

The scope of this study is about translation and limited to the translation of English verb *have* into Indonesian in Novel.

## **1.6 Organization of the Study**

This thesis consists of five chapters; each chapter consists of sub chapters. The first chapter is the Introduction which presents the background of the study, statement of the problem, objective of the study, significance of the study, scope and limitation, and organization of the study. The second chapter discusses the review of related literature which consists of the theories of translation. The third chapter is the research method which deals with the research design, source of the data, data collection procedure, and data analysis procedure. The analysis of the data is discussed in chapter four. Finally, the conclusion of this study is presented in chapter five.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

In this chapter, the writer would like to discuss about the related literature of this study which consist of the theories of translation (2.1), Common Problem of Non-Equivalence in Translation (2.2), verb *have* in Indonesian (2.3)

## **2.1 Theories of Translation**

### **2.1.1 Definition of Translation**

Some experts define translation in various ways. Translation is generally defined as “a written communication in a second language having the same meaning as the written communication in a first language. an uniform movement without rotation the act of changing in form or shape or appearance.” A photograph is a translation of a scene onto a two-dimensional

surface. Hatim and Munday *Translation An advanced resource book* (2004: 6) define translation as “the process of transferring a written text from source language (SL) to target language (TL)”. In this definition they do not explicitly express that the object being transferred is referring as meaning or message. Nida and Taber (1982: 12), on the other hand, state that “translating consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message”. This definition is more comprehensive than the previous ones. Nida and Taber explicitly state that translation is closely related to the problems of languages, meaning, and equivalence. The point of this that translation aim to transfer SL to TL by reproducing SL into TL as close as natural equivalent of SL while paying attention to the meaning or the message. Translation In conclusion, translation is the interpretation of the meaning of a text in one language (the source text) and the production, in another language, of an equivalent text (the target text of translation), which communicates the same message.

According to the famous Russian-American linguist *On Linguistic aspects of Translation* by Roman Jakobson (1959) considers three kinds of translation of the ‘verbal **sign**’: **intralingual** translation, **interlingual** translation and **intersemiotic** translation. Of these, he classes **interlingual** translation as ‘translation proper, an interpretation of verbal **signs** by means of some other language’ (Jakobson 1959/2000:114). This is what is most commonly understood as written translation. However, Jakobson goes beyond the idea that translation involves the **word-for-word** replacement of linguistic items, insisting instead on substitution of ‘entire messages in some other language’. This concept of **equivalence** between languages and its exact nature was to occupy translation theorists for several decades afterwards.

### 2.1.2 Types of Translation

Larson in Simatupang (2000:39-41) distinguishes translation into two types: literal and idiomatic translation. Literal translation is translation based on form. It means that in doing translation, the translator try to follow the grammatical pattern of the source language text. This translation has no meaning, and almost has no communication value because the reader will be difficult to understand the content of the translation, for example, *Be my guest* is translated into Indonesian *jadilah tamu saya*. The correct translation of *be my guest* should be 'silakan' because it is not inviting someone to be his/her guest, while idiomatic translation is translation based on meaning. It means that the translator tries to convey the meaning of the SL text into the TL text naturally. For instance, *The river runs* is translated into Indonesian *Air sungai mengalir*. The meaning of the SL here is replaced naturally into the TL by translating the word *runs* 'mengalir', not 'berlari'.

Furthermore, Nida and Taber in Simatupang (2000:41) states that a good translation should give priority to the meaning (deep structure or semantic structure) of the original text. This statement is classified into dynamic translation type whose purpose is to produce dynamic equivalence in the target language. In contrast to this, formal correspondence translation type based on form causes distortion on meaning and style, in other words, it may cause misunderstanding or even wrong interpretation.

Thus, the most important thing in translating a text is transferring the same message as the Source Language produces. Since both languages, English and Indonesian, have different cultural background, it is very essential to find the closest equivalent in the Target Language (Indonesian), although it does not pay attention on semantic and grammatical aspect.

## **2.2 Common Problem of Non-Equivalence in Translation**



According to *A Course book on Translation* by Mona Baker ( 1992:20-25), non-equivalence at word level means that the target language has no direct equivalence at word which occurs in the source text. The following are some common problems of non-equivalence at word level which are faced by the translators in translating a text:

a) Culture specific concept

The Source language may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture. The term may be abstract or concrete; it may be related to a religious belief, a social custom, or even a type of food. Such concepts are often referred to as ‘culture specific’. For example, an abstract English concept *privacy* is rarely understood by common people in other languages. Similarly, the Indonesian concept *gotong/royong*.

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 language but simply not lexicalized (or put into word). The word *savoury* has no equivalent in many languages. Similarly, the word *guci* may not be expressed in single word in English, although the concept may be readily understood by most people.

c) The source language word is semantically complex

This is a fairly common problem in translation. A semantically complex word may not have to be morphologically complex. For example, *tulah* in Indonesian means ‘affliction sent as punishment for disrespect to elderly people or sacred places’.

d) The Source languages make different distinctions in meaning

The target language may make more or fewer distinctions in meaning than the source language.

What one language considers as an important distinction in meaning another language may not

perceive as relevant. For example, *kehujanan* and *hujan-hujan* in Indonesian are not distinguished in English.

e) The Target language lacks a superordinate

The target language may have specific words (hyponyms) but not general word (superordinate) to head the semantic field. For example, Indonesian has words for *grandfather* 'kakek' and *grandmother* 'nenek' (specific) but lacks word for grandparents (general).

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

More commonly, languages tend to have general words (superordinates) but lack specific ones (hyponyms) since each language makes only those distinctions in meaning which seem relevant to its particular equivalence. For example, English does not have specific words in Indonesia which distinguish different kinds of *rice*, such as *beras*, *nasi karak*, *menir*, *gabah*.

g) 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, such as *come/go, take/bring, arrive/depart*. Perspective may also include into relationship between participants in the discourse. For example, Indonesian has several words for die. *Mati*, *meninggal*, *wafat*, *mangka*, depending on about whom it is addressed.

h) 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 subtle but important enough to pose a translation problem in a given context. For example, *ceriwis* is inherently negative and is more difficult to use in neutral context.

i) Differences in form

There is often no equivalent in the target language for a particular form in the source text. Certain affixes which convey propositional and other types of meaning in one language often have no direct equivalents in other languages. For example, *able* in English words *retrievable* and *drinkable* are paraphrased as ‘can be retrieved’ and ‘suitable for drinking’, depending on the meaning they convey. It is most important for translator to understand the contribution that affixes make to the meaning of words and expressions, especially since the affixes are often used creatively in English to form new words for various reasons, such as filling temporary semantic gaps and creating humor.

j) Differences in frequency and purpose of using specific form

Even when a particular form does not 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. English uses *-ing* form much more frequently for binding clauses than other languages. Consequently, translating every *-ing* form into similar form in the target language will result in unnatural style.

k) The use of loan words in the source text

It poses a special problem in translation. Loan words may be used for prestige value because they can add an air of sophistication to the text of 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. An inexperienced translator may be confused Indonesian *simpatik* (‘nice’, ‘likeable’) with English *sympathetic* (‘understanding’, ‘concern’).

According to *A Course book on Translation* by Mona Baker (1992:26-42), the above problems of non-equivalence at word level can be solved by using the strategies used by the professional translator as follows:



#### 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. For example, (hair product) *shampoo.your hair with the mild Wella Shampoo*. The back translation of its is that *Wash your hair with ...* translated into Indonesian *cucilah rambut anda dengan ...*

#### 2) Translation by a more neutral/less expressive word

For example, *The shamanic practices are seen as an archaic mysticism*. The back translation of its is that *The shamanic practices are seen as an ancient mysticism* translated into Indonesian *Praktek-praktek shaman dipandang sebagai mistik kuno*.

#### 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. The main advantage of using this strategy is that it gives the reader a concept with which he/she can identify, something familiar and appealing. The translator's decision to use this strategy will depend on how much license is given to him/her by those who commission the translation and the purpose of the translation. For example, the *Oedipus complex* illustration for excessive love relationship between mother-son may be translated into *sangkuriang*.

#### 4) Translation using a 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 an explanation is very useful when the word in question is repeated several times in the text. Once explained, the loan word can be used on its own; the reader can understand it and is not distracted by further lengthy explanations. For

example, *I believe it is the beautiful gift that God has given us has become distorted ... several obvious sources of distortion ...* is translated into Indonesian *saya percaya bahwa karunia Allah yang indah bagi kita inilah yang telah mengalami distorsi atau dibelokkan ... beberapa sumber distorsi yang jelas ...*

#### 5) Translation by paraphrase using a related word

This strategy is usually used when the concept expressed by the source language is lexicalized in the target language in a different form. Here, the frequency with which a certain form is used in the source text is much higher than would be natural in the target language. As an example, a text in English says, “there is strong evidence, however, that giant pandas are **related** to the bears.” When it is back translated from Chinese, it becomes “But there is rather strong evidence that shows that big pandas **have a kinship relation** with the bears.”

#### 6) Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words

If the concept in the source language 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 it is semantically complex. For example, ... *the lower forest ... are the area most accessible to and disturbed by man ...* is translated into Indonesian ... *hutan bagian bawah ... adalah wilayah yang paling mudah dimasuki manusia dan ...*

#### 7) Translation by omission

This strategy may sound rather drastic, but it does not harm to omit translating a word in some contexts, especially if the word is not vital enough to the development of the text. For example, *here is your chance to remember the way things were, and for younger visitor to see in real life detail the way their parents ...* is translated into Indonesian *inilah kesempatan untuk*



*menemukan kembali masa muda anda, dan bagi anak muda untuk melihat bagaimana orangtua mereka ...*

#### 8) Translation by illustration

This is useful option if the word which lacks an equivalent in the target language refers to a physical entity which can be illustrated, particularly if there is any restriction on space and if the text has to remain short, concise, and to the point. For example, a tea bag product is illustrated with the picture of the product.

### 2.3 Verb Have in English

According to Oxford Dictionary *new edition*, the verb *have* is a word that express possession. This word has many meanings, such as:

1. *Have* used in possession (e.g. *they have four children*) to express a possession. When indicating possession, the most commonly used verb in British English form which is *have got*.
2. *Have* used in experiencing (e.g. *How often do you have a bad back?*) which can be used to ask someone experiences.
3. *Have* used in showing or displaying (e.g. *surely she didn't have the nerve to say that to him?*) to show or demonstrate a quality of one's action.
4. *Have* used in taking or accepting somebody (e.g. *who we can have as treasurer?*) which can be used to indicate an intention or arrangement.
5. *Have* used in performing action (e.g. *let me have a try*) to indicate action which done by following noun.

6. *Have* used in receiving or undergoing (e.g. *we're having a wonderful time*) which is used in continuous sentences.
7. *Have* used in producing (e.g. *my wife having a baby*) to express action of someone produce something.
8. *Have* used in causing or allowing something to happen (e.g. *They're going to have their house painted*) to express result of one's action.

#### 2.4 Verb Have in Indonesian

The verb *memiliki* is derived from the root *milik*. The word *milik* come from the Arabic word *m-l-l* (*milik*) and has the sense 'property' (Jones 1978: 57.). Wehr (1979: 1082) notes that the word *milik* has the sense 'property', possessions, goods and chattels, fortune, wealth; estate; landed property, real estate' and the plural from *amlak* has the sense 'possessions (=colonies); lands, landed property, estates'.

The verb *mempunyai* is derived from the root *punya*, which originally consists of *(em)pu* and *=nya* and is morphologically complex. The morpheme *(em)pu* is from the old Javanese word *empu* (*mpu*, *ampu*, *pu*) which has the main meaning 'distinguished person, "master", "lord" often, but by no means exclusively, of religious persons (Brahmans and others) and is attached to a proper or categorical noun "sir", "lord", "master", "the honorable or reverend" (Zoetmulder 1982: 1149). It is also glossed as 'ancient title for scholars, poets, outstanding artists, master craftsmen' (Home 1974: 168).

Hopper (1972: 138) states that *punya* is losing, or has already lost, its original connection with the root *(em)pu*, and in all varieties of Malay, including Indonesian, is analyzed as the colloquial equivalent of *mempunyai*. The existential verb *ada* derives the copula *adalah* ia

a nominal predicate construction. An existential predicate construction requires *ada* obligatorily, while in a locative predicate construction *ada* is optional.

Hopper (1972: 137-140) states that in formal written Indonesian, *mempunyai* has come into general use which corresponds to most usages of English *have* in the sense of ‘to own’ or ‘to possess’. Its function is so close to that of the Western European verbs of having as to be clearly modeled on these verbs. Like *mempunyai*, *punya* serves as a general equivalent of Western *have*-like verbs. *Ada* is said to bear the same relation to *punya*, as *have* does to *own* in English.

Alieva (1992: 15-19) mention that Malay verbs such as *-punyai* ‘to have’ and *-miliki* ‘to have’, ‘to possess’ are special possessive verbs with their proper voice forms, but all of them belong to modern educated speech and are secondary in origin, i.e. they are originally not Indonesian words. *Punya*, which is common in everyday speech, is not primary either. Instead of clause with a lexeme ‘to have’ the following two synthetic clause models – the one with pronominal clitics, the other with verb-deriving prefixes – can be considered as the primary forms or the basis of possessivity in Malay:

1. Real topic clause with *ada* + possessive noun phrase. In this clause a possessor noun phrase in the initial position is cross – referenced by a pronominal enclitic and the possessive meaning disappears from *ada*, being expressed in the possessive noun phrase, as in example (1e).
2. Clause with predicates expressed by *ber-* verbs (also *ber-kan* verbs) are a real and original device for rendering the meaning ‘to have, to possess’, but in a peculiar, synthetic form. The relation between the possessor and the possessed object are both expressed in a sentence by one and the same word.



Three denominal affixes, prefix *ber-*, circumfix *ber-...-kan*, and suffix *-an*, denominalize Y so that Y becomes a verbal predicate in each construction. Sneddon (2009: 137) calls this phenomenon as ‘predicativization’ and notes that it is a process which results in a reanalysis of the categorical and syntactic status of the phrase which contains the possesses. This predicativized possessee phrase can be directly translated into *moneyed*, *red-nosed*, *wide-eyed*.

None of these three constructions can be passivized. The suffixal part *-kan* in the X *ber* – Y – *kan* Z construction triggers the presence of an obligatory noun complement (Z) as in example SL: ‘He already **has** a Minang person as his wife.’ TL: Dia sudah **ber-istri-kan** orang Minang. As for the X *ber* – Y construction it may take an optional noun complement which specifies Y as in example SL: ‘He already **has** a wife.’ TL: Dia sudah **ber-istri**. and SL: ‘He already **has** a Minang person as his wife’. TL: Dia sudah **ber-istri** orang Minang. Both X *ber*-Y and X *ber*-Y-*kan* Z tend to appear in formal Indonesian, while X Y-*an* tends to appear in informal Indonesian.

According to Alwi et al. (2000: 139) and Sneddon (1996: 62-63), the prefix *ber-* with a nominal base has one of the following meanings:

1. ‘to have’, e.g. *beratap* ‘to have a roof’ (<atap ‘roof’), *beristri* ‘to have a wife’ (<istri ‘wife’)
2. ‘to use, to wear, to operate’, e.g. *bersepeda* ‘to ride a bicycle’ (<sepeda ‘bicycle’), *berbaju* ‘to wear a shirt’ (<baju ‘shirt’)
3. ‘to produce’, e.g. *bertelur* ‘to lay eggs, to spawn’ (<telur ‘egg’), *berkeringat* ‘to sweat’ (<keringat ‘sweat’)
4. ‘reciprocal, indicating that two people stand in the same relationship to each other’, e.g. *berteman* ‘mutual friends’ (<teman ‘friend’), *bertetangga* ‘mutual neighbours’ (<tetangga ‘neighbour’)

5. 'to engage in the activity specified by the base', e.g. *berpiknik* 'to picnic' (< *piknik* 'picnic'),  
*berperang* 'to wage war' (< *perang* 'war')

According to Moeljadi (2010), arguing that =*nya* functions as the 'inalienability' marker, is not the case. X *ada* Y =*nya* construction can be divided into three groups and can be included in X *ada* Y. in the first group, =*nya* functions as a definite marker and it should appear within a context. For example,

1. TL: *Dia ada buku.*

SL: *She/He has a book.*

2. TL: *Dia ada buku=nya.*

SL: *She/He has the book.*

Included in this group are possesses (Y) such as: *mata* 'eye', *dinding* 'wall', *nama* 'name', *khasiat* 'efficacy', *karat* 'rust', *uban* 'gray hair', *jerawat* 'pimples', *janggut* or *jenggot*, 'beard', *penyakit* 'disease', *jantung* 'heart', *ekor* 'tail', *bunga* 'flower', *ibu* 'mother', *kakek* 'grandfather', and *bagian dalam yang kosong* 'empty space'.

