CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Definition of Translation

Some experts had given many brief definitions of translation, as follows:

Newmark (1981:7) says, “Translation is a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language.”

Nida and Taber (1974:12) says, “Translation consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message.”

Catford (1965, in Muchtar, 2013:7) says, “Translation is the replacement of text material in language (Source Language) by equivalence textual material in another language (Target Language).”

Larson (1984, in Muchtar, 2013:24) states that translation consists of transferring the source language meaning into the target language by considering the semantic structure.”

2.2. Process of Translation

In translating the text, there are some processes that the translator has to do to make the translation appropriate with the original text. According to Larson (1984, in Choliludin, 2005:30-31) when translating a text, the translator’s goal is an idiomatic translation which makes every effort to communicate their meaning of the SL text into the natural forms of the receptor language. Furthermore, he states that translation is concerned with the study of the lexicon, grammatical structure, communication
situation, and cultural context of the SL text, which is analysed in order to determine its meaning. The discovered meaning is then re-expressed or reconstructed using the lexicon and grammatical structure which are appropriate in the receptor language and its cultural context. Larson simply presents the diagram of the translation process, as follows

![Diagram of the translation process](image)

Diagram 1. Translation Process (Larson in Choliludin, 2005:30-31)

2.3. Procedures of Translation

According to Vinay and Dalbernet (in Venuti, 2000:84), at first different methods or procedures seem to be countless, but they can be condensed to just seven, each one corresponding to a higher degree of complexity. In practice, they may be used either on their own or combined with one or more of the others.

2.3.1. Procedure 1: Borrowing

To overcome a lacuna, usually a metalinguistic one (e.g. a new technical process, an unknown concept), borrowing is the simplest of all translation methods. It is to adopt SL when the TL has no equivalent for the
SL. It is a case where a word or an expression is taken from the SL and used in the TL. It is made to conform to the rules of grammar or pronunciation of the TL. It occurs when there is no changing meaning from SL into TL. For example the word “formula” in English is translated into “formula” too in Indonesian.

2.3.2. Procedure 2: Calque

It is a special kind of borrowing whereby a language borrows an expression form of another, but then translates literally each of its elements. The result is either (i) a lexical calque which respects the syntactic structure of the TL, whilst introducing a new mode of expressions, (ii) a structural calque which introduces a new construction into the language. For example:

Governor General  Gubernur Jenderal
Science-fiction    Science-fiction

2.3.3. Procedure 3: Literal Translation

Literal, or word for word, translation is the direct transfer of a SL text into a grammatically and idiomatically appropriate TL text in which the translators’ task is limited to observing the adherence to the linguistic servitudes of the TL. For example:

I go to school everyday  Saya pergi ke sekolah setiap hari
Wo ai ni                  I love you

In principle, a literal translation is a unique solution which is reversible and complete in itself. It is most common when translating between two languages of the same family (e.g. between French and Italian), and even more so when they also share the same culture.
2.3.4. Procedure 4: Transposition

It involves replacing one word class with another without changing the meaning of the message. For example, “a pair of trousers” in English is translated into “sebuah celana”. It changes from plural to singular.

2.3.5. Procedure 5: Modulation

It is a variation of the form of the message, obtained by a change in the point of view. This change can be justified when, although a literal, or even transposed, translation results in a grammatically correct utterance, it is considered unsuitable, unidiomatic or awkward in the TL. For example, “It’s not even expensive” is translated into “itu murah kok”

2.3.6. Procedure 6: Adaptation

It is used in those cases where the type of situation being referred to by SL message is unknown in the TL culture. In such cases translators have to create a new situation that can be considered as being equivalent. Adaptation can, therefore, be described as a special kind of equivalence, a situational equivalence. For example, “Dear Sir” is translated into “Dengan hormat”

2.3.7. Procedure 7: Equivalence

One and the same situation can be rendered by two texts using completely different stylistic and structural methods. In such cases, we are dealing with method which produced equivalent texts. The classical example of equivalence is given by the reaction of someone who accidentally hits his finger with a hammer. He said “Aduh!” in Indonesian, and we see the translation becomes “Ouch!” in English. The other examples are:

Kukuruyuk cock-a-doodle-do
2.4. Common Problems of Non-Equivalence at Meaning Level

According to Baker (2011:18), non-equivalence at meaning level means that the target language has no direct equivalent for a word which has a similar meaning occurred in the source text. The following are some common types of non-equivalence at meaning level, with examples from various languages.

2.4.1. Culture-Specific Concept

The source-language word may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture. The concept in question may be abstract or concrete; it may relate to a religious belief, a social custom or even a type of food. Such concepts are often referred to as “culture-specific”. An example of an abstract English concept which is notoriously difficult to translate into other languages is that expressed by the word *privacy*. This is a very ‘English’ concept which is rarely understood by people from other cultures. *Speaker* (of the House of Commons) has no equivalent in languages such as Russian, Chinese and Arabic, among others. An example of concrete concept is *airing cupboard* in English which, again, is unknown to speakers of most languages.

2.4.2. The Source-Language Concept Is Not Lexicalized in the Target Language

The source-language word may express a concept which is unknown in the target culture but simply not lexicalized, that is not ‘allocated’ a target-
language word to express it. The word *savoury* has no equivalent in many languages, although it expresses a concept which is easy to understand. The adjective *standard* (meaning ‘ordinary, not extra’, as in *standard range of products*) also expresses a concept which is very accessible and readily understood by most people, yet Arabic has no equivalent for it. *Landslide* has no ready equivalent in many languages, although it simply means ‘overwhelming majority’.

2.4.3. The Source-Language Word Is Semantically Complex

The source-language word may be semantically complex. This is a fairly common problem in translation. A single word which consists of a single morpheme can sometimes express a more complex set of meanings than a whole sentence. We do not usually realize how semantically complex a word is until we have to translate it into a language which does not have an equivalent for it. An example of such a semantically complex word is *arruação*, a Brazilian word which means ‘clearing the ground under coffee rees of rubbish and pling it in the middle of the row in order to aid in the recovery of beans dropped during harvesting.’

2.4.4. The Source and Target Language Make Different Distinctions in Meaning

The target language may make more or fewer distinctions in meaning than the source language. What one language regards as an important distinction in meaning, another language may not perceive as relevant. For example, Indonesian makes a distinction between going out in the rain with the knowledge that it is raining (*hujan-hujanan*). English does not make this
distinction, with the result that if an English text referred to going out in the rain, the Indonesian translator may find it difficult to choose the right equivalent, unless the context makes it clear whether or not the person in question knew that it was raining.

2.4.5. The Target Language Lacks A Superordinate

The target language may have specific words (hyponyms) but no general word (superordinate) to head the semantic field. Russian has no ready equivalent for facilities, meaning ‘any equipment, building, services, etc. that are provided for a particular activity or purpose’. It does, however, have several specific words and expressions which can be thought of as types of facilities, for example sredstva peredvizheniya (means of transport), naem (loan), neobkhodimye pomeshcheniya (essential accommodation) and neobkhodimoe oborudovanie (essential equipment).

2.4.6. The Target Language Lacks A Specific Term (Hyponym)

More commonly, languages tend to have general words (superordinate) but lack specific ones (hyponyms), since each language makes only those distinctions in meaning which seem relevant to its particular environment. There are endless examples of this type of non-equivalence. English has many hyponyms under article for which it is difficult to find precise equivalents in other languages, for example feature, survey, report, critique, commentary, review and many more. Under house, English again has a variety of hyponyms which have no equivalents in many languages, for example bungalow, cottage, croft, chalet, lodge, hut, mansion, manor, villa, and hall.
2.4.7. Differences in Physical or Interpersonal Perspective

Physical perspective may be of more importance in one language than it is in another. Physical perspective has to do with where things or people are in relation to one another or to a place, as expressed in pairs of words such as *come/go, take/bring, arrive/depart* and so on. Perspective may also include the relationship between participants in the discourse (tenor). For example, Japanese has six equivalents for *give*, depending on who gives to whom: *yaru, ageru, morau, kureru, itadaku, and kudasaru.*

2.4.8. Differences in Expressive Meaning

There may be a target-language word which has the same propositional meaning as the source-language word, but it may have a different expressive meaning. The difference may be considerable or it may be subtle but important enough to pose a translation problem in a given context. It is usually easier to add expressive meaning than to subtract it. In other words, if the target-language equivalent is neutral compared to the source-language item, the translator can sometimes add the evaluative element by means of a modifier or adverb if necessary, or by building it in somewhere else in the text. So, it may be possible, for instance, in some contexts to render the English verb *batter* (as in child/wife battering) by the more neutral Japanese verb *tataku*, meaning ‘to beat’, plus an equivalent modifier such as ‘savagely’ or ‘ruthlessly’.

The above are some of the more common examples of non-equivalence among languages and the problems they pose for translators. In dealing with any
kind of non-equivalence, it is important first of all to assess its significance and implications in a given context.

2.5. Form Equivalence in Translating Poetry

Translating poetry is more difficult than translating other literary works. Because it has the elements of poetic or aesthetic expression in its form, such as rhyme, metre, the use of figure of speech, style, and etc. The form equivalence should be kept in translating the original poem into another language. although it is not an easy work to do, but it is possible for the translator to do it. Rhyme is one of the important elements in a poetry (poem). Rhyme is two or more words which are ended with the same sound. According to Lefevere (1991: 81), there are four different strategies in translating poetry:

1. **Phonemic translation.** It attempts to reproduce the SL sound in the TL while at the same time producing an acceptable paraphrase of the sense. This strategy is applied in languages which have similar phonemic system. For example, in translating English to Spanish, “Víctor” [vɪktəɹ] could be rendered correctly as [biktor] or [viktor].

2. **Literal translation.** It emphasizes on word-for-word translation distorts the sense and the syntax of the original. For example: In *Firman ke-12* by Goenawan Mohamad

   ST : “Mungkin sesuatu tentang angin dan muara,” you say
   TT : “Maybe something about the wind and the estuary,” you say

3. **Metrical translation.** It emphasizes the reproduction of the original meter into the TL. Because each language has its own specific stressing
and pronunciation system, this method will result in the inappropriate translation in terms of meaning and structure.

4. **Rhymed translation.** The translator tries hard to translate the same rhyme in SL into TL. Lefevere says that this is the most difficult work to do, beside translating the meaning.

For example: In the translation of *Mangupa* text by Syahron Lubis (2013: 179)

**ST**: *Antong angkon salumpat do saindege* (a)

   *Sapangambe sapanaili* (b)

   *Anso rap lomo roha mambeg* (a)

   *Ulang ma hita on pasili-sili* (b)

**TT**: We should be always in harmony (a)

   Be together night and day (b)

   All would be pleased this to see (a)

   Let conflict stay away (b)