II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Definition of Translation

The importance of translation leads many people, including the experts, to the curiosity on translation. According to Larson (1998), translation is a process that “consists of transferring the meaning of the source language into the receptor language. This is done by going from the form of the source language into the receptor language, going from the form of the first language to the form of a second language by way of semantic structure. It is the meaning which is being transferred and must be held constant” (p. 3). Larson’s definition is supported by Catford (1964) in his theory that says, “Translation is the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language” (p. 20). Therefore, it is obvious that both Larson and Catford agree that translation is transferring a meaning of a text from the source language into the target language without changing its content.

According to Larson (1998), there are two types of translation. They are form-based translation and meaning-based translation. He explains that form-based translation is a kind of translation that follows the form of its source language. Form-based translation is a kind of translation that makes an effort to communicate the message from the source language as natural as it can in the target language. It is concluded that the target of meaning-based translation is delivering a translation which does not look like being translated. In other words, it can be called as an idiomatic translation.

Newmark (1988) also takes part in giving his ideas on this subject (p. 39). He suggests that there are two types of translation, semantic and communicative
translation. He explains that semantic translation is a translation that seems more complex, awkward, detailed. He calls this type as an over translated because it tends to be more specific than the original one. Hence, the semantic translation is more informative but less effective. As Newmark (1988) states that, communicative translation “attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original” (p. 64). It means that the communicative one tends to be smoother, simpler, and clearer.

B. Process of Translation

Translating is not only a process of changing the form of the source language into the target language, but it is also a process of transferring meaning. Larson provides a diagram that shows a process of translating.
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Larson (1998) also explains that the first step in translating is studying the lexicon, grammatical structure, context situation, and culture of the source language. The next step is analyzing them in order to get the meaning of the passage. After that Larson suggests reconstructing the meaning from the source language into the target language by using its lexicon and also grammatical
structure. The translation has to be appropriate to its culture and the context situation (p. 4).

C. Culture-Specific Concepts

Concepts that appear in language and refer to cultural entities in the source language that is usually unfamiliar in the target language of other culture is called culture-specific concepts (Baker, 1992, p.21). Meanwhile, Nord who called cultural entities as culture defines culture-specific concepts as “a cultural phenomenon that is present in culture X but not present (in the same way) in culture Y” (p. 34). Newmark divides cultural words or culture-specific concepts into 6 categories; they are “1) Ecology 2) Material culture (artefacts) 3) Social culture 4) Organizations, customs, activities, procedures, concepts; 5) Gestures and habits, etc. (p. 95).

Ecology category covers CSCs that are included as geological and geographical terms, such as flora, fauna, winds, plains, hills, etc. (Newmark 1988 p. 112). Newmark explains that geographical features can be easily determined from other CSCs, but their diffusion to the target language depends on the importance of their country of origin as well as their degree of specificity in both languages. Many countries have their own local words for plains, savannahs, tundra, and others, all with their own cultural color. These words would normally be transferred with the additional ‘culture-free term’ where it is necessary to help explains the words to the target reader. Usually flora and fauna are not translated unless they appear in target language’s environment like in source language, since they are local and cultural (p.113).
On Newmark’s (1988) material culture’s category, food is the most delicate and crucial terms of culture. Therefore, it has always become the subject of many translation procedures. Newmark recommends translation for these cultural words with recognized translation procedure such as equivalents or transference with the additional neutral terms (e.g. ‘the pasta dish’). Next is clothes as cultural terms, these terms usually are sufficiently described to the target reader by the translator. Important notes to the translator is that sometimes generic terms used to replace the absence of the source text CSCs can only be limited to creating the visual of which part of body the clothes cover. Hence, losing the climate in which the clothes are used in and material used to make the clothes, the significant parts which indicate their identity as CSCs. Other than food and clothes, houses and transportations are included in this category as well (114).

One of the problems usually appears along with Newmark’s (1988) social culture category in translation process is its denotative and connotative. Most of its denotative meaning can be translated since they almost always have denotative meaning in the target language. This is not the case for connotative meaning, for example words like, ‘the people’, ‘the common people’, ‘the masses’, ‘the working class’, ‘the proletariat’, ‘the working classes’, ‘the lower order’. These terms can either be used satirically and humorously therefore put in inverted commas. The term ‘the working class’ still has its political resonance, ‘proletariat’ is used mainly for its emotional effect and can hardly be used seriously since the majorities of developed countries nowadays are property-owning. ‘The masses’ can be used both positively and negatively. The translator must pay close attention to the context where these kinds of words are used in order to know which
connotation are carried in the target text to be transferred to the target text (p. 115).

Social organisation and customs categories include local organization, customs, activities, procedures, concepts terms in the source text. Some of the examples are the title head of a head of state (‘President’, ‘Prime Minister’, ‘King’) or the name of a parliament which are created internationally and has its own through translation (e.g. ‘National Assembly’, ‘Chamber of Deputies’). Some of the government inner circle, such as cabinet or council of ministers may be informally be referred to by the name of its capital city, same goes to some political institutions and parties can be referred to by their recognized terms in the target text. Often times the names of the ministries are literally translated, because they are descriptive by nature themselves (e.g. Finance Ministry-English, Kementerian Keuangan-Indonesia). Newmark suggests to transferred the name in official settings, however informally it could be translated by a cultural equivalence. Under this category are historical terms, international terms, religious terms, and artistic terms (p. 116).

Last but not least gestures and habit is the last category this paper focuses on. Every culture has its own way to express gratitude, appreciation, remorse, blessings, etc. In some culture people smile a little when someone dies, do a slow hand-clap to express warm appreciation, spit as a blessing, nod to dissent or shake their head to assent, kiss their finger tips to greet or praise, give a thumbs-up to signal OK, and sometimes they do not translate the same way culturally in other culture. Newmark (1988) proposes to use a universal term that may be understood in the target language culture and its readership (119).
D. Strategies in Translating Culture-Specific Concepts

Hurtado quoted in Guerra (2012) observes that sometimes procedures and strategies are overlapping, nonetheless, procedure focuses more on ‘translation result’ than ‘translation process’ (6). Newmark (1988) defines procedures as a way to translate ‘sentences and smaller units of the language’ (98). There are many procedures proposed for dealing with culture-specific concepts. Newmark suggests several procedures to handle culture-specific concepts, namely, transference, cultural equivalent, descriptive equivalent, literal translation, naturalization, componential analysis, deletion, couplet, etc. Transference is transferring a word adopted from SL to TL with little or no change (loanword), for example, kantor (Indonesian) – kantoor (Dutch) and radio (Indonesian) – radio (English). This procedure is used when the translator decides to transfer unfamiliar terms in the source language text to the target language text. It is to give a sense of intimacy between the text and the reader – sometimes to create imagery of the text which can assist the reader in understanding the text (99).

Cultural equivalent is a procedure that replaces culture-specific concepts of SL to its approximate culture-specific concepts of TL even though they are not accurate, for example, baseball (English) – kasti (Indonesian). In Newmark (1988) thinks this procedure is limited because the translation often times are inaccurate but still can be used in general texts (99). Baker (1992) views cultural equivalence as replacing a culture-specific item with the same propositional item in the target language to give similar effect to the target reader (31). Baseball (English) basically is not the same as kasti (Indonesian), however kasti is the same propositional item in Indonesian which gives the same taste to the word baseball.
Descriptive Qualitative is explaining the culture-specific concepts into several words in the TL, for example, ‘becak-Indonesian becomes ‘a three-wheeled vehicle’. In this procedure the description and function of the cultural-specific item are crucial to provide equivalent effect from the source text in the target text (Newmark 1988, p. 100). Vinay and Dalbempt quoted in Guerra’s (2012) research explains deeper at descriptive equivalence as a procedure which describes similar situation or thing using different ‘structural method’ to produce equivalent text. Basically, the translator uses recognized item in the target language to establish the cultural-specific concept to the target reader (10).

Componential analysis uses comparison of cultural-specific item in source text and target text, but not exactly one-to-one equivalent (Newmark 1988). Newmark explains, this means the translator will have to compare the similarities and the difference which the cultural-specific items have. He observes that usually the item in source text has more specific meaning than the target text, thus the translator must add target language ‘sense components’ to the corresponding word to replace the missing sense in the meaning (p. 131).

Modulation is transmitting the message of culture-specific concepts of SL in conformity with the current norms of TL because SL and TL may have a different perspective and/or “TL rejects literal translation” (Newmark 1988 p.88). Vinay and Darbelnet quoted in Newmark (1988) call modulation as a “change of point of view” (248). According to them, this strategy involves a free translation, one of them is using a positive for double negative and vice versa. However, this method must be appropriate to the ‘context’ and the ‘formulation’ of the culture-specific item (p.105).
Another strategy from Newmark (1988) is paraphrasing where translation explains much more detailed comparing to descriptive equivalent. This strategy is mostly used in free translation where the translator is not faithful to the source text and focuses more on explaining the culture-specific concept for the target reader. In addition, it results in a longer target text than the source text, which does not seem like a translation (63 – 64). Usually, to deal this problem, translator will use another marginal strategy, cultural footnotes which gives additional information put at the bottom of the page. Newmark (1988) suggests that translator needs to put the possibility that the culture-specific item may be mentioned throughout the book into consideration, therefore using footnote may be proven more efficient than to paraphrase the same concept over and over to the target reader (216).

Couplets deals with culture-specific concepts that cannot be translated just by using one strategy, Newmark suggests applying couplets, which is combining two or more strategies (91). Some of the strategies which translator combine in a couplet are proposed by Davies (2003); preservation, addition, omission, globalisation, localization, transformation, and creation (p. 72-89). Preservation is a strategy which is applied when the culture-specific concept in the source text does not have equivalence in the target language text, which Newmark refers to as transference (1988, p. 98-99). There are two kinds of preservation, form preservation and content preservation (Davies, 2003, p. 77). Addition is an act of providing extra information when the culture-specific concept which is preserved by the translator is still vague to the target reader. According to Davies, the extra information can be added inside or outside the text (Davies, 2003, p. 77).
Other than those procedures Newmark proposes, this study also uses omission and globalisation as other options of strategies proposed by Baker (1992). Omission is applied when the problematic culture-specific concepts are discarded without damaging the context of SL text since it if often ‘not vital’ enough (52). Davies (2003) observes that it is often used by the translator under circumstances when the target reader may not be aware of the culture-specific concept’s existence (p. 79). Globalisation is “the process of replacing culture-specific concepts with ones which are more neutral or general”. It is often used by the translator to avoid misunderstanding by the target reader since they, the target reader, are unable to relate to the culture-specific concept (p 83).