

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter discusses the related literature and studies after the thorough and in-depth search which is done by the researcher. This will also presents the synthesis of the terms and theoretical framework to understand completely.

2.1 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is concerned with the study of the relationship between language and the contexts in which it is used. It grew out of work in different disciplines in the 1960s and early 1970s, including linguistics, semiotics, psychology, anthropology and sociology. Discourse analysts study language in use: written texts of all kinds, and spoken data, from conversation to highly institutionalised forms of talk. (McCarthy, 1991:5)

Discourse analysis is also described as a method of seeking in any connected discrete linear material, whether language or language-like, which contains more than one elementary sentence, some global structure characterizing the whole discourse, or large sections of it. (Harris, 1963:7)

The aim of discourse analysis is to map out the processes in which we struggle about the way in which the meaning of signs is to be fixed and the processes by which some fixations of meaning become so conventionalised that thinking of them as natural (Jorgensen/Philips, 2002 :26) One aim of discourse analysis is to pinpoint and analyse the myths of society as objective reality that are implied in talk and other actions (Jorgensen/Philips, 2002:40).

Discourse analysis studies about discourse or text, both written and spoken text. Reading a text is far more complex: we have to interpret the ties and make sense of them. Making sense of a text is an act of interpretation that depends as much on what readers bringto a text as what the author puts into it. (McCarthy, 1991:27)

2.1.1 Texture in text

The word text is used in linguistics to refer to any passage, spoken, or written, of whatever length, that does form unified whole. A text is a unit of language in use. It is not grammatically unit, like a clause or sentence, and it is not defined by its size. (Halliday&Hasan, 1976:1) A text is best regarded as a unit not of form but of meaning. Thus it is related to a clause or sentence not by size but by realization, the coding of one symbolic system in another. (Halliday&Hasan, 1976:2)

The concept of texture is entirely appropriate to express the property of 'being a text'. A text has a texture and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text. It derives this texture from the fact that it functions as a unity with respect to its environment. (Halliday&Hasan, 1976:2) If a passage of English containing more than one sentence is perceived as a text, there will be certain linguistic features present in the passage which can be identified as contributing to its total unity and giving its texture. For instance:

Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fireproof dish.

It is clear that *them* in the second sentence refers back to (is ANAPHORIC to) the *six cooking apples* in the first sentence. This ANAPHORIC function of *them* gives cohesion to the two sentences, so that we interpret them as a whole; the two sentences together constitute a text. The texture is provided by the cohesive relation that exists between *them* and *six cooking apples*. (Halliday&Hasan, 1976:2)

2.1.2 Coherence and Cohesion

Coherence is the feeling that a text hangs together, that it makes sense, and is not just a jumble of sentences (Neubauer 1983: 7) as quoted from (McCarthy:1991). According to Halliday and Hasan (1976:4), cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The sentences 'Clare loves potatoes. She was born in Ireland.' are cohesive (*Clare/she*), but are only coherent, if one already shares the stereotype ethnic

association between being Irish and loving potatoes, or is prepared to assume a cause-effect relationship between the two sentences. So cohesion is only part of coherence in reading and writing, and indeed in spoken language too, for the same processes operate there.(McCarthy, 1991:26)

Cohesion is the network of lexical, grammatical, and other relations which provide links between various parts of a text. These relations or ties organize and, to some extent create a text, for instance by requiring the reader to interpret words and expressions by reference to other words and expressions in the surrounding sentences and paragraphs. Cohesion is a surface relation; it connects together the actual words and expressions that we can see or hear. (Baker, 1992:180)

According to Mona Baker (1992:26), like cohesion, coherence is a network of relations which organize and create a text: cohesion is the network of surface relations which link words and expressions to other words and expressions in a text, and coherence is the network of conceptual relations which underlie the surface text. Both concern the way stretches of languages are connected to each other. In the case of cohesion, stretches of language are connected to each other by virtue of lexical and grammatical dependencies. In the case of coherence, they are connected by virtue of conceptual or meaning dependencies as perceived by language users. We could say that cohesion is the surface expression of coherence relations, that it is a device for making conceptual relations explicit. For instance, a conjunction such as *therefore* may express a conceptual notion of reason or consequence. However, if the reader cannot perceive an underlying semantic relation of reason or consequence between the propositions connected by *therefore*, s/he will not be able to make sense of the text in question; in other words, the text will not ‘cohere’ for this particular reader.

Cohesion is expressed partly through the grammar and partly through the vocabulary. We can refer therefore to *grammatical cohesion* and *lexical cohesion*. (Halliday&Hasan, 1976:6) The various types of grammatical cohesion are reference, substitution/ellipsis, and conjunction(Halliday&Hasan, 1976:6), while the types of

lexical cohesion are reiteration and collocation (Halliday&Hasan, 1976:279). This study examines about grammatical cohesion which only focuses on *Ellipsis in phrase level*.

2.1.3 Ellipsis

2.1.3.1 Ellipsis in English

Ellipsis involves the omission of an item. In other words, in ellipsis, an item is replaced by nothing. This is a case of leaving something unsaid which is nevertheless understood. It does not include every instance in which the hearer or reader has to supply missing information, but only those cases where the grammatical structure itself points to an item or items that can fill the slot in question. (Baker, 1992:187)

Ellipsis is also described as the omission of elements normally required by the grammar which the speaker or writer assumes are obvious from the context and therefore need not be raised. Ellipsis is distinguished by the *structure* having some ‘missing’ element. If two people have to stack and label a pile of items and one says to the other ‘you label and I’ll stack’, the fact that *label* and *stack* are usually transitive verbs requiring an object in the surface structure is suspended because the content ‘supplies’ the object. (McCarthy, 1991:43)

According to (Halliday&Hasan, 1976:144), where there is ellipsis, there is a presupposition in the structure that something is to be supplied, or ‘understood’. An item is elliptical if its structure does not express all the features that have gone into its make up— all the meaningful choices that are embodied in it. So that, it can be taken as a general guide the notion that ellipsis occurs when something that is structurally necessary is left unsaid. (Halliday&Hasan, 1976:146) classifies ellipsis in three headings: *nominal ellipsis*, *verbal ellipsis*, and *clausal ellipsis*.

(McCarthy, 1991: 43) added the examples of each ellipsis in sentences. Nominal ellipsis often involves omission of a noun headword, for instance:

- (1) *Nelly liked the green tiles; myself I preferred the blue.*

Ellipsis within the verbal group may cause greater problems. Two very common types of verbal-group ellipses are what Thomas (1987) calls echoing and auxiliary contrasting. Echoing repeats the element from the verbal group, for instance:

(2) A: *Will anyone be waiting?*

B: *Jim will, I should think.*

Contrasting is when the auxiliary changes:

(3) A: *Has she remarried?*

B: *No, but she will one day, I'm sure.*

With clausal ellipsis in English, individual clause elements may be omitted; especially common are subject-pronoun omissions ('doesn't matter', 'hope so', 'sorry, can't help you', etc.). Whole stretches of clausal components may also be omitted, for instance:

(4) *He said he would take early retirement as soon as he could and he has*

The ellipsis applied in the research is just in level phrase—nominal and verbal ellipsis. Thus, the clausal ellipsis is not used in this study.

2.1.3.2 Ellipsis in Indonesian

According to Hasan Alwi, if two clauses are merged in a sentence, it can result the same element. The element can be omitted without missing the meaning of the sentence. This term is known as *ellipsis* or in Indonesian is called *pelesapan* which is the omission of the element in one sentence or text. (Alwi, 2000:415) defines three kinds of *pelesapan* :

1. *Pelesapan Subjek* (Subject ellipsis)

Subject ellipsis occurs when two sentences or clauses have the same subject and so the subject in one of the clauses can be omitted. For instance:

(1) *Dia sebenarnya sakit, tetapi tetap masuk sekolah.*

The sentence above have the same subject *dia*, so the subject *dia* in the second clause can be omitted.

2. *Pelesapan Predikat* (Predicate Ellipsis)

The occurrence of predicate ellipsis is the same as subject ellipsis. If the clauses have the same predicate, so the predicate can be omitted. For instance:

- a. *Kalimat 10 mengacu ke manusia.*
- b. *Kalimat 11 mengacu ke binatang.*
- c. *Kalimat 12 mengacu ke benda tak bernyawa.*

The sentences above have the same predicate that is *mengacu*, so the sentences can be merged as :

Kalimat 10 mengacu ke manusia, kalimat 11 ke binatang, dan kalimat 12 ke benda tak bernyawa.

3. *Pelesapan Objek* (Object Ellipsis)

The rule of object ellipsis is still the same as the ellipsis before, two sentences or clauses which have the same object can be omitted. For instance:

- (1) *Kita mencari atau mencuri bahan peledak itu?*

2.2 Translation

The study of translation has become an important aspect of linguistics analysis. The disciplines of translation allow the people of different languages to communicate and understand each other. When they have difficulty in understanding another language, they need what it is called translation. Thus their language (source language) must be translated into another language (target language).

(Ourdudari: 2009:120) explains that translation typically has been used to transfer written or spoken SL texts to equivalent written or spoken TL texts. In general, the purpose of translation is to reproduce various kinds of texts—including

religious, literary, scientific, and philosophical texts—in another language and thus making them available to wider readers.

Massey (2009:25) defines translation as the process that allows the transfer of sense from one language to another, rather than the transfer of the linguistic meaning of each word. Therefore, the goal of translation is the equivalence by translating meaning instead of translating structure due to the fact that translating source language by its structure is mostly not appropriate with the sense of the target language. A translator must be able to master both source language and target language to achieve the equivalence in translation. Thus the first point in translation is transferring of meaning, and the second is structure.

2.2.1 Problems of Non-Equivalence

According to (Baker, 1992:21), the following are some common types of non-equivalence:

a) **Culture-Specific Concept**

The source language word may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target language. the concept in question may be abstract or concrete; it may relate to a religious belief, a social custom, or even type of food.

b) **The source language concept is not lexicalized in the target language**

The source language word may express a concept which is known 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.

c) **The source language is 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. For example, *arruÇã*, a Brazilian word which means ‘clearing the ground under coffee trees of rubbish and pilling it

in the middle of the row in order to aid in the recovery of beans dropped during harvesting’.

- d) The source and target languages make different distinction in meaning

The target language may make more or fewer distinctions in meaning than the source language. For example, Indonesian make distinction between going out in the rain without the knowledge that it is raining (*kehujanan*) and going out in the rain with the knowledge that it is raining (*hujan-hujan*). However, English does not make this distinction.

- e) The target language lacks of superordinate

The target language may have specific words (hyponym) but no general word (superordinate) to head the semantic field. For example, Russian has no ready equivalent for *facilities*, meaning ‘any equipment, building, services, etc’. It does, however, have several specific words and expressions which can be thought as types of facilities, such as *sredstvaperedvizheniya* (‘*means of transport*’) and *neobkhodimoeoborudovanie* (‘essential equipment’).

- f) The target language lacks a specific term (hyponym)

More commonly, languages tend to have general words (superordinates) but lack specific ones (hyponyms). For instance, English has a variety of hyponyms under *house* which have no equivalents in many languages, such as *bungalow*, *cottage*, *croft*, *chalet*, *lodge*, *hut*, *mansion*, *manor*, *villa*, and *hall*.

- g) Differences in physical or interpersonal perspective

Physical perspective has to do with where things or people are in relation to one another or to a place as expressed in pairs or words such as *come/go*, *take/bring*, *arrive/depart*, and so on. Japanese, however, has six equivalent for *give*, depending on who gives to whom: *yaruu*, *ageru*, *morau*, *kureru*, *itadaku*, and *kusadaru*. (MrCreary, 2986) as quoted from (Baker:1992).

- h) Differences in expressing meaning

Differences in expressive meaning are usually more difficult to handle when the target language equivalent is more emotionally loaded than the source language item. This is often the case with items which relate to sensitive issues such as religion politics, and sex.

i) Differences in form

There is often no equivalent in the target language for a particular form in the source text. Certain suffixes and prefixes which convey propositional and other types of meaning in English often have no direct equivalents in other languages. English has many couplets such as *employer/employee*, and *trainer/trainee*. It also makes frequent use of suffixes such as *boyish*, *greenish*, *conceivable*, and *drinkable*. Arabic, for instance, has no ready mechanism for producing such forms and so they are often replaced by an appropriate paraphrase, depending on the meaning they convey.

j) Differences in frequency and purpose of using specific forms

Even when a particular form does have a ready equivalent in the target language, there may be a difference in the frequency with which it is used or the purpose for which it is used.

k) The use of loan words in the source text

The use of loan words in the source text poses a special problem in translation. Loan words such as *au fait*, *chic*, and *alfresco* in English are often used for their prestige value, because they can add an air of sophistication to the text or its subject matter. This is often lost in translation because it is not always possible to find a loan word with the same meaning in the target language.

2.2.2 Translation Strategies

(Baker, 1992:26) explains about the strategies of translation used by professional translators. The following are 8 strategies of translation:

1) Translation by a more general word (superordinate)

This is one of the commonest strategies for dealing 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 hierarchical structure of semantic fields is not language-specific.

- 2) Translation by more neutral/less expressive word

- 3) Translation by cultural substitution

This strategy involves replacing a culture-specific item or expression with a target-language item which does not have the same propositional meaning but is likely to have a similar impact on the target reader.

- 4) Translation using loan word or loan word plus explanation

This strategy is particularly common in dealing with culture-specific items, modern concepts, and buzz words. Following the loan word with explanation is very useful when the word in question is repeated several times in text. Once explained, the loan word can then be used on its own; the reader can understand it and is not distracted by further lengthy explanations.

- 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 target language but in a different form, and when the frequency with which a certain form is used in the source text is significantly higher than would be natural in the target language.

- 6) Translation by paraphrase using unrelated word

If the concept expressed by source item is not lexicalized at all in the target language, the paraphrase strategy can still be used in some contexts. Instead of a 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.

- 7) Translation by omission

This strategy may sound rather drastic, but in fact it does no harm to omit translating a word or expression in some contexts. 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 the lengthy explanation, translators can and often do simply omit translating the word or expression.

8) Translation by illustrated

This is useful option if the word which lacks an equivalent in the target language refers to a physical entity which can be illustrated