Translating Texts by Means of Discourse Analysis Informed by Systemic Functional Linguistics

Tri Wiratno
Universitas Sebelas Maret
tri_wiratno@uns.ac.id

Abstract — **This paper is concerned with putting into practice Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) as a tool of discourse analysis in translation with a particular reference to translating English texts into Indonesian. The texts selected to be analyzed belong to exposition and report genres. From the translation practice of the texts selected as cases, it can be highlighted that this model of SFL-based discourse analysis can help the translator to produce better results of translation.**

Keywords— translation; Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL); discourse analysis

I. INTRODUCTION

It is generally known that translation involves two languages, i.e. source language (SL) and target language (TL). SL is the language being translated, while TL is the language used to express the translation result. In the act of translating a text of SL into another text of TL, meaning is essential because what is transferred is actually meaning. Since translation is "the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)" (Catford, 1965), and "translation consists of transferring the meaning of the source language into the receptor language" (Larson, 1984), in doing translation, the meaning of the source text should be kept more or less the same as that of the target one. Translating means doing a process of recreating meaning, not that of creating it (Cf. Machali, 1998).

The practice of translation usually takes the following procedure: (1) analyzing the source text and its aspects, (2) transferring the source text to the target one, and (3) reconstructing the target text (e.g. Nida & Taber, 1969; House, 2018, summarizing the phases into two; Jakobsen, 2019, focusing on revising and post editing). It is obvious that before a text is translated, it should be analyzed first. This paper will discuss how SFL can be used as a tool of analysis for translation with a special attention to translating texts of English into Indonesian. In order to produce better translation results, SFL initiated by Halliday (1985), Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), and Martin and Rose (2007) is proposed to be used in doing text/discourse analysis before the phase of translating is taken.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

SFL is a school of linguistics which has to do with how language is used as text in context (Halliday, 1985; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). In line with this framework, language is organized into three functions: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. Ideationally, language is used to express what is biologically or physically going on in the surroundings, interpersonally, it is used to maintain social relationships, and textually, it is used to arrange text. These three functions are covered under one umbrella: metafunction. On the other hand, in SFL meaning is not only seen from a single perspective. It is diversified on the basis of the three functions above: ideational meaning, interpersonal meaning, and textual meaning. The diversification of meaning is also covered under the term of metafunction, and therefore, it is called metafunctional meaning.

A text or discourse contains the three types of meaning all together (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; Martin & Rose, 2007). From the point of view of SFL, using language means producing a meaningful type of text to achieve a communication goal. Furthermore, translating a text is a form of communication through which a translation goal is achieved by recreating meaning in the TL. The meaning recreated here is indeed the unification of ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings. It is these three modes of meaning that should be kept relatively the same.

SFL has been chosen to be a tool of discourse analysis for translation in account that translation and SFL can support the work of translation. In addition, these two fields share the same object of study, which is in fact text. Text/discourse analysis is principally text deconstruction from various aspects. It is done by describing its text structure (how a text is organized) and its grammatical features (lexicogrammar – how words are put into a grammatically meaningful arrangement). In the context of meaning in translation, the meaning of the source and target texts can be kept the same if the two texts have the same text

structures and grammatical features, although in some cases, "meaning in one language can also often be translated into more than one linguistic form in another language" (Huang, 2009; Wiratno, 2009). Halliday (2010) suggests that a translator can pinpoint appropriate linguistic choices for meaning equivalence.

To some extent, the application of SFL-based discourse analysis for translation can improve the understanding of the textual organization and the linguistic aspects of the text to be translated. In one way or another, this kind of application can thus far be found in, for example, Munday (2016), Munday and Zhang (2017), and Baker (2018). To simplify the discussion of this paper, the aspects to be analyzed as examples only include: text structure and conjunctivity (textual, ideational), speech function (interpersonal), mood, modality (interpersonal), transitivity (ideational), theme-rheme (textual), and identification (ideational, textual).

III.   METHOD

For the purpose of this paper, the texts entitled "Social dan Political Leaders should not Have High Formal Education" (Text 1a) and "Goanna" (Text 2a) have been selected as the examples for analysis and for translation practice as well. Text 1a is analyzed from the points of view of text structure and conjunctivity, whereas Text 2a is analyzed from the points of view of speech function, mood, modality, transitivity, theme-rheme, and identification. Text 1a and Text 2a belong to exposition and report genres respectively, and these two types of genre have been chosen for the reason that they contain the linguistic features expected to be analyzed as cases.

IV.   RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Text 1: Text Structure and Conjunctivity

It can be seen in Table 1 that in terms of text structure Text 1a as SL has been well translated into Text 1b as TL. Text 1a belongs to exposition genre having a text structure of "Thesis Statement^Arguments^Reiteration" and is translated into the same genre with the same text structure. It will not be appropriate if SL is translated into TL in a genre other than exposition.

With respect to conjunctivity, in an exposition text, the employment of conjunctions is anchored to strengthen the arguments presented. Table 1 shows that Text 1a employs conjunctions (bold type) reflecting the logical meanings of contrast (**however**, **but**, **while**, **although**), addition (**another**, **also**), emphasis/addition (**even**, **in fact**), and conclusion (**then**). At the same time, these types of conjunctions are also used to scaffold the organization of the text. It should be noted, however, that the same conjunctions may result in different logical relations when they are used in different genres. In a recount genre, for example, **then** is not used to initiate a conclusion, but a sequence of events. Therefore, misunderstanding the use conjunctions in the SL may result in a shift of ideational and textual meanings in the TL. As displayed in Table 1, such a misunderstanding is not found in the Indonesian translation (Text 1b).

TABLE I.   TEXT STRUCTURE AND CONJUNCTIVITY OF TEXT 1

SL: English (Text 1a)	TL: Indonesian (Teks 1b)
SOCIAL AND POLITICAL LEADERS SHOULD NOT HAVE HIGH FORMAL EDUCATION	PEMIMPIN SOSIAL DAN POLITIK TIDAK HARUS MEMILIKI PENDIDIKAN FORMAL YANG TINGGI
Thesis statement	*Thesis statement*
That formal education is important for people has been known to all. **However**, whether people will be good social and political leaders does not always depend on their formal education. It is believed that experience is also a salient contribution to success.	Bahwa pendidikan formal itu penting bagi manusia telah diketahui oleh umum. **Namun demikian**, apakah orang akan menjadi pemimpin sosial dan politik tidak selalu bergantung kepada pendidikan formal mereka. Diyakini bahwa pengalaman juga merupakan sumbangan nyata untuk menjadi sukses.
Arguments	*Arguments*
It is true that formal education gives benefits to leaders-to-be, **but** things they have got from formal education are not necessarily applicable in the society where they later become leaders. **In fact**, at schools and universities people only "learn" theories, **while** in society, people do learn actual lives through their experience. This experience, **then**, often creates good social and political leaders. They are actually born from what they have learned in the society.	Betul bahwa pendidikan formal memberikan manfaat bagi calon pemimpin, **tetapi** hal-hal yang telah mereka dapatkan dari pendidikan formal tidak selalu dapat diterap- kan di masyarakat tempat mereka di kemudian hari men-jadi pemimpin. **Sesungguhnya**, di sekolah dan universitas, orang hanya "mempelajari" teori, **sedangkan** di masyara- kat, mereka betul-betul mempelajari kehidupan nyata melalui pengalaman. Pengalaman ini, **kalau begitu**, sering menghasilkan pemimpin sosial dan politik. Mereka betul-betul lahir dari sesuatu yang mereka pelajari di masyarakat.
To take some examples of good social and political leaders, we	

can mention some figures. The late Adam Malik was appointed Indonesian Vice President not because of his formal education – he just finished a certain level of elementary school – **but** because of his capacity acquired from his autodidactic learning. The late Hamka was **another** leader born from his own way of learning. He **also** became a wellknown religious man and literary man as well because of his autodidactic learning. **Even** Einstein did not have a good reputation in his formal education, **but** through his real learning in society he turned out to be a distinguished expert in Physics.

Reiteration

It is clear, **then**, through formal education people only learn how to learn, not how to live. **Although** formal education is necessary, it is not the only way leading people to be social and political leaders. (Adapted from Wiratno, 2003: 65)

Sekadar menyebut contoh pemimpin sosial dan politik yang baik, kita dapat menunjuk beberapa tokoh. Almar- hum Adam Malik – konon ia hanya menyelesaikan jenjang pendidikan dasar tertentu – diangkat menjadi Wakil Presiden Indonesia bukan karena pendidikan formalnya, **melainkan** karena kapasitas yang ia dapatkan dari belajar secara otodidak. Almarhum Hamka adalah contoh pemim- pin **lain** yang lahir dari caranya belajar sendiri. Ia **juga** menjadi pemimpin agama dan sastrawan terkenal sekaligus karena pengalaman belajar pribadinya. **Bahkan**, Einstein tidak mempunyai reputasi pendidikan formal yang bagus, **tetapi** melalui usahanya yang nyata untuk belajar sendiri di masyarakat, ia terbukti menjadi ahli fisika yang sangat terkenal.

Reiteration

Dengan demikian, jelaslah bahwa melalui pendidikan formal orang hanya mempelajari cara belajar, bukan cara menjalani hidup. **Meskipun** pendidikan formal diperlukan, pendidikan formal bukan satu-satunya jalan yang dapat ditempuh oleh setiap orang untuk menjadi pemimpin sosial dan politik.

Text 2: Speech Function, Mood, Modality, Transitivity, Theme-Rheme, and Identification

The grammatical features of Text 2a in Table 2 can be broken down by deconstructing every clause of it. In Figure 1, Clause 1 (*In Australia, monitor lizards are called goannas*) is analyzed as an example. From the example, the following facts can be identified: (1) Speech function: Indicative-declarative; (2) Mood (*monitor lizards are*); (3) Modality: Modalization-usuality (*are called*); (4) Transitivity: Participants – Nominal groups (*monitor lizards, goannas*), Process – Verbal group (*are called*), Circumstance – Adverb (*in Australia*); (5) Theme: Marked topical theme (*in Australia*), and (6) Identification: Anaphoric reference (*monitor lizards ← goannas*).

Speech function is basically concerned with how a clause functions: indicative (declarative, interogative) or imperative. Text 2a consists of 15 clauses, and all of them fall into indicative-declarative. It indicates that the text is informative. As Text 2a belongs to report genre, it gives information about classification (Martin & Rose, 2008), in particular, the classification of goanna. Interpersonally, through such clauses, the writer of the text shares information to his readers equally. Meanwhile, the mood (the combination of Subject and Finite) selected in the text shows interpersonally that it is presented from the point of view of the object of talking (goanna), not the writer's point of view. Similalry, the text selects modality that generally falls into modalization-usuality (e.g. *are called*) and modalization-probability (e.g. *may have*), meaning that the text is also presented from the point of view of goanna as the object of talking. In the translation version (Text 2b), there is no shift of interpersonal meaning because the grammatical features related to speech function, mood, and modality are still maintained the same.

	Indicative-declarative				
	In Australia	monitor lizards	are	called	goannas
Interpersonal	Adjunct	Subject	Finite	Predicator	Complement
		Mood		Residue	
Ideational	Circumstance	Value	Process: Relational Idenifying		Token
Textual	Marked Topical Theme	Rheme			

Fig. 1. Example of clause analysis

Transitivity involves participants (humans and non-humans), processes (verb categories: material, relational, mental, verbal, behavioural, and existential), and circumstances (adverbial aspects). It deals briefly with "which participants do what activities where and when" or "what happens where and when" (Martin, 1992). Participants are further categorized depending on the types of process (e.g., in material process, participants are termed as Actor and Goal; in identifying relational process, they are termed as Token and Value). As displayed in Table 2, in association with transitivity, Text 2a makes use of non-human participants (bold type), identifying/attributive relational and material processes (underlined), and locative or time circumstances (italic type). Subjects conflated with unmarked topical themes realized by participants and marked topical themes realized by circumstances are put in square brackets, while ellipsis is put in regular brackets. The same marking is also applied to the Indonesian TL (Text 2b). What is meant by theme here is the prominent information which is usually placed in the initial position in the clause, and the information following the initial one is called rheme (Martin, Matthiessen, & Painter, 2010).

All of the Subjects of the clauses in Text 2a are filled with non-human participants (*goannas* and their classes/subclasses). Ideationally, this selection means that the subject matter of the text is discussed around goannas and their related entity. The

Subjects themselves also function as the unmarked topical themes in most the text's clauses, combined with the only marked topical theme realized by circumstance (*in Australia*). The other circumstances are in the end positions, and are therefore not thematic. The end positions of circumstances are used to build the environments where and when the activities associated with goannas take place. This kind of theme realization means that the topic of discussion throughout the text is textually organized with respect to goannas in Australia, not in the other places. In the context of translation in TL (Text 2b), there is no shift of ideational and textual meanings because non-human participants are translated into non-human participants, and unmarked/marked topical themes are translated into unmarked/marked topical themes as well.

Dealing with the processes selected in Text 2a, the identifying relational processes are used to define goannas in the sense that they identify what classes of animals goannas are. As has been displayed in Figure 1, *In Australia, **monitor lizards** (Value) <u>are called</u> (Identifying relational) **goannas** (Token)* is a definition clause. It can be reversed into *Goannas are monitor lizards in Australia*. Attributive relational processes are used to describe goannas in accordance with their physical characteristics, for example: ***Their necks** (Carrier) <u>are</u> (attributive relational) **long** (Attribute)*. On the other hand, material processes is used to illustrate what goannas do, for example: ***Goannas** (Actor) <u>hunt</u> (material) **small mammals, birds and other reptiles** (Goal)*. In conjunction with transitivity (participants, processes, circumstances), Text 2a is ideationally translated very well into Text 2b. No shift of meaning occurs.

TABLE II.   EXAMPLE OF ANALYSIS OF TEXT 2

SL: English (Text 2a)	TL: Indonesian (Text 2b)
GOANNA	GOANNA
[Australia] <u>is</u> *home to* **25 of the world's 30 monitor lizard species**. [*In Australia*], **monitor lizards** <u>are called</u> **goannas**.	**[Australia]** <u>adalah</u> *tempat bagi* **25 dari 30 spesies biawak dunia**. [*Di Australia*] **binatang biawak** <u>disebut</u> **goanna**.
[Goannas] <u>have</u> **flattish bodies, long tails and strong jaws**. **[They]** <u>are</u> **the only lizards with forked tongues, like a snake**. **[Their necks]** <u>are</u> long and ([**their necks**]) <u>may have</u> **loose folds of skin beneath them**. **[Their legs]** <u>are</u> long and strong, with **sharp claws on their feet**. **[Many goannas]** <u>have</u> **stripes, spots and other markings that help to camouflage them**. **[The largest species]** <u>can grow</u> to more than two metres in length.	**[Goanna]** <u>mempunyai</u> **badan pipih, ekor panjang, dan mulut kuat**. **[Binatang itu]** <u>merupakan</u> **satu- satunya biawak dengan lidah bercabang, seperti ular**. **[Lehernya]** (*<u>adalah</u>) panjang dan <u>mungkin terdapat</u> **lipatan-lipatan lebar pada kulit di bagian bawahnya**. **[Kakinya]** (*<u>adalah</u>) panjang dan kuat, dengan **jari-jari tajam pada telapak kakinya**. **[Beberapa goanna]** <u>mempunyai</u> **garis-garis, bintik-bintik, dan tanda-tanda lain yang membantu untuk menyamarkan diri**. **[Spesies yang terbesar]** <u>dapat tumbuh</u> panjang sampai lebih dari dua meter.
[All goannas] <u>are</u> **daytime hunters**. **They** <u>run, climb and swim</u> well. **[Goannas]** <u>hunt</u> **small mammals, birds and other reptiles**. **[They]** also <u>eat</u> **dead animals**. **[Smaller goannas]** <u>eat</u> **insects, spiders and worms**. **[Male goannas]** <u>fight</u> with <u>each other</u> *in the breeding season*. **[Females]** <u>lay</u> **between two and twelve eggs**. (Silkstone 1994, as extracted by Martin & Rose, 2007: 99)	**[Semua goanna]** <u>adalah</u> **pemangsa di siang hari**. **[Binatang-binatang itu]** <u>berlari, memanjat, dan berenang</u> sekaligus. **[Goanna]** <u>memangsa</u> **mamalia kecil, burung, dan reptil yang lain**. **[Goanna]** juga <u>memakan</u> **bangkai**. **[Goanna yang lebih kecil]** <u>memakan</u> **serangga, laba- laba, dan cacing**. **[Goanna jantan]** saling <u>menyerang</u> *pada musim kawin*. **[Goanna betina]** <u>bertelur</u> **antara dua sampai dengan dua belas butir**.

Finally, from the perspective of identification – that is how things are referred to as the ones mentioned before (anaphora) or after (cataphora), inside the text (endophora) or outside the text (exophora), in the cultural context (homophora), and within the group (esphora) – most of the references belong to endophora and or anaphora (as has been exemplified above: *monitor lizards ← goannas*). However, it should be taken into consideration that English and Indonesian have different plural and singular identifications related to whether the objects of translation are humans or non humans. For example, ***[Goannas]** have **flattish bodies, long tails and strong jaws**. **[They]** <u>are</u> **the only lizards with forked tongues, like a snake*** should be translated into ***[Goanna]** <u>mempunyai</u> **badan pipih, ekor panjang, dan mulut kuat**. **[Binatang itu]** <u>merupakan</u> satu-satunya biawak dengan lidah bercabang, seperti ular*. It can be seen that *goannas* (plural) referred to as *they* (plural) is translated into *goanna* (singular) referred to as *binatang itu* (singular). In Indonesian, plural and singular are not important when they are not concerned with quantity, and plural pronouns for things and animals tend to be translated into singular. From the perspective of identification, Text 2a is ideationally and textually translated into Text 2b very well, with some adjustments in relations to the special grammatical environments of Indonesian as TL.

V. CONCLUSION

After doing SFL-based discourse analysis with which translation practice is done, some important notes can be put forwards bellow.

1) Different types of texts (genres) have different text structures and different grammatical features. Therefore, in translating a text, the target text should have the same type of text as the source one has.

2) Because grammatical features are used to realize metafunctional meaning (ideational, interpersonal, textual), both the target text and the source one should contain the same metafunctional meaning, with some adjustments of the TL grammar if required.

3) SFL-based discourse analysis can help translators to improve the understanding of the SL texts and to avoid unnecessary shifts of metafunctional meaning.

References

Catford, J.C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (2nd Ed.). London: Routledge.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (2010). Pinpointing the choice: Meaning and the search for equivalents in a translated text. In Mahboob, A., & Knight, N.K. (Eds.), *Appliable linguistics*. London: Continuum, pp. 13-24.

Halliday, M.A.K., & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar*. London: Hodder Education.

House, J. (2018). *Translation: The basics*. London: Routledge.

Huang, G. (2009). Different ways of meaning and different ways of translating (Paper). Presented in *36th International Systemic Congress*, Beijing, China, July 14-19, 2009.

Jakobsen, A, L. (2019). Moving translation, revision, and post-editing boundaries. In Dam, H.V., Brogger, M.N., & Zethsen, K.K. (Eds), *Moving boundaries in translation studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 64-80.

Larson, M.L. (1984). *Meaning-based translation*: A guide to cross-language equivalence. Lanham: University Press of America.

Machali, R. (1998). *Redefining textual equivalence in translation*: With special reference to Indonesian-English. Jakarta: The Translation Center, Faculty of Arts, the University of Indonesia.

Martin, J.R. (1992). *English text: System and structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Martin, J.R., Matthiessen, C.M.I.M., & Painter, C. (2010). *Deploying functional grammar*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.

Martin, J.R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse* (2nd Ed.). London: Continuum.

Martin, J.R., & Rose, D. (2008). *Genre relations: Mapping culture*. London: Equinox.

Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th Ed.). London: Routledge.

Munday, J., & Zhang, M. (Eds.). (2017). Discourse analysis in translation studies. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nida, E.A., & Taber, C.R. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Wiratno, T. (2003). *Kiat menulis karya ilmiah dalam bahasa Inggris*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Wiratno, T. (2009). Functionally selecting linguistic units for equivalence in translation (Paper). Presented in *International Conference on Systemic Functional Linguistics and Its application in translation*. Surakarta, Universitas Sebelas Maret, 6-7 October 2009.