

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Statement of Some Researchers about Translation

Danila Saleskovitch, interpreter and writer has said:

“Everything said in one language can be expressed in another –on condition that the two languages belong to cultural that have reached a comparable degree of development.”¹¹

To this, Peter Newmark comment:

“The condition she makes is false and misleading. Translation is an instrument of education as well as of truth precisely because it has to reach reader whose cultural and educational level is different from, and often “lower” or easier, than that of the readers of the original...No language, no culture is so “primitive” that it can not embrace the terms and the concept of, say, computer technology or plainsong”.¹²

2.2 Types of Translation

1) Literal Translation

Word-to-word translation. Word often treated slightly out of context.

2) Faithful Translation

A faithful translation preserve the SL’s grammatical and lexical abnormalities and “transfer” cultural word.

¹¹ Peter Newmark, “*A Textbook of Translation*”, 1988, p 6.

¹² Newmark, 1988, p 6.

3) Semantic Translation

The difference between faithful and semantic translation is that the latter is more flexible. The aesthetic value of the TL must be taken into account and cultural words may be replaced by culturally neutral terms.

4) Adaptation

This is the freest form of translation and is normally used only for plays and poetry. The plot, characters, and theme is usually preserved, while the SL culture is converted to that of the TL and the text is rewritten.

5) Free Translation

Newmark:

“Free translation reproduces the matter without the manner, or the content without the form of the original.”

6) Idiomatic Translation

For this type of translation, the message of the original text is reproduced, but in the TL text, colloquialism and idioms not present in the SL text are added.

7) Communicative Translation

Newmark:

“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.”¹³

The differences between semantic and communicative translation is primarily that a semantic translation is written at the author's linguistic level, while a

¹³ Newmark, 1988, p 47.

communicative translation is written at the leadership's level. Semantic translation is used for informative texts.¹⁴

2.3 Types of Translation Strategy According to Newmark:

1) Transferring The Word

This is done by including the SL word in the TL text, often "familiarizing" any spellings that would look odd in the TL.

Example: when transferring a word from English to Indonesian, "c" would usually become "k", "-tion would usually become "si"

2) Making a Neologism

Unlike transferring a word, this technique allows the translator to actually create a new word or expression rather than just transfer one. This technique should only be used when translating an actual neologism and optimally matches the SL neologism.

3) Explaining The Word

When a word is not transferable is not a neologism, this is the technique to utilize. The translator describes, in as few words as possible as we are aiming for economy, the meaning of the SL word.¹⁵

¹⁴ John Lyons. 1995. *Linguistic Semantic: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press. p 6.

¹⁵ Wehner. 2000, p 7-9.

2.4 Types of Translation Strategy According to LKS Bahasa Indonesia Which Was Written by MGMP Bahasa Indonesia Team:

- 1) Adopsi
 Cara tersebut digunakan apabila pemakaian bahasa diambil dalam bentuk dari keseluruhan bahasa yang diserap.
 Example: film → film, mall → mall, bank → bank.
- 2) Adaptasi
 Cara tersebut digunakan apabila cara pengambilan kata asing menggunakan cara penyesuaian ejaan kedalam bahasa Indonesia.
 Example: critic → kritik, stucture → struktur
- 3) Penerjemahan
 Cara tersebut digunakan apabila pemakai bahasa mengambil konsep yang terkandung dalam bahasa asing itu kemudian kata tersebut dicari padanannya dalam bahasa Indonesia.
 Example: try out → uji coba
- 4) Kreasi
 Cara tersebut digunakan apabila pemakai bahasa hanya mengambil kata dasar yang terkandung dalam bahasa asing/ bahasa sumbernya kemudian kata tersebut dicari padanannya dalam bahasa Indonesia.
 Example: effective → berhasil, guna, spare part → suku cadang¹⁶

From the explanation above could be concluded that Indonesian has four translation strategies which called **adopting, adapting, translating and creating**. **Adopting strategy** is a strategy used to transfer a word of SL into TL in the same form. **Adapting strategy** is a strategy used to transfer a word when that is done by including the SL word in the TL text, often “familiarizing” any spellings which would look odd in Indonesian. **Translating strategy** is a strategy used to transfer a word from SL to TL by taking a base concept of SL and then adjusted to Indonesian

¹⁶ Tim MGMP Bahasa Indonesia. 2006. *LKS Bahasa Indonesia kelas XII*, (Jogjakarta: Ganesa Press), p 25-26

system. **Creating strategy** is a strategy used to transfer a word from SL to TL by taking a root of word (base) and then adjust it to Indonesian system.

The translated theory which given by Newmark and Indonesian theory almost had the same way to translate a word from SL to TL. “*Adaptasi* (Adapting)” theory in Indonesia is the same as “transferring the word” theory (Newmark’s theory). Although Newmark almost has the same theory than Indonesian’s, they have different theories, called *Adopsi* (adopting), Terjemahan (translating) and *Kreasi* (creating). Researcher had to include that kind of the theory to make more variation theory in ordered to make easy to decide which theory that suitable with text.

2.5 Review of Related Study

2.5.1 Translation Theory by T. David Gordon

The paper consists of **three parties of communication, formal and dynamic equivalence, translation is a theological task, semantic theory (semantic field and context, “root” meaning, etymologies and semantic change, polyvalence, words and concepts, semantic “minimalism)**, and each explanation of those.

Three parties or dimensions of communication which was written on the paper were speaker (or author), Message, and Audience. In the paper he wrote,

“The more we can know the original author, the original audience, the better acquainted we will be with that particular act of communication. An

awareness of three-partite character of communication can be very useful for interpreters”.

In formal and dynamic equivalence section, he wrote,

“Translation should reflect the syntax, or form, of the original language. All translators agree that translation should reflect faithfully the message of the original, but none is agreed on whether the translation should adhere closely to grammatical form of the original language.”

So, according him fair to say the most contemporary linguists favour the dynamic equivalence approach in theory, though they might be disappointed in the various attempts at producing one. The reason for preferring to produce the thought of the original without attempting to conform to its form was that all languages had their own syntax of other languages; it was also dissimilar as well. Thus, if we attempt to adhere to the formal syntax of another language, we produced forms which were abnormal or confusing, if not downright distracting in the target language.

Then, in the section of **Translation is a theological task** he explained that translation could not really be performed in a theological vacuum. When varieties of linguistic options present themselves, theological factors could influence the decision to choose one option over the other. Fortunately, if one was willing to entertain sympathetically a variety of options, one could grow in the confidence with which one evaluates a given translation. One had to never pretend, however, that translation was a step of “pre-exegesis” or “pre-interpretation.” The first step of interpretation was translation. In this step

influences all other steps, so it had to be approached with the entire arsenal of theological tools.

For **Semantic Theory** which consisted about semantic field and context, root meaning, etymologies and semantic change, polyvalence, words and concept, word and concept, and semantic minimalism just consist about analysis of a poem.¹⁷

2.5.2 “Translation Theory: The Snow Debate and Beyond” by Lasse Winther Wehner

The paper consist about *the snow debate (a summary of the snow debate), and translation theory.*

The snow debate was a discussion on the (supposedly huge) amount of words for snow in the Eskimo tongue and what that told us about the Eskimo. This paper (Lasse writing) was more about taking some critical and analyzed about the argument of Edward Sapir (a student of Boas) and Benjamin Lee Whorf (an amateur student of Sapir) were devotes to “linguistic determinism” and “linguistic relativity”.

Linguistic Determinism : Our thinking is determined by language

Linguistic Relativity : People who speak different languages perceive and think about the world quite differently.

¹⁷ Gordon, 1985.

For translation theory, he analyzed two novels. They were Tolkien's novel and Hickman's "Dragonlance". In the paper he analyzed about the translation of the supernatural races inhabiting the fantasy worlds described in those book. He used two theory of translation, namely: Transferring and making neologism to analyze some words.¹⁸

2.5.3 Theories of the Translating Process by Bruce M. Metzger

This paper consist of Translation in the ancient world (*Aquila, Symmachus, Jerome*), English Translations, Edward Harwood's Translation, Noah Webster's Bible, Julia E. Smith's Translation, The Revised Version(1881-1885), Dynamic Equivalent Translation, Paraphrase.

Three parts of **Translation in the ancient world** Metzger just explained about the era or period when translation born.

For **English Translation** it self, Metzger presented about a great variety of types rendering in the King James Version; and for Edward Harwood's Translation, Noah Webster's Bible, Julia E. Smith's Translation, The Revised Version(1881-1885), those just about some translation versions after King James version.

In **Dynamic Equivalent Translation** part, Metzger presented a formal equivalent are those that seek to offer what can be called dynamic equivalent.

The prime mover in developing such translations, whether in English or in other

¹⁸ Wehner, 2000.

languages, has been Eugene A. Nida, long associated with the American Bible Society.

In the paper Metzger said:

“Dynamic equivalence” is defined as “the quality of a translation in which the message of the original text has been so transported into the receptor language that the response of the receptor is essentially like of the original receptors...The opposite principle is formal correspondence. More recently the term “function equivalence has been used to describe such a quality in the translation.”

In **Paraphrases** part, Metzger wrote about the difference between a translation and a paraphrase which expressed as follows: a paraphrase tells the reader what the passage means, whereas a literal translation tells what the passage says.

2.5.4 Gender and Translation by Behrouz Karoubi

This paper consists of **Grammatical gender, Translation problems Due to Grammatical gender, Semantic Gender: Natural vs. Social Gender, Social Gender and Gender Stereotypes, the effects of societal, chronological, and contextual factor, translation problems due to Social Gender, And nominal Gender and the Related Translation Problems.**

Grammatical Gender in this paper, explained about language with a “grammatical gender” system categorize nouns into gender classes on the basis of morphological or phonological features. However, while many believe that grammatical gender system does not have connection with “extralinguistic

category of sex”, Corbett the author of Cambridge text book of Gender, acknowledges that grammatical gender system is not merely a morphological system, but also a semantic basis which becomes obvious, particularly in gender assignment to human (agent) nouns, where most nouns referring to woman are feminine, and those referring to men are masculine.

In **Translation Problems Due to Grammatical Gender’s** part, Karoubi wrote that grammatical gender might cause translators some difficulties when they translate from SL in which gender is differently grammaticalized compared with the TL. These difficulties might be particularly intensified when grammatical gender coincides with the sex of the referent; for example when the source language shows no gender distinction in the first-person pronoun but grammatical gender agreement patterns which might produce the effect of gendered self-reference through gender concord, and the TL shows not only no gender distinction in the first person pronoun, but also no grammatical gender agreement.

In **Semantic Gender: Natural vs. Social Gender** , Karoubi wrote that, where grammatical gender was a category with syntactic consequences throughout the grammar, English was said to show “semantic gender”, i.e. the nouns English speakers refer to as she are assumed to possess a biologically (or socially) feminine semantic property in the real world.

The distinction between social and biological gender (sex) as two different, however interdependent, semantic level is one of the most crucial

factors in the discussion of gender. These two semantic levels of gender are often inaccurately conflated with each other. Where (social) gender usually refers to a socially constructed system of classification that, regardless of external genitalia, attributes qualities of masculinity and femininity to people, sex (natural/ biological gender) refers to physical and biological characteristics of a person based on their anatomy.

In the paper, he also wrote about McElhinny 's argument of the distinction between sex and gender. According McElhinny, the distinction between sex and gender is the antithesis of those socio-biological views that attribute differences and inequalities between woman and men to sex or biology as a natural determinant of behaviours and roles. She believes that in such socio-biological views "there is no gender, for there are no cultural determinants of human life.

For **Social Gender and Gender Stereotype**, he presented about the differences between social gender and gender stereotypes.

Social gender is chiefly on the basis of a stereotypical classification. While, stereotyping as an act which involves a reductive tendency: to "stereotype someone is to interpret their behaviour, personality and so on in terms of a set of common-sense attributions which are applied to whole groups. Gender stereotypes are sets of beliefs about the attributes of men or women, such as that men are stronger and more aggressive; women are passive, talk more than men and so on.

For **the effects of societal, Chronological and contextual factors**, Karoubi presented that according to Cameron (2003), ideologies of language and gender are specific to their time and place: “they vary across cultures and historical periods, and they are infected by representations of other social characteristics”. Gender is viewed as a fluctuating variable over time which could be placed between societies and culture.

Societal and cultural factors play an important role in understanding the fluid and dynamic nature of social gender. Different cultures vary in their expectations about what it means to be a man or woman; therefore, they may have different systems of stereotypical classification for gender. She refers to the handbooks traditionally written by both men and women in western societies in which expectations of what it means to be a man or woman (in those societies, in a specific period time) are expressed, and argue that these expectations may vary across different societies and cultures.

The next important feature of social gender is dependency on time. For he last important feature of social gender is dependency on context. The meaning of words, including allegedly gender-marked (sexist) words are not fixed and vary from one context to another. The same words can take on different meaning and significance depending on who uses them in a particular context.

For Pronominal gender and the related translation problem, he presented that in language that are said to have a pronominal gender system, gender is marked solely on personal pronouns. English has pronominal gender system

based on semantic criteria that is reflected only in personal possessive and reflexive third-person pronouns. The use of he, she and it is determined by simple principles: “male humans are masculine (he), female humans are feminine (she) and anything else is neuter (it). Whereas related translation problems he written was translating pronouns between languages that encode gender differently in their pronoun systems: where as some languages, like Persian, do not encode gender distinctions in their pronoun system at all; some others, like Shilha, extend gender distinctions to almost all of pronouns.