

ISSN 2656-5323
e-ISSN 2808-2451

Vol 6 No. 1. April 2023

BEYOND LINGUISTIKA

(Journal of Linguistics and Language Education)

PRODI PENDIDIKAN BAHASA INGGRIS
FAKULTAS KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN
UNIVERSITAS BANDAR LAMPUNG

Jl. Z.A. Pagar Alam No. 26, Labuhan Ratu Bandar Lampung, 35142

CONTENTS

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FIRST LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AT THE TELEGRAPHIC STAGE Patricia Vamela, Farnia Sari	1
ANALYSIS OF USING SUSTAINED SILENT READING STRATEGY TOWARD STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION OF DESCRIPTIVE TEXT Dhania Haura Griselda, Dini Hidayati	11
THE ANALYSIS OF DERIVATIONAL AFFIXES IN COLLINS SCRABBLE WORDS 2021 (CSW21) Agil Ramadhan Saputra, Franscy	18
SERVING TWO MASTERS: <i>SKOPOSTHEORIE</i> AND ETHNOLINGUISTIC TRANSLATION ORIENTATION Harris Hermansyah Setiajid	27
A SEMIOTIC ANALYSIS OF K-POP'S SELECTED MUSIC VIDEOS: THE STUDY OF THE KOREAN WAVE AS A GLOBAL PHENOMENON Widya Sabrina	32
THE CORRELATION BETWEEN MORPHOLOGICAL AWARENESS AND VOCABULARY MASTERY Irma Khirana, Deri Sis Nanda, Susanto	47

Serving Two Masters: *Skopostheorie* and Ethnolinguistic Translation Orientation

Harris Hermansyah Setiajid
Universitas Sanata Dharma, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
harris@usd.ac.id

Abstract

The skopostheorie and ethnolinguistic translation orientation are two important concepts in the field of translation studies. The skopostheorie, first introduced by Hans J. Vermeer, focuses on the functional aspect of translation, specifically on the communicative purpose or "skopos" of a translation. This theory posits that the purpose of a translation is what determines its appropriate form and content. In other words, the skopos of a translation guides the translator in choosing the best way to convey the source text in the target language. On the other hand, ethnolinguistic orientation refers to the cultural and linguistic factors that influence a translator's decision-making process. It highlights the importance of considering the target audience's cultural background and linguistic expectations when translating a text. This orientation recognizes that translation is not just a linguistic process, but also a cultural one, and that the target audience's culture and language should play a crucial role in determining the appropriate form and content of the translation. The combination of these two theories provides a comprehensive framework for translation, as it considers both the functional and cultural aspects of the translation process. The skopostheorie ensures that the translator has a clear understanding of the communicative purpose of the translation, while the ethnolinguistic orientation ensures that the translation takes into account the cultural and linguistic expectations of the target audience. In conclusion, the skopostheorie and ethnolinguistic translation orientation are essential concepts for translators, as they provide a comprehensive framework for understanding the translation process. By considering both the functional and cultural aspects of translation, translators can ensure that their work is both effective and culturally sensitive, and that the target audience can understand and appreciate the translated text.

Keywords: *ethnolinguistics; skopostheorie; translation orientation*

Available at <http://jurnal.ubl.ac.id/index.php/bl>

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Introduction

Translation is an activity full of dilemmas. Translators in carrying out their activities are always faced with several choices. As Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) state in SCFA, there are two aspects in translation activities, namely *servitude* and *options*. *Servitude* is a change that must be made due to the inevitability of language differences, while *options* are changes (or no changes) that are at the discretion of the translator. The current translation paradigm emphasizes that translation is an autonomous entity separate from the source text. In fact, the translation itself is called "original" because basically it is the work of other people who are different from the author of the source text. The translation product is the result of the translator's interpretation of the source text so that there are definitely differences

between the source text (ST) and the target text (TT). This requires intervention from the translator so that his position is not too loyal to the text he is translating. He must make a decision regarding the translation or not of phrases/terms/sentences/paragraphs that contain unacceptable content. That is the dilemma faced by translators: maintain or change content that has the potential to cause controversy.

Ricoeur (2004), a French philosopher of hermeneutics, in his book *On Translation* writes, "to translate is to serve two masters: the foreigner with his work, and the reader with his desire for appropriation." This statement emphasizes that the dilemma faced by translators is real and has its own consequences: are we more inclined to "serve" ST readers or "serve" ST writers. In their

activities, translators are faced with 2 choices, which according to Schleiermacher "brings the author to the target reader" (which Venuti termed as domestication) or "brings the reader into the author's world" (termed as alienation).

When faced with problematic content, especially one that has the potential to offend a group or is culturally unacceptable, a translator is in a dilemmatic position. They must realize that translation is not made in a vacuum, but in an environment full of intertwined interests. Therefore, the translator must pay attention to the context before making a choice. They must be able to imagine the readers of their translation because they are the ones who determine whether the translation is acceptable or not. Indifference to the target reader will have a negative impact. This paper tries to examine the decisions taken by translators when dealing with issues that have the potential to become controversial, terms that, if faithfully translated, would arouse concern, even resistance, from readers. Therefore, it is very interesting to see how translators try to 'play' at two poles: translating something that is not too far off the mark, but also not too 'close'.

For this reason, various approaches are offered in translation, including *skoposteorie* and ethnolinguistic approaches. These two approaches have opposite orientations: *skoposttheorie* tends to be close to TT readers, while ethnolinguistics tends to maintain the identity contained in ST, which means that this approach emphasizes maintaining the source language.

This paper discusses these two different polar orientation by discussing in sufficient detail their development and application in translation.

The Skopostherie Orientation

Christiane Nord (1998) is one of the translation theorists who defended *Skopostherie*. On various occasions, Nord provides a kind of improvement and development to *Skopostherie*. Nord answered criticism of *Skopostherie* in his book *Text Analysis in Translation* (1988) which said, "even though the purpose or functionality of TT is the main criterion for a translation, translators are still not allowed to do whatever they want." To answer the criticism of *Skoposttheorie*, Nord distinguishes between *loyalty* and *fidelity*. She said that loyalty is the concept of a binding relationship between source

and target *texts*, while loyalty refers to interpersonal categories between *humans*.

Nord calls this principle "functionality plus loyalty." In other words, loyalty is the responsibility of translators to their partners ("players" to borrow Holz-Mänttari's term). Translators have to play "pretty" between maintaining their loyalty and maintaining loyalty to the text.

Nord differentiates between *documentary* translations (*translation*) and instrumental translation (*instrumental translation*):

- Documentary translation acts as a documentation of source culture communication between the writer and the reader of ST. For example, in translating literary texts, TT gives access to the target readers to recognize the source culture as it is, and the target readers are aware that what they are reading is the translated text. Translators give an "exotic" color to their translated texts, for example in the translation of Ahmad Tohari's short stories, some *cultural items* are not translated, eg *mitoni*, *siraman*, etc.
- Instrumental translation acts as an instrument for transmitting messages in the target culture, which is intended to fulfill communicative purposes so that readers are not aware that they are reading the translated text, or as if they are reading a text written in their own language. Nord calls this *function-preserving translation* (cf. Nida's concept of the equivalence effect). However, she also provides examples of translated texts that are completely different from their original function, such as the translation of *Gulliver's Travels* for children's story books.

Nord did not stop there. In her book entitled *Translating as a Purposeful Activity* (1997) she proposes a more flexible model that emphasizes 3 main aspects, namely:

1. the importance of *the translation commission* (which he later termed a *translation brief*),
2. role of ST Analysis,
3. functional hierarchy of translation problems.

The three main aspects mentioned above, can be explained as follows:

1. The importance of *translation briefs*. Prior to textual analysis, the translator needs to compare the ST and TT profiles specified in *the brief* (*commission*) to obtain information

- about (1) the function of each text, (2) the ST author and the TT recipient, (3) the place and time when the translation was carried out and received by readers, (4) the media used, (5) motives (why was ST written and why translated).
2. The role of ST analysis. ST analysis to map (a) the feasibility of translation, (2) the most relevant ST points that need attention to achieve a functional translation, (c) the translation strategy needed to fulfill the requirements in the translation brief. Nord lists the intratextual factors that must be considered: (1) subject of translation, (2) content, (3) presupposition, (4) text composition, (5) non-verbal elements, (6) lexis, (7) sentence structure, (8) suprasegmental features.
 3. Functional hierarchy of translation problems. Nord recommends a functional hierarchy when translating, with a top-down approach starting from a pragmatic perspective with the desired TT function: (a) comparison of the ST and TT functions to decide the type of translation to produce (documentary or instrumental), (b) analysis of *translation brief* to determine what functional elements will be reproduced or adapted according to the situation/context of the target readers, (c) problems encountered in the text can be overcome at the micro-linguistic level by using ST intratextual analysis.

This emphasis on the importance of the target audience makes the functional approach, which was born from the refinement of *the Skopostheorie* proposed by Vermeer and Reiss, become a clear foundation for translators in determining the orientation of their translation. In subsequent developments, this functional approach opened and became the basis for the birth of other translation theories.

Skopostheorie is a theory that introduces the importance of the purpose of translation and moves from the perspective of the translation paradigm which has so far been prescriptive and focuses on accuracy which emphasizes loyalty to the source text. It turns out that the translation activities carried out have a variety of interests and goals that have been given priority in order to maintain the fidelity of the source text. The presence of this theory dismantles the stagnation and paradigm of translation.

Even though *the Skopostheorie* introduced by Vermeer and Reiss (2012) succeeds in showing the importance of *audience design* before *translational action was carried out*, this theory does not escape various criticisms, including:

1. The hierarchical rules of the theory cause *Skopostheorie* to *dethroning* (subordinating) ST, which raises controversy and the question: is translation considered good as long as the purpose of ST is fulfilled?
2. To what extent must the translator fulfill *the commission* specified by the client?
3. The term *translatum* to replace the TT term does not really show significance.
4. *Skopostheorie* does not pay full attention to the micro level. So, even though the objectives can be fulfilled, there are problems at the semantic and stylistic level.

Holz-Mänttari (1984), a Finnish linguist and translator, developed *Skopostheories* by creating a translation model which she called *translatorial action*. This *translatorial action* model views translation as "human interaction that is goal-based and result-oriented" which involves intercultural transfers, "[It] is not about translating words, sentences or texts but in every case about guiding the intended co-operation over cultural barriers enabling functionally oriented communication" (Holz-Mänttari, 1984).

Holz-Mänttari describes translation as a *translatorial action* and as a communicative process that involves a series of "roles" and "players", namely:

- *initiator*: company or individual who needs translation.
- *commissioner*: the individual or agency that contacts the translator.
- *ST producer*: an individual within the company who writes the ST but is not necessarily involved in the production of the ST.
- *TT producer*: translator or translation agency.
- *TT user*: people who use TT, for example lecturers who use translated textbooks, or publishers/companies
- *TT receiver*: the final recipient of the TT, for example students who read translated textbooks assigned by lecturers, or general readers of translation books published by companies.

Holz-Mänttari's *translatorial action* model focuses on producing TT that is *functionally communicative* for the target reader. She states

that the forms and genres of TT must be adapted to TT culture, instead of just copying ST culture.

The functional suitability is determined by the translator as the key player, which ensures that the intercultural transfer takes place in a way that satisfies all the "players" in the *translational text operation* (borrowing the term Holz-Mänttari to refer to TT production).

The Holz-Mänttari model is driving the development of thought to judge translations not based on their compatibility with ST, but also their functionality for the target readers. Translated text is no longer measured by its level of conformity to ST, but rather how adequately the translation has an impact on the target reader. In subsequent developments, however, the Holz-Mänttari model was criticized because it was considered not to maintain a balance between superior and inferior language.

Ethnolinguistic Orientation

Ethnolinguistics is the study of the characteristics and grammar of various ethnic groups and their distribution. It is the science of studying language not only in terms of its structure alone, but more in its function and use in the context of socio-cultural situations. This ethnolinguistics was first pioneered by Franz Boas as a theoretical pioneer of ethnography from America which was originally known as anthropological linguistics, "Anthropological linguistics is the sub-field of linguistics which is concerned with the place of language in its wide social and cultural context."

Ethnolinguistics was born from the marriage between ethnosciences and anthropology. Previously, anthropologists who were interested in knowing about kinship systems would certainly describe the system in more detail in their ethnography when compared to anthropologists who were interested in knowing about religious or environmental phenomena. This difference occurs because anthropologists do not use the exact same method in collecting ethnographic data (Ahimsa, 2007: 2004).

Anthropologists then try to solve this problem by looking at linguistic disciplines. Linguistics discusses everything about language, including the problem of phonology, or the sounds of language. Anthropologists use descriptions in a sub-field of linguistics, namely phonology. Attempts to use language models in ethnographic writing have forced experts to

finally redefine the main concept in anthropology, namely the concept of "culture" (Ahimsa, 2007: 94).

The history of the emergence of the ethno-scientific analysis model inspired by the sub-disciplines of linguistics shows that language has a very close relationship with culture. Language is a container of collective consciousness that exists within humans (Ahimsa-Putra, 2007: 95-96). Through language, the mindset of a society can be known so that later anthropologists and linguists use ethno-scientific analysis models to describe cultural phenomena. Meanwhile, the description of linguistic phenomena in relation to culture is a field of ethnolinguistic study.

Ethnolinguistics can be applied in translation research by using semantic analysis tools, namely comparing the similarities of cultural terms in two languages. The more similarities, the closer the equivalence.

This ethnolinguistic approach opens up the possibility to analyze translation by looking at the representation of ST culture in TT culture. An ethnolinguistic approach can be used to explore whether the translation of terms related to culture represents ST or is deliberately omitted/hidden for a specific purpose (eg politics, religion, ease of understanding for readers, cultural hegemony, etc.).

To carry out an ethnolinguistic analysis, all the words in the language used for a particular subject are collected by the researcher and used to model how those words relate to one another. Anthropologists who use ethnolinguistics to create these models believe they are a representation of how speakers of a particular language think about the topic being described.

In her book *The Anthropology of Language: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology*, Harriet Ottenheimer (2009) uses the concept of plants and how dandelions are categorized to explain how ethnosemantics can be used to examine differences in cultural ways of thinking about certain topics. In his example, Ottenheimer explains how the topic "plants" can be divided into the two categories "lettuce" and "weeds". Ethnosemantics can help anthropologists discover whether a particular culture categorizes "dandelion" as "lettuce" or "weed," and using this

information can find out something about how that culture thinks about plants.

Using this approach the speaker's statements about the people in that social circle and their behavior can be analyzed to understand how he perceives and conceptualizes his social world. The first step in this analysis is to identify and map all the social categories or social identities identified by the speaker. Once the social categories are mapped, the next step is to try to define the precise meaning of each category, and examine how the speaker describes category relationships, and analyze how he or she evaluates the characteristics of the people grouped in those social categories.

Another method used in ethnosemantic analysis is componential analysis. Componential analysis is used to describe the criteria people use to classify concepts by analyzing their semantic features. For example, the word "man" is analyzed into the semantic features of "man", "adult", and "human"; "female" can be analyzed into "female", "adult", and "human"; "girl" can be analyzed into "girl", "immature", and "human"; and "bull" can be analyzed into "male", "adult", and "cow". Using this method, the characteristics of words in a category can be examined to form hypotheses about the significance and identifying characteristics of words in that category. This componential analysis method is a very important part of the ethnolinguistic approach because to get an equivalent that is similar in component to the source text, the translator must know the components of the terms or phrases of the source text.

Concluding Remarks

The two-translation orientation described in this paper, namely *skopostheorie* and ethnolinguistics, have helped translators determine their orientation. The choice of orientation depends on the context of the situation when the text is translated. Because translation is not done in a vacuum, the translator must be able to read the situation correctly by conducting audience design in order to determine which approach to choose: tend to TT readers or defend ST more. There is nothing wrong with either of these orientations, but translators should be wise when choosing an orientation that is appropriate to the context of the time when the translation was made.

References

- Hatim, Basil & Munday, Jeremy. (2004). *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E., & Taber, P. (1971). *Translation Theories and Practices*. EJ Brill.
- Niranjana, T. (1992). *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism and the Colonial Context*. University of California Press.
- Nord, Christiane (1988). *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*. Translated by Christiane Nord and Penelope Sparrow. 2nd edition. Rodopi.
- Nord, Christiane. (1997). *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. St. Jerome.
- Ottenheimer, HJ (2009). *The Anthropology of Language: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology (Second Edition)*. Wadsworth. pp. 22–23
- PACTE (2003). "Building a Translation Competence Model". In F. Alves, *Triangulating translation: perspectives in process-oriented research* (pp. 43-66). John Benjamins.
- Reiss, Katharina. (2004). 'Type, kind and individuality of text: Decision making in translation'. Translated by Susan Kitron in Lawrence Venuti (ed.). *The Translation Studies Reader*. 2nd edition. Routledge.
- Reiss, Katharina & Vermeer, Hans (2013). *Towards a General Theory of Translational Action: Skopos Theory Explained*. Translated by Christiane Nord. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Ricoeur, P. (2004). *On Translation*. Routledge.
- Vermeer, Hans (2012). 'Skopos and commission in translational action' in Venuti (ed). *The Translation Studies Reader*. 3rd edition. Routledge.
- Vinay, JP & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English. A methodology for translation*. (JC Sager & MJ Hamel, Trans.). John Benjamins.



ISSN 2808-2451



9

772808

245006