

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

According to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary online, literature is "pieces of writing that are valued as works of art, especially novels, plays, and poems" (Oxford University Press, Literature, 2019). Mario Klarer further argued (1998, p. 1) that literature is identified as "the entirety of written expression, but with the restriction that not every written document can be categorized as literature in the more exact sense of the word". Klarer's definition sounds quite similar to what Jonathan Culler (2000, p. 27) proposed in this regard: "that something is not considered literature unless it is issued in a literature context," such as in a poem book. Raymond Williams (1960, pp. 295-296) elaborated the idea of literature by defining it as a "social activity" in which the author's "values" are presented in their works as a portrayal of the relation between the author's reality and their expectations toward the reality. Culler (2000, p. 27) argued moreover that what is meant by literature is "a speech act or textual event that elicits certain kinds of attention." The 'attention' mentioned in Culler's argument refers to how readers are willing to spend their time reading, interpreting, and criticizing the text, given they believe that the language of a literary text carries along with it the cultural codes of the time it was composed and the society in which it was produced, in addition to its generic codes, such as poetry, drama, and prose.

In regards to the language used in a literary text, it tends to be "decontextualized" (Culler, 2000, p. 25). By this it implies that the language in a literary text has gone through a process of "tropological estrangement" (Wolfreys, Robbins, & Womack, 2006, p. 62) that tends to produce a language which, as Terry Eagleton (1996, p. 4) well-argued, is in contrast to the daily-use language. Literary language, in other words, would prompt the readers to nurture a sense of

imagination through the aesthetic language used, as they try to interpret the text (Eagleton, 1996, p. 2; Wolfreys, Robbins, & Womack, 2006). Therefore, providing the language used in a literary text is peculiar and estranged, a text could then be interpreted in different ways, depending on the imagination and knowledge of the readers who do the interpretation, which might or might not correspond to the value system in the text as conceived by the writer.

The readers' ability to interpret a text might be related to the background knowledge they have. A. Teeuw (1988) affirmed that every literature is chained to a certain society through a complex interpretation (Slamet, 2018). It is believed that men of letters are the spokesmen of a society, according to Phillips (1987) in Slamet (2018) and Luxemburg et al. (1992) in Sulaiman and Febrianto (2017). Phillips (1987) and Luxemburg et al. (1992) were convinced that literature is written based on what has taken place in the society and that society in turn nurtures and inspires the authors to write stories about it in a perfect and emotional way (Luxemburg et.al., 1992 in Sulaiman & Febrianto, 2017; Wellek & Warren, 1970; Phillips, 1987; Damono, 2002; Duhan, 2015 Dubey, 2018 in Slamet, 2018). In the meantime, if seen from the fields of anthropology and sociology, it is assumed that through literature one can learn about society as well as its culture, politics, belief systems, norms and behavior all in one package (Duhan, 2015 in Slamet, 2018). Early English literature, for example, was written more to describe the ideology, political value, and social class (Eagleton, 1996, p. 15). In some extreme cases, the existence of literature, such as poetry, might even be used as a "social reform" (Williams, 1960, p. 264), which meant to benefit some parties and classes in the past. Hence, not only does literature contain a linguistic matter, it also contains history, the story of society, and the struggle of a nation that, though written in aesthetic language, its true meaning needs to be retrieved and well-interpreted.

In regard to Indonesian literature, Ratna (2007) affirmed that many scholars tended to agree that the period of Indonesian literature began during the period of Hindu-Buddha Kingdoms, and it then functioned as the knowledge source of the

society, inasmuch as literature written in that era was more about ethics and aesthetic (Slamet, 2018). Later, in the era of New Order in around the 1920s, authors started to portray the various facets of Indonesian culture and society in their works, which, it could be well argued, marked the beginning of the modern era of Indonesian literature (Teeuw, 1967, p. 2). After World War II, a new age of literature, namely the contemporary literature, has begun and existed until now. Indonesian contemporary literature has mainly dealt with the criticism to the government and the development of Indonesia as well as the people as a whole (Teeuw, 1967, p. 35). Until recently, the works considered Indonesian contemporary literature are being used as one of the teaching materials in Indonesia's education, due to the fact that the contemporary literature has the virtue of tracking down the national history and helps in this sense with character formation of the learners (Widyahening & Wardhani, 2016). Nonetheless, it is essential for not only the Indonesian contemporary literature, but also the modern literature, to be taught to the young generation as part of cultural heritages of what had happened to Indonesia before its independence in 1945.

According to scholars and experts, translation can be defined in several ways. J. C. Catford (1978) defined translation as an act performed on a text to substitute one language into another. Similar to Catford's definition of translation, Newmark (1988) stated that translation is a process of changing the language of a text into another without exchanging the meaning of the text itself. Spivak (2000), argued that translating means transferring meaning from the original language of a text into the study language (Choi, Kushner, Mill, & Lai, 2012). Thus, to sum up, it can be argued that translation is a process of changing one language (source language) into another language (target language) of a text without changing or distorting its original meaning.

When translating a text, according to Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015), a translator should be able to transfer and convey not only the language but also the culture of the source text. In other words, it can be assumed that talking about one

language means talking about its culture. Bhabha (2004, p. 228) also observed that “translation is the performative nature of cultural communication”, which implied that one of the ways to enhance a cross-language communication is through understanding the culture of the addressee. Nonetheless, it is common place to say that different cultures with different languages generate different ways of perceiving things. This common sense has become a starting point of the research in terms of cross-cultural communication. Squires (2009) and Regmi et al. (2010) argued that translating a text is not merely changing the language itself, but also making certain that the target text receivers can fully understand the meaning of the text because the translator has preserved the relevance of the culture in the source text into the target text, which is also known as a “hybrid text”, as the target text is associated with both cultures (Choi, Kushner, Mill, & Lai, 2012; Syed, 2017). Enríquez-Aranda (2016) in her view of translation as a cultural product, further argued that translation reflects cultural norms, values, and behavior of a society. However, given rendering a source text into a target text might be challenging if certain words in the source language do not have the same connotation as in the target language or the target culture, Chang et al., (1999) suggested that a translator is advised to apply conceptual equivalence by referring to words, ideas, or concepts that have related meanings (Choi, Kushner, Mill, & Lai, 2012) in the rendition. For example, the English word ‘aunt’ can be rendered into two different terms in Indonesian as “*tante*” or “*budhe*”. The prior refers to a mother’s or a father’s younger sister, while the latter refers to the older sister of a mother or a father. In other words, it can be argued that having a linguistic understanding of a language is not the same as having a cultural understanding. Yet, linguistic understanding may be developed by learning the culture of a society.

Even though several approaches in translation studies are often mentioned, approaches such as technical translation, screen translation, and literary translation, the one that is closely related to translating a cultural system from a source text to a target text is the literary translation, which usually deals with the translation of art

works like poetry, prose, drama, and other genres of literature (Bassnett, 2002; Kuhiwczak & Littau, 2007; Munday, 2009; Venuti, 2012; Valdeón, 2018). Literary translation, however, is somehow mistakenly interpreted as one of the translation techniques, for example, word-for-word translation (Ghazala, 2014 in Khrais, 2016), while, in fact, translating a literary text deals with more than words; it often deals with what is unsaid, or beyond words, such as “figurative, non-figurative, denotative, connotative, cultural, and non-cultural” terms (Khrais, 2016) or “extra-linguistic” elements (Beekman & Callow, 1974; 1986 in Shirinzadeh & Mahadi, 2014). In a similar study, Hussain (2017) argued that the translator of literary texts needs to be able to connect the dots between what is meant by the author and the target readers of the translated texts, given literary texts are recognized as texts with aesthetics and “creative practices”. Enríquez-Aranda (2016) further argued that in translating literary texts, interdisciplinary knowledge is indispensable, due to the fact that beside textual context, contextual context is also needed to be fully comprehended and rendered by the translator (Enríquez-Aranda, 2010 in Enríquez-Aranda, 2016). To sum up, literary translation is one type of translation and not simply one kind of translation technique. Literary translation, however, requires a higher skill level of a translator, given it deals with not only the intertextual elements, but also with the intra-textual elements.

Translating literary texts are therefore believed to be more challenging than translating other kinds of texts. Viktor Shklovsky (1988, p. 24) introduced the idea of “defamiliarization” in picturing how a literary translator feels when translating a text that has quite different cultural perspectives from what the translator is familiar with (Khrais, 2016). The challenge of rendering a literary translation increases as the translator needs to master the linguistic and artistic skills to truthfully represent the originality of the meaning (Fowler & Hodges, 2011), since the text has its own “uniqueness” and contains “cultural anomaly”, or terms in the source language that do not have the equivalents in the target language (Khrais, 2016; Khrais, 2017; Syed, 2017). It can be, therefore, affirmed that literary translation is a higher level

of translation, because of its complexity and ramifications (Ayoub, 2014). The complexity and ramifications, including cultural anomaly, might not be easily rendered, yet, as brought forth in previous arguments, a translator can always find a way to transfer the meaning of a source text to the target text by choosing terms in the target language that have the closest meaning to the anomaly in the source language.

In translating a literary text, several strategies might be deemed appropriate, for instance, domestication and foreignization. According to Venuti (1995), “domestication” refers to the strategy used to bring a target text closer to the target readers. This also implies that the terms, including cultural terms in the source text, are made familiar to the target readers so that they can easily understand the meaning of the target text. “Foreignization”, according to Venuti (1995) again, refers to the strategy which aims to bring the target text closer to the author. In other words, in rendering a source text into a target text, a translator may leave some cultural terms untouched as they were originally written in the source text. Further elucidation on both terms is to be conducted in Chapter two when we deal with the theoretical framework.

Based on the above discussion, this study aims to explore the translation strategies in terms of domestication and foreignization, as proposed by Venuti (1995) by reviewing Harry Aveling’s (1976) English translation of *Inem*. The analysis is carried out by scrutinizing the linguistic or language shift and the cultural items shift that are discovered in the target text. The discovery of the language shift is executed according to the theory proposed by Catford (1965), while the analysis of the cultural shift is completed by studying the linguistic relativity from the perspective of a Javanese context after classifying each term according to the cultural categorization listed by Newmark (1988).

The story “*Inem*” was originally written in the old spelling of Bahasa Indonesia, namely *Ejaan Van Ophuijsen* or Van Ophuijsen Spelling, and was re-

typed many times using Bahasa Indonesia's current spelling system, *PUEBI*. This new version of the short story can freely be accessed online. I chose "*Inem*" as the object of this study because its story is still relevant to the current social condition in Indonesia. According to UNICEF, child marriage of young girls until March 2018 was estimated as much as 21% around the world (UNICEF, 2019), an astonishing fact that proves the relevance and validity of "*Inem*," though written in 1952. Moreover, the short story was originally set in a Javanese community in which the hierarchical system was highly respected and extolled. As Frida Kusumastuti (2018) accurately observed, it is common for the Javanese people to use different addressing terms on different occasions to show either intimacy or formality. For this reason, the translation strategy used in the rendition becomes the main focus of this study in order to investigate whether the translator can accurately deliver the cultural aspects embedded in the source text to the target text.

1.2 Statements of the Problems

There are three particular problems to be investigated, and they are:

1. How did the translator formulate the linguistic shifts in translating an Indonesian text, "*Inem*"?
2. How did the translator formulate domestication and foreignization as translation strategies in the English rendition of "*Inem*"?
3. How were domestication and foreignization employed by Harry Aveling as translation strategies in translating "*Inem*" from the perspective of a Javanese context through linguistic relativity?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To figure out how the translator formulated the linguistic shifts in translating an Indonesian text, “*Inem*.”
2. To discern how the translator formulated domestication and foreignization as translation strategies in the English rendition of “*Inem*.”
3. To distinguish how domestication and foreignization used as the translation strategies in translating “*Inem*” from the perspective of a Javanese context through the linguistic relativity.

1.4 Definition of Terms and Abbreviations

1. ST : Source Text
2. TT : Target Text
3. SL : Source Language
4. TL : Target Language

1.5 About “*Inem*”

1.5.1 Synopsis

“*Inem*” was one of the short stories collected in a book entitled “*Tjerita Dari Blora*”, or “Tales of Blora.” The story, written by Pramoedya Ananta Toer during the period of Indonesian Revolution in 1952, is divided into seven parts. In the first part, *Inem* was introduced as a beautiful eight-year-old girl who worked as a helper in the house of Muk’s, a six-year-old boy, who also played the role as the narrator in the story. Although *Inem* was still very young, she already worked to help her parents because she came from an underprivileged family. Her mother earned money by making batik, while her father was a gambler and a criminal who robbed people in the forest. One day, *Inem* told Muk that her parents would marry her off with a seventeen-year-old boy named Markaban.

In the second part, it was told that a few days later, *Inem*’s mother came to talk to Muk’s mother about her intention to marry her daughter off. She told Muk’s

mother that Inem was already one year late to get married and that she had to accept the marriage proposal because she was afraid that nobody would propose to her daughter if she was older. Inem's mother further clarified that Inem's marriage could help her family economically, as the family had to work hard every day, while the groom was the only child of a wealthy family in the village. Surprised at the sudden news, Muk's mother tried to explain to Inem's mother that Inem was too young to be wed because marriage in a young age would not benefit the bride. Inem's mother, however, insisted on taking Inem away from Muk's house the day before her marriage.

In the third part the reader was told how Muk wanted to play with Inem the way they used to, but his mother prohibited him from playing with Inem anymore, saying that sometimes there were borders that could not be crossed, for Muk's mother firmly believed that an engaged girl should not be friends with any boy.

The fourth part talked about Inem's Javanese wedding ceremony; how the wedding was held festively, which cost her parents a lot of money; how the neighbors rendered help throughout the wedding procession, and how people were touched by the ceremony.

In part five of the story, Inem was finally married to Markaban, a seventeen-year-old boy from a wealthy family, and they lived in a house just behind Muk's house. One night, Muk and his mother unintentionally heard Inem screaming from her house. His mother was concerned that something terrible might have happened to the little girl. The next day, Inem visited Muk's house with a pale face and puffy eyes, saying that she wanted to work at Muk's house again and that she was afraid of his husband because they fought every night and he would not hesitate to lay a hand on her. Nonetheless, because of the local culture, Muk's mother could not accept her anymore because Inem was a married girl and the community believed that a married woman should do her best even though she felt terrible about what had happened to Inem.

In part six, the reader was told that a nine-year-old Inem was a widow. Inem confided to Muk's mother that even though she dutifully served her husband, he

kept beating her. She added that her parents also beat her and she did not feel safe anymore. She asked to be accepted in Muk's house. For all the plea, Muk's mother still could not accept her back because there were norms that could not be violated.

In the last part, Inem was pictured as a widow who became a disgrace to her family due to her divorce. She was vulnerable now because not only her parents, even her little brother, uncle, aunt, and neighbors, in fact anybody in her community, could hit her as she was merely a nuisance.

1.5.2 About the Author

Pramoedya Ananta Toer, born in Blora, Java, Indonesia in 1925, was a well-known novelist and story writer, whose works were acknowledged as mainly about politics and social events happened in Java during the Dutch colonialism and the period of Indonesian Revolution (The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, n.d.). Toer himself was such a strong nationalist that even during his 15 years of imprisonment, he still managed to write stories about Indonesia which were "smuggled out by a sympathetic Dutch intellectual" for publication (Haridas, 1978; Hu, 2016). Toer was sent to jail by the Indonesian Government for writing a non-fiction story in which he criticized Indonesian politics, and was therefore suspected as a communist, a threat to the country (Pramoedya Ananta Toer: *Why You Should Know Him*, 2017). Of his many works, 16 of them, including "*Tales of Blora*" (1952) were banned in Indonesia, due to their subversive nature in criticizing political injustice (Haridas, 1978). Because of his perseverance in delivering what he thought needed to be addressed, such as social and political injustice, Toer was nominated in 1988 for the Nobel Prize in Literature and in 2000, he was awarded the Fukuoka Prize in 2000 for his literary contribution (Pramoedya Ananta Toer: *Why You Should Know Him*, 2017). Throughout his life time, Toer was known as a man of letters who dedicated his entire life to his country through his writing.

1.5.3 About the Translator

Harry Aveling, the translator of “*Inem*”, was born in Australia in 1942. He is a scholar and expert in translation studies, specializes in Indonesian and Malay Literature and is now a Professor of Translation Study at Monash University, Australia (Harry Aveling, 2019). He has works of literary translations, including translation of Vietnam and Malay literature, such as, “*Legends from Serene Lands: Classical Vietnamese Stories*” (2008) and “*A History of Classical Malay Literature*” (2013) (La Trobe University Scholars, 2019). He has translated several Toer’s books, such as “*The Fugitive*” (*Perburuan*, 1950) and “*The Girl from the Coast*” (*Gadis Pantai*, 1962) (Books by Harry Aveling, n.d.). Aveling has published many translations of literary works from Indonesia and Malaysia, namely “*From Surabaya to Armageddon*” (1976), “*Contemporary Indonesian Poetry*” (1985), and “*Fables of Eve*” (1991). Due to his efforts, the Southeast Literatures are now more recognized worldwide. In 1991, he was awarded the Anugerah Pengembangan Sastra by the Federation of Malay Writing Society (GAPENA). His translation “*Secrets Need Words: Indonesian Poetry 1966-1998*”, published by Ohio University, was short-listed for the NSW Premier’s Translation Awards in 2003.