**CHAPTER II**

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

These chapters provide several theories in translation related with the compound word to support Analysis on the Student’s Problems in Translating English Compound Word into Indonesia by Sixth-Semester Students of English Department of Stain Kediri. It consists of the definition of translation, the process of translation, the procedures of translation, the definition of compound word, semantics and pragmatics.

1. **Translation**
2. **Definition of Translation**

There are some experts who give opinions the definitions of translation. Newmark states that translation is a skill in the attempt to replace a written message or in one language by the same message or statement in another language.[[1]](#footnote-1) Furthermore, Brislin in Babaee, asserts that translation is a general term referring to the transfer of thoughts and ideas from one language (source) to another (target) whether the language are in written and oral.[[2]](#footnote-2) From both definitions above, it can be seen that both of them have similar focus on a replacement process of a message or material from the source language into the same message or material in the target language.

Meanwhile, Catford defines translation is the replacement of text in the source language/ SL by equivalent in the target language/ TL.[[3]](#footnote-3) Moreover, Suryawinata states that translation is a process of finding a TL equivalent for an SL utterance.[[4]](#footnote-4) From the statements above, it can be seen that the all definitions focus on process. Basically, they have the same perception about translation. They see it as a process of transferring message or material from source language into target language, still maintain equivalent message or meaning in target language.

In addition, Bell in Priyono defines translation as the expression in target language of what has been expressed in source language, preserving semantic and stylistic equivalences. It seems that translation as the process of analyzing a source language to find target language, considering the element of linguistic studies and target language culture and emphasize that the important thing in translation is equivalent meaning. From the definitions above, it can be concluded that translation is a process of transferring or reproducing from written source language to written target language meaning which have the closest equivalence. In this research, the researcher only restricts translation only in transferring written English messages into Indonesian.

Also, essentially they have similarity in aspects of translation as follows: (1) focus on the process of analyzing and transferring a source language (a written or oral form, thoughts, ideas, informations, and messages) into the target language meaning. (2) Reproucing equivalence in message, material, and meaning from the source language into the target language

1. **The Types of Translation**

 When someone wants to be a good translator, one of ways is understand about the types of translation. There are three types of translation; intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic translation.[[5]](#footnote-5)

1. **Intralingual translation**

An interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs into the same language. For example: an interpretation or rewriting poetry into prose in the same language.

1. **Interlingual translation**

An interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language. The translator focuses on transferring message or meaning from source language into target language. This type is the real translation process

1. **Intersemiotic translation**

An interpretation of verbal signs by means of sign of nonverbal sign systems. For example: a hand signal wave to a person means “come here”.

Other types of translation, according to Catford, are word for word translation, literal translation, and free translation[[6]](#footnote-6):

1. **Word for word translation**

This is also called interlinear translation, with the target language immediately below the source language words. The main use of this type is either to understand the mechanics of the source language or to construe a difficult text as a pre translation process. The source language word-order is preserved and the words translated singly by their most common meanings, out of context. But overall, this type is not recommended to be applied in translation since the result is often has no sense and awkward especially in translating idiomatic expression.

1. **Literal translation**

Dealing with literal translation, Catford suggests that:

literal translation lies between these extremes (free translation and word for word translation), it may starts as it were, from word for word translation but make changes in conformity with the TL grammar (e.g. inserting words, changing structures at any ranks, etc); his make it a group-group or clause-clause translation.[[7]](#footnote-7)

From definition above it can be inferred that in this type, the translator tries to preserve the source language grammatical structures by translating the lexical words singly. Then, if there is still awkwardness about the result he deserves to do some adjustment or modification based on the target language grammatical structures.

1. **Free translation**

In this type, the translator emphasizes on the equivalence of meaning and often ignoring the SL grammatical structure. He has a freedom to express the message from SL into TL long as the main idea of the message does not deviate from the original. This type is usually found in idiomatic expression and literary translation.

1. **Translation Process**

 A translator must comprehend about process of transferring the
message from the source language into the target language. There are three steps in process of translation; analysis, transfer, and restructuring[[8]](#footnote-8).

1. **Analysis**

For the first, the translator analyzes structurally clearest forms in source language. The translator should have knowledge and master the linguistics structure of the source and the target language. The translator analyzes combination, meaning of words and grammatically. In the text analysis, translator also should know the meaning of difficult vocabulary, strange words and to pay attention on the title, paragraph used, clause, idioms, collocations, etc.

1. **Transfer**

 After finishing the process of analysis, the next process is
transferring material which is source language into the mind of translator and presenting within a target language. In other word, the translator should replace the ideas from the source language into the target language without change the meaning of source language. In replacing the message, the translator has to be careful because it is difficult to build and arrange the sentences from the source language into the target language.

1. **Restructuring**

 For the last stage, the purpose of the restructuring is to get the final acceptable message fully in the target language. There are ways to find out equivalence meaning or message about the result of translation. The translator should try to decide the essence message of the source language and then re-composition, which means, the translator can translate text freely with own words or sentence in order to provide the most appropriate communication in the target language.

1. **Translation Procedure**

Based on theory vinay and dal bernet, there are seven procedures in translation, it divides into two terms. There are direct translation and oblique translation. In direct translation there are three procedure applies, they are borrowing, calque and literal translation. In oblique translation there are four procedures applies, they are transposition, modulation, equivalence, and adaptation[[9]](#footnote-9). These used to control translator work and to guide the translator in translating English compound words.

1. Borrowing

Borrowing is such procedure as the simple types of translation, since it merely involves the transfer of a source language into target language without being modified in anyway. The source language form is taken into the target language, usally because the letter has gap in its lexicon, although the technique can be used for other reasons. One often overlooked area of borrowing is in the domain of brand names, where problems of sound and meaning

1. Calque

Calque is refers to the case where the translator imitates in the translation structure of expression. It is special kind of borrowing whereby an expression form is translated literally each of the elements.

1. Literal translation

This translation is easily conducts because is purely apply towards source language literally and both meaning are in line. This is direct transfer of source language text into a grammatically and idiomatically appropriate to target language.

1. Transposition

It involves replacing one-word class with another without changing the meaning of the message. There are two types, obligatory transposition and optional transposition. Obligatory translation is happening when the target language has no other choice because of language system. Optional transposition is happening for shake of style; the translator can choose if it fits better into the utterance.

1. Modulation

It defined as a variation in the message, obtain by changing point of view. This procedure occurs when there is change perspective accompanied with a lexicon change in the target language. There are free or modulation which can a lexical change in the target language. There are two types of modulation, there are free or modulation which can happen because of non-linguistic reason, and fixed modulation that occurs when a word, phrase or structure cannot be found in the target language.

1. Equivalence

Equivalence define essential as the translation of idioms when two language refer to the same situation in totally different ways. It happens in the proverb, saying or idiom. The main focus of this procedure is the proper communicative situation, because the source language tends to the form of figurative meaning and so does target language.

1. Adaptation

It is referring to the source language message is unknown in the target language culture. So, the translator has to creates a new situation that can be consider being equivalent.

1. **Problem in translation**

Translation is a challenging activity and there are few difficulties that emerge throughout the translation process since every language portrays the world in diverse way and has its own grammar structure, grammar rules and syntax variance. For example, Greek has separate words for ‘light blue’ and ‘dark blue’, while other languages, such as Welsh and Japanese, have words that can denote ‘blue’ or ‘green’, or something in between. In the title of Nicole Brossard’s book (L’Amèr, ou le chapitre effrité), “l’amèr” is a multifaceted pun, which contains at least three French words: “mère” (mother), “mer” (sea), and “amer” (bitter)” (Cited in Dimitriu, 2002: 171). As Zhongde (1991) says.[[10]](#footnote-10)

 The difficulty in translation just lies in the fact that both the content and the style are already existent in the original and as a result, you will have to do your best to reproduce them as they are in quite a different language. The most particular problems that the translators face include- illegible text, missing references, several constructions of grammar, dialect terms and neologisms, irrationally vague terminology, inexplicable acronyms and abbreviations, untranslatability, intentional misnaming, particular cultural references etc. Nonetheless, there are some theorists who think that ‘literal translation’ is not possible. They present three main reasons supporting their stance:

a. Because a particular word in one language often contains meanings that involve several words in another language. For example, the English word ‘wall’ might be rendered into German as *Wand* (inside wall) or as *Mauer* (exterior wall),

b. Because grammatical particles (verb tenses, singular/dual/plural, case markers etc.) are not available in every language, and

c. Because idioms of one language and culture may be utterly perplexing to speakers from another language and culture.

“Language is in the nature of man” (Benveniste, 1971: 223-224) and “provides the very definition of man” (Adams and Searle, 1986: 729).[[11]](#footnote-11) Edward Sapir claims that human beings are at the mercy of the language that has become the medium of expression for their society and culture; language habits of the group of people determine experience generally and every disjointed structure signifies a separate authenticity. The translators encounter the complexities of differences between cultures; the subject of ‘cultural difference’ is very problematic and Walter Benjamin (1968) has described it as “the irresolution, or liminality, of ‘translation’, the *element of resistance* in the process of transformation, ‘that element in a translation which does not lend itself to translation’’. Sapir (1956) utters: No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached. Conversely, ‘equivalence’ consists of many countenances; for instance, it is an essential condition for translation, an obstruction to advancement in Translation Studies, or helpful category for analysing translations. Sometimes, it is ‘damaging’ (Gentzler, 1993) or ‘irrelevant’ (Snell-Hornby, 1988:). The domain of equivalence covers linguistic units such as morphemes, words, phrases, clauses, idioms and proverbs. “Most translators are used to it (equivalence) rather than because it has any theoretical status” (Baker, 1992). Catford (1965) opines that the central problem of translation practice is that of finding T.L (target language) equivalents. A central task of translation theory is therefore that of defining the nature and conditions of translation equivalence.

The translators, through using equivalence approaches, also endeavour to influence their readers by the ‘standard translation’. Yet, the notion of equivalence creates several problems since we can interpret it in miscellaneous manners. Both the words as well as context are considered in equivalence. In this connection, Catford (1965) simply puts forward that translation is the “substitution or replacement of textual materials in one language by equivalent textual material in another language”. But, his linguistic theory of translation was not (and is not) accepted liberally by many. Snell-Hornby (1988) argues that Catford’s definition of textual equivalence is‘circular’, his hypothesis’ dependence on bilingual informants ‘hopelessly inadequate’, and his model sentences‘isolated and even absurdly simplistic’. She reckons that the perception of equivalence in translation is nothing but a ‘delusion’. Let us extend the question of ‘semiotic transformation’ by considering the translation of a simple noun, *butter*.[[12]](#footnote-12)Weedon (1987) explains that Saussure’s theory of the sign includes the following ideas, “each sign is made up of a ‘signifier’ (*significant* sound or written image) and a ‘signified’ (*signifie* meaning)”. The structural relationship between the signified (*signifie*) or concept of butter and the signifier (*significant*) or the sound image made by the word *butter* shapes the linguistic sign *butter*. Susan Bassnett (1980) claims that “when translating *butter* into Italian, there is a straightforward word-for-word substitution: butter-*burro*”. However, we cannot say that both *butter* and *burro* are the same because these possess different cultural frameworks. Normally, *burro* has a light colour and it is not salted; people use it in Italy mainly for cooking purpose; obviously, it has nothing to do with high status.

1. **Compound Words**

There are some definition of compound words by some experts. The present study investigates morphological decomposition in compound words using visual lexical decision with simultaneous magneto encephalography (MEG), comparing compounds, single words, and pseudo morphemic foils; (fiorentino:2007)[[13]](#footnote-13)

These finding add to a growing literature suggesting that the lexicon includes structured representations, consistent with previous findings supporting early morphological parsing using other tasks. The results do not favor two putative constraints, words length and lexicalization, on early morphological-structure based computation.

Compounding is one of the word formation processes. Yule (1985:54) states that compounding is a joining of two separate words to produce a single form. Compound word is a combination of two or more separate words to form a new word with a new meaning. They can function as different part of speech, which can dictate what form the compound takes.

A compound is a word which consists of two or more words.[[14]](#footnote-14) For example, the Malay compound matahari‘sun’ is a word which consists of two words: mata ‘eye’ and hari ‘day’. Compounds are subject to phonological and morphological processes, which may be specific to compounds or may be shared with other structures, whether derived words or phrases; we explore some of these, and their implications, in this chapter. The words in a compound retain a meaning similar to their meaning as isolated words, but with certain restrictions; for example, a noun in a compound will have a generic rather than a referential function: as Downing (1977) puts it, not every man who takes out the garbage is a garbage man.

Compounding is the process of bringing together two or more words into a single entity that has one meaning of the word. According to Matthews (1974: 82) compounding is a process by which a compound lexeme is derived from two or more simpler lexeme. It is a combination from form lexemes to not simply form.

According to O‘Grady and Dobrovolsky (1987: 139) English orthography is not consistent in representing compounds since they are sometimes written as single words, sometimes with an intervening hyphen, and sometime as separate words. Booij (2005: 93) said that compounds are combinations of two or more lexeme. Compound word is a new word that formed from two or more morphemes. Related to O’Grady (1997:119) who said that a morpheme is the smallest unit of language that carriage information about meaning or function.

Katamba (1993: 311) states that there are three types of compound; 1) endocentric compounds**,** that is compounds with a head. 2) exocentric compound, headless compound. 3) Copulative compounds are compounds that have two words which are coupled or conjoined.[[15]](#footnote-15)

1. **Types Of Compound Words**

Linguists distinguish at least three types of compound words based on the different semantic relations between the head and modifier(s), there are endocentric compound, copulative compound, and exocentric compound. According to Katamba (1993: 305) the types of compound are:

1. **Endocentric compounds**

Katamba (1993: 311) said that, most compound in English are endocentric, they have a head. In such compound, normally the head element appears as the right-handmost constituent of the word. Semantically an endocentric compound indicates a sub-grouping within the class of entities that the head denotes. There are the examples with the head is underlined; a *schoolboy* is a kind of a *boy* and a *bedroom* is a kind of *room*.

1. **Exocentric compounds**

Exocentric compounds or bahuvrihi compounds are headless compounds which do not contain an element that function as the semantic head which is modified by the nonhead element. The constituents in exocentric compounds do not have a head-modifier semantic relationship, for examples; a *blue-nose* is not a nose at all but a purplish variety of potato grown in Nova Scotian, and *white-collar* is neither a kind of a collar nor a white thing, but the meaning is something which is related with a worker. From semantic point of view, exocentric compounds are opaque. Their meaning often cannot be transparently guessed from its constituent parts like idioms.

1. **Copulative compounds**

Copulative compounds or dvanda compounds in the Sanskrit name are compounds that have two words which are couple or conjoined. They have the structure shown in:

- girl (N) + friend (N) = girlfriend (N)

- bitter (A) + sweet (N) = bitter-sweet (A)

From a syntactic point of view, copulative compounds are headed. But from a semantic point of view, the coupled elements are equal status, with neither element being regarded as the head that dominates the entire word.

The other study, which is reviewed, is the one conducted by Berkowitz (2009) entitled Recognizing English Compound Words: The Role of Morphological Family Size which discussed about the use of lexical decision, naming, and eye tracking tasks to examine the role of morphological family size in compound word recognition. The family size is manipulates using a factorial design. In the naming and lexical decision tasks, participants responded faster to compounds from large as opposed to small morphological families.[[16]](#footnote-16) These results suggest that compounds from large morphological families are easier to recognize than compounds from small morphological families, and that this is asemantic effect.

The next part, the writer explained the meaning of compound words, they are transparent and opaque meaning. Transparent meaning is the meaning can be known from its elements. Opaque meaning is the meaning can not be identified from its elements.

a.Transparent Meaning

* Growing up The meaning of the word growing up can be determined from the word growing which means increase in size, number, strength or quality. The word up means toward or in a higher position. Then the word growing up has a meaning develop gradually. It can be determined from their elements.

b. Opaque Meaning

* Mankind The word mankind has opaque meaning because the meaning of the word can not be identified from their elements. Its have to be explained each word so that can be found the meaning of it. The word man means person either male or female. And the word kind means group of people or things with similar feature. Those words man and kind create a new meaning after they are combined. The meaning of the word mankind is the human race.[[17]](#footnote-17)

In English, words particularly adjective and nouns, are combines into compound structures in variety of ways. Once they are forms, they sometimes metamorphose over time. A common pattern is that two words fire fly, ore will be joined by hyphen for a time fire-fly, and then be joined into one words firefly. It is call a compound words as a lexical unit consisting of more than one base and functioning booth grammatically and semantically as a single word. English compounds words consist of three basic forms influenced by the way of separating the words as follows:

1. The **closed form,** in which the words are melded together, such as firefly, secondhand, softball, childlike, crosstown, redhead, keyboard, makeup, notebook;
2. The **hyphenated form**, such as daughter -in-law, master –at-arms, over the –counter, six-pack, six-year-old, mass-produced;
3. And the **open form,** such a post office, real estate, middle class, full moon, half-sister, attorney general. Further, English compound words have two structures as noun compounds and adjective compounds which cover their own characteristics and rules.[[18]](#footnote-18)

According to quirk’s theory in this book a University Grammar of English, compounding can take place within any of the word classes, but within the present framework, we shall in effect be dealing only with the productivity of compounds resulting above all in new noun and, to a lesser extent, adjectives. These may involve the combination of the unchanged base; or the firs element may be in its special ‘combining form’; or the second element may have a suffix required by the compound type; or both elements may have a form compound-specific. Further, he characterizes in English compound words as follows:[[19]](#footnote-19)

1. Noun compound
2. Subject and Verb
3. Noun + deverbal noun🡪 e.g.: sunrise
4. Verb + noun 🡪 e.g.: hangman
5. Verbal noun + noun 🡪 e.g.: washing machine
6. Verb and Object
7. Noun + verbal noun 🡪 e.g.: dressmaking
8. Noun + agentive noun 🡪 e.g.: songwriter
9. Noun + deverbal noun 🡪 e.g.: blood
10. Verb + noun 🡪 e.g.: knitwear
11. Verbal noun + noun 🡪 e.g.: chewing gum
12. Verb + adverbial
13. Verbal noun + noun 🡪 e.g.: swimming pool
14. Noun + verbal noun 🡪 e.g.: daydreaming
15. Noun + agentive noun 🡪 e.g.: baby-sistter
16. Noun deverbal noun 🡪 e.g.: homework
17. Verb + noun 🡪 e.g.: searchlight
18. Verbless 🡪 e.g.: motorcycle
19. Bahuvrihi 🡪 e.g.: paperback
20. Compound Verbs
	1. Noun + Verb: sky-dive
	2. Adjective + Verb: fine-tune
	3. Particle + Verb: overbook
21. Adjective compound
22. Verb and object
23. Noun + -ing participle 🡪 e.g.: heart-breaking
24. Verb and adverbial
25. Noun + -ing participle 🡪 e.g.: ocean-going
26. Noun + -ed participle 🡪 e.g.: handmade
27. Adjective/adverb + -ing participle 🡪 e.g.: easy-going
28. Adjective/adverb –ed participle 🡪 e.g.:quick – fozen
29. Verbless
30. Noun (based of adverbial respect) + adjective 🡪 e.g.: homesick
31. Noun (based of comparison ) + adjective 🡪 e.g.: sea-green
32. Adjective + adjective 🡪 e.g.: bitter sweet
33. Preposition Compound

 Preposition + Verb -> e.g :Afterwards

Afterwards is a compound word that is forms from two different elements, those elements are preposition + verb. The word after (Prep)means later than something. The word wards (V) means protect or defend yourself from danger, illness, attact, etc. Those words after and wards forms verb compound afterwards which the meaning is at later time.

1. **Semantics and Pragmatics**

Based on john I. Saeed “A similarly difficult distinction is between semantic and pragmatics. These terms denote related and complementary field of study, both concerning the transmission of meaning through language”.[[20]](#footnote-20)

Follows Charles Morris in Saeed book, he describes the definition about semantics and pragmatics division of semiotics:

Semantics : the relation of sign to the objectives to which the signs are applicable.

Pragmatics : the relation of signs to interpreters. (adapted from morris 1938,1995)

Following Jerrold Katz, defined semantics as the study of the conventional, linguistic meaning of expression-types. Pragmatics phenomena, “Katz says, are those in which knowledge of the setting or context of an utterance plays a role in how utterances are understood”. In contrast semantics deals with “ what an ideal speaker would know about the meaning when no information is available about its context ”(Katz 19977:14)[[21]](#footnote-21)

According to Patrick Griffiths, state that semantics and pragmatics are two main branches of the linguistics study meaning. Semantics is the study of the “toolkit ” for meaning: knowledge encoded in the vocabulary of the language and in its patterns for building more elaborate meanings, up to level of semantics meaning. Pragmatics is concerned with the use of these tools in meaningful communication. Pragmatics is about the interaction of semantics knowledge with our knowledge of the world.[[22]](#footnote-22)

Based on Geoffrey N. Lech explanation, semantics and pragmatics are concerned with meaning, but the difference between them can be traces to two different uses of the verb to mean. Semantics traditionally deals with meaning as a dyadic relation, while pragmatics deals with meaning as a triadic relation. Thus, meaning in pragmatics is defines relative to a speaker or user of the language, whereas meaning in semantics is defined purely as a property of expressions in a given language, in abstraction from particular situation speakers, or hears.[[23]](#footnote-23)
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