
Equivalence in Literary Translation: A Case Study of Telugu Short Story “*Samudhram*” into English as “An Ocean”

Kumbha V. Koteswara Rao,
Lecturer In English, Hindu College,
Guntur.

Abstract:

The author tries to establish the suitability of an approach of translation following Peter Newmark's Theory of Equivalence: The Communicative Translation, the Semantic Translation. The author himself being a translator translated the SL story “*Samudram*” into TL. He translated it to observe if the source text could be translated and find literary equivalence between the two languages with reference to their linguistic, cultural aspects while translating the story. He made an attempt to bring the linguistic problems in two heads: a) Lack of equivalents, b) More equivalent words in TL for the SL words of the story. He has also discussed some aspects do not have suitable equivalents as there are some culture specific words which cannot be translated easily.

Keywords: Literary, Translation, linguistic, problems, TL, SL etc

The paper is a case study of literary equivalence between the source language text (SLT) and the target language text (TL). The writer of this paper made an attempt to understand the applicability of Peter Newmark's theory of equivalence especially the two principles: The Semantic Equivalence and the Communicative Equivalence.

Objectives:

1. To find possible equivalent word in the target language for the word in the source language.
2. To observe the perfect suitability of the word in the target language.

Methodology: The writer of the paper has applied Peter Newmark's theory of equivalence to translate the vernacular text into the target language and observed the intricacies of translation under four sections: A. Story Synopsis, B. Analysis of the story, C. Random sample analysis, D. Observations.

A. Story Synopsis: The SL story *Samudram* is written by Ramana GV, and it is translated into English by the researcher himself as “An Ocean”.

It is a story of strong will and determination of a king who wants to dig for an ocean, which seems to other kings a crazy act. The narrator of the story was a character who was also a writer in the story.

The plot begins at a mental hospital where the narrator was admitted for mental illness that was kept a secret by his wife thinking it would be disclosed later after he had been cured from the illness.

The story was actually a dream in which he sees an ocean that had been dug by all the people of a country. Ages pass on digging for the ocean and the news spread all through reaches the ocean. Initially, the ocean doesn't believe it, but when the birds have told about it, it became furious and would wish to look at the toil of the people, and wanted to take revenge against them. Having thought of seeing the scene, it crosses countries, hills, deserts, forests and finally reaches the country where the people have been continuously digging the earth for it.

It sees a wide, deep valley being dug by the people. The people are seen dull, pale and thin. It felt that they might have not eaten for many years involving themselves in the process of digging for the ocean.

The ocean makes a big sound by spreading in all the directions like a snake with a thousand hoods. Having looked at it, all the people of the country have knelt down before it instantly. It sees great respect in them, and it also observed they are surprised and shocked and offering their prayers to it. The ocean has forgotten to take revenge against them; instead felt pity on them, and sheds water involuntarily from its eyes. The entire area is drowned in it within no time. The ocean realises that the water is from its eyes and it thought that the people might be thinking that it is an ocean. The narrator suddenly stopped telling the story; all the staff of the hospital stood still there with awesomeness towards him. He felt the eyes of each one who gathered there seem him nothing but an ocean.

B. Analysis of the Story: It is observed by the author that he has faced I) Linguistic, II) Idiomatic/Usage and III) Cultural problems while translating the story.

C. I. Linguistic Problems:

D. a) Lack of Equivalent:

cean (TLT)	Words in SLT: <i>moo, thikka thikkaga, yojanaalu, chippillu, ravvalu, aavaahana, subhmuhoortham, sidhaanthulu, paravllu thokku, dheeksha, posukolu, kuppinchi, prachenda, gagurpodiche, dhumadhumalaadu, kosaana, oho, oosh, jivvuna, pelapela, chimmagillina, paaravasyam, thanmayathwam, vubhiki vubhiki,</i>
------------	--

The above words in the select story in Telugu (SL) have no equivalent words in English (TL) and therefore, the researcher tried to bring equivalence by using certain communicative expressions in the TL.

b) More than One Equivalent:

of the story	s in SL	Equivalent words in TL
Ocean (TLT)	<i>ika</i>	Volume, number, issue.
	<i>yi</i>	Gathr, accumulate, collect, assemble.
	<i>na</i>	Suddenly, quickly, promptly, abruptly.
	<i>haaram</i>	Custom, practice, usage, trade, occupation, behaviour.
	<i>lu</i>	Small piece, particle, speck.

The author has found more than one equivalent words in English (TL) for the Telugu (SL) words to understanding the translated text (TT) by the target readers. He has also discussed the idiomatic and usage related words that are being troubled him while translating the story with a title as:

II. Idiomatic/Usage related Words:

The usage of Telugu language has some idiomatic expressions and words of practical Telugu usage are described as *Thikka thikkaga* is a term expresses the mental condition of individual, it means 'disturbed'; *pottanupettukonu* means succumb to death, *ragilipovu* means get angry upon, here the ocean has got angry upon the people of the country who have started digging for it; *kuthakutha vuduku* literally means boil at high point, contextually, the ocean having heard the news of digging to bring it to their country boiled; *kadhalukadhaluga cheppu* means tell stories about the attempt for the ocean by the people of the country under the comradeship of its king. The author has also discussed some words that are culture specific in nature in the story as:

III. Culture Specific Words:

Subha muhoorthamu is a culture specific word used as an auspicious time to be fixed by learned scholars of Sanskrit in India; *sidhaanthulu* means the learned Hindu priests who often look the auspicious time to begin any new thing in one's life in India; *pandithulu* means learned scholars of Sanskrit or the name of Brahmin race; *kharmaa* philosophy.

The author has analysed the samples collecting randomly in order to find the suitability of Peter Newmark's Theory of Equivalence here for better understanding the applicability of either the approaches of translation.

E. Analysis of Random Samples with reference to Peter Newmark's Theory of Equivalence:

Text. 1. *Nenu pichaasupatrilo vunnappudu vachindhi aa email. (SLT)*

- I received that email when I was in the mental hospital.(TLT)

The source writer makes the character inform his condition at the time of beginning to write the story for the magazine. In the SL text the narrator of the story who happens to be the writer within the story informs us that he was at a mental hospital when he received the email asking him to write a story for the magazine.

Each word of the SL text has been translated into the TL by using communicative equivalence as *nene* in SL means “I” in TL; *pichaasupatri* in SL means ‘mental hospital’ in TL; *vachindhi* is translated as received in TL where as it can also be translated as ‘came’, but the contextual meaning ‘received’ may well suits to the situation and *aa* as ‘that’. The word email is retained as it is because the word itself is a transliterated word.

Text. 2. “*Eeconditionlonaa?*” *andhiapplenicheethilokitheesikuntoo*, “*sare,sareraayandee meeku kaastha changegaavuntundhi.*”(SLT)

- “In this condition!” while taking an apple into her hand she continued “Ok, Ok, write, it would be a changeover to you.”(TLT)

The SL text is also translated into TL following the communicative equivalence because certain words have been translated and transliterated. The translator has also brought sense equivalence in translating the words into the TL. *Ea* in SL is translated as ‘in this’ and *conditionlonaa* is a compound word that has the TL element and SL element in it as a transliterated word and is translated as ‘condition’ by retaining; *andhi appleni chethiloki theesikunthoo* is a phrase and it is translated as ‘while taking an apple into her hand she continued’, where the word continued is written in the place of *andhi* but its actual meaning to be translated into TL as ‘said’. The translator have given importance to the TL reader and therefore used sense translation following the communicative equivalence. *sare, sare* as Ok, Ok, which are also communicative expressions. The word *change ga* is a transliterated word and therefore translated as a whole not individually as ‘it would be a changeover to you’ in the TL.

Text. 3. “*Raayanu. Chebthaanu. Nuvvu raasipedathaavaa?*” *thala voopindhi angeekaarangaa. “Pennutho raayaali aithe...” annanu.* (SLT)

- “I can’t write but tell you, can you write for me?” She nodded her head indicating her consent. I said, “You need to write with the pen...”(TLT)

The SL text is an interrogative sentence; the word *raayanu* is translated as ‘can’t write’, *chebuthaanu* as ‘will tell’, and the word ‘*raasipedathaavaa?*’ is translated as ‘can you write for me?’ and *thala* as ‘head’, *angeekaarangaa* as ‘consent’. The word *aithe* has been ignored as the context has been understood by the listener in the story. The translator has translated the sentence applying the communicative translation.

Text. 4. *Nenu cheppina khathallo yelaanti prathyekathaa aithe vundedhikaadhu. Chaalamandhicheppelaantivee.* (SLT)

- There would not have anything special in my stories. They were very common, the stories often told by many people.(TLT)

The SL text is a statement and the character tells that there was nothing special in his stories and they are as normal stories as often told by many. The word *nenu* is generally

translated as “I” in subjective case whereas it is translated as ‘my’ which is contextually fits to the situation; *yelaanti* is translated as ‘anything’, *prathyekathaa* as ‘special’ and *cheppelaantivee* as ‘often told by many’. The sentence has been successfully translated into the TL by applying the communicative equivalence.

Text. 5. *Chaalamandhipandithulnisampradhinchichaalagrandhaalni parisodhinchaaka dhaanni samudramantaarani thelisindhi.*(SLT)

- After consulting many learned persons and referring to number of books, he came to know that it was called an ocean.(TLT).

The SL text is a descriptive statement. The sentence is translated into the TL meaningfully and sensibly following the communicative equivalence. The SL words *chaala mandhi* is translated as ‘many’, *pandithulni* as ‘learned persons’, *grandhaalni* as ‘books’ and *samudram* as ‘ocean’. The translator succeeded in bringing equivalence between the SL and the TL texts by applying the communicative equivalence.

Text.6. *Samudhraanni thavvataaniki oo subha muhoorthaanni nirnayinchaaru sindhaanthulu.* (SLT).

- The priests decided an auspicious day and fixed the time to dig for the ocean. (TLT)

The SL text is also a descriptive statement. The words *thavvataaniki* is translated as ‘to dig for’, *oo subha muhoorthaanni* as ‘an auspicious time’ and the word *nirnayinchaaru* is translated as ‘fixed’ and *sindhaanthulu* is translated as the ‘priests’. The translator has applied the communicative equivalence to translate the text.

Text. 7. *Dhesaadinetha manasu paravallu thokkuthundhi. “Manam cheshthunnapani ee bhoomedha yevaroo kala kooda kanalenidhi.”* (SLT)

- The conscience of the king was very enthusiastic and said, “Nobody on the planet earth could have dreamt about what we are going to do now?” (TLT)

The SL text is a mix of statements in which the SL word *dhesaadinetha* is translated as the ‘king’, the phrase *paravallu thokkuthundhi* is translated as ‘very enthusiastic’ and the phrase *kala lo kooda kanalenidhi* is translated as ‘could have dreamt about’. The sentences are translated by applying the communicative equivalence because the translator has tried to bring content and context sensibly in the TL. His prime concern is to make the TL reader understand the SL content and context in the TL.

Text. 8. *Ee vaartha alapaaki ilapaaki dhooranga vunna samudhraaniki thelisindhi.* (SLT)

- The news spread here and there and finally reached the ocean. (TLT)

The SL text is a description. It is translated meaningfully into the TL by the translator following the communicative equivalence as it is understood that the translator has focused to make the TL reader understand it sensibly in his/her language. In this process, *ee vaartha* is translated as ‘the news’, *alapaaki ilapaaki* as ‘spread here and there’; *dhooranga vunna samudhraaniki thelisindhi* is translated as ‘finally reached the ocean’.

Text. 9. “*Oho! Ikkadannamaata samudhraanni thavvuthunnadhi,*” *thala pankinchidhi samudhram.* (SLT)

- “Oho! Here is the place where people have been digging for an ocean”, the ocean nodded. (TLT)

The SL text is an exclamatory sentence. The translator has translated it communicatively following the communicative equivalence, keeping the target reader in view. In this process, the SL phrase ‘Oho!’ has been retained as it has no equivalent in the TL. The word *ikkadannamaata* is translated as ‘here is the place’, *samudhraanni thavvuthunnadhi* as ‘digging for an ocean’, and *pankinchidhi* is translated as ‘nodded’, however the translator has succeeded in bringing out the text and the context into the target language.

Text. 10. *Aa aghaadhapu vodduna aaviritho neellu thode yenthraalni choosi aascherya poyindhi samudhram.*(SLT)

- The ocean got surprise on looking at the water drawing machines run by the water vapour on the edge of the valley. (TLT).

The SL text is a descriptive sentence. The translator has translated it communicatively with communicative equivalence. In the process, the SL word *aghaadhapu* is translated as ‘valley’, the SL phrase *neellu thode yenthraalni* as ‘water drawing machines’ and *ascheryapoyindhi* as ‘got surprise’. Almost all the words in the sentence have been translated keeping the TL reader in view by the translator.

F. Observations: The translator, having followed Peter Newmark’s principle of Communicative equivalence to translate the text, analyzed the story. Most of the text is translated communicatively; however, certain expressions are translated semantically so as to bring equivalence to the TL text from the SL text. The writer having been the translator himself observed difficulty to find equivalent/suitable words to communicate the verbatim of the vernacular text (Telugu) into the target language(English) and tried to convey the context communicatively. Most of the time, the Communicative Equivalence is applied to interpret the text and at times used the Semantic Equivalence. It is found that there is scope of analysis of the text with different principles of translation while translation.

References:

- Ramana, G.V. “*Samudhram*”: Naveen Vasireddy, and Sivasankar Papineni, editors. Paathikella Katha-1990. Bangalore: MaNaSu Foundation, Vol.II, 2016 pp.1150-1152.
- Ramana, G.V. “*Samudhram*”. A short story translated as “An Ocean” by Koteswara Rao, K.V. 2019.
- Bassnet-McGuir, Susan. Translation Studies. London and New York: Methuen, 1985. Print.
- Catford, J.C. A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics. London: Oxford University Press, 1965. Print.
- Gwynn, J. P. L. Assisted by Venkateswara Sastry, J. Oxford Telugu-English Dictionary. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Hornby, A.S. Hey, Leonie and Holloway, Suzanne, editors. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, Edition 9, 2015.

Naveen Vasireddy, and Sivasankar Papineni, editors. Paathikella Katha-1990. Bangalore: MaNaSu Foundation, Vol.II, 2016 pp.1150-1152.

Newmark, Peter. A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice Hill, 1988. Print.

Nida Eugene and Taber, Charles. The Theory and Practice of Translation. London: E.J. Brill, 1982. Print.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. New York: Routledge, Print.