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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.
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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 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I. TEXT STRUCTURE AND CONJUNCTIVITY OF TEXT I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL: English (Text 1a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL AND POLITICAL LEADERS SHOULD NOT HAVE HIGH FORMAL EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

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, interrogative) 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. Similarly, 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative-declarative</th>
<th>In Australia</th>
<th>monitor lizards</th>
<th>are</th>
<th>called</th>
<th>goannas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Finite</td>
<td>Predicator</td>
<td>Complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideational</td>
<td>Circumstance</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Process: Relational Identifying</td>
<td>Token</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Marked Topical Theme</td>
<td>Rheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) are called (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) are (attributive relational) long (Attribute). On the other hand, material processes is used to

\[ \text{Their necks} \text{ are long and } (\text{their necks})! \] may have loose folds of skin beneath them. [Their legs] are long and strong, with sharp claws on their feet. [Many goannas] have stripes, spots and other markings that help to camouflage them. [The largest species] can grow to more than two metres in length.

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] are the only lizards with forked tongues, like a snake. [Their legs] are long and with sharp claws on their feet. [Many goannas] have stripes, spots and other markings that help to camouflage them. [The largest species] can grow to more than two metres in length.

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.
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