II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Types and Methods of Translation

Newmark (1988) in Suparman (2003:144-145) explains that "the translators of literary works mainly have difficulties in translating the linguistic aspects, socio-cultural aspects, and moral aspects implicitly stated in the literary works (e.g. novels)". In translating literary work, a translator usually has problems or difficulties in the process of translating the works. Translating figurative languages or idiomatic meaning and expression are the examples for the problems. This figurative language and idiomatic meaning need to be translated and acceptable in the TL to get the quality of the translation works. The translation itself is very close to the work of interpretation to properly deliver the message in SL. A translator cannot add his or her own interpretation that is out of the original text, a translator should have a deep sense of language, particularly the source language or understand the author's will, intention or purpose. Hence, a translator should pay attention to the essence of the translation process itself.

Translation type is the type used in translating process in delivering the meaning or the message based on each translator's intention in translating a translation work. Translation types are applied to identify text categories while translation method is the way to translating text. According to Larson (1984:54), he divides two major types of translation. They are Form-Based translation, which attempts to faithfully follow the form of the SL and is known as literal translation and Meaning-based or idiomatic translation which makes every effort to communicate the meaning of the SL text in the natural forms of TL. Another expert, Nida (1964:127) states "the nature of the message determines the types of

translation". Based on his theory, a translation depends on the degree of focus on the form or the content. Therefore he defines two types of translation; a formal equivalence translation in which the form and content of the original message are to be preserved, and a dynamic equivalence translation which focuses on creating an equivalence effect in TL text.

Translation method according to Newmark (1988:81) explains "While translation methods relate to whole texts, translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language". Newmark (1988:45-47) divides translation methods into eight; word-for-word translation, free translation, faithful translation, literal translation, adaptation, semantic translation, idiomatic and communicative translation. Word-for-word translation means the SL is translated word by word. A translation that is not bounded of structure and manner in grammar form is what free translation described. As for faithful translation, it transfers the cultural words in SL, faithfully follow the grammatical form in SL while trying to reproduce the contextual meaning within the grammatical form in TL. The literal translation means the grammatical form in the SL is converted to the nearest TL equivalent. Another method called adaptation, usually used for comedy plays and poetry. Semantic translation concerns about the aesthetic value which is expected to be beautiful and natural-sound in the SL, this method aims to create appropriate meaning or message in the TL. Idiomatic translation tries to reproduce the message in the ST but tends to distort the nuance of meaning by using idioms. The last method is a communicative translation, which focuses to send the exact contextual meaning in the ST in a way both language and content are acceptable and comprehensible by the reader. These Newmark's methods are

slightly different with the theory that will be used in this study because Newmark's methods are applied to analyze the whole text, not for each sentence or utterance use.

According to the theories above, Larson's literal translation, Nida's formal translation, and Newmark's semantic translation focus on the form of the context. On the other hand, Larson's idiomatic translation, Nida's Dynamic translation, and Newmark's communicative translation aim one main focus which is to find the equivalent effect. Similar to the previous theories explained, in his book A Linguistic Theory of Translation, Catford introduces three kinds of Translation; Word-to-word translation, Literary Translation, and Free Translation. For the reason of some consideration, this study uses Catford's categories of type of translation to analyze some utterances as seen in the table. In order to connect these theories with speech acts theory, there are only two kinds of translation that will be discussed. Another consideration is that literal translation and free translation are two main methods that are mostly used by translators in delivering ideas between languages.

- **Literal Translation (LT)**

"Literal translation lies between these extremes; it may start. As it were, from word-to-word translation, but make changes in conformity with TL grammar (inserting additional words, changing structures at any rank, etc); this may make it in group-group or clause-clause translation" (Catford 1974: 25)

Based on Catford, the literal translation is close and similar to word-to-word translation. Its main focus is to maintain the SL form in the TL. This

translation method depends on the equivalents in the TL as the word rank but the grammatical structure or the clause rank adjusted with the principles of TL. The concept of literal translation here is seen as a denotative form which is delivered from the SL to TL without interpretation. Using this type of translation, the translator is faithful in the SL so the form in it is maintained in TL. Newmark (1981) agree that this technique is the best option for translating text when the form is as important as the content such as autobiographies, great speech acts, etc. Literal translation is also known as direct translation, not concerning with the intended meaning (connotative) but only concern to the literal meaning (denotative) of the words.

- **Free Translation (FT)**

"*A free translation is always unbounded—equivalences shunt up and down the rank scale, but tend to be at the higher ranks—sometimes between larger units than the sentence*" (Catford 1974: 25).

Free translation is used when a translator reads and understands the meaning in ST, and produces the same meaning in the target language with different words and a different word order to create a more natural-sounding sentence for the translation. In order to maintain the same sense in the SL, the translators would like to use FT as the main method in the process of translation. In a non-literary text, the denotations of a word normally come before its connotations (Newmark, p.16). Not like a literal translation, this method is mostly used because the translator is not faithful to the source text and focus on the TL.

ST	LT	FT
Take my hand	Ambil tanganku	Ulurkan tanganmu

A translator tends to adjust the grammatical form in the SL to get the same equivalent form in the TL, thus literal translation is based on the form. While for free translation, a translator tends to focus on the meaning in the SL and re-express the same meaning with different form in TL, thus the translator is trying to deliver the same sense in the SL. A translator who focuses on the meaning of the utterance will use literal translation as the last option to translate. Therefore, to deliver the same sense in the ST into the TT, a translator tends to use another form in TT to get the closest meaning in the TT. It is difficult to maintain the same form in the ST but get the same sense in the TT as well. However, for some cases, speech acts which also focuses on the meaning can be applied in literal translation. It is possible to re-create the same speech acts aspect through literal translation but it cannot be used as a primary method in translation.

B. Definition of Speech Act

Speech act was first introduced by J. L Austin (1911-1960) a British philosopher and it is developed by Searle (1969) an American philosopher who was his pupil in this study. Austin stated that words are often used to perform an action such as promising, advising, commanding, welcoming, etc. This is when the speech act has a role. He stated that sentences do not just impart information but also perform an act.

While Adams in his book argues that the interpretation of the speech act is often ruled by the fact of the speaker's intention to achieve a certain effect on the hearer by utilizing the social convention. It means there must be a result of the spoken utterance. Roger had a different term for it called Connotation and Denotation. Connotation described as the meaning which is not referential but associational, subjective and effective, it is being personal, may or may not be shared by the community at large (1991:98). As for Denotation means more referential, objective and cognitive, hence the shared property of the speech community which uses the language of which the word or sentence forms a part (1991:99). What people intend with a certain speech act as entail meaning with who or to whom, where, when and how, is Leech version of speech act (1983:5)

Speech acts are also known as pragmatic meaning in the text. However, speech acts are commonly used in delivering the message in a form of conversation. Therefore, to analyze the sample, it is needed to refer to the pragmatic meaning in the process of analyzing. Based on Austin speech act has 3 aspects; Locution, Illocution, Prelocution. Physical utterance by the speaker, the words that are said is what Locution means. While the illocution is described as the intended meaning by the speaker to the hearer. The action that results from the locution is called perlocution.

EXAMPLE:

	Can you stop talking, dude?
Locutionary act: created by locution aspect and it works as the basic utterance that is considered as the literal meaning or intention.	Asking a question about whether or not the hearer has the ability to stop talking. → **A question**
Illocutionary act: the real intention that is occurred in the utterance, also known as performative speech by the speaker.	The speaker wants the hearer to stop talking. → **A command or a request**
Prelocutionary act: the effect of the utterance on the hearer or listener, something that is the speaker intended to be done by the hearer.	The speaker is expected to stop talking in response rather than answering yes or no the question. → **Expected response or reaction**

The act that is being performed in the sentence is not necessarily given by the form of the sentence alone but also requires contextual information in it. This is how speech acts can be performed in various different ways. According to Austin, performative utterances are neither true nor false; rather, they are successful or infelicitous (13). Either they work as completed actions or they don't. Central to the analysis of speech acts is the idea of context:

"Once we realize that what we have to study is not the sentence but the issuing of an utterance in a speech situation, there can hardly be any longer a possibility of not seeing that stating is performing an act" (14). A central topic of speech acts can be related to the theory of argumentation, an argument evaluation. For any particular argument, the question can be asked whether it is good or bad, rational or irrational, valid or invalid, reasonable or unreasonable. In the Waltons

theoretical framework, arguments are analyzed and evaluated in their conversational context. According to Waltons theory, the evaluation of an argument is in part determined by the rules and goals that obtain in the particular context of that argument.

Speech Act by Searle (1976) that is divided into five types: assertive, commissive, declarative, expressive, and directive), are used to analyze the utterance, especially in the characters personalities area. The underlying meaning in an utterance can be analyzed through the personality analysis and the context of the conversation in the story. Searle in his book classified Illocutionary into two; Indirect and Direct Illocutionary. In indirect speech acts the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and nonlinguistic, together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer. (Searle, 1975,p.60). This is also known as primary illocutionary, means it is not literarily performed. While for direct illocutionary or the secondary illocutionary means the meaning is performed in the literal utterance of the sentence (1985). For example:

A: Let's play football this weekend.

B: I have to help my mother preparing for my parents' 50th anniversary.

Direct illocutionary is shown in A's suggestion to ask B playing football with him. The intention is clearly stated in the utterance and there is no other meaning besides that. While B's response is what indirect illocutionary described. B is informing to A that B has a schedule or thing to do on the same day; it is literally performed as the direct intention. But B's utterance also has another

intention that stands as a rejection. B's rejection of A's suggestion is the form of indirect illocutionary. By explaining how the illocutionary act is divided into two parts, Searle shows how his version of speech acts work, when two meanings from the same utterance exist. Searle, in his doctrine of speech act, attempts to explain how it is possible that a speaker can say an utterance as a response and mean it, but additionally mean something else. Direct Illocutionary tends to deliver the meaning or the intention in the literal form of the utterance, while Indirect Illocutionary delivers the intention depending on the context.