1.1. Translation and Language Theory

Many definitions of translation have been made. Catford explain translation as a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another. He also defined it as the replacement of textual material in one language (Source Language) by equivalent textual material in other language (Source Language) (Catford, 1965). Newmark explains translation as rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text (Newmark, 1988a). In a common sense, translation means to be able to say something as well in one language as in another.

On his journal, Orduhari writes that translation is also used to transfer written or spoken SL texts to equivalent written or spoken TL texts. The purpose of translation itself is to reproduce various kinds of texts in another language and thus making them available to wider readers (Orduhari, 2007).

Bell Rogger suggests three distinguish meanings of translation. They are translating, a translation and translation. Translating is the process, the activity, rather than the tangible product. A translation is the product of the process of translating. Translation is the abstract concept, which encompasses both the process of translating and the product of the process. (Bell, 1991, hal. 13).
As has been mentioned earlier in background to the research, any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language or a general linguistic theory, a theory about how languages work that provides categories, drawn from generalizations based on observation of languages and language-events (Catford, 1965, p. 1).

In one of his article, Halliday explain how the concept of translation theory is problematic, between translator and those who work on linguistic. For a translator, a theory of translation relates to how he/she should translate, how best to achieve a good translation. However, for linguist, theory of translation is not about how we should translate, but it is about what happen when we do translate (Halliday, 1992, p. 15).

Furthermore, Halliday said that translation is a meaning-making activity, and any activity that is to be translation always results in the creation of meaning, a guided creation of meaning. This is where linguistic comes into picture.

1.2. Clause as a Unit of Translation

Unit of translation is the minimal stretch of language that has to be translated together, as one unit. This unit can be in the level of word, collocation, group, clause, sentence or even paragraph (Newmark, (1988a), pp. 54-55). On this research, the writer will use clause as the unit or translation in finding the meaning of subject ‘we’ in Bahasa Indonesia.

According to Tallerman, a sentence that contains one predicate is called a clause (Understanding Syntax, 2011, p. 73). Sentence is often divided into two main parts: subject and predicate. Maggie Tallerman also divides clause into two.
They are independent clause and subordinate clause. Independent clause stands alone and is not attached to any other clause. Subordinate clause is embedded within the matrix clause and is dependent on the matrix clause (p. 75 & 85).

Eastwood explains clause into two categories, main clause and sub clause. Main clause is indicated by the same subject when two clause linked together using and, or and so while, sub clause is a clause that becomes part of the other. Sub clause is usually linked using because, when, if, that, etc (Eastwood, 1994, p. 318).

Basically, we can say that there are only two kind of clause. First, independent or main clause, a clause that can stand alone and kind linked together using and, or and so when two clauses of this kind use the same subject. And the other one is subordinate clause which always embedded within the matrix clause using because, when, if, that, etc.

On his book, Halliday called independent clause as free clause, a clause that can stand by itself as a complete sentence (Halliday, 2004, p. 72). He also divides free clause into two, major and minor. Major clause has a Predicator in its structure. A major clause is either indicative or imperative in MOOD. If indicative, it has a Finite (operator) and a Subject. It could be either declarative or interrogative.

In declarative clause, the Subject comes before the Finite but in interrogative clause, the Finite comes before the Subject (Halliday, An Introduction to Functional Grammar, 2004, pp. 23-24). For example the interrogative clause, Are we famous? The finite are comes before subject ‘we’.
And in the declarative clause *We are to obey God’s word*, the finite *are* comes after subject ‘we’.

Minor clause is a clauses with no mood or transitivity structure, typically functioning as calls, greetings, exclamations and alarms, such as *Mary!, Good night!, Well done!*. It has no thematic structure either (p. 100).

1.3. Elements of Mood

Mood is particular component of the clause is being, as it were, tossed back and forth in a series of rhetorical exchanges and carries the argument forward. The elements of Mood consist of two parts. They are Subject and Finite. Subject and Finite are closely linked together, and combine to form one constituent, which we call the Mood (Halliday, 2004, pp. 111-113).

1.3.1. Subject

The first element of the Mood is subject. The subject of a sentence is the person, animal, place or thing that does the action shown by the verb (Seaton & Mew, 2007, p. 47). It is located before the finite if the clause is declarative and it comes after the finite in an imperative clause. Subject could be any personal pronoun or nominal group (Halliday, 2004).

Eastwood says that Personal pronouns do not always refer to people. 'Personal' means first person (the speaker), second person (the person spoken to) and third person (another person or thing) (Eastwood, 1994, p. 234). The words *I, you, he, she, it, we and they* are called personal pronouns. They take the place of nouns and are used as the subject of the verb in a sentence (Seaton & Mew, 2007, p. 47).
In the form of subject, first person consist of *I* for singular and ‘*we*’ for plural. Second person is *you*, whether it is singular or plural. Subject for third person singular are *he*, *she* and *it*. And third person plural is *they* (Eastwood, 1994).

Subject can also be in the form of a clause but it cannot stand independently and must be embedded in a main clause or we can call it subordinate clause. This subordinate clause is known as clausal subject (Tallerman, p. 75 & 85).

‘*We*’ is a plural pronoun that refers to more than one person or thing. ‘*We*’ means the speaker and one or more other people. ‘*We*’ can include or exclude the person spoken to (Eastwood, 1994, hal. 235). If the person spoken to is included, it is called inclusive ‘*we*’. But if the person spoken is excluded, it is called exclusive ‘*we*’. See Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1
Inclusive and Exclusive ‘We’
On the left side, the addressee is included as the people spoken to, this is called inclusive ‘we’. While the picture on the right shows that the addressee is not included as the people spoken to, this is exclusive ‘we’.

*Kita* and *kami* are the Indonesian translation of ‘we’. Just as ‘we’, *kami* and *kita* is first person plural in Bahasa Indonesia (Djenar, 2003, p. 126). *Kami* shows the first personal pronoun plural, which does not include the person spoken to, which can be called exclusive plural or limited plural. *Kita*, which shows the first personal pronoun plural including the person spoken to, which can be called inclusive plural or extensive plural. In English, both exclusive plural and inclusive plural are called ‘we’ (Surjaman, 2014, hal. 96-97).

1.3.2. Finite

Finite is the element of Mood that comes after subject in declarative clause and before subject in interrogative clause. It is a verbal operator that expressing tense or modality. The function of the finite element is to make the proposition finite. It brings the proposition down to earth so that it can be argued about by give it a point of reference in the here and now.

Finite also relates the proposition to its context in the speech event that can be done in one of two ways. One is by reference the time of speaking and the other is by reference to the judgement of the speaker to.

By reference the time of speaking, in grammatical terms, is primary tense. Primary tense is only a proposition and arguable through being located in time by reference to the speech event. There are three primary tenses. They are past, present and future.
In grammatical terms, by reference to the judgement of the speaker is modality. Modality means likely or unlikely (if a proposition), desirable or undesirable (if a proposal) in terms of the degree of probability or obligation that is associated with it (Halliday, 2004, pp. 115-116).

Thus, finite is expressed by means of a verbal operator either temporal or modal. The table below shows how a finite is either a verbal temporal operator or modal.

Finite temporal operator is indicated by the tense of the verb. In English, there are only two verbs, be and have. Be could be is, am or are in present tense and could be was/were in past tense. It depends on the subject. Here, have does
not mean possess or take. It cannot stand alone but must be followed by past participle. The use of *do/does* in present tense and *did* in the past tense are also the indication of finite temporal operator.

In some instances, the finite temporal operator is ‘fused’ into a single word. For example, in the present tense we say *loves* not *does love*. In addition, in the past tense we say *loved* and *gave* instead of *did love* and *did give* (Halliday, 2004, p. 111).

Note that the main verb of reported speech is usually in the past tense. The present form in direct speech changes to the past in reported speech. But if the situation described in the reported speech is a permanent/habitual situation, or still exist at the time we are reporting it, we can either consider to use present or past tense (Murphy, 2004).

Finite modal operator is to state the intermediate degree between *yes* and *no*. It is one of the ways to express proposal in the form of obligation, related to command and inclination, the representation of offer. In expressing the proposal, the speaker is either requesting the listener to do something or suggesting that they both do something. They rarely have third person Subjects, except as prayers or oaths (2004, pp. 146-147).

Finite is only allowed to be in the verb of an independent clause (i.e. a clause that stands alone); therefore, if we find an independent clause with just one verb in it, it is likely to be finite (Tallerman, 2011, p. 74). However, if we find a complex sentence, it is the main clause that has a finite verb (Eastwood, 1994, p. 317) because in English, only one verb element in any clause can be finite. The
finite element always occurs first in the sequence of verbs/auxiliaries (Tallerman, pp. 75-76).

1.4. Our Daily Bread and its Text Type

On her paper work, Katarina Reiss explains text types into three. They are:

(1) the informative text type, with the focus on the referential content such as encyclopedias, manuals, etc.;

(2) the expressive text type, with the focus on the author and the form of the message like novels, poems and other literary works; and

(3) the operative text type, where the function is to appeal to or persuade the reader, often advertisements.

Using different term, Newmark also divides text into three types; they are expressive which is the author-centered, informative which use external situation as the core and vocative texts which use readership and addressee as the core.

Figure 2.3
Text Type Triangle
As we go further to the Reiss text type triangle (see Figure 2.3), we see that sermon is located between informative and operative (Munday, 2008). Not just contain information from the Bible, sermon is pervaded by some strong ideological features intended to influence the readers in order to get them convinced and persuaded about the subject matter. Articles in magazines and tracts can simply be referred to as written sermons because they are written to get people persuaded about Christian life styles (Bankole, 2014).

Our Daily Bread is a daily devotional published by Radio Bible Ministry that is read by millions of people in countless locations and in dozens of countries around the world throughout the day. Our Daily Bread is published and distributed worldwide in more than 55 languages by affiliated ministries around the globe. One of them is Santapan Rohani, the Indonesian edition of Our Daily Bread which has been published since 1998.

In general, Our Daily Bread passage contains title, the verse to read, article, a short prayer and a statement of faith that underline the message of the article. While the article itself usually contain about the story of the writer experience related to the days verse in the beginning and that closed with a proposal that persuade the reader to act according to the day’s message.

Giving a careful attention to Our Daily Bread, we will find out that Our Daily Bread is both informative and vocative text since Our Daily Bread puts referential information from the Bible so as to the past experience of the writer and it also persuades the reader to follow the messages in it.
In Our Daily bread, there are three actors appear in the passage. They are the writer, the reader and other people being spoken by the writer. The word ‘we’ sometimes refers to the writer and the reader or it sometimes refers to the writer on other people speaking to the writer or being spoken by the writer. Look at the figure below to take from Our Daily Bread September 7th, 2016 passage.

Figure 2.4
Our Daily Bread September 7th, 2016

While I was pastoring a church early in my ministry, my daughter Libby asked me, “Dad, are we famous?” To which I replied, “No, Libby, we’re not famous.” She thought for a moment and then said rather indignantly, “Well, we would be if more people knew about us!”

Poor Libby! Only 7 years old and already struggling with what many of us struggle with throughout life: Who recognizes us, and are we getting the recognition we think we deserve?

Our desire for recognition wouldn’t be such a problem if it didn’t tend to replace Jesus as the focus of our attention. But being absorbed with ourselves crowds Him out of the picture.

Life cannot be all about us and all about Jesus at the same time. This makes Paul’s statement that he counted “everything as loss because of the surpassing worth of knowing Christ” (Phil. 3:8 ESV) strategically important. Faced with a choice between himself and Jesus, Paul intentionally discarded the things that would draw attention to himself so he could concentrate on knowing and experiencing Jesus (vv:7-8,10).

For us, the decision is the same. Will we live to draw attention to ourselves? Or will we focus on the privilege of knowing and experiencing Jesus more intimately? — Joe Stowell

Lord, thank You for reminding me of the value of knowing You more intimately.
Help me to keep myself out of the way as I pursue a deeper walk with You.

Do our choices bring honor to God or to us?

Pay attention to subject ‘we’ in the clause, *While I was pastoring a church early in my ministry, my daughter Libby asked me, “Dad, are we famous?”* (Paragraph 1). The word ‘we’ in the clause refers to the Dad, the writer himself
and Libby, another person speaking to the writer. Here, ‘we’ inclusive to the writer and his daughter but exclusive to the reader.

Now look at this clause, *Will we live to draw attention to ourselves?*, in the same passage. Here the word ‘we’ refers to the writer and the reader. They are inclusive in this clause. So the word ‘we’ in Our Daily Bread could be inclusive to the reader or exclusive to the reader. But this research will not go that far. It will only analyze the clause as it were, without differing the relation between the writer, the reader and other people in the clause of the passage.