

TRANSLATION PROCEDURES OF *SIJALAPEN* IN KARONESE WEDDING CEREMONY INTO ENGLISH

Milisi Sembiring, Martina Girsang

Universitas Methodist Indonesia, Medan, Indonesia

e-mail: milisi_sembiring@yahoo.com

Abstract

The aims of this study were to observe the translation procedures to translate Sijalpen in Karonese Wedding Ceremony into English. The data of this study were found from the participant observation of the authors. There were six cultural terms in the groom's party and five cultural terms in the bride's party. All together were 11 cultural terms and they were the lucky numbers for Karonese society. They referred to Karonese belief of *ersada tendi ku rumah* means have all souls gathered at home. If their souls are all at home, they believe that they all had good health. It was believed because they did the ceremony of *perumah tendi*. It was the ceremony of asking for their *tendi* at home. The qualitative research was done to collect the data and did the analysis. Translation analysis, cultural analysis and discourse analysis were applied in doing this study. The result shows that the problems of untranslatability occur in the process of translation the SL into the TL. Newmark's translation procedures were not workable, instead, Sembiring and Panggabean's familiar translation procedure were used to translate *sijalpen* in Karonese wedding ceremony into English. The authors would recommend the researchers on untranslatability texts to use Sembiring and Panggabean's translation procedure to overcome their translation process problems.

Keywords: translation procedures, Karonese society, Sijalpen

1. Introduction

Translation is an activity of understanding of a source language (SL) and a source culture and using instruments which are available to support the activity in transferring the messages of a source language into its equivalence in a target language (TL). The use of google translation which is supported by grammarly checker as the instruments in the process of translation are reasonable to have a good structure in restructuring of a message in the TL. these instruments are also to avoid the misspelling of the words in the TL. The use of these two instruments are only relevant to evaluate a lexical and a structure rule of the TL.

As a translator it is not enough to understand both SL and TL but he also needs to be familiar with a source culture and a target culture. Sembiring and Panggabean, (2018) describe clearly that a researcher as a translator should be familiar with a source culture and a target culture. Transferring cultural term is usually a challenge in transferring a source

culture into other cultures. There are two alternatives of cornerstones in translating an SL into TL. They are a source language oriented and a target language oriented. These two alternatives cornerstones which are proposed by Newmark (1988) translation methods mostly applied in the process of a translation and in evaluating a translation product. Newmark (1988) adds alternatively to use translation procedures which focus on sentences analysis. Furthermore, House, (2015:1) explains translation is both a cognitive procedure which occurs in a human being's, the translator's, head, and social, cross-linguistic and cross-cultural practice.

The authors did some researches on translating Karonese culture into English and applied Newmark's translation procedures. They are Sembiring, (2015), Translating *Daliken si Telu* texts in Karonese society into English, Sembiring (2016), Translating *Tutur si Waloh* in Karonese Society into English and Sembiring, Panggabean (2018), Translating Culture-Bound Terms in Wedding Speech Texts of Karonese Society into English. The authors mostly applied descriptive equivalent in translating them into English. They use the translation procedure because the absence of a source culture in a target culture. There are no equivalences of a source culture in a target culture. They are untranslatable and they are the problems in translating a SL into a TL. This paper talks about about *sijalapen* in Karonese society.

Sijalapen is held after the *nganting manok* and after negotiating *gantang tumba kalimbubu*. The implementation of the *sijalapen* was witnessed by *sangkep nggeluh*, the *nereh* and *sangkep*, the *empo*. The purpose of *Sijalapen* is to trace and determine the people who are related to cultural ties in the dialogue between *nganting manok*, this - to get to know more about the person responsible for the wedding party plan. Before the implementation of the *sijalapen* the bride and groom were asked whether they were serious about carrying out the marriage, the men were asked whether there were no other women who bound the friendship with him as well as the women.

To translate the cultural terms of the *Sijalapen* activity is difficult because the terms in the SL are not found in the TL. This problem must be solved in the process of translating cultural terms in the source language into the target language.

The authors want to use translation concepts proposed by experts to get answers to this problem. The authors use a lot of the concepts of Newmark's translation to solve the problem of translating cultures that cannot be translated.

2. Literature Review

Newmark (1988) classifies two ways in the translation process, they are translation methods and translation procedures.

2.1 Methods of Translation

Newmark (1988: 45-47) proposes the methods of translation are as follows:

- a. *Word-for-word translation* is the process of transferring a meaning in as SL is maintained and translated singly with its closest meaning in a TL.
- b. *Literal translation* is the process of restructuring of a message in a TL is converted to the closest structure rules of a TL, but the lexical word of an SL is translated singly into a TL.
- c. *Faithful translation* is an attempt by translators to get the contextual meaning right from the source language and according to the structure in the target language.

- d. *Semantic translation* is the translation process that prioritizes the aesthetic value of source language texts in the target language.
- e. *Adaptation*: Is an effort made in translating source languages that include comedy, poetry, themes, characters, and plots as well as culture in the source language remain preserved and converted to the target language.
- f. *Free translation* is the process of transferring meaning in translation from the source language to the target language regardless of the style, form, or content that exists in the source language.
- g. *Idiomatic translation* is effort in the process of translation where the message of the source language is distorted in the target language towards everyday meaning and idioms which are not obtained in the source language.
- h. *Communicative translation* is an effort to transfer contextual meaning from the source language in such a way that both content and language can be accepted and understood by the readers.

The authors applied two of Newmark's methods of translation, they are literal translation and semantic translation.

2.2 Translation Procedures

One part of the translation process is the procedure of translation focusing on sentence elements and sentences from a text. The procedure is used to find equivalence of meaning from the source language in the target language.

The authors use three of all Newmark's procedures, in translating the SL to the TL, they are descriptive procedure, couplets, and transposition. The translation procedures were applied because the subjects of the translation are from cultural terms.

Newmark (1988: 81-91) determines some translation procedures as the follows:

- a. Transference
- b. Naturalization
- c. Cultural equivalent
- d. Functional equivalent
- e. Descriptive equivalent
- f. Componential analysis
- g. Synonymy
- h. Through-translation
- i. Shifts or transpositions
- j. Modulation
- k. Recognized translation
- l. Compensation
- m. Paraphrase
- n. Couplets, and
- o. Notes

In this paper the authors apply Newmark's translation procedures which are supported by critical discourse analysis (CDA) to have the closest equivalent of the message of the SL in the TL, but however the descriptive equivalent is not sufficient. The authors furthermore applied Sembiring and Panggabean's concept of familiarity in cultural translation. Newmark,

(1988) explains descriptive equivalent is one of the translation procedure solutions, and the meaning of the *sijalapen* is explained in several words.

In translating the *sijalapen*, the authors were hard to find their equivalences shift can not be cannot be avoided. Newmark (1988) explains shifts or transpositions involves a change in the lexical category and structure of a sentence or types of a sentence.

The authors use three of Newmark translation procedures, in translating *sijalapen* dialogues in *nganting manok* ceremony of the Karonese society into English.

The three translation procedures are equivalent descriptive, transference, paraphrase, notes and transposition. These three procedures are used to move meaning in the source language and find its equivalence in the target language. *Sijalapen* are the dialogues refer to the agreement to record the family of the prospective bride and groom responsible for the wedding party plan.

According to Saldanha and O'Brien (2014) the starting point in CDA is register which is influenced by the context of situation covers field, tenor and mode. Furthermore they add the context of culture is also needed in the process of translation to know the ways people use a language within a culture.

3. Research Method

This paper applied qualitative research and it is supported by translation analysis, critical discourse analysis, and cultural analysis. Newmark's (1988) translation procedures, Saldanha and O'Brien (2014) research methodologies in translation studies are used to analyze the data. The authors attended the wedding ceremony to get the data by video recording. It was held on 10th March 2019 at Mahardika's maba *belo selambar* and *ngkanting manok* at Jambor Tamsaka. The *tokoh adat* (traditional leaders) gave some explanations dealt with the function of *sijalapen*. The authors use all of the data which were as the dialogues between the bride's relatives and the groom's relatives to talk about *sijalapen*.

4. Result and Discussion

The total number of persons who are responsible in the groom's relatives are 6 elements of cultural classificatory and 5 for the bride's relatives.

4.1 The Groom's Sijalapen

At the *nganting manok* ceremony, there was a session named *sijalapen*. It is started by the groom's relatives. The mediator of *sijalapen* in *anak beru si ngerana*, he manages *sijalapen* regularly and culturally. *Sijalapen* is never managed by a woman. The dialogues of *sijalapen* are as follows:

The bride's *anak beru* asked the groom's *anak beru*.

1. SL : Kai gelar si empo?

TL : What is the name of the groom?

Data 1 is translated literally with what is the name of the groom. It does not show any problems in translating the SL into the TL. The term *si empo* linguistically means posses.

2. SL: Ise si mupus ?

TL: What are the of names of the groom's parents.?

Translation method of communicative is relevant in transferring the message of data 2 in the SL into the TL. This translation method was used to make the meanings of data 2 in the SL into the TL

acceptable. *Si mupus* means parents but in Karonese culture which have patrilineal system. Literally *simupus* means who bore the groom or the bride. The name of a mother is never mentioned who born the the children, instead the name of a father.

The term *simupus* in the source language is a polite cultural term. It means parents.

Karonese culture is patrilineal that is why the father's name is only mentioned.

Bere-bere means the clan of a mother. Every Karonese has a clan and the mother's clan is called *bere-bere*. If a bride is from another ethnic group she has to have an adjusted clan refer to the groom's mother clan. The people who ask for the groom's name, clan and his *bere bere* is *anak беру si ngerana si nereh*. *Anakberu si ngerana si nereh* means the wife taker of the bride who has two or more generations got married previously with the wife-givers' clan. For example, a man whose father and grandfather simultaneously got married the wife giver clan.

3. SL: *Si mupus tetap ngenda si mupus, ula melus bulung-bulung i kerangen, gelar si mupus eme Jendakin*

TL: It is clearly known who was *simupus, ula melus bulung-bulung i kerangen*, his name is Jendakin.

The name of the groom and his *bere-bere* is questioned by the bride's *anak беру*. *Ula melus bulung-bulung i kerangen* is not translated because it is a methapor and it does not have an equivalent in the TL. If *ula melus bulung-bulung i kerangen* is translated literally, it is hopely the leaves in the jungles will not be withered. It does not have any sense in English speaking people.

4. SL: *Bapa si pempokenca*.

TL: A classificatory father who is responsible for the groom marriage.

Descriptive equivalent is applied to transfer the cultural term in the SL into the TL. A classificatory father means groom's father's relatives who has the same clan. He is responsible for the groom marriage culturally.

5. SL: *Senina*

TL: A man who has the same clan with the groom.

Litral translation of *senina* is brother, but *senina* here a man who has the same clan with the groom. Lengthy explanation is needed in the process of translation *senina* in the SL into the TL, *senina* is social culture. *Senina* is predicted *sada ninina*. It means a man or a woman who has the same grandfather.

6. SL: *Anak беру tua*

TL: *Anak беру tua*

Transference was used to avoid the missing meaning of the SL in the TL. Newmark (1988) explains transference is the process of transferring an SL word to a TL text and including loan word.

Anak beru tua is an *anakberu* who manage the other *anak beru* to run the wedding ceremony. One can be as *anak beru tua*, if he had the historical generation of marriage to the wife-giver's clan, and he had got the process of *bulang-bulangi*. *Bulang-bulangi* is the symbol of delegation of the cultural authority. *Beka buluh* is used to cover his head witnessed by the relatives is named *bulang-bulangi*.

7. SL: Anak beru cekoh baka

TL: *Anak beru* of *anak beru*

Anak beru cekoh baka is not translated literally and it does not have an equivalent either in the TL. It should be explained familiarly. Sembiring and Panggabean (2018) propose translation procedure of familiar culture as the development of Newmark's (1988) translation procedure. The culture in the SL is identified, classified, explained, and modified in the TL. *Anak beru cekoh baka* is an *anak beru* whose grandfather and father married the same wife-giver's clan. They are familiar to their *kalimbubu* situation.

4.2 The Bride's *Sijalapan*

8. SL: Ise gelar si tersereh?

TL: What is the name of the bride?

The linguistic meaning of *tersereh* is who is coming. The bride comes to the groom's family and she is possessed by the groom's family culturally.

9. SL: Ise Simupus?

TL: Who born the bride?

Simupus is polite term which means who bear the bride. It has the cultural shift in translating *simupus* in the SL into the TL, because there is no polite term in the TL. literal translation was applied but the SL has different message of the TL.

10. SL: Bapa sinerehkenca.

TL: Who is the classificatory father of the bride is responsible the bride's marriage?

The authors use who in the TL to identify the interrogative sentences. The SL does not use a question word to form interrogative sentence.

11. SL: Biak senina

TL: Biak senina

Biak senina is bride's father relatives who has same clan.

12. SL: Anak beru tua

TL: Anak beru tua

Sijalapan is the process of noting the people who are responsible in the *nganting manok* process. The people who are responsible are the relative classificatory of the groom and the bride.

5. Conclusion

The authors apply the Newmark's (1988) translation procedures of transference, cultural equivalent, descriptive equivalent, shifts or transpositions, and Sembiring and Panggabean's (2018) translation procedure of cultural familiarity in translating *Sijalapen* in Karonese Wedding Ceremony into English. Translating *sijalapen* in Karonese culture has no equivalent in the TL, therefore descriptive equivalent is mostly used to get message of the SL in the TL.

The authors recommend the cultural researchers to apply the translation procedures in translating cultures into other languages and to analyse the ways people use the language in a certain culture as to preserve our culture.

Acknowledgements

The research got fund from the fundamental research grant, based on research contract no. 059/N/LP3M-UMI/2018 of the Ministry of Research, Technology, & Higher Education.

References

- House, J. (2015). *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*. New York: Routledge
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York and London: Prentice-Hall.
- Saldanha, Gabriela & O'Brien, Sharon. (2014). *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Sembiring, M. (2016) Translating *Tutur si Waloh* in Karonese Society into English. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 6, No. 6. <http://www.academypublication.com/ojs/index.php/tpls/article/view/tpls060611421148>
- Sembiring, M. & Girsang, M. (2018) Translating Textual Theme in *Maba Belo Selambar* Dialogue of Karonese Society into English. Proceeding of 1st AICLL UISU 2018. <https://knepublishing.com/index.php/Kne-Social/issue/view/87>
- Sembiring, M., & Panggabean, H. (2018). Translating Culture-Bound Terms in Wedding Speech Texts of Karonese Society into English. *Skase Journal of Translation and Interpretation*, vol. 11 no. 1. http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTI14/pdf_doc/05.pdf