source text for the charge of a bull and this usage distorts the meaning of the entire poem. In search for a dynamic equivalence for the word he has disregarded the communicative value of the source language altogether. As Andrew Lefevere has observed "this type of disregard will end up in a translation which is detrimental to the structure of the source text".4

A feature to be noted in the translation by Ramanujan is the dynamic equivalence that he provides for the line

\[ \text{Tata vollenak kurvuen kol} \]

---

His equivalence "or cry wolf" is a dynamic equivalence that conveys effectively, by use of an idiom in the target language, the meaning contained in the source poem.

Yet another serious problem is the nonavailability of effective equivalences to words that carry basic poetic concepts. The use of the words "kàttal", "kàmam" and "parattai" are examples which do not have exact equivalences in English which will convey the exact semantic components of the word. Hence one can notice the translators using "love", "passion", "desire" for "kàttal" and "harlot", "courtesan" and "concubine" for "parattai". The problem could be settled by selecting one equivalent and using it consistently throughout the translation process, as these words in the source text are used without any semantic variation. The translators under the present study use different equivalences for the same concept. Each not only differs from the others in this regard, but even differs from himself by using different equivalences for the same word occurring in different poems. To look at one case:

```
Poem | Hart | Ramanu | Shanmugam Pillai & Ludden
-----|------|--------|------------------------
15   |      | love   | loving intimacy        |
99   |      | passion| great desire           |
136  |      | love   | love                   |
290  | desire| love   | love                   |
52   |      | love   | love                   |
```
The table shows that the equivalences are varied for the word; with the result that a certain "set" convention in the source text is lost. Conformity to one equivalence is the only way to ensure that a traditional concept is always understood in its fixed signification.

Whether it is the multiplicity of meaning out of which the poet's usage has to be found and fixed and used by the translator, or the pun in the poem for which the Target Language equivalent has to be discovered and used, or a problem posed by the gender of a lexeme or the basic poetic convention, what is required on the part of the translator, as Beaugrande observes, is the poetic competence by which he means the ability to produce and interpret the poetic use in a particular piece of literature. With reference to the Cangkam poems, ancient and classical in its nature, this competence could be developed only by one's thorough familiarity with the poems compiled in all the anthologies.

II. MORPHOLOGICAL FEATURES:

Of morphological features the present study limits itself to the study of the words in different forms and in different word combinations. This part of the study deals with the problems posed by such combinations or usages which are the exclusively characteristic features of the Cangkam love poems.

---

A typical word combination of the Cangkam poems is an adjectival phrase consisting of an adjective followed by two nouns consecutively. The structure is Adj. + Noun + Noun. The poetic usage here is that the adjective qualifies both nouns. This phrasal structure, if not available in the target language, becomes a problem to the translators.

A usage of this structure is found in poem 275. It is the utterance of the heroine's friend and in her address to the heroine she pacifies her, stating that the hero may be on his way with brave young men with strong bows. To describe the brave young men with strong bows the adjective phrase "valviliLaiyar" is used. This is a combination of "val" + "vil" + "iLaiyar". "val" is the adjective and the other two are nouns. Here by making use of this combination the poet has the adjective serve both the nouns. The adjective "val" means "strong" or "brave" depending upon the object or person with which it is used. Here "valvil" and "valliLaiyar" are embedded into the adjective phrase "valviliLaiyar". When translating this phrase structure the translators are not likely to find an equivalent structure. Ramanujan provides "with young archers driving by his side" (AKR:IL, 82) as its equivalence. The adjective he provides is "young" and the nouns "vil" and "iLaiyar" are embedded into one. Here the adjective for the bow is lost. Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden provide the following translation:
his chariot with young warriors,
with bows at their sides,
Pillai & Ludden, 229, ix-x.

But here again the adjective for the bow is lost and the semantic components of the phrase are distributed in the lines. It is to be noted that for a similar expression in poem 100 viz. "valvilori" Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden provide "strong-bowed Ori" as the equivalent, connecting the adjective to the bows. In the above examples the beauty of the phrase is lost. At least the structure could have been split and made into two phrases — (Adj + Noun) + (Adj + Noun) so that the semantic components are brought out. A note to show the linguistic excellence of the source language text may be added to the translation. Or a post-nominal descriptive phrase, such as "young man with bows, of great might" can be used to create the same effect.

Another instance of an adjectival phrase posing problems to the translator is seen in poem 31. The poem is a monologue of the heroine to her friend. She takes this occasion to express her clandestine love affair with her hero to her friend. She says that she is worried over the fact that she is not able to find her hero anywhere. She calls him "ma:N Takkosn" meaning the honourable hero. "ma:N" is the adjective attached to the noun "takkosn", Ramanujan while translating provides the following equivalence — "my pride my lover" (AKR:IL 33). The
equivalence provided by Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden is "high-born man" (Pillai & Ludden, 174.) In the absence of an exact equivalence in structure both the translators have tackled the phrase in their own way. While Ramanujan's equivalence is poetic, the other one is just literal. Such phrases are so deceptive in structure that the translators often miss them. In poem 33 one such phrase is used. It is a monologue of the heroine at the time of receiving a message for her hero through his friend. The poem ends with an adjectival phrase of praise to him. The line in the source text are as follows:

\[
\text{virundtinirum perugn cemmalane:} \quad K 33, \text{ iv.}
\]

The adjectival phrase is "peru cemmalane". "cemmalane" is the noun prefixed with the adjective "peru". Ramanujan while translating condenses the meaning in two lines and misses out this phrase. The corresponding lines in his translation are:

\[
\text{And his talent} \\
\text{is looking for fresh feasts.} \quad \text{AKRIL, 35, vii-viii}
\]

The source text states that he is a great leader who goes in search of feasts. The phrase "peru cemmalane" ascribes qualities of leadership and greatness. This is missing in the equivalence provided by Ramanujan. The corresponding lines in the translation of Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden are as follows:
he will be guest of honour,
riding from banquet to banquet.

Pillai & Ludden, 241, vii-viii.
The phrase "guest of honour" though not an effective equivalence
carries to some extent the meaning of the phrase of the source
text. The omission in Ramanujan's text appears to be deliberate
on account of the untranslatability of this phrase with its unique
structure.

The form of the vocative, used to address the silent
listener of these monologues, is a poetic convention in these
poems and the nature of its function has given problems in
translation. By convention the heroine and her friend mutually
address each other using the same term. A common term is "toizhi"
(friend) and this has been given the equivalences of "Friend" and
"My friend". But other forms of address which appear to be terms
of relationship between the speaker and the listener are often left
out untranslated. A major reason for such omission is that the
structure of the term is in its inflected form. For example it is
the poetic convention that the heroine and her friend call each
other "mother". The term in Tamil is "annai" which has the
inflected form of "annaziy" in the poems. tollkappiyar while
commenting on this poetic convention writes:

\[
\text{annai enmai enRalum uLave:}
\text{tonneRi muRaimai collinum ezhuttinum}
\text{tonRa: marapina enmanair pulavar}
\]
tol., 1192.
This could be summarised as: In both literary tradition and conventional practice it is customary that the heroine and her friend call each other as "mother" and both refer the hero as "my man". Poem 33 of Kurundtokai uses such a term. It is the monologue of the heroine to her friend. The first line carries the form of address:

\[ \text{anna: yivano: riLama: Nakkkan} \]

The term in Tamil referring to mother is "annai" and in the line quoted above it has the inflected form " annary ". Ramanujan while translating this poem leaves out this word of address. His rendering is:

\[ \text{This singer is still a young student} \]

AKR:IL, 35, i.

The omission of the vocative deprives the target text reader of the opportunity to get to know of important poetic convention and prosodic feature of these poems. If an equivalence of this viz."mother" or "my mother" is believed to confuse the reader, an end note could have been added or the form of address could have been modified in conformity with the other forms of address used in the anthology. The translation of this poem by Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden follows the second method of translation. The corresponding lines are:
My friend
he is but a young student

Pillai & Ludden, 280, i-ii.

While not supplying an exact equivalent to the term "annary" this modified form conforms to the forms of address in the other poems. More importantly, the more personalized utterance indicated by the presence of the vocative becomes a general impersonal statement when the vocative is omitted as in Ramanujan's translation. The exclamatory tone is lost, and an assertive is the result.

Yet another form of address that eludes the translator's consideration is "ke:TTicin" which means "listen". The root word for "listen" in Tamil is "keiL" and in the poem, according to the traditional prosodic features, this gets the present form. Commenting on this tolka:ppiyar writes:

\[
\text{miya ikamo mati irum cin ennum a:vayin aslum munnilai acaiccol}
\]

tol.,759.

To paraphrase:
When the address is to the second person the verb gets inflected with the following suffixes -- "miya, ika, mor, mati, irum, cin"
Poem 30 of KuRundtokai employs this form of address. The line of address is as follows:

\[
\text{keiTTicin vaizhi tozhi}
\]

K 71, i.
Ramanujan leaves out the entire form of address. Though this does not distort the meaning or the message of the poem, the tone is altered by the omission. Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden provide the following equivalence.

Listen, my friend;

... ... ... ... 

Pillai & Ludden, 402, i.

The omission of this form by Ramanujan might have been due to the inflected structure of this term; in other poems where the form of address is direct as "to:zhi" he uses the suitable form of address. Examples are poems 67 and 126 which start with "Will he remember friend? (AKR:IL, 45), "Friend" (AKR:IL, 57) respectively.

An understanding of the poetic convention and the rules of prosody alone can equip the translator to tackle such issues. Since the prosodic features, the inflection and derivation and their functional use in the poems are quite alien to modern Tamil, the problems in translating get intensified. But yet in order to do justice to all such features the translator has to find a method of providing appropriate, or at least approximate equivalents for them in the target text.

III. SYNTACTICAL FEATURES

Under syntactical features this part of the study deals with problems posed by the category of words higher than a
lexeme or morpheme. The combination of words forming the syntax of the poems deserves the attention of any reader of Cangkam poetry because there is no precedent to rely on. It is unique and lies with the tradition of Cangkam poems alone. When a unique use of phraseology occurs the translators have the problem of fitting it into the target text. The phrases will sound odd if literally translated, and on occasions be even unintelligible in the target language. But if they are left out the translation remains incomplete and the beauty of the poem will be somewhat impaired.

Poem 131 contains an example of this feature. It is a soliloquy of the hero expressing his sad plight. He has been separated from his love owing to his departure to amass wealth. His ardour is impatient to see his lady, whose physical features (shoulders, eyes) he is always thinking of. But her abode is far away. The poem in the Source text runs thus:

```
\[a: \text{Tamai puraiyum vanappiR paNaittoT}
\text{petramark kaNNi yirundaT vu:re:}
\text{neTundce: Na:riTai yatuve: negnce:}
\text{irmampaTTa cevvip paimpunat}
\text{oore: ruzhavan poslap}
\text{peruvitup puRRanRa: noko: yane:}
```

K 131.

The problem in translation arises with reference to the tag "noko: yane " which means "I feel sad on that" The syntax of the source text connects the message in this phrase of this line to the addressee in the third line viz. his heart -"negnce:." The
following sequence could be derived from the pattern of the poem.

--- I feel sad over my pathetic condition in which my heart wants to rush towards the place of my love like the ploughman who rushes towards his field when it is wet. Ramanujan provides the following translation:

Her arms have the beauty of a gently moving bamboo.
Her eyes are full of peace.
She is far away.
Her place not easy to reach.

My heart is frantic with haste,

    a plowman with a single ox
    on land all wet
    and ready for seed.

AKR:IL, 59.

Hart translates thus:

Her round arms are as lovely as swaying bamboo
her large eyes are angry.
The town she lives in is far away
and my heart rushes toward her
like a farmer with one plow
when his field is wet and ready.

Hart, 66.

Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden provide the following translation:

The village of that girl,
with large eyes that torment men's hearts
and beautiful, large shoulders, like dancing bamboo

is far away
and hard to reach.
My heart rushes toward her,

    like a ploughman with one plough
    to his field when it is wet
    and ready

How I suffer.

Pillai & Ludden, 442.
While the first two translations have left out the last phrase, the equivalence provided in the third translations remains isolated from the preceding lines. Commenting on the translation of Ramanujan J. Parthasarathi writes that the tag is omitted and assimilated in the main verb. It does not appear to be the case. The verb "frantic" conveys how his heart is excited while it races towards the place of his love but it does not contain the semantic component of suffering. The sad note of the hero's anguish is not conveyed. In the translation by Hart also this omission is obvious. But in the translation by Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden the equivalence "How I suffer" stands aloof and does not get itself connected with the remaining lines as it does in the source language text. Hence instead of placing the tag at the end the translator could have fused it into the main body of the poem as in the source text. The syntactical differences between the two poetic structures as a result of this type of shifting of such phrases require consideration.

Just as modifying the structure of the phrase and placing it elsewhere is sometimes essential so too is the condensing of repetitive phrases to be adopted at certain places. Again only the translator's poetic competence and his awareness of the syntactic patterns of the two language systems can help in

---

this regard. In poem 202 a phrase gets repeated for intensity. The poem is a monologue of the heroine to her friend in response to her friend's intercession on behalf of the hero who has returned from his courtesan. The heroine says that her heart grieves over the indiscipline of her man. To present effectively the continuous grief of the heroine the poem repeats the particular phrase initially twice and ends the poem with one more repetition of the same phrase. The following is the source text:

K 202.

The translation by Ramanujan is as follows:

As the lovely new flower
of the small-leaved cow's thorn
covers the meadows
and gives birth
to thorns

my lover who was kind
now does evil,

and I am sick at heart.

Since a literal repetition of the phrase will not fit the English poetical syntax Ramanujan effectively brings it at the end. When it just gets repeated it may not suit the English way of expression and
syntax. The following is the translation by Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden:

My heart aches; Oh
how my heart aches:
as the small-leaved nerunchi plants
 growing thickly in dry lands
 has fresh flowers sweet to the eye,
 which
 produce thorns,
 so my lover
 who made my life sweet
 has hurt me so.
 My heart is aching.

Pillai & Ludden, 272.

It is to be noted that in poem 4 where the same phrase is repeated
in the same way Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden avoid the initial
repetition and present the idea effectively with a different
equivalence. The source text is:

no:men negnce: no:men negnce:
imaityp panna kaNNir tangki
amaitaR kamaindtandang ka:talar
amaivila rakuta no:men negnce:

K 4.

The translation by Shanmugm pillai and Ludden has the following:

My heart is aching
bearing tears that burn my eyelids
 like fire,
my heart is sick with grief,
Because our lover,
who was born to wipe my tears away
and comfort me,
is gone,
My heart is full of pain.

Pillai & Ludden, 328.
While literal repetition mars the beauty of the translation, effective equivalence concise in its occurrence makes the translation more communicative.

When a phrase in the source text is an inflected lexeme and the translator is not aware of the words that are embedded or the semantic components of the phrase, it is likely that the translator employs an equivalence which does not bring out the full meaning of the phrase. In poem 66 one can find an example of this. There is a reference to the flowers of cassia trees. The description occurs in the penultimate line of the poem in the source text.

```
kompu cer koTiyiNa ru:zhtta
vampa ma:riyaik ka:rena matitte:
```

K 66, iii-iv.

The flowers of "konRai" trees blossom in long bunches. Hence the description "kompu cer koTiyiNa" -- to mean "the bunches of flowers that collectively blossom in the branches". Ramanujan has provided two versions of his translation for this poem with little variation -- one in The Interior Landscape and the other in Poems of Love and War. The first version has the following lines corresponding to the above lines of the SL text:

```
though these trees
mistaking the untimely rains
have put out
their long arrangement of flowers
on the twigs
as is for a proper monsoon.
```

AKR:IL, 49, viii-ix.
In the second version too the equivalence "long arrangement of flowers" is retained omitting only the possessive pronoun "their". The sense that these flowers in bunches have blossomed all along the branches is not brought out. The deletion of "their" is an improvement but the semantic components of the phrase are not effectively brought out. The equivalence provided by Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden bring out all these components of this phrase. Following are the corresponding lines of the text:

it flowers in crowded, but orderly, bunches, along its branches.

Pillai & Ludden, 211.

Though expanded a bit, these two lines communicate to the reader the entire semantic output of the source text.

In the above example, expansion of syntax solves the problem; in certain other cases addition of elements may help provide an effective equivalence. The addition is justified in the sense that the text under translation viz. a poem employs nonordinary use of language. Since a poem deviates from the ordinary grammar and function of language, as Beaugrande observes, the text entails "insertion of more items than are used." A translation involving the addition of an adjective in order to

---

give a proper syntactical pattern equivalence to the original text is found in Ramanujan's rendering of poem 31. This is a monologue of the heroine to her friend. She feels sad since she is not able to see her hero on several occasions. She states that he has made her bangles get loose. The lines under study in the source text are:

```
en kaik
ko:Ti:rilangku vaLa:i ndekizhtta
```

Ramanujan's translation of the above lines are:

```
for love of him
these conch-shell bangles slip
from my wasting hands ...
```

The source text does not employ an adjective for the "hands" in the phrase. It is just the "hands". But the text reveals the fact that she is becoming thinner because she is pinig away. In order to bring out this sense Ramanujan adds the adjective "wasting"; the phrase "wasting hands" goes along with the text as an effective equivalence. Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden's translation is strictly literal, using the equivalence "slip from my hands" (Pillai & Ludden, 174). Adding an extra element, as Ramanujan has done, solves the problem of finding an equivalence for the syntactic pattern.

While translating a poem problems often arise on whether a question has to be reproduced as a question in the
target text, and also whether an affirmative statement may be translated as a question. The answer depends on the context of the poem and the poetic competence of the translator. An analysis of poems 281 and 324 throw some light on such issues. Poem 281 of KuRundtokai is a monologue of the heroine to her friend while she worries about the hardships that her man will meet with. In her anguish she asks her friend whether he would have passed the hardship of the dry land by that time. The question-bearing line in the source text is as follows:

```
........ ....... .......
kunRutalai maNandta ka:nam
cenRanar kollo: ceyizhai ndamare:
K. 281. v-vi.
```

Ramanujan has the following equivalence:

```
You, wearing red gold!  
Our man went there  
........ ....... .......
AKR:IL, 84. i-ii.
```

The question is changed into an affirmative statement. Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden provide the following equivalence for the lines:

```
O girl with red jewels:  
........ ....... .......
Did he not go into the wasteland studded with mountains,  
my friend  
Pillai & Ludden, 432. i, ix-x.
```

Here the question is rendered as a question and a comparison of this and Ramanujan's with the source text shows that in the
affirmative statement form of Ramanujan the agony and anguish of the heroine is lost; it comes out effectively in the translation by Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden. Here the context requires that the question be rendered only as a question.

In the translations of poem 324 we have an instance of a statement rendered as a question, and we note that it finds an effective equivalence in a question form. The poem is a monologue of the friend of the heroine. When the hero informs her friend that he will turn up during night she says that the heroine is afraid of the dangers he may confront on the way. She, as her friend, is worried over the plight of the two as a mother who is worried over both her twin children who have taken poison. The closing lines of the poem of the source text are:

..... ..... ..... yamanatu
kavaimaka nagncuN Tarang
kagn cuval perumaven negncat ta:ne:

K 324, v-vii.

In Ramanujan's translation this is provided in the form of a question.

And I,
what can I do but shudder in my heart:
like a woman watching her poisoned twins?

AKR:IL, 93.

Hart's translation of the corresponding lines are the following:

................
and I,
As if my twin children had drunk poison.
feel a terror in my heart, great lord.

Hart, 80, viii-x.
Shanmugam Pillai and Ludden give the following:

..... ..... ..... ....
..... ..... ..... my heart fears for you both,
as it would for my own twins
who had swallowed poison.

Pillai & Ludden, 313, xi-xiii.

All the three translations communicate the semantic components but the equivalent lines in the form of rhetorical question communicate the sense more effectively than do the other two texts. The issue is one of style. If the context permits it without leading to misrepresentation, a statement can be rendered as a rhetorical question and vice versa, depending on the natural way of expression in the target language, if the change can convey more effectively the semantic components of the source text.

The problems posed by the features of style of the various poets of the Cangkam Age are even more complex and varied in nature. The foregoing discussion under the broad divisions viz. lexical, morphological and syntactical has attempted to show samples of such problems that a translator is likely to confront with. For any problem of style that a translator comes across while translating Cangkam poems, the above discussion concludes to say that it is the poetic convention that forms the basis for any problem and the context is the key to tackle the problem.