CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The scope of translation studies has expanded considerably over the years. Today it has taken into its fold linguistics, genre studies, pragmatics and culture. As studies in cross-cultural communication and in contrastive discourse linguistics, translation is still in its infancy. However, as far as the Theory of Translation is concerned it can be said that one of the main achievements in the last decade in this domain (hence one of the main distinctions establishing between translation and contrastive studies) has been a gradual shift of emphasis from focussing on interlingual to centring upon intertextual relationships. As interlingual textual equivalents of existing texts, translations are characterised by always having a unique or privileged relationship with another text in another language. They may be dependent on the source text but they have a life of their own.

In a successful translation, there is symmetry between the source and target language texts in the sense that the source text can be seen as one possible translation of the target text. In the same sense there is also full reversibility in successful functional
translation. It must contain an element of textual reproduction. Without reproduction, without something counting as the same or almost the same in the source and target texts, there can be no equivalence.

1.1 Bases For The Study

One of the basic issues in translation studies is the necessity to sensitize would-be translators to idiosyncrasies of both the source and target language and how these idiosyncrasies are mapped out in the texts that confront them during the act of translation.

1.2 The Problem Of Intertextual Relationships

The process of translation is concerned with capturing the organization of a text and all the meaning that this entails in order to be able to re-create the same message in another language.

The idea of the text as the basic unit of translation was first introduced by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Louis Darbelnet. It was their greatest contribution to the field of translation. They were, in fact, among the first to see the link between contrastive linguistics and translation theory, and their 'comparative stylistics' was the most original attempt
to give discourse its proper place in language comparison but because their book, *Stylistique Comparée du Français et de l'Anglais, Méthode de Traduction*, Paris: Didier 1958/66 was published when such studies were not considered prestigious in linguistic theory, the historic importance of their statement was missed.

Vinay’s starting point was the hypothesis of the ‘situationally equivalent text’, that is, a target-language message may be considered equivalent to the source-language text both because it has the same meaning and because the situations to which the message relates are identical (1958:22). Their conviction was that translation must be seen in the framework of interlingual communication since it is different from ordinary communication in that it involves more than one code, or language, or dialect. As such it was necessary to take into account the mutual relationships between different communication systems.

Vinay Darbelnet’s model gets around the problem through the notion of ‘equivalence’. Their basic assumption is that there are conventionalised styles associated with different communicative situations. Vinay and Darbelnet called their approach, ‘stylistique comparée’, that is comparative stylistics, because to them translating a text means finding its situationally
equivalent counterpart in the other language. The target is situational equivalence whilst the method is that of stylistic adaptation.

Vinay's approach is sociolinguistic as opposed to Nida's, which is more psycholinguistic as the path of translation goes via deep structure, involving transformational analysis and synthesis.

For Nida, 'dynamic equivalence' is not accidental fit between situationally similar texts, but the result of a controlled cognitive process in which the transfer between codes is facilitated by reducing the syntactic and semantic complexities of a text or sentence to a series of kernels and components, thus working at the level of universal underlying structures. Though an adequate procedure for tackling simple sentences, the operation can become unmanageably elaborate for more complex sentences.

Translation means producing a text. Translators may not have the burden of inventing the ideas to be communicated in the text, but they may well go through the same agony of textual composition: the never-ending quest for the right expression, the perpetual temptation to improve through revision.
On the other hand, a translator may also enjoy many of the liberties of textual creation and textual manipulation. The translator’s freedom is, however, limited. He works under all the restrictions that original text producers must also accept, but there is an additional limitation on the translator’s production.

Like all other texts, translations have intertextual relationships with other texts, and since any type of text (in any language) may become subject to translation (into any other language), the intertextuality of translations is no less complex than for non-translated texts.

Unlike nearly all other types of text, however, a translation always has a unique intertextual relationship with another text, the source language text of which it is the target language version. It is this unique or privileged intertextual relationship which most obviously defines all the possibilities and the limits of the translator’s work and makes translation a special kind of text production method.

For a text to be a translation, it must be a representation in another language of the communicative potential of a text. The process of translating operates on or from one text and results in another (in another
language). Therefore, the translation activity always involves both textual production and textual reproduction. A translation is not just a translation; it is a translation of something, an existing text.

1.3 Textual Cohesion - Textuality Devices

Optional transformations often referred to as stylistic transformation influence the process of reconstruction in a translation and help to create or support text coherence and in so doing provide it with what Ruqaiya Hasan calls "the property of texture". (Halliday and Hasan, 1976; Hasan, 1971), or others term "text-ness" or "textuality".

Every language has at its disposal a set of devices (ellipsis, reference, substitution, conjunction, lexical organisation etc.) for maintaining textual cohesion, but different languages have different preferences in the use of these devices. A language may opt for certain of these devices and neglect others. While the relationships that can obtain between sentences are universals, the formal devices which signal the exact nature of the relationships holding between successive sentences differ from language to language.
The present study undertakes to find out how different pairs of languages are in terms of their textual conventions, more specifically, to what extent Malay and English differ in terms of these formal devices which are deployed and manipulated by contextual factors to bring about a flow of information through a linguistic sequence. This is done by placing a Malay translation side by side with the original English text and identifying the similarities and differences in the formal devices used in the construction of both the source and target language texts.

The technical term for this sort of exercise in the field of contrastive textology/comparative discourse analysis is "parallel texts", a technique exploited by Jean-Paul Vinay (1958) in translator training and used by a number of interpreters' institutes such as Vienna University, for advanced language practice since the late 50's. Several research projects - Mario Wandruszka at Tubingen and Salzburg (1968), Rudolf Filipovic at Zagreb (1970), Jacek Fisiak at Poznan (1973) - also adopted the procedure of comparing translationally equivalent texts to arrive at contrastive descriptions.

In this study translation is looked upon as a sort of interlingual paraphrase, a form of analysis in
which the meaning of an utterance in one natural language is explained by rephrasing it in another language. Translation is thus form manipulation (in the target text) with reference to content (manifested in the linguistic signs of the source text).

A translation is an interpretation in another set of linguistic systems, of the signals that were the components of the original message and of their relative importance. As such it seems safe to posit that a source text and its translation may not be marked by the same kind of relationship linkers at the sentential and at the intersentential levels. The expository characteristics of different languages are quite different. We find an analogy to this in Krzeszowski's suggestion (Krzeszowski, 1971) that "equivalent constructions have identical deep structure even if on the surface they are markedly different". Krzeszowski's conception of deep structure was more along Lakoff's (Lakoff, 1969; 1970) level of abstraction than Chomsky's (Chomsky, 1965). Lakoff, while working with essentially the same type of grammar, argued that the application of transformations must be constrained by what he terms a "semantic representation" of the sentence which must exist at the level of the deep structure. The structure of this semantic base was not
well defined, though it was assumed to include the deep structure of the sentence, some "presuppositions", the topic and the focus.

To avoid terminological confusion Krzeszowski reworded her definition of equivalent sentences to read,

"Equivalent sentences (and constructions) have identical input (semantic) structure, even if on the surface these sentences (constructions) are markedly different".

(Krzeszowski, 1971)

A professional translator must be able to discern the relations of discourse as they occur in a source text, acting in the role of reader, then, he must be able to reproduce them in the target, acting as a writer. He is constantly examining pragmatic phenomena as he seeks to penetrate the source text and rewrite it in the target language.

My investigation is concerned with the resources of language that are essential to turning messages into text, the grammatical and semantic devices that produce linking within successive portions of a text. More specifically it is concerned with the ways in which these resources are used in the process of translation.

The text analysis approach is adopted in this contrastive study in preference to the more
traditional orientation of establishing static systemic contrasts of synthetical, lexical and phonological elements mainly because translation is among other things communication: it is always text-bound dealing with text wholes and not items in isolation.

This study focuses on the use of language as an instrument for the sending and receiving of messages and on the way the language is structured to facilitate communication. The source text is not looked upon merely as consisting of sentences but as being realised in sentences which were formulated by the original writer, that is, as a result of the writer's choices and decisions. In the same manner, the translator, having discerned the relations of discourse as they occur in the source text, assumes the role of the writer and recaptures each shading of the message in a totally different set of systems with all proportions kept.

1.4 Material And Procedure

The fundamental objective of this research being to contrast the cohesive aspects of two languages, namely Malay and English, it was deemed appropriate that the material for such a study should be accomplished
translations in the languages concerned. The inescapable fact that a corpus consisting of translations by different translators marked by a variety of genre can turn up too many stylistic differences determined eventually the option for a single translated work as the source of the research data. The translation may be the outcome of the toil of four different translators but it has sufficient built-in safety devices to ensure that the presentation is one unified whole.

1.4.1 Data Base - Translated Texts

Translated texts are an obvious basis for textual contrastive analysis. This thesis will use as its tool of investigation, the product of translation, that is, a translated text that has been published and used as a textbook by pre-university students as well as undergraduates in the local institutions of higher learning. The title of the book is Biologi: Satu Pendekatan Dari Segi Fungsi. The version in the source language is entitled Biology: A Functional Approach.

The study is based on the analysis of two corpora. The first, consisting of 20 selected texts representative of expository scientific discourse, is taken from the aforementioned textbook in English. The second consists of the translations of the texts found
in the first corpus. These are systematically examined in parallel texts manner for the various features mentioned in 1.1 above.

The product of a translation project undertaken by the University of Malaya, the translation was actually done by a team of four translators. Three of them were language specialists from the Language Centre (now the Faculty of Languages and Linguistics), Tuan Haji Yassin bin Haji Taib, Noor Ein bt Mohd Noor and the late Siti Hawa bt Mohd Yatim. The fourth translator was Dr Abdul Aziz bin Haji Kecil of the Faculty of Science, University of Malaya. All members of the team are native speakers of Malay, thereby fulfilling one of the basic canons of translation which states that a translator should, whenever possible, be translating into his mother tongue or his first acquired language or language of habitual use. Also in the team were a language editor, Professor Dato' Dr Asmah Haji Omar, a prominent Malay linguist and Dean of the Faculty of Languages and Linguistics, and a subject specialist editor, Professor E. Soepadmo of the Science Faculty, who was responsible for editing the content.
1.5 Rationale For Choice Of Texts

The reasons for choosing the above translation as the text-base of the investigation are as follows:

(1) The credibility of the translators who produced the translation and the authenticity of the language in which the translation is encoded. The translators are native speakers of Malay. They had a commitment to their own reputation to create a product which was an accurate reflection of the source text and at the same time a natural rendition in the target.

(2) The format and content of the book which is rich and varied enough to provide the different subtypes of expository discourse, that will constitute the corpus of texts to be analysed in this research.

(3) The text is representative of expository discourse.

(4) Features that establish text-ness vary between different stylistic genres or 'text-types'. If typologically different texts are involved, the analysis of a huge representative corpus may be necessary before any reliable conclusions can be drawn. Hence the restriction of the text-base to just one source.
1.6 Procedure

A total of 20 passages representative of different sub-typological expository discourse, mainly descriptive and narrative, are extracted from the original textbook and contrastively analysed against their Malay translations.

Cohesive devices in the sources texts in English and the target texts in Malay will be identified and classified according to the categories spelt out by Halliday and Hasan, namely reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. Each occurrence of these cohesive resources is then analytically examined and recorded in terms of its usage and function in the passages. Refer to Appendices III and IV for the complete list of occurrences of these items derived from the passages.