

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Theoretical Framework

This section elaborated theory applied to analyze the errors on translating monument inscriptions in Surabaya.

##### 2.1.1 Translation

The definitions of translation which are proposed by theorists are various. According to Catford (1965, p. 20), translation is “the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)”. Newmark, another translation theorist, defines translation as “rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text” (Newmark, 1988, p. 5).

Nevertheless, some people cannot differentiate between translating and interpreting. Basically, translating is an activity which produces a written text, while interpreting is in form of oral speech (Schäffner, 2004). Translating activities can be done anywhere, such as school, office, or university. Furthermore, the results of translating activities are varied these days from books, films, magazines, newspapers, public signs, and even historical monuments.

Today, there are many historical monuments which have bilingual inscriptions to inform not only locals, but also foreign tourists who come to a certain country or city. Surabaya, as one of the biggest and historical cities in Indonesia, has several bilingual monument inscriptions. The source language (SL)

for these inscriptions is Indonesian and its target language (TL) is English. These inscriptions are placed near or on the locations of historical buildings or streets. Moreover, the monument inscriptions provide information about those historical buildings, for example what about its functions in the past, the inhabitants, and the importance for Surabaya today.

These monument inscriptions are very important for local and foreign tourists who want to know the history of Surabaya because important information about historical buildings, streets, and places are mentioned. If there are errors in translating that information, confusion will arise from the readers and they probably will misunderstand the history.

Nowadays, the product of translating is not only in a form of printed text, but also in audiovisual. Because of that, the classification of text types is needed in order to ease the scholars who want to learn about translation.

### **2.1.2 Type of Text**

To analyze the error in translating, the writer had to know the type of text which she would analyze. According to Reiss in Hatim (2009, p. 40) text types are divided into:

- a. 'Informative' texts, which convey information
- b. 'Expressive' texts, which communicate thoughts in a creative way
- c. 'Operative' texts, which persuade readers

The writer realized that her object of study was considered as informative text since it was monument inscriptions. Informative text should transmit full referential context and convey information (Hatim, 2009). That means translating

monument inscriptions must convey the same the information of the SL to the TL readers. The focus is on the content of the SL. Since the informative text provides Surabaya's history at the time of Japanese and Dutch colonization, the translation should transfer similar information to foreign tourists as the target readers.

### **2.1.3 Informative Text**

It is already mentioned that monument inscriptions can be classified as informative text. According to BBC (2011), an informative text is “a text that wants to advise or tell you about something” for example; a company website may give you its brief information about their company. Informative texts usually avoid repetition, contain facts, and give information in a clear way. Moreover, translators must pay attention two things when they encounter an informative text. First, translators have to focus on building semantic equivalence, and, secondarily, on connotative meanings, and aesthetic values (Hatim, 2009).

In addition, according to Newmark (1988), for the aims of translation, typical ‘informative’ texts are concerned with topic of knowledge. The format of informative text is often usual, such as text books, articles in newspaper, or scientific papers. Most informative texts will not be purely informative if there are opinions, recommendations, or subjective point of views. Based from these brief definition and explanation, the writer concluded that monument inscriptions which she chose were informative texts since its characteristics matched with the previous explanation. Instead advising, these monument inscriptions tell the readers important information about history of Surabaya.

#### 2.1.4 Monument Inscriptions

In Surabaya, there are many monuments completed with inscriptions which provide information about history of the monuments. According to Oxford Dictionary, monument is a “building, statue, etc., to remind people of a person or event” (Oxford: Learner's Pocket Dictionary, 2011, p. 285). Then, one feature of a monument is “very old interesting building” (Oxford: Learner's Pocket Dictionary, 2011, p. 285). Next, Merriam-Webster (Inscription, 2015) defines monument as “a building, statue, etc., that honors a person or event and the second definition is “a building or place that is important because of when it was built or because of something in history that happened there”. Furthermore, Glossary of Statistical Terms defines monuments more specifically into historic monuments. Historic monuments are “fixed assets that are identifiable because of particular historic, national, regional, local, religious or symbolic significance” (Terms, 2001). From these definitions, it can be drawn a conclusion that monuments are symbols to commemorate certain buildings or places. These buildings or places are important because they have many historical events happened at that areas.

Next, there are also definitions on inscription. According to Oxford (2015), inscription is “words written in the front of a book or cut in stone or metal” (Inscription, 2015). Longman dictionary defines inscription as “piece of writing inscribed, especially on stone” (Longman Handy Learner's: A Dictionary of American English, 2003, p. 214). Inscription also has a meaning as “words that are written on or cut into a surface” (2015). Furthermore, “the study of written matter recorded on hard or durable material” is called epigraphy (Puhvel,

Historiography: Epigraphy, 2015). Epigraphy is derived from the Classical Greek *epigraphēin* (“to write upon, incise”) and *epigraphē* (“inscription”). In addition, monumental inscriptions are anticipated to sustain display and are therefore, as a rule, executed in lasting material, such as stone or metal (Puhvel, Materials and techniques: Epigraphy, 2015). In short, inscription can be said as words or texts written or carved on a certain surface.

From these definitions of monuments and inscriptions, it can be summarized that monument inscriptions are words carved on a building or statue built to commemorate historical events happened in the past. The carved words or inscriptions are brief information about the historical buildings or places, so these monument inscriptions have a function to provide information about the historical buildings or places.

### **2.1.5 Translation Errors**

Monument inscriptions in Surabaya are not only written in one language or monolingual but also in two languages or bilingual. These bilingual monuments are expected to help foreign tourists in understanding Surabaya’s history. In order to acquire that purpose, the translations of the inscriptions need to follow the method suggested for translating informative texts. If there are errors on the target texts, confusion will arise from the readers. Because of that, the analysis on translation error is needed.

It is obvious that some scholars do not differentiate between errors in translation and error analysis which is one of the theories in Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Translation error is a failure to carry out any of the translating

instructions (Nord, 2005) while Error Analysis (EA) is “an approach to SLA that takes an internal focus on learners’ creative construction of language” (Saville-Troike, 2006, p. 187). Construction of language here means the second language or L2 of learners. Therefore, error analysis (EA) only focuses on one language of learners, while translation error focuses on two languages which are source language (SL) and target language (TL).

According to (Nord, 1997, p. 75), translation error is “a failure to carry out the instructions implied in the translation brief and as an inadequate solution to a translation problem”. Therefore, errors in target text are produced by translators who failed to carry out the instructions. Because of that reason, Nord classifies translation errors into four categories:

- a. Pragmatic translation errors, caused by inadequate solutions to pragmatic translation problems such as a lack of receiver orientation (Nord, 1997, p. 75)
- b. Cultural translation errors, due to an inadequate decision with regard to reproduction or adaptation of culture-specific conventions (Nord, 1997, p. 75)
- c. Linguistic translation errors, caused by an inadequate translation when the focus is on language structures (as in foreign-language classes) (Nord, 1997, p. 75)
- d. Text-specific translation errors, which are related to a text-specific translation problem and, like the corresponding translation problems, can usually be evaluated from a functional or pragmatic point of view (Nord,

1997, p. 76)

Below is one of the examples of linguistic translation error:

**ST (English):** The feminists who had...

**TT (Danish):** Feministerne, som...havde

\*Source: (Schjoldager, Gottlieb, & Klitgard, 2008, p. 263)

In Danish, there is an error in a word 'Feministerne'. It should be added by 'De' before it because the meaning will be different if there is no determiner (Schjoldager, Gottlieb, & Klitgard, 2008). While in the source text, 'the feminists' means the specific one, not all feminists while in the target text, it means all feminists. It is clear that the meaning is different between source text and target text due to structural differences.

Another theorist, Juan C. Sager, classifies translation error into different types. According to Sager in Deeb (2005, p. 45), various levels are generally identified, for example, there are three levels of gravity of error and those are:

- a. Distortion of sense
- b. Omission
- c. Minor errors (such as stylistic infelicity, orthographic error, etc.)

Nevertheless, Sager elaborates the error classifications which work for elaborate, but traditional system. Sager classifies it into five error categories which are identified as lexical or syntactic, as follows (1994, p. 240):

- a. Reversal of meaning or 'contresens'
- b. Omission of elements of content or 'non-sens'
- c. Addition of elements of content or over-translation
- d. Deviation or distortion of meaning inside the topic or 'faux sens'

e. Incompleteness or under-translation

Sager explains that the last two types of error is not clear enough (Sager, 1994). Deviation or distortion of meaning may have a close meaning as reversal. Then, incompleteness may be interpreted as an omission in small portion.

On the other hand, Kim (2009) classifies types of error according to meaning-oriented assessment criteria. Kim develops her theory based on NAATI assessment criteria for translation tests. NAATI (National Authority of Accreditation for Translators and Interpreters) has adopted an error deduction method of translation assessment for the last 30 years (Kim, 2009). The maximum deduction point is 45 for each text. The NAATI assessment criteria on errors are categorized into 11 (eleven) categories and those are too free a translation in some segments, too literal a translation in some segments, spelling, grammar, syntax, punctuation, failure to finish a passage, unjustifiable omissions, mistranslations, non-idiomatic usage, and insufficient understanding of the ethics of the profession.

The criteria above are significantly limited, for example “too free” and “too literal”. These criteria are too general and there are no definite measurements to define these criteria. In addition, the NAATI criteria seem only focus on experiential level (e.g. who does what to whom, when, why, and how) and omit other categories on how the translation delivers to the readers, in this case, the meaning (Kim, 2009). The omitted categories are interpersonal meaning (e.g. formality of the translation) and textual meaning (e.g. coherence and cohesion of the information).



Because of these reasons, Kim develops meaning-oriented assessment criteria. She classifies them into two, and those are major and minor errors. Kim explains that major errors influence one or two aspect to the meaning of target text, while minor errors influence a little impact to the target text. To analyze major errors, she does it on the basis of different aspects of meaning, such as experiential, logical, interpersonal, and textual. Furthermore, the errors may impact on the accurate and natural delivery of the ST (accuracy) and TT (naturalness). Moreover, Kim also classifies major errors into experiential, logical, interpersonal textual then minor errors into graphological mistakes (such as spelling) and minor grammar mistakes which do not impact meaning.

Experiential translation error is mainly textually. There are two types of experiential errors and those are experientially inaccurate translation and experientially unnatural translation. She explains that experiential errors concerned with rendering the process in the sentence. When the translators cannot render the TT meaning fully, it can be categorized as experiential error. Below is the example of experiential translation error:

**ST (English):** Howard first **flagged** the change of Australia's nuclear policy during a visit to New Delhi in early 2006.

**TT (Korean):** 하워드 총리가 호주 의 핵 정책에 처음으로 변화를 가져온 것은 2006 년 초 뉴델리 방문 기간 중이다.

(It was during a visit to New Delhi in early 2006 when Howard first **brought in** the change of Australia's nuclear policy).

Source: (Kim, 2009, p. 138)

There is an error in rendering the process, which is 'flagged'. In Korean, 'flagged' is translated into 'brought in' which is inaccurate since the meaning of brought in is introduce something new while flagged is give signal. In short, the meaning of these verbs is different and may confuse the readers who read it.

Logical translation error is an error in rendering clauses, for example clause in ST (Source Text) is different from clause in TT (Target Text). Kim also suggests logically justifiable translation shift which means one sentence in ST is translated into two sentences in TT. Kim adds that one sentence in ST can be also translated into one sentence in TT, but it will be complicated to explain in TT. Below is the example of logically justifiable translation shift:

**ST:** But on August 16th, Australia's prime minister said he would **lift a ban on selling uranium to India**, which refuses to sign the NPT, has tested nuclear weapons and does not rule out testing more.

**TT:** 그러나 지난 8월 16일, 호주 총리는 인 도에 **우라늄을 수출하 는 것을 금지할 수도 있다**는 가능성을 시사 했다. 인도는 핵확산 방지 조약에 서명하 기 를 거부하고, 핵무기를 시험했던 적이 있으 며 앞으로의 핵무기 실험 가능성도 배제하 지 않고 있다.

(But on August 16th, Australia's prime minister said he would **ban exporting uranium to India**. India refuses to sign the NPT, has tested nuclear weapons and does not rule out testing more.

It is clear that in the target text the sentence is divided into two sentences while in the source text, it is only in one sentence. By dividing it into two sentences, the meaning will be much more understandable.

Interpersonally inaccurate translation is one lexical error can be a much more serious error than others. Moreover, she also explains about interpersonally inadequate translation which means that failed to make lexical choices. Below is the example of interpersonally inaccurate translation:

**ST:** However, should India test another bomb, public outrage **would** kill uranium exports in a flash.

**TT:** 그렇지만 만일 인도가 또 다시 핵 무기 실험을 하게 되면, 호주 대중의 노여움으로 인도로의 우라늄 수출은 그 즉시 중단될 지도 모른다.

(However, if India tests another bomb, *due to Australian public outrage, the uranium export **might** be stopped immediately*).

The lexical error in target text makes a serious error to the meaning. In source text already uses certain verb, but in target text uses conditional verb.

Last, textually inaccurate translation is related to cohesion and coherence.

Below is one example of textually inaccurate translation:

ST: **The** sales will be subject to “strict conditions”.

TT: **우라늄 판매는** 앞으로 “엄격한 조건” 에 한해 이루어질 것 이다.

(**Uranium sales** will be subject to “strict conditions”).

In Korean, there is an error in ‘Uranium sales’. It should be added by ‘in India’ after it. ‘The’ in the source text means ‘Uranium sales in India’ while in the target text, it means all feminists. It is clear that the meaning is different between source text and target text due to structural differences.

The connection between Kim’s theory and the writer study is that the writer’s purpose of the study was to reduce and hopefully, eliminate the confusion from the readers who read monument inscriptions in Surabaya. By using Kim’s theory on meaning-assessment criteria, it was expected that the confusion from the readers is reduced and Surabaya gets positive impact from tourists.

## 2.2 Related Studies

Analysis on errors in translation has been done quite many times. For instance, Sari (2006) analyzed on the translation error of brochures of Ibis Accor Hotels. On her first step of collecting the data, Sari chose the brochures from third to fifth-star hotels. Then, she chose the brochures from Ibis Accor Hotel since it was in two languages. The brochures were taken from 8 (eight) different cities where Ibis Accor Hotels are located.

In analyzing the text, Sari concluded that most of the translation in the brochures did not use the proper translation procedures, so Sari gave some of suggested translation procedures. She hoped that the suggestion would make the translation better. In addition, Sari used Vinay and Darbelnet’s translation

procedures as her theory to support her study. There are differences between Sari's study and the writer's study. First, Sari used brochures as her object, while the writer used bilingual monument inscriptions as her object. Second, the theory used is also different. Sari used translation procedures theory by Vinay and Darbelnet while the writer used translation errors theory (Meaning-assessment criteria) by Mira Kim.

The next study is by Olvera-Lobo and Garcia-Santiago (2010). They investigated translation errors on the automatic translation (in this case is QA systems). Olvera-Garcia used Google Translator, Promt Translator and Worldlingo as the objects. They identified that Promt as the most reliable translator, on the average, for the two linguistic pairs studied. However, for German-Spanish online translating, a good evaluation was obtained by the Google Translator. In conclusion, their finding was mostly on lexical errors. Anyhow, lexical errors had been identified, all of them concerning vocabulary which varies with the semantic context of each sentence. There are also differences between Olvera-Garcia's study and the writer's study.

First, Olvera-Garcia used automatic translation or machine translation as their object, while the writer used bilingual monument inscriptions as her study. Second, the SL and TL used in the studies are also different. Olvera-Garcia used English (SL) – Spanish (TL) and German (SL) – Spanish (TL) as their languages, while the writer used Indonesian language (SL) – English (TL) as her language in the study. The third difference is that after analyzing the errors, Olvera-Garcia compared the errors found between Google Translate, Prompt, and Worldlingo

while the writer only analyzed then categorized the errors found on the translation of bilingual inscriptions.

The last research on error analysis was by Ammaratu (2014) who focused on verb translation errors made by the students. Her subject was Universitas Gajah Mada students who attended the Translation Class in the first semester of academic year 2012 – 2013. Ammaratu's findings were that most of the errors found when students translating the verbs. Second, the students changed the verb of source language into different type in target language. Last, the third most of the students' error was in changing the active verb into passive verb. Ammaratu used Newmark's error translation theory and *doushi* theory as her theoretical framework. Similar as the other two previous studies, there are also differences between Ammaratu's study and the writer's study.

First, Ammaratu used students' translation tasks as her object, while the writer used bilingual monument inscriptions as her object. Second, the SL and TL between the two studies are different. Ammaratu used Japanese (SL) – Indonesian language (TL) as her languages, while the writer used Indonesian language (SL) – English (TL) as her languages. Third, the theories used in the studies are also different. Ammaratu used 2 (two) theories which were Newmark's error translation theory and *doushi* theory to analyze her data, while the writer used 1 (one) theory which was Kim's meaning-assessment criteria.

Nevertheless, this study focused only on certain type of errors. The writer used Kim's theory on types of error according to meaning-assessment criteria since her theory supported the writer's study and topic. Furthermore, the previous

studies did not use Kim's meaning-assessment oriented criteria, so the writer used different theory from the previous studies. In addition, the writer's subject was different from the previous studies because the writer analyzed monument inscriptions in Surabaya as her subject, neither students' tasks nor machine translations.

These monument inscriptions are open and easily accessed by the tourists and pedestrians who want to read the history of Surabaya from these inscriptions. It is different from students' tasks or books since it usually needs to use permission in order to gain access to them. The writer chose monument inscriptions since error in translating them could cause confusion among the readers and bring negative impact on tourism in Surabaya. Next, the previous studies only focused on certain type of error such as on verb and vocabulary.