CHAPTER II

A DESCRIPTION OF TRANSLATION

2.1 Definition of Translation

The definitions of translation would be varied as many experts in this subject have their own idea about the definition of translation. Therefore, I would like to discuss about the definitions of translation based on the experts and then try to take conclusion about these definitions.

Catford (1965: 1) defines translation as “Translation is the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL). The use of “textual material” is to underlying the fact that in normal condition, not all of the SL text is translated into the TL equivalents. For example, when we translate “what is your name?” into Bahasa Indonesia, ”siapa nama mu?” based on Catford, we are replacing the material of SL (English) grammar and lexis by the equivalent of TL (Bahasa Indonesia) grammar and lexis. But the graphological form of its translation into TL (Bahasa Indonesia) is not the equivalent of the SL (English) form.

Larson (1984: 10) states “Translation consists of studying the lexicon, grammatical structure, communication situation and cultural context of the source language, analyzing it in order to determine its meaning, then reconstructing the same meaning using the lexicon and grammatical structure which appropriate in the receptor language and its cultural context”.

Nida and Taber (1974: 12) state “Translating consists of reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style”.

Newmark (1984: 28) says “Translation is rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text”.

After reading all definitions given by the experts above, we may conclude that translation deals with two different languages. They are Source Language (SL) and Target Language (TL) or Receptor Language. As experts above stated, in translation we are transferring meaning of SL in the form of TL. So although the form is changing (the language, the grammar, the words, and sometimes the lexis) but the meaning in the SL is maintained. We cannot say one as translation if the meaning is not the equivalent or even the contrary of the SL.

We also have to note the style of language that stated by Nida & Taber and Kridalaksana. As a translator, we have to consider the type of the style based on the target readers. It is maintaining the naturalness of the language. For example, when a translator translates a journal and the target readers are public (general people), then the translator has to translate it by using the style that could be easily understood by the readers. And if the target readers are the university students, then the translators should keep the “scientific” style.

2.2 Function of Translation

Translation deals with language. As language is a means of communication, so does the function of translation. Nida (1981:2) states that translation means communication because it has three essential elements to form a process of communication. The three essential elements are source, message, and receptor, and these elements must be found in all communication activities.
Translation is the medium of the SL and TL. We “transform” the meaning in SL in the form of TL by translation, so the readers in TL understand the meaning in the SL.

Another function of Translation is also to help the development of knowledge, science, religion and uses in the entertainment world. It helps the development of knowledge because by translating a book of science so it can be read by the TL readers. In entertainment world, it may best seen in the use of translation text when we see a movie of foreign language. We see the translation text, typed in the screen, so we understand what is the movie about.

2.3 The Role of Culture in Translation

Language and Culture is something that cannot be separated from each other. It was Wilhelm Von Humboldt (1767-1835) who made the vital connection between language and culture, language and behaviour. For Humboldt, language was something dynamic, an activity (energeia) rather than a static inventory of items as the product of activity (ergon). At the same time language is an expression both of the culture and the individuality of the speaker, who perceives the world through knowledge (in Hornby, 1988:40).

Nababan (1984: 50) states “… Bahasa, sebagai sistem komunikasi, mempunyai makna hanya dalam kebudayaan yang menjadi wadahnya… mengerti sesuatu bahasa tertentu memerlukan sedikit banyak pengertian tentang kebudayaan”. Any translator who wants to translate SL to TL must, therefore, understand the culture of both SL and TL. Varmeer (in Hornby, 1988:46) event says that a translator must be bicultural, if not pluricultural. By understanding the culture of the SL and TL, it will help us in conveying the massages and the translation task would be easier.
2.4 The Process of Translation

Nababan (1999:25), divide the process of translation in three major steps. They are:

1. Analyzing the ST.
   The first step is analyzing the text. We analyze the text by first reading the ST and gain the meaning in the text. We also analyze the linguistics and extralinguistics elements in the text. Linguistics elements is the elements deals with language, while extralinguistics is the elements beyond the language, such as the culture and the social context of the text. In analyzing the linguistics elements, we analyze the text at all level such as in the level of sentence, clause, phrase, and word. By doing this, we can gain the fully understanding of the meaning in the ST.

2. Transferring the meaning
   The second step is transferring the meaning. In this step the translator has to find the equivalent of the ST. This process happens in mind (Nababan called it as proses batin). In means that this process is in the abstract form.

3. Reconstructuring
   The last step is reconstructuring. After finding the equivalent of ST, we reconstruct it in the form of TL becoming TT. In this step, we must decide what style that suits best to the text and the readers.

This three steps, would be explain by the draw bellow (Adopted from Suryawininata, in Nababan, 1999:25):
2.5 Types of Translation

The types of translations also varied. Here, I quote some experts and types of translation issued by them.

Larson (1984:15), divided two major types of translation. They are:

1. Form-based translation

Form-based translations attempt to follow the form of the source language and are known as literal translations.

If the two languages are related, the literal translation can often be understood, since the general grammatical form may be similar. However, the literal choice of lexical items makes the translation sound foreign.

2. Meaning-based translations make every effort to communicate the meaning of the source language text in the natural forms of the receptor language. Such translations are called idiomatic translations. Idiomatic translation uses the natural form of the receptor language, both in the grammatical constructions and in the choice of lexical items. A truly idiomatic translation does not sound like a translation. It sounds like it was written originally in the receptor language. The translator’s goal should be to reproduce in the
receptor language a text which communicates the same message as the source language but using the natural grammatical and lexical choices of the receptor language, his goal is an idiomatic translation.

Based on Catford (1965:21-22), there are 3 broad types or categories of translation in terms of the extent, levels, and ranks.

1. **Extent – full vs. partial** translation. In a full translation, the entire text is submitted to the translation process, that is very part of the ST is replaced by the TT material. In a partial translation, some part or parts of the ST are left untranslated: they are simply transferred to and incorporated in the TT. In literary translation it is not uncommon for some ST lexical items to be translated this way, either because they are regarded as ‘untranslatable’ or for the deliberate purpose of introducing ‘local colour’ in to the TT.

2. **Level - Total vs. Restricted** translation. This distinction relates to the levels of language involved in translation. By total translation we mean what is most usually meant by ‘translation’; that is, translation in which all levels of the ST are replaced by the TT material. Strictly speaking, ‘total’ translation is a misleading term, since though total replacement is involved it is not replacement by equivalents at all levels. Total Translation may best defined as: replacement of ST grammar and lexis by equivalent TT grammar and lexis with consequential replacement of SL phonology/graphology by (non-equivalent) TT phonology/graphology. By restricted translation we mean: replacement of ST material by equivalent TT material at only one level. That is translation performed only at the phonological or at the graphological level, or at one of the two levels of grammar and lexis.

3. **Ranks – Ranks of Translation.** It relates to the rank in a grammatical (or phonological) hierarchy at which translation equivalence is established.
Newmark (1995:45), distinguish 8 (eight) kinds of translation. They are:

1. Word-for-word translation

This is often demonstrated as interlinear translation, with the TT immediately below the ST words. The ST word-order is preserved and the words translated singly by their most common meanings, out of context. Cultural words are translated literally. The main use of word-for-word translation is either to understand the mechanics of the source language or to construe a difficult text as a pre-translation process.

2. Literal translation

The ST grammatical constructions are converted to their nearest TT equivalents but the lexical words are again translated singly, out of context. As a pre-translation process, this indicates the problems to be solved.

3. Faithful translation

A faithful translation attempts to reproduce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the TT grammatical structures. It ‘transfers’ cultural words and preserves the degree of grammatical and lexical ‘abnormality’ (deviation from ST norms) in the translation. It attempts to be completely faithful to the intention and the text-realization of the ST writer.

4. Semantic translation

Semantic translation differs from ‘faithful translation’ only as far as it must take more account of the aesthetic value of the ST, compromising on ‘meaning’ where appropriate so that no assonance, word-play or repetition jars in the finished version. Further, it may translate less important cultural words by culturally neutral third or functional terms but not by cultural equivalents and it may make other small concessions to the readership.
5. Adaptation

This is the ‘freest’ form of translation. It is used mainly for plays (comedies) and poetry; the themes, characters, plots are usually preserved, the ST cultures converted to the TT culture and the text rewritten.

6. Free translation

Free translation reproduces the matter without the manner, or the content without the form of the original. Usually it is a paraphrase much longer than the original, a so-called ‘intralingual translation’, often prolix and pretentious, and not translation at all.

7. Idiomatic translation

Idiomatic translation reproduces the ‘message’ of the original but tends to distort nuances of meaning by preferring colloquialisms and idioms where these do not exist in the original.

8. Communicative translation

Communicative translation attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership.

The types of translation of number 1 to number 4 is what called SL oriented translation while number 5 to number 8 is called TL oriented translation.

Besides the types of translation above, the types of translation could also divide based on the language that involved in the process of the translation. Jakobson, In his article entitled ‘On Linguistic Aspects of Translation’ (in McGuire, 1991:14) states that there are 3 types of translation. They are:

1. Intralingual translation, or rewording (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs in the same language).
2. Interlingual translation or *translation proper* (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language).

3. Intersemiotic translation or *transmutation* (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems).

### 2.6 Translation Equivalence

In producing translation, it is impossible to produce a translation that has the same “exact” meaning between the SL and TL. It is because every language is different or *sui generis* (Catford, 1965:27). Therefore, as a translators, we must concern to the term *equivalent* in producing a translation. Translation equivalence is the similarity between a word (or expression) in one language and its translation in another ([www.sil.org](http://www.sil.org)). A translator must look for the equivalence between source text and target text, so that there is no missing information when he transfers the message from SL to TL (in Venuti, 2000:133).

Based on Nida & Taber (1997) there are two types of equivalent. They are formal and dynamic equivalent.

1. The formal equivalent focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. In such a translation one is concern with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept. Viewed from this formal orientation, one is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language. This means, for example, that the message in the receptor culture is constantly compared with the message in the source culture to determine standards of accuracy and correctness (in Venuti, 2000:129). Formal equivalence is basically source-oriented (in Venuti, 2000:134); that is, it is designed to reveal as much as possible of the form and content
of the original message. In doing so, a formal equivalence attempts to reproduce several formal elements, including: (1) grammatical units, (2) consistency in word usage, and (3) meanings in terms of the source context.

2. *Dynamic equivalence:* based on the principle of *equivalent effect*, i.e. that the relationship between the receiver and message should aim at being the same as that between the original receivers and the ST message.

In such a translation the focus of attention is directed, not so much toward the source message, as toward the receptor response. One way of defining a dynamic equivalence translation is to describe it as “the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message.” This type of definition contains three essential items: (1) *equivalent*, which points toward the source-language message, (2) *natural*, which points toward the receptor language, and (3) *closest*, which binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation.

A translation which aims at dynamic equivalence inevitably involves a number of formal adjustments. In general, this limitation involves three principal areas: (1) special literary forms, (2) semantically exocentric expressions, and (3) intraorganismic meanings.

### 2.7 Translation Shift

Shift in translation is allowed since every language has its own characteristics. Shift in translation is not something to avoid by translator. Machali (2000) in her book entitled ‘*Pedoman Bagi Penerjemah*’ even use shift as one of technique or procedure that can be used by the translator to overcome the problems in translation especially in translating from
English to *Bahasa Indonesia*. By using the shift, such as modulation, transposition, etc, the translator can avoid the awkwardness of the translation product.

Larson (in Machali, 1997:12) views shift as the mismatch of the structure, while Newmark (2000, in Machali, 1997:12) refers to the same concept as transposition (structure shift). The shift itself could be viewed as the consequence of the translator's effort to establish translation equivalence (TE) between two different language systems (*www.acurapid.com*).

Basically, the differences that occur in TL that is not the same in SL may be called as shift. Shift not only happens in the linguistics features (such category and level shifts by Catford), but also in culture (adaptation) or in point of view (modulation). For example: If a translator doing an adaptation in translating a text such as changing the name of the place so the target readers could more familiar with the name, then we may call this as shift in culture. Another example for modulation is the changes of active structure in SL become passive in TL. For example:

SL: The problem is hard to solve

TL: Masalah itu sukar untuk di pecahkan

The types of the shift may be varied based on the expert point of view. Machali (1997:152) in his book ‘Redefining Textual Equivalence in Translation’ issued two types of shift that is different from Catford. She issued Obligatory and Optional Shifts. As we seen from the term, Obligatory shifts are shifts that oblige by the rules of the TL, while the Optional Shifts are shifts that caused by the translator’s discretion.

In this thesis I would like to focus my discussion on Catford’s types of shift because it has close relation to my thesis analysis that is the class-word shift.

Catford divide the translation shift into two major types. They are *level shift* and *category shift*. *Level shifts* are that a SL item at one linguistic level has a TL translation equivalent at a different level. He also stated that in level shifts the only possible shift is
between grammar and lexis and vice-versa. *Category shifts* is departures from formal correspondence in translation.

In category shift there are four types of shift. They are *structure-shift*, *class-shifts*, *unit-shifts*, and *intra-system-shifts*.

1. Structure Shifts

Structure shifts are the most common shift. Structure shifts are the change of grammatical position of SL in its translation in TL.

For example:

```
A   big   house
    \
Sebuah rumah besar
```

We can see here that, the position of big (besar) in English is placed at the back of house (rumah). We can say that in this translation, there is a structure-shift. This shift happens because of the difference of grammatical rules of both SL and TL. If in English grammar the adjective placed at the front of the noun, then in Bahasa Indonesia, the adjective is placed at the back of the noun.

2. Class Shifts

Class-shifts are shift of one SL item translated into TL which belongs to different grammatical class. For example, *she hates the girl* translated as *dia benci gadis itu*. The verb *hates* translated as *benci* that is an adjective in Bahasa Indonesia.
3. Unit Shifts

Unit-shifts are that shift of SL item translated into TL that belongs to different unit (word, phrase, clause, and sentence). Example: *the childish boy* translated *anak yang kekanak-kanakan*. *Childish* which is a word is translated into a phrase *yang kekanak-kanakan*.

4. Intra-Systems Shifts

Intra-system shifts are occur when SL and TL possess systems which approximately correspond formally as to their constitution, but when translation involves selection of a non-corresponding term in the RL system, for example when the SL singular becomes a RL plural.