CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 TRANSLATION

2.1.1 Definition

There are several definitions of translation described scholars. According to Catford (1965) translation is the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL). This definition is supported by Nida and Taber as quoted in (Suryawinata 1988:3) state translating consists of reproducing in the TL the closest natural equivalence of the SL message, first in the terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style.

Indonesian translation scholar, Simatupang (2000:2) says “menerjemahkan adalah mengalihkan makna yang terdapat dalam bahasa sumber kedalam bahasa sasaran dan mewujudkannya kembali di dalam bahasa sasaran dengan bentuk bentuk yang sewajar mungkin menurut aturan - aturan yang berlaku dalam bahasa sasaran”. This statement is totally supported by the Larson’s statement (1984:3) about translation. He states that translation is basically a change of form, translation consist of transferring the meaning of SL into TL. It means that the act of translation involves the change of the form SL to the form of TL; but the meaning is not changed.

Larson (1984:6) states that a best translation is the one which a) uses the normal language forms of the TL, b) communicates, as much as possible, to the TL speakers the same meaning that was understood by the speaker of SL, and c) maintain the dynamics of the original SL text. Maintaining the “dynamics” of the original source text means that the translation is presented in such a way that it will, hopefully, evoke the same response as the source text attempted to evoke.
Based on those definitions about translation, translation is a process of transferring the meaning of a text into another language then recreating it back with the most proper forms based on the structure of the TL. The object that was transferred is the meaning of the text. The main aim of translation is transferring the meaning as natural as it could in TL.

2.1.2 Methods of Translation

Methods of translation have a very close relationship with kinds of translation. Different kinds of translation occur because there are different methods used in translation. Even some of translation scholars consider that kinds of translation and the methods of translation are the same. Furthermore, the word “methods” will be used to represent the kinds or the methods of translation in this analysis.

In doing translation, a translator has to apply the methods of translation. Nababan (2003:29) states there are four factors why the method of translation should be applied. First is the different system between SL and TL. Second factor is there is difference material or translated text. Third, the appearance of paradigm stated that is a mean of communication. The last factor is the different function or goal of translation. It can be promotion, suggestion, persuasion, argumentation and etc.

According to Larson (1984:15) there are two kind of translation. They are:

1. Form based translation attempt to follow the form of the source language and are known as literal translation. If two languages are related, the literal translation can often be understood, since the general grammatical form may be similar. However, the literal choices of lexical items make the translation sound foreign.
2. *Meaning based translation* makes every effort to communicate the meaning of the SL text in natural form of TL that was famous by name *idiomatic translation*. Idiomatic translation uses the natural form of the TL, both in the grammatical construction and in the choice of lexical items. A truly translation does not sound like translation. It sounds like it was written originally in the TL.

Nida and Taber as cited by Simatupang (2000:9) support and agree with Larson, but they have their own name for their concept. Nida and Taber divide translation into two kinds of translation; they are *literal translation* and *dynamic translation*. Literal translation has a same concept with the form based translation by Larson. The other kind of translation that Nida and Taber proposed is dynamic translation. Dynamic translation is a translation that makes meaning more important than the form. The target of dynamic translation is to produce the dynamic equivalence in TL.

Based on the explanation above, there are two translation methods should be applied by the translator in order to achieve a good translation. They are meaning based translation, proposed by Larson, and dynamic translation that was stated by Nida and Taber. Those methods are considered as the naturalness meaning of translation that should be achieved in doing translation.

### 2.1.3 Translation as Product and Process

Based on the definition of translation that some scholars have defined above, translation has two roles, as a product and as a process. Translation as a product means a text which is the result of transferring the content, the message, and
the meaning of a text in SL to TL by considering the linguistic and non-linguistic elements (Muchtar 2011: 10).

Translation as a process means there are some steps should be done by the translator to transfer the meaning of the text correctly and as natural as possible. In addition, Levy in Venuti (2000:148) states that translation as a decision process. He states that translation as a series of a certain number of consecutive situation – moves, as in a game – situation imposing on the translator the necessity of choosing among a certain (and very often exactly definable) number of alternatives. Nida and Taber in Munday (2001:40) divide the process of translating into three stages system: 1) analysis of message in the SL; 2) transfer, and; 3) reconstruction of the transferred message in the TL. This process is described in the following figure:

![Figure 1: Nida’s three – stage system of translation (Munday, 2001:6)](image)

According to the figure above, the process of translation is started from analyzing the original text. In this step, the translator should be able to understand the content and the meaning of the text. In the next step, the translator intends to transfer the meaning of the original text (SL) into target text (TL). The next step is restructuring where the translator rewrites or re-expresses the materials in such a way that the translation product is readable and acceptable in terms of rules and styles in the TL.
EQUIVALENCE

2.2.1 Definition

Equivalence can be said to be the central issue in translation. The notion of equivalence is undoubtedly one of the most problematic and controversial areas in the field of translation theory. A translator must look for the equivalence between ST and TT, so that there is no missing information when he transfers the message from ST to TT (Venuti 2000:133).

Baker (1998:77) defines equivalence as the relationship between a source text (ST) and a target text (TT) that has allowed the TT to be considered as a translation of the ST in the first place.

This is in accordance with what Catford states that “equivalence is the central concept of translation which shifted the focus of translation theory away from the traditional dichotomy of ‘faithful’ or ‘free’ to a presupposed inter-lingual tertium comparison.” (Snell – Hornby, 1988:15). He further points out that “the central problem of translation practice is that of finding TL equivalents. A central task of translation theory is that of defining the nature and conditions of translation equivalence.” (Snell – Hornby, 1988: 15)

Larson (1984:57) suggests that a translator will often find that there is no exact equivalent between the words of one language and the words of another. There will be overlap in translation product, and there is seldom a complete match between languages. Because of this, it is often necessary to translate one word of the source language by several words in the receptor language in order to give the same meaning.

Baker (1998: 77) claims that uses the notion of equivalence for the sake of convenience because most translators use it rather than because it has any theoretical
statements. Thus equivalence is variously regarded as a necessary condition for translations, an obstacle to a progress in translation studies, or a useful category for describing translation. She also added that proponent of equivalence as the relationship between a source text (ST) and a target text (TT). That’s allowed the TT to be considered as a translation of the ST in the first place.

2.1.3 Kinds of Equivalence

Equivalence is classified become several kinds depend on some theory of several translation scholars. Kinds of equivalence according to Nida which are stated in Munday (2001: 41) which are: (1) formal equivalence and (2) Dynamic equivalence. Nida defined these as follows:

1. Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content. 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 target culture is constantly compared with the message in the source culture to determine standards of accuracy and correctness (Venuti 2000:129)

A formal equivalence attempts to reproduce several formal elements, including: 1) grammatical units, 2) consistency in word usage, and 3) meaning in terms of source context. Nida also calls this kinds of equivalence as ‘gloss translation’, which aims to allow the reader to understand as much as the ST context as possible.

2. Dynamic equivalence is based on what Nida calls ‘the principle of equivalent effect’, where ‘the relation between receptor and message should be
substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message’. One way of defining a dynamic equivalence translation is to describe it as “the closest natural equivalent to the SL message.” This kind of definition contains three essential items: 1) equivalent, which points toward the SL message, 2) natural, which points towards the TL, and 3) closest, which binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation.

A translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture; it does not insist that he understand the cultural patterns of SL context in order to comprehend the message.

Baker (1992) explains a more detail list of condition upon which the concepts of equivalence can be defined. She explores the notion of equivalence at different levels, in relation to translation process, including all different aspects of translation and hence putting together the linguistic and the communicative approach. She divided equivalence into four groups, they are:

1. *Equivalence that can occurred at word level and above word level* while doing translation from SL to TL. Baker acknowledges that, in a bottom up approach to translation, equivalence at word level is the first element to be taken into consideration by translator. In fact, when the translator starts analyzing the ST, the translator looks at the words as single units in order to find a direct ‘equivalence’ term in the TT.

2. *Grammatical equivalence*, when referring to the diversity of grammatical categories across languages. She notes that grammatical rules may vary across languages and this may pose some problems in terms of finding a
direct correspondence in the ST. in fact, she claims that different grammatical structures in the ST and TT may cause remarkable changes in the way the information or message is carried across. These changes may include the translator either to add or to omit information in the TT because of the lack of particular grammatical devices in the TT itself.

3. **Textual equivalence**, when referring to the equivalence between a ST and a TT in terms of information and cohesion. Texture is a very important feature in translation since it provides useful guidelines for the comprehension and analysis of the ST which can help the translator in his or her attempt to produce a cohesive and coherent text for the TL audience in a specific context. Translator can decide to maintain or not the cohesive ties as well as the coherence of the ST. his or her decision will be guided by three main factors, they are; the target audience, the purpose of the translation and the text type.

4. **Pragmatic equivalence**, when referring to implicatures and strategies of avoidance during the translation process. Implicature is not about what is explicitly said but what is implied. Therefore, the translator needs to work out implied meanings in translation in order to get the ST message across. The role of the translator is to recreate the author’s intention in another culture in such a way that enables the TT reader to understand it clearly.

### 2.3 Equivalence Translation strategies

#### 2.3.1 Equivalence Translation strategies at word level

There are seven strategies was offered by Baker in order to overcome the problems of non equivalence in doing translation. They are:
1. Translation by a more general word

This is one of the commonest strategies with many types of non-equivalence, particularly in the area of propositional meaning. It works equally well in most, if not all, languages, since the hierarchal structure of semantic fields is not language – specific. For example:

SL: I will go back to Chicago two days later (English)
TL: Saya akan kembali ke Amerika dua hari lagi. (Bahasa Indonesia)

The above example illustrate the use of a general word (superordinate) to overcome to a relative lack of specificity in TL compared to the SL. What the translators of the above extracts have done is go up a level in a given semantic field to find a more general word that covers the core propositional meaning of the missing hyponym in the target language.

2. Translation by a more neutral/less expressive word

To make a clear comprehension notice the example below:

SL: The panda is something of a zoological mystery (English)
TL: Kemunculan panda dalam dunia hewan adalah sebuah teka teki (B.Indonesia)

There is an equivalent for mystery in Bahasa Indonesia, but it mostly associated with religion. The translator felt that it would be wrong to use it in a zoological context.

3. Translation by cultural substitution.

One of the strategies to achieve “equivalent effect” used in the latter situation is translation by cultural substitution. This strategy is called “cultural equivalent” (Newmark, 1988:82-83). It involves “replacing a culture-specific item or expression
with a target language item which does not have the same propositional meaning” (Baker, 1992: 30). The main advantage of using this strategy is that it gives the reader a concept with which s/he can identify something familiar and appealing.

4. **Translation using a loan word or loan word plus explanation**

   This strategy is particularly common in dealing with culture-specific items, modern concepts, and buzz words. As with the strategy of cultural substitution, the freedom with which translator use loan words will often depend on the norms of translation prevailing in their societies. Example:

   **SL:** She is completely **narcissistic** (English)
   **TL:** Pendeknya, kakaku itu benar-benar **narcissistic** (Bahasa Indonesia)

5. **Translation by paraphrase using a related word.**

   This strategy tends to be used when the concept expressed by the source item is lexicalized in the TL, but in a different form, and when the frequency with which a certain form is used in the ST is significantly higher than would be natural in the TL. Example:

   **SL:** He **really** love it (English)
   **TL:** Ia girang **bukan main** (Bahasa Indonesia)

6. **Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words**

   If the concept expressed by the source item is not lexicalized at all in the TL, the paraphrase strategy still used in some contexts. Instead of related word, the paraphrase may be based on modifying a superordinate or simply on unpacking the meaning of the source item, particularly if the item in question is semantically complex. The main advantage of this strategy is that it achieves a high level of
precision in specifying propositional meaning. The disadvantage using this strategy is paraphrase does not have the status of a lexical item and therefore cannot convey expressive, evoked, or any kind of associative meaning. For instance, look at the example:

SL: Andy looked pleased as the Rocky Road finally engulfed the tip of his nose

(English)

TL: Andy kelihatan senang. Hidungnya sudah hampir tertutup es krim

(Bahasa Indonesia)

7. Translation by omission

This strategy may sound rather drastic, but in fact it does no harm to omit translation a word or expression in some context. If the meaning conveyed by a particular item or expression is not vital enough to the development of the text to justify distracting the reader with lengthy explanation, translator can and often do simply omit translating the word or the expression in question.

Example:

SL: That's not exactly appropriate for Luigi's

(English)

TL: Tak cocok dipakai ke Luigi's

(Bahasa Indonesia)

2.3.2 Equivalence Strategies at above word level

The non-equivalence problems of translation are not only occurred on the word level. In fact, words are combined with other words and make a new meaning. This combining words generally known as idioms, phrase, and fixed expression. Baker (1992: 65) mentions that there are two main problems of idiomatic and fixed expressions pose in translation. They are: the ability to recognize and interpret an
idiom correctly; and the difficulties involved in rendering the various aspect of meaning that an idiom or fixed expression conveys into the TL. To overcome the problems above, Baker mention several strategies which are working on these combining words such idiom, phrase and fixed expression. There are several strategies that Baker has stated, they are:

1. Using an Idiom of similar meaning and form

   This strategy involve using an idiom in the TL which roughly the same meaning as that the SL idiom and in addition consist of equivalent lexical item. This kind of match can only occasionally be achieved. Example:

   SL: Perhaps Granamyr wanted to show us that things aren’t always what they seem. (English)
   TL: Mungkin Granamyr ingin menunjukkan kepada kita bahwa sesuatu hal tidak lah selalu sama dengan apa yang kita lihat. (Bahasa Indonesia)

2. Using an idiom of similar meaning but dissimilar form

   It is often possible to find idiom or fixed expression in the TL which has a meaning similar to that of source idiom or expression, but which consist of different lexical item. Example:

   SL: “Those idiots are letting her get into her stride,” said George (English)
   TL: “para idiot itu membiarkannya menumpahkan kemarahannya.” kata George (Bahasa Indonesia)
3. Translation of paraphrase

This strategy has the same concept with the paraphrase strategy at word level, but the difference lied on the way it translated. At the word level, paraphrase strategy translates a word in to unrelated words, but in this paraphrase at this level, the idiom was translated into related idiom. This strategy is the most common way of translating idiom (Baker 1992:75). It possible for the translator find inaccurate paraphrase. Example:

SL: “It was the first week after term ended” said Ron (English)
TL: “terjadinya pada minggu pertama liburan kita” kata Ron (Bahasa Indonesia)

4. Translation by omission:

An idiom may sometimes be omitted altogether in the TT because it has no close match in the TL, its meaning cannot be easily paraphrased, or for stylistic reason.

2.4 SLANG

2.4.1 Definition

There are many definitions of slang offered by many linguists. According to Microsoft Encarta 97 Encyclopedia slang can be described as informal, nonstandard words or phrases which tend to originate in subcultures within a society. Thorne (2007) defines that “slang is language deliberately selected for its striking informality and is consciously used in preference to ‘proper’ speech (or, more rarely, writing).” It usually originates in small social groups. slang is expressions that do not belong to
Standard English. For example: “what’s up?” is an example of term for asking about people or greeting a person.

For some groups, slang is a private code connecting their particular values and behavior and reinforcing their exclusivity. Slang may escape from the original group and become more widely used, and although slang draws much of its effect from its novelty, some terms (*booze, punk, cool*) may stay in the language for many years (Thorne, 2007).

Slang consists of the words and expressions that have different from the *cant*, *jargon* and *argot* (and to a lesser extent from dialectal, nonstandard, and taboo speech) of specific subgroups of society so that they are known and used by some of the general population, even though the words and expressions often retain some associations with the subgroups that originally used and popularized them. Thus, slang is a middle ground for words and expressions that have become too popular to be any longer considered as part of the more restricted categories, but that are not yet (and may never become) acceptable or popular enough to be considered informal or standard.

### 2.4.2 Slang Form

1. Slang Word

Slang words beside specific vocabulary are also formed by a variety of processes (Matillo, 2003) they are the main ones:

- Established words used in extended or special meanings: *flash* and *juice* in the previous paragraph, *awesome* = excellent, *hooter* = nose.

- Words made by abbreviation or shortening: *fab* from *fabulous*, *pro* from *professional*, *snafu* (= *situation normal: all fouled up*).
• Rhyming slang: *Adam and Eve = believe, butcher's (hook) = look.*

• Loanwords from other languages: *gazump, nosh, shemozzle* from Yiddish, *kaput* from German, *bimbo* from Italian (= little child).

• Backslang, in which the spelling or sound of other words are reversed: *yob* from *boy*, *slop* from *police*.

2. Slang Phrase

Slang phrases are characterized by some features in sound realization such as intonation, rhythm, stress underlined by purposely lax way of speaking, inaccurate or omitted pronunciation of some sounds or even group of sounds. The words are usually produced in a shortened, easier and more relax way (Matillo, 2003). The processes described below:

• Words formed by compounding: *airhead* = stupid person, *couch potato* = person who lazes around watching television, *snail mail* = ordinary mail as opposed to email.

• Merging of two words: 'portmanteau' words such as *ditsy* = *dotty + dizzy*, *ginormous* = *gigantic + enormous*.

• Reduplications and fanciful formations: *heebie-jeebies, okey-doke*. Words based on phrases or idioms: *bad-mouth* = to abuse, *feel-good* as in *feel-good factor*, *in-your-face* = aggressive, *drop-dead* = extremely (beautiful etc.), *must-have* = essential, *one-night stand* = brief sexual encounter.

• Slang phrases also use inaccurate pronunciation; *What’m I going t’do now? Ah'm over here*. Consonant gemination: *innit*? (isn’t it?), *wunnit* (wasn’t it?)
The Use of Slang

Slang is used for many purposes. But there are six main purposes why people used it in their spoken activity (Eriksen, 2010), they are:

- Establish group relations and identity
- Separate one group of people from another
- Rebel against standard language through the use of words and expressions that are not defined in standard language
- Lead a conversation towards informality
- Suggest ‘insider-knowledge’ with the people to whom you are speaking
- Show the speaker’s attitude through the use of words and expressions that differ from standard language