Translation Challenge: The Beginning of Tolstoy’s “Anna Karenina”

1 Text in English

The text to be translated in this Translation Challenge is the initial passage of Tolstoy’s 1878 novel Anna Karenina.¹ The Ayeri translation here follows the English one by Constance Garnett (1901), which can be found on Project Gutenberg.

Happy families are all alike; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.

Everything was in confusion in the Oblonskys’ house. The wife had discovered that the husband was carrying on an intrigue with a French girl, who had been a governess in their family, and she had announced to her husband that she could not go on living in the same house with him. This position of affairs had now lasted three days, and not only the husband and wife themselves, but all the members of their family and household, were painfully conscious of it. Every person in the house felt that there was no sense in their living together, and that the stray people brought together by chance in any inn had more in common with one another than they, the members of the family and household of the Oblonskys. The wife did not leave her own room, the husband had not been at home for three days. The children ran wild all over the house; the English governess quarreled with the housekeeper, and wrote to a friend asking her to look out for a new situation for her; the man-cook had walked off the day before just at dinner time; the kitchen-maid, and the coachman had given warning. (Tolstoy 2013)

2 Text in Ayeri

¹ Hat tip to Steven Lytle for suggesting it.
1 Kamayon pandahajang-hen mino; minarya miraneri sitang-ton pandahāng-hen minarya.

2 Enyareng atauy kāryo nangaya pandahana Oblonski. ³ Silvisaye sarisa envanang, ang manga miraya ayon yena cân-cānas layeri Kahani, seri ganvayās pandahaya ton, nay ang narisaye ayonym yena, ang ming saylingoyye mitanyam nangaya kamo kayvo yāy. ⁴ Eng manga yomāran eda-minye luga bahisya kay, nay tong vakas ten pulengeri, sitang-tong-namoy ayonang nay envanang, närya nasimayajang-hen pandahana nay nangānena ton naynay. ⁵a Ang mayayo nyān-hen nangaya, ming tenubisoyrey, mitantong kadanya. ⁵b Ang engyon vihyam miromānjas keynam si sa lancon kadanya apineri kondangaya, nasimayajas pandahana nay nangānena Oblonski. ⁶ Ang saroyye envan sangalas yena, ang manga yomoyya ayon rangya ton luga bahisya kay. ⁷ Sa senyon ganye nangaya-hen; ang range ganvaya Angli kayvo lomāyaya visam nay ang tahanye ledoyam, yam mya balangyeng pinyan yanokey gumo hiro ye; ang saraya ersaya bahisya sarisa pidimya tarika sirutayyānena; ang narisaton lomāya risang nay lantaya vapatanas ton.

3 Interlinear Breakdown

(1) Kama -yon pandaha -ye -ang =ben mino; mino -arya miran -eri sitang- ton
be.like -3PL.N family -PL -A =all happy; happy -NEG way -INS self- 3PL.N.GEN
pandaha -ang =ben mino -arya.
family -A =every happy -NEG.

“All happy families are alike; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.”

I was looking for a way to express ‘alike’ here, first trying to go with the kamo ‘equal, same’ and then realizing that it might in fact be better to use the related verb ⁵a kama- ‘be as ... as ...’ intransitively to mean ‘be alike’, i.e. expressing likeness rather than equality.

In an earlier article on the blog, I wrote about constituent order in Ayeri that “the predication in equative sentences seems to be interpreted in the way of a transitive sentence, although it is lacking an overt predicate” (Becker 2012): in Ayeri, adjectives and nominals in predicative sentences come after the subject NP, as though they were objects. This, in fact, goes counter to Universal 145 in The Universals Archive (Plank et al. 2009), since Plank et al. predict predicative adjectives in VSO languages to be treated like (or at least similar to, I suppose) verbs. I decided to break my rule and follow the universal in this case for stylistic reasons, since I thought that pandahāng-hen minarya minarya miraneri sitang-ton does not flow as well as the sentence with the constituents reversed.

(2) Enya -reng atau -ya kāryo nanga -ya pandaha -na Oblonski.

“Everything was in a big chaos in the Oblonski family’s house.”
This sentence shows Ayeri’s normal constituent order again, as compared to (i), the predication being the NP “atauya kāryo.” Tagalog, as a VSO language which I have been returning to as an inspiration for Ayeri, however, seems to place not only predicative adjectives before actors like the universal cited above predicts, but also predicative NPs:

(i) Tagalog (Schachter 1976: 499):
   a. Abogado ang lalaki.
      lawyer t- man
      “The man is a lawyer.”
   b. Matalino ang lalaki.
      intelligent t- man
      “The man is intelligent.”

Since I could not find out anything about the etymology of the name Oblonsky, I left it as it is and respelled it with the graphemes available in Ayeri transcription.

(3) a. Silvisa - ye sarisa envan - ang, ang manga mira - ya ayon yena
discover -3SG.F previously wife - A, AT PROG do -3SG.M husband (-t) 3SG.F.GEN
cán -cán -as lay -eri Kabani, si -eri ganvaya - as pandab - ya ton, ...
love -DIM - p girl ins French, REL -INS governess - p family -LOC 3PL.N.GEN, ...
“The wife had previously discovered that her husband had been having an affair with a French girl, who had been a governess in their family, ...”

b. ..., nay ang narisa - ye ayon - yam yena, ang ming sayling - oy ...
   ..., and AT announce -3SG.F (-t) husband -DAT 3SG.F.GEN, AT can continue -NEG
   - ye mitan - yam nanga - ya kamo kayvo yāy.
   -3SG.F (-t) live -PTCP house -LOC same with 3SG.M.LOC.
   “..., and had announced to her husband that she could not continue living in the same house with him.”

This is the first section that necessitated coming up with new vocabulary: অন্‌তঃ মহি‌ল ‚cān-cān ‘(love) affair’ as a diminutive of অন্‌তঃ মহি‌ল ‘love’ (a little like German Liebelei and Techtelmechtel); নাগর গাউন্যা ‘governess’ from a combination of নাগর gan ‘child’ and the feminine occupational derivative suffix ক্ষি-vaya; and নারি‌ল ‘announce’ as a causative derivation of নারি‌ল ‘say, speak’: ‘make sth. said’.

This sentence is also a good illustration for Ayeri’s tendency to underspecify tense. For one, narratives are not marked by the epic past tense, and secondly, the aspect of actions happening before the time of narration or leading up to it is only signified by the time adverb সরি‌ল sarisa ‘previous(ly), earlier; former(ly)’.
These issues had continued to exist for three days, and they had all been aware of them with pain, not only the husband the wife themselves, but all members of their family and household as well.

Words new or modified in this sentence are vakas ‘conscious, awake’, whose definition should also include ‘aware’, and nangān ‘household’, which is a renominalization of nanga ‘house’. 

The ongoing aspect of the conflict is indicated by the progressive marker manga in addition to the time reference luga babisya kay ‘for three days’.

Sentence (5a) posed a difficulty in translating “there was no sense in their living together” due to the nominalized VP, “living together” (Tolstoy 2013). I decided to leave the phrase unnominalized in my translation, although in principle, mitankadanyān ‘living-together’ would have been possible. The problem then is, however, how to express the genitive part of the original phrase. Fortunately, Ayeri allows complement phrases, so mitantong kadanya is here literally ‘that they live together’, the conjunction being inferred from context. Furthermore, I did not want to literally translate “there was no sense in …” after I discovered that I had earlier coined a verb tenubis- ‘make sense of’. Since I wanted to avoid a non-specific ‘you’ here, I rendered the subject of this clause as a patient, thus turning the verb into a passive form.
Sentence (5b) contained the difficulty of a comparative statement that was beyond a simple ‘cmp is more qty than std’. To evoke a more literary style, I used the comparative verb \( \text{en}_p \): eng- ‘be more qty than std’ instead of a simpler construction with the corresponding suffix \( \text{en}_p \)-eng. I am actually not completely sure if the verb construction makes sense syntactically, but I assumed that \( \text{en}_p \)-eng would be the head in this case and the phrase headed by \( \text{vih}_p \): vih- ‘share’ would be subordinate to it, essentially serving as the quality qty of the standard std that the comparee cmp is compared to:

(ii) a. cmp be.more \([\text{qty} \big\text{big}]\) than std.
    b. cmp be.more \([\text{qty} \big\text{sharing traits}]\) than std.

The rather complex comparative structure is, however, further complicated by the relative clause attributed to the agent \( \text{keynam}\{\text{ang}\} \) ‘people’. Due to information flow and syntactic weight, this constituent moves to the right edge of the clause.

(6) Ang sara \(-oy\) \(-ye\) envan sangal \(-as\) yena, ang manga yoma \(-oy\) \(-ya\) ayon
    at \( \text{leave} \)-neg \(-3sg.F\) wife \(-t\) \(3sg.f\).GEN, at \( \text{prog} \) \( \text{exist} \)-neg \(-3sg.m\) husband
    rang \(-ya\) ton luga babis \(-ya\) kay.
    \(-t\) home \(-\text{loc}\) \(-3pl.m\).GEN for day \(-\text{loc}\) three.
    “The wife did not leave her room, the husband had not been at home for three days.”

I am a little tempted to insert a conjunction between the two main clauses here, but I do not know whether it should be \( \text{oy} \) \( \text{nay} \) ‘and’ or \( \text{y} \) \( \text{yanoyam} \) ‘because’, since either reading is possible.

(7) a. Sa sen \(-yon\) gan \(-ye\) nanga \(-ya\) =ben; ...
    pt \( \text{neglect} \)-3pl.n child \(-pl\) \(-t\) house \(-\text{loc} \)=all; ...
    “Children were neglected all over the house; ...”

b. …; ang ran \(-ye\) ganuya Angli \( \text{ki}\) \( \text{yama}\) \(-ya\) visam nay ang taban
    …; at \( \text{argue} \)-3sg.F Governess \(-t\) English with servant \(-\text{loc} \)main and at \( \text{write} \)
    \(-ye\) ledo \(-yam\), \( \text{yam}\) mya balang \(-\text{yeng}\) \( \text{pinyan}\) \( \text{yano} \) \(-\text{ley}\) gumo hiro ye
    -3sg.F \(-t\) friend \(-\text{dat} \), \( \text{dat} \) shall find \(-3sg.f.a\) please place \(-\text{p.inan}\) work new 3sg.F
    ; ...
    \(-t\) ; ...
    “...; the English governess argued with the head servant and wrote to a friend that she may please find her a new work place; ...”

c. …; ang sara \(-ya\) ersaya babis \(-ya\) sarisa pidim \(-ya\) tarika sirutavyan \(-\text{ena}\); ...
    …; at \( \text{leave} \)-3sg.m cook \(-t\) \( \text{day} \)-\( \text{loc} \)previous hour \(-\text{loc} \) exact dinner \(-\text{gen}\); ...
    “...; the cook left the previous day at the exact hour of dinner; ...”
For this passage as well, new words had to be coined or extended: "neglect", and "announce", coined in (3), gains the additional meanings ‘express, pronounce’. ‘driver’ and ‘warning’ are not in the dictionary, but they are nouns regularly derived from verbs, in so far, they are transparent and not in desperate need of a new dictionary entry.

4 Conclusive Thoughts

This translation exercise was originally proposed in a discussion thread as a stand-in for the popular “Babel Text” from the biblical book of Genesis (11:1–9) for those who do not wish to use a religious mythical story to compare fictional languages and showcase their own. And while the passage from Anna Karenina contains many simple sentences, it still poses some syntactic difficulties that may be hard to tackle in a rather newly developed conlang. At least, this is the context in which I have most often seen the “Tower of Babel” story used in.

However, this passage from Tolstoy provides vocabulary that seems more immediately useful to get a conlang started than the “Tower of Babel” story. How often, after all, does one talk about ‘mortar’ and ‘bitumen’, or translate texts into one’s conlang that do? At least in my own experience, vocabulary of the domestic and everyday life spheres appears much more frequently.