PROPOSITIONAL AND EXPRESSIVE MEANINGS
IN TRANSLATION OF LUKE'S GOSPEL INTO BALINESE

Frans I Made Brata
Faculty of Letters, Udayana University
fbrata@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Perbedaan sistem linguistik dan budaya antara dua bahasa mengakibatkan penerjemahan makna proposisi *I-you* (dalam *Tu*(*n*)-*Vous*(*n*) bahasa Inggris dalam Injil Lukas ke dalam bahasa Bali memungkinkan mendapat bentuk variasi padanan yang berbeda. *Formal Equivalent* yang diterapkan penerjemah memungkinkan mendapat padanan makna proposisi dalam *potential meanings*: *icang – cai* 'biasa', *tiang – ragane* 'menengah', *titiang–iratu*. 'merendah–meninggikan'. Pronomina pertama tidak mempunyai bentuk 'meninggikan', sedangkan pronomina kedua tidak mempunyai bentuk 'merendahkan'. Selanjutnya, *Dynamic Equivalent* dan penerapannya melalui teknik pergeseran dalam penerjemahan: transposisi, dan modulasi memungkinkan mendapat padanan makna ekspresif dalam *meaning potentials* dalam penekanan makna-makna tertentu.

Attitude*, bagian dari Teori Apraisal dalam *Linguistic Fungtional Systemic* digunakan untuk menginvestivigasi makna interpersonal para pelibat dalam merujuk dan menentukan stratifikasi sosialnya. Ditemukan adanya beberapa bentuk variasi pronomina yang berbeda, baik dalam domain linguistik maupun domain sosial dalam penerjemahan Injil Lukas yang disebabkan oleh orientasi metode penerjemahan yang dilakukan penerjemah.

Kata Kunci: afek, *judgment***, appresiasi,** *potential meanings, meaning potentials.*

1. Background and Problem

The translator's orientation, either text or reader focus, will determine the choice between propositional meanings or expressive meanings in transferring the meaning of the English pronoun of the source Language (SL) in Luke's Gospel into the Balinese as the target language (TL). Formal Equivalence will lead the translator to choose the potential meanings in a linguistic domain.. In the other hand, Dynamic Equivalence will lead him to do some efforts to search for the meaning potentials in a social domain for the closest natural equivalent for its reader.

Based on the above explanation the aim of the study is to seek the answer to the question: what types of meanings were employed in the translation of pronoun of Luke's Gospel in English and their translations into Balinese?

2. Concept and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Concept

2.2.1. Propositional Meanings vs Expressive Meanings in Translation

Pronoun is a part of speech as one of a class words that serves to replace a noun phrase that has already been or is about to mention in the sentence or context (Collins, 2005:1297). Besides replacing a noun phrase, pronoun also used for addressing in the forms of lexical or phrasal choice belonged to a group of people in a certain society used by the addresser (A1) to address the addressee (A2) or person speaking about (A3) (Braun, 1988:5). The lexical choice may relate to either propositional meanings or expresif meanings.

Baker (1992:13) stated that:

"The propositional meaning of a word or an utterance arises from the relation between it and what it refers to or describes in a real or imagery world, as conceived by the speakers of the particular language to which the word or utterance belongs. It is this type of meaning which provides the basis on which we can judge an utterance as true or false"

Referring to the pronoun belongs to SL and TL, *I – you* may have their Formal Equivalence to the real forms of linguistic variations the textual meanings: icang - cai 'ordinary', tiang – ragane 'middle', titiang – iratu – 'humble-refined'. *He/she* may have their translation equivalent to: ia 'ordinary', dane 'middle', ipun 'humble', ida 'refined', as seen in the table below:

Pronouns	Source Language (SL)	Target Language (TL)			
		Ordinary Form (OF)	Middle Form (MF)	Humble Form (HF)	Refined Form (RF)
1st Pronoun (1P)	*I/we*	icang	tiang	titiang	-
2nd Pronoun (2P)	*You/you*	cai	Ragane,	-	IRatu,
3rd Pronoun (3P)	*He/She/they*	ia	dane	ipun	Ida

"Expressive meaning can not be judged as true or false. This is because expressive meaning relates to the speaker's feeling or attitude rather than to what words and utterances refer to" (Baker, 1992:13).

In relation to the expressive feeling of the addresser (A1) towards addressee (A2), or the people speaking about (A3), *I – you*, or *he / she* may have their Dynamic Equivalence to noun in a social domain of the contextual meanings; such as: *son*, *teacher*, *servant, human*, etc. Choice made by the translator either the propositional meanings or expressive meanings much depend on the translator preference.

2.2.2. Formal Equivalence vs Dynamic Equivalence

Nida in Venuty 2004: 153 divided two basic orientations in translating: (1) Formal Equivalence, and (2) Dynamic Equivalence. From the perspective of Bible translations, Kraft (2002:265) stated that:

"Formal Equivalence aims *simply to transfer the word forms* of the source language into the corresponding word forms of the source language. In addition, a formal Equivalence translation attempts insofar as possible *to render each given word consistently* in the source language more or less mechanically *by the same term in the receptor language*."

From the above statement we can say that the Formal Equivalence only transferring cohesively what is stated in the SL into the potential meanings of the given linguistic phenomena in the TL. Choice made by the translator in transferring the expressive textual potential meanings of the given SL linguistic domain. Different from the Formal Equivalence, he stated that:

"Dynamic Equivalence aims to produce translations that are so true to both the message of the source documents and the normal ways of expressing such a message in the receptor language that the hearers/readers can, by employing their own interpersonal reflexes derive the proper meanings."

From the above statement we can say that the Dynamic Equivalence transferring coherently what is meant in the SL into the social meaning potentials of the new information in the TL. Choice made by the translator's tacit knowledge in transferring the expressive discoursal meaning potentials of the SL social domain for its intended reader.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

The study of pronoun based on the *Tn-Vn* Theory (Braun,1988) under covers of the Appraisal Theory as an extension and development of Systemic Functional Linguistic (Halliday, 1985, Qian Hong, 2007). Attitude, ways of feeling, in the Appraisal Theory employed to analyze the translator's appraisal in order to investigate the choice of TL variation forms of pronoun made by the translator.

Attitude consists of three types: (1), affect: personal emotion; expressing a person's feeling; affect in SL in the progression of vertical-down interaction can be paralled to Upper Class (UC) to Low Class (LC) employed Ordinary Form (OF): icang – cai in TL, (2) judgment; expressing moral judgement of people's behaviour ; or how people should or should not do; judgment in the progression of horizontal interaction can be paralled to Middle Class (MC) to Middle Class (MC) employed Middle Form (MF), and (3) appreciation: evaluation of phenomena valued by society; appreciation in the progression of vertical-up interaction can be paralled to LC – UC employed Humble Form (HF) / Refined Form (RF).

3. Meanings Employed by Translator in Translation of English pronouns in Luke's Bible into Balinese

3.1. Propositional Meanings

Text orientation under covers of Formal Equivalence may result in choice of linguistic variation forms of potential meanings in a linguistic domain. It is due to the difference in linguistic system of the two languages.

3.2.1. Affect in Progression of Vertical-down Interaction

(01) *He said to him, 'You bad servant! I will use your own words to condemn you! You know that I am a hard man, taking what is not mine and reaping what I have not planted.* (Luke 19 : 22)

Anake agung laut ngandika teken ia kene: 'Ih **cai** parekan ane jele. **Icang** lakar ngukum cai manut buka munyin caine. **Cai** suba nawang **icang** mula anak angkara, demen nyuang ane tuara pagelahan **icange** muah ngalapin ane tuara pamula-mulaan **icange**.

Address Forms' Variation		Field	Tenor / Social stratification	Mode	*Attitude* / Stratification
SL	*I - you*				
TL	**icang - cai**	The parable of Jesus in Zacheus house about the gold coin	A1: The noble man (*social status*) A2: The servant (*Role*)	statement, OF, monolog	Affect, unhappiness - anger UC ↓ LC

The above parable in (01) tells us about an unfaithful servant who was bad in the sense of irresponsible, inefficient, or lazy. The statement:
SL: *You know that I am a hard man,*
TL: **Cai**   suba   nawang   **icang**   mula   anak angkara,
   2P OF   already   know   **1P OF**   of course   man arrogant
 stated by a nobleman towards his servant [affection] due to being unhappy [-*unhappiness*] that made him angry [-anger]. From the vertical-down interaction, we can see that the nobleman addressed himself **icang**, and addressed his servant **cai**. The translation from *I – you* into **icang** – **cai** employed OF was due to the progression of vertical-down interaction of A1 UC and A2 LC.

(02) *"Anyone who is not for me is really against me; anyone who does not help me gather is really scattering.* (Luk 11 : 23)

Anake sane nenten maroang ring **Tiang**, anake punika sujatinne nglawan **Tiang**, tur anake sane nenten munduhang sareng-sareng ring **Tiang**, anake punika wantah ngae buyar."

Jesus mission of driving out demons [affect] from a dumb man had caused a controversy. When the man was able to talk again because the devil was expelled from the dumb man, some religious teachers wondered about who gave Jesus the power and accused Him had cooperated with the devil. Jesus reaction was to give options to the group of people whether to believe in Him or to the devil.

SL: *anyone who does not help* **me**

TL: <u>tur   anake   sane nenten munduhang sareng-sareng ring **Tiang**</u>,

    And anyone who not   gather   together   with **1P MF**

The translation from *I* into **tiang** employed **MF**, was due to the vertical-down interaction of A1 UC and
    A2 MC

3.2.2. Appreciation in Progression of Vertical-up Interaction

(03)	*on the Judgement Day the Queen of Sheba will stand up and accuse the people of today, because* **she** *traveled all the way from her country to listen to King Solomon's wise teaching; and there is something here,* **I** *tell* **you***, greater than Solomon.*(Luk11: 31)	Rikala rauh Rahina Pangadilane, Sang Ratu Istri saking jagate kelod pacang, mapadu arep ring jadmane ring masane mangkin, tur ida pacang nyisipang ipun. Santukan **ida** rauh saking tanggun gumine misadia mirengang kawicaksanan Ida Sang Prabu Salomo. **Tiang** nuturin **ragane**, sujatinne sane mangkin iriki wenten anak sane luihan ring Sang Prabu Salomo.

	Variation Forms of Linguistic Domain	Field	Tenor: Social Strafication / Attitude		Mode
SL	*I – you : she*				
TL	**tiang-ragane :ida**	The demand for a miracle	A1: Jesus (*title*) A2: Group of people (*social status*) A3: Queen of Sheba (*role*) A2n: Indirect Addressees (*social statusl*)	*Judgment* UC ↓ :UC LC	Statement, MF, RF, Monolog

The Queen of Sheba was once a queen that came from far away who used to do a miracle. She would arise at the Judgement Day and acted as a witness against the people living in Jesus' Day. However, Jesus convinced the group of people that he was greater that her, as stated in (03):

SL: *because* **she***…,* **I** *tell* **you***,…*

BT: <u>Santukan **ida** ..., **Tiang**   nuturin **ragane**</u>, ...

LT: because 3P RF, 1P MF tell   2P MF

In the translation *I – you*: choice made by the translation, as a formal equivalence, into <u>ttiang</u> – <u>ragane</u> in MF, and *she* into <u>ida</u> in RF, was due to vertical-down interaction between A1 (UC) – A2 (LC), and horizontally about A3, having the same social stratification, (UC).

(04)	*("Ah! What do you want with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Are you here to destroy us?)* **I** *know who* **you** *are:* **you** *are God's holy messenger!"*(Luke 4 : 34)	("Inggih Ratu, Hyang Yesus saking kota Nasaret, napi sane arsayang IRatu ring titiang? Punapike IRatu puniki mapakayun nyirnayang titiang?**) Titiang** uning sira sujatinne **IRatu**: **IRatu** puniki Utusan Ida Sang Hyang Widi Wasa sane suci! "

In (04), the devil [reaction] knew that Jesus [appreciation] would interfere with the affair of a man who had the spirit of an evil demon in him. Regarded as an enemy, through the man [impact, -tedious], the devil said to Jesus:

SL: *I know who* **you** *are*

TL: **Titiang** <u>uning sira sujatinne</u> **IRatu**

1P HF know who really   **2P RF**

SL: *you are God's holy messenger'*

TL: **IRatu** puniki Utusan   Ida Sang Hyang Widi Wasa   sane   suci'

  : **2P RF** this   Messenger God   mighty which holy

From the vertical-up interaction, we can see that the devil addressed itself **titiang**, and addressed Jesus **IRatu**. The translation from *I – you* into **titiang** – **IRatu** employed HF/ RF was due A1 LC and A2 UC.

3.2.3. Judgment in Progression of Horizontal Interaction

(05)	*and said to him, "Tell **us**, what right do **you** have to do these things? Who gave you the right to do them?"*(Luke 20 : 2)	saha matur pitaken ring Ida Hyang Yesus, sapuniki: "Indayang ndikayang ring **tiang**, wewenang punapi sane druenang **Ragane**, buat nglaksanayang saluiring paindikane punika. Tur sapasira sane ngicen Ragane wewenang punika?"

Address Forms' Variation		Field	Tenor / Social stratification	Mode	*Attitude* / Stratification
SL	*us - you*				
TL	**tiang-ragane**	Question about Jesus' authority to teach in the synagogue	A1: Chief of the Priests (*Profession*) A2: Jesus (*Tittle*)	Rhetorical question, MF, monolog	Judgment, social esteem, tenacity, - reckless MC ⟶MC

In the point of view of the chief priests and the teachers of the law together with the elders, Jesus was considered had no right to teach in the synagogue. Accordingly, in (05), Jesus authority to teach in the synagogue was questioned by the chief priests:

Sl: *Tell **us**, what right do **you** have…*

TL: Ndikayang ring **tiang**,   wewenang punapi sane druenang **Ragane**, …

    Tell   to   **1P MF**   right   what   which possess **2P MF** …

From the rhetorical question, they thought [judgment] that how resolute 'He' was [tenacity, - reckless] to teach together with them. From the horizontal interaction, we can see that they addressed themselves **tiang**, and addressed Jesus **Ragane**. Shift done by the translator from **titiang** – **IRatu** (HL) into **tiang** – **Ragane** (MF) was due to negative attitude [- reckless] of A1 that construed A2 in MF.

3.2.4. Affect, Appreciation, and Judgment in Context of Situation

1.1.4.1 Affect

(06)	*The people stood there watching while the Jewish leaders made fun of him, "He saved others; let him save himself, if **he** is the Messiah whom God has chosen!"* (Luke 23 : 35)	Anake akeh pada majujuk tur mabalih, sadaweg para pamimpin Yahudine pada minjulin Ida, sapuniki pangucapnyane: "Anak lenan suba pada tulungina. Yen saja **ia** Sang Prabu Ane Kajanjiang baan Ida Sang Hyang Widi Wasa, ane jani apanga tulungina ibanne!"

" ... let him save himself... " was Jewish's leaders order to the group of people but meant to Jesus [affection]. The disbelief of the Jewish leaders towards who Jesus was had made them said the following mocking statement, as in (06)

:SL: *if **he** is the Messiah whom God has chosen*

TL: Yen saja   **ia**   Sang Prabu Ane Kajanjiang baan Ida Sang Hyang Widi Wasa

    If   really **3P OF** the king Who Promised by God   Mighty

   [affection, insecurity, - anxiety]

Reader-focused shifts of coherence in translation employed from *he* into ia OF instead of Ida RF was due to A1 MC construed A3 LC.

1.1.4.2 Appreciation

(07 *And he said to Jesus, "Remember me, Jesus, when **you** come as King!"* (Luk 23: 42)

Raris ipun matur ring Ida Hyang Yesus: "Inggih Ratu Hyang Yesus, elingangja titiang yening **I Ratu** sampun madeg Ratu."

There were two other men, both of them criminals, to put to death with Jesus. One of them had insulted Him, and in the other hand the other one not just in the sense of thinking about him, but also hoping that He would do something for him, as in (07)

SL: *Remember me, Jesus, when **you** come as King*

TL: Inggih Ratu Hyang Yesus, elingangja <u>titiang</u> yening **I Ratu** sampun madeg Ratu

    Oh   King God   Jesus, remember **1P HF** when **2P RF** already become King

The translation from *you* into <u>I Ratu</u> 2P RF, was due to A1 LC acknowledged A2 UC as a king in the kingdom of God.

1.1.4.3 Judgment

(08) *One of them, named Cleopas, asked him, "Are **you** the only man living in Jerusalem who does not know what has been happening there these last few days?"* (Luke 24 : 18)

Sinalih tunggal saking pantaran sang kalih, sane mawasta Kleopas, masaur sapuniki: "Punapi wantah **Jerone** kewantenke Anak pendonan sane wenten ring kota Yerusalem, sane tan uning ring paindikane sane wau-wau puniki?"

The 3rd day after Jesus death, Jesus' followers found that the stone rolled away from the tomb and it was empty. Jesus was not seen by anyone when He was raised to Life. Cleopas, one of His followers, even did not recognize Him when Jesus had been having a discussion with him and thought that Jesus was a stranger. At the same time, looking very sad, he questioned Him as in (08)

SL: *Are **you** the only man living in ...?*

TL: <u>Punapi wantah **Jerone** kewantenke Anak pendonan sane wenten ring kota ...</u>

    What   just   **2P MF** only   Man live   which is   in city

    [Judgment, social esteem, normality, - hopeless].

<u>Jerone</u>, similar to <u>ragane</u>: is less deference, used for stranger, (Kersten, 1984 : 312)). The translation from *you* into <u>jerone</u> 2P MF instead of <u>I Ratu</u> 2P RF, was due to A1 MC judged A2 MC as a stranger.

From the above explanation we can summarize that the choice of variations of pronouns done by the translator as a social interpersonal meaning was due to the certain context of situation as it can be seen in the diagram below.

Types of Attitude	Class of Jesus	Field	Tenor	Mode	Variations of Adress Terms
Affect UC ↓ : LC LC	Lower Class	The Jewish leaders insulted Jesus when He was crucified in the hill of Golgota	A1: Jewish lesders A2: Group of people A3: Jesus	Statement, OF, Monolog	**Ia 3P OF**
Appreciation **UP** ↑ LC	Upper Class	The Roman Officers crufied Jesus at the hill of Golgota	A1: the other criminal A2: Jesus	Statement, RF, Monolog	**I Ratu 2P RF**
Judgement MC→**MC**	Middle Class	Day 3. The Resurrection. Yesus Rises from Death	A1: Cleopas, one of Jesus, followers A2: Jesus, as a stranger	Interrogative, MF, monolog	**Jerone 2P MF**

3.2. Expressive Meanings

Reader orientation under covers of Dynamic Equivalence may result in choice of linguistic variation forms of meaning potentials in a social domain. It is due to the difference in cultural system of the two languages.

Shifts made by the translator for the closest natural equivalent aimed at its reader can be done either through grammatical dependencies which is called cohesion shift or through conceptual dependencies which is called coherence shift (Baker,1992:218, Brata, 2008).

3.2.1. Cohesion Shifts

(09	*How glad and happy you will be, and how happy many others will be when **he** is born!* (Luk 1: 14)	Kita lakar liang tur masuka rena, buina liu anake lakar pada milu masuka rena uli krana lekad **pianak kitane** (anakmu) ento.

Zechariah and Elizabeth married for long, but they had no children because Elizabeth could not have any. God had heard his prayer and through His angel, He announced the birth of John the Baptist, as stated in (09:

SL: *... when **he** is born*

TL: ... uli krana lekad **pianak kita(ne)** ento.

    … because born **son** **2P rough poss** that

The transposition technique in the translation from 3P (*he*) into 2P poss (pinak kitane) was employed to stress the blood kin relationship: possesive between participants: Zechariah as A1 and his son as A2, John the Baptist.

(10)	*One time when Jesus was praying alone, the disciples came to him. "Who do the crowds say **I** am?" he asked them,* (Luk 9 : 18)	Sedek rahina anu, rikala Ida Hyang Yesus ngastawa praragayan, parasisian Idane rauh nangkilin Ida. Ida raris mataken ring dane sapuniki: "Manut panyengguh anake liu, nyenke **Guru** ene?"

Jesus knew that Herod, the king, was confused about the rumors going around about who He was. It happened one time that as Jesus was praying alone, His disciples came to him; and Jesus asked one of them as in (10:

SL: *Who do the crowds say **I** am?*

TL: Manut panyengguh anake liu, nyenke **Guru** ene?

    According to opinion people many, who **Teacher** this?

The transposition tehnique in the translation from pronomina (*I*) into nomina (<u>Guru</u>) was employed to stress the title of A1 towards A2.

3.2.2. Coherence Shifts

(11	*because he has remembered **me**, his lowly servant! From now on all people will call me happy,* (Luk 1 : 48)	santukan Ida ledang macingak ring **kaulan Idane** sane nista dama. Ngawit saking mangkin sakancan jadmane pacang majarang titiang bagia,

Mary was talking to herself. With all of her heart she praised the Lord, because He had looked upon the condition of His servant, as stated in (11:

SL: *because he has remembered **me***

TL: santukan Ida ledang macingak ring **kaula(n) Ida(ne)**

    because 3P willing to see at **servant 3P**

Shift of differerent focus of point of view from 1P (me) into addition of lexical <u>kaula</u> followed by 3 P (Idane) employed to show the humbleness of A1.

| (12 | *But God said to him, **'You fool**! This very night you will have to give up your life; then who will get all these things you have kept for yourself!"* (Luk 12 : 20) | Nanging Ida Sang Hyang Widi Wasa masabda ring ipun sapuniki: 'lh **jlema belog**! Dipetenge jani urip ibane lakar kabanjut. Nyen lantas namiang sakancan branane ane suba punduhang iba ento?' " |

The parable of a foolish rich man was told by Jesus to warn against love of the riches as stated in (12):
SL: *'You fool!*
TL: 'lh   **jlema**   belog!
   'Oh **human** stupid
    As Bible has to present to all people, shift from different focus of point of view from specicic A2 **you** into generic A3 **jlema** as impersonal A3 employed that the rich person to whom Jesus was addressing to was intended to the rich people in general.

4. Conclusion

There were two types of meanings in the translation of English pronoun in Luke's Gospel and their translation into Balinese.
   (1) Propositional Meanings in a linguistic domain under covers of Formal Equivalence. Lexical choice made by the translator was due to the accurateness of the SL message through the linguistic variation forms of the potential meanings employing three dimensions of attitude of the Appraisal Theory: affect, appreciation, and judgment.
   (2) Expressive Meanings in a social domain under covers of Dynamic Equivalence. Lexical choice of the meaning potentials made by the translator was due to the naturalness of the SL message for its intended reader via either cohesion or coherence shift which was unavoidable in translation.
   Difference in two linguistic systems and cultures have made shifts in cohesion and coherence are unavoidable.

Daftar Pustaka

Baker, M. 1992. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Sage Publication.

Brata, Frans Made. 2008. Cohesion and Coherence shift of Expression in Translation. http://www.journal.discoveryindonesia.com/index.php/mli/search

Braun, F. 1988. *Terms of Address Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures*. New York: Mouton.

Collins, W.2005. *Collins Ebglish Dictionary*. Glasgow: Legoprint

Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1985. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University.

Kraft, Charles.H. 2002. *Christianity in Culture: A Study in Dynamic Biblical Theologising in Cross-Cultural Communication*. New York: Orbis Book.

Qian Hong. 2007. Investigating Unfaithful Translations via the Appraisal Theory – A Case Study of the Translations of Public Notices. Online Address: www.wartahpi.org/conference-program.pdf. Accessed on June 05, 2009.