

Reviewer

Gufran Ali Ibrahim
Burhan Nurgiyantoro
Setya Yuwana Sudikan
Sayama Malabar
Asna Ntalu
Sance Lamusu
Ellyana Hintu

PROSIDING

Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya dalam Perubahan Sosial
dan Lingkungan serta Implementasinya dalam Pembelajaran

PROSIDING

Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya dalam Perubahan Sosial
dan Lingkungan serta Implementasinya dalam Pembelajaran



Fakultas Sastra dan Budaya
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo

2017



PROSIDING

Seminar Nasional Bulan Bahasa 2017

Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya
dalam Perubahan Budaya Sosial dan Lingkungan
serta Implementasinya dalam Pembelajaran



Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Fakultas Sastra dan Budaya



PROSIDING

Seminar Nasional Bulan Bahasa 2017

Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya
dalam Perubahan Budaya Sosial dan Lingkungan
Serta Implementasinya dalam Pembelajaran

ISBN : 978-602-50665-0-4

Penulis

Gufran Ali Ibrahim dkk.

Reviewer

Gufran Ali Ibrahim

Burhan Nurgiyantoro

Setya Yuwana Sudikan

Sayama Malabar

Asna Ntelu

Sance Lamusu

Ellyana Hint

Penyunting

Usman Pakaya

Novriyanto Napu

Mira Mirnawati

Fakultas Sastra dan Budaya
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Jalan Jendral Sudirman No. 6 Kota Gorontalo

PENGANTAR

Alhamdulillah, puji syukur kami panjatkan ke hadirat Allah Swt., Tuhan Yang Maha Esa atas terselenggaranya kegiatan seminar ini. Seminar yang mengambil tema bahasa, sastra, dan budaya dalam perubahan sosial dan lingkungan serta implementasinya dalam pembelajaran adalah kegiatan akademik Fakultas Sastra dan Budaya, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo dalam memperingati Bulan Bahasa yang setiap tahunnya diperingati di bulan Oktober.

Kegiatan seminar ini mengangkat beragam isu mengenai eksistensi bahasa, sastra, dan pembelajaran dalam melihat gejolak perubahan sosial dan lingkungan, serta bagaimana institusi pendidikan, akademisi, praktisi, dan pemerhati menyikapi perubahan tersebut. Hal ini penting dilakukan, sebagai persiapan untuk menghadapi tantangan literasi digital yang semakin mengglobal di depan.

Ucapan terima kasih dan apresiasi yang sebesar-besarnya kami haturkan kepada semua pihak yang telah berpartisipasi atas terselenggaranya kegiatan seminar ini. Rektor Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, civitas akademika Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, pimpinan Fakultas Sastra dan Budaya, ketua Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, ketua Jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia Fakultas Sastra dan Budaya, seluruh dosen Fakultas Sastra dan Budaya, *keynote speaker*, pemakalah, peserta seminar, dan semua pihak yang terlibat langsung maupun tidak langsung yang tidak sempat disebut di sini karena terbatasnya ruang yang ada. Utamanya ucapan terima kasih tak terhingga kami persembahkan kepada seluruh panitia, atas kerja kerasnya mensukseskan kegiatan seminar ini. Akhir kata, kami selaku pimpinan Fakultas Sastra dan Budaya berharap kegiatan seminar ini dapat memberikan manfaat yang besar kepada kita semua.

Gorontalo, Oktober 2017
Dekan Fakultas Sastra dan Budaya
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo

PRAKATA

Puji syukur dipanjatkan ke hadirat Allah Tuhan Yang Maha Esa atas segala rahmat dan hidayah yang telah diberikan kepada kita semua, sehingga Prosiding Seminar Nasional dalam rangka Bulan Bahasa pada tanggal 26 Oktober 2017 di Universitas Negeri Gorontalo dapat terwujud.

Seminar Nasional Bulan Bahasa tahun ini mengangkat tema ***“Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya dalam Perubahan Sosial dan Lingkungan serta Implementasinya dalam Pembelajaran”***. Melalui seminar ini bahasa, sastra dan budaya diharapkan untuk dapat lebih memberikan dampak yang lebih bermanfaat lagi dalam mewujudkan perubahan yang positif terhadap sosial dan lingkungan melalui pendidikan.

Adapun seminar nasional ini melibatkan beberapa pembicara utama yang juga merupakan guru besar dengan keahlian berkaitan dengan tema seminar. Berikut ini nama-nama pembicara utama.

1. Prof. Dr. Gufron Ali Ibrahim, M.S. (Badan Pembangunan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kemdikbud)
2. Prof. Dr. Burhan Nurgiyantoro (Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta)
3. Prof. Dr. Setya Yuwana Sudikan, MA (Universitas Negeri Surabaya)
4. Prof. Dr. Sayama Malabar, M.Pd. (Universitas Negeri Gorontalo)

Seminar ini menyasar berbagai kalangan yang peduli dalam perkembangan bahasa dan sastra. Para peserta terdiri dari dosen, peneliti, guru, mahasiswa, serta para pemerhati bahasa dan sastra.

Atas nama panitia, kami mengucapkan terima kasih yang tulus atas bantuan tenaga dan pemikiran, moral dan material kepada seluruh pihak yang mendukung berlangsungnya Seminar ini. Harapan kami, semoga Prosiding Seminar Nasional ini memberikan manfaat bagi perkembangan bahasa dan sastra dalam pendidikan di tanah air.

Gorontalo, 26 Oktober 2017
Panitia

DAFTAR ISI

Kata dan Kita: Penguasa Makna di Dunia Maya

Gufran Ali Ibrahim

Hal.1 – Hal.6

Sastra Anak dan Pembelajarannya

Burhan Nurgiyantoro

Hal.7 – Hal.16

**Ekologi Sastra (Ecocriticism) sebagai Disiplin Ilmu Baru
dalam Kritik Sastra Indonesia**

Setya Yuwana Sudikan

Hal.17 – Hal.46

Mengemas Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia

Berbasis Media Teks

Sayama Malabar

Hal.47 – Hal.54

Anxiety, Language Anxiety, and Second Language Acquisition:

A Brief Perspective

Muziatun

Hal.55 – Hal.60

Literasi dan Komunitas Baca:

Memaksimalkan Peran Sastra

**dan Meningkatkan Motivasi Belajar Siswa
di Sekolah**

Zakiyah Mustafa Husba

Hal. 61 – Hal.68

Revitalisasi Budaya Gorontalo

dalam Upaya Melestarikan Budaya Lokal

Supriyadi

Hal.69 – Hal.76

On Theoretical Approaches to Translation: Linguistic-Based Translation

Shift and Functional Theory

Novriyanto Napu

Hal.77 – Hal.84

Pengajaran Menulis Paragraf Deskriptif

Berbasis Lingkungan Sosial

Muhammad Akhir

Hal.85 – Hal.94

**Telaah Leksikostatistik dan Glotokronologi Bahasa Gorontalo dan
Bahasa Bulango di Provinsi Gorontalo
(Suatu Kajian Linguistik Historis Komparatif)**

Asna Ntelu
Hal.95 – Hal.102

**Eksplorasi Alam, Uang, dan Tradisi Menjaga Lingkungan dalam *Burlian*
Karya Tere Liye**

Ririn M. Djailani dan Magdalena Baga
Hal.103 – Hal.110

**Representasi Kerusakan Lingkungan di Kalimantan
dalam Novel Anak Bakumpai Terakhir Karya Yuni Nurmalia
(Perspektif Ekologi Sastra)**

Herman Didipu
Hal.111 – Hal.116

Pelestarian Budaya Suwawa Berbasis Lingkungan

Fatmah AR. Umar
Hal.117 – Hal.132

**Falsafah Hidup Masyarakat Muna: Kajian Linguistik Antropologi tentang
Konstruk Nilai Kearifan Bahasa Menghadapi Tantangan Global**

Adrianto dan Hadirman
Hal.133 – Hal.140

**Pembelajaran (Mulok) Sekolah Dasar
Berbasis Strategi Pembelajaran "*English For Young learners*"**

Rahmawaty Mamu dkk.
Hal.141 – Hal.146

**Pengokohan *Superego* Anak Didik
Melalui Kegiatan Membaca Karya Sastra Anak**

Herson Kadir
Hal.147 – Hal.152

**Protes Perempuan Amerika terhadap Ketidakadilan Sosial
melalui Anti Patriarki Tercermin dalam Cerita Detektif
Karya Pengarang Perempuan**

Mery Balango
Hal.153 – Hal.162

***Manusia Kelapa* dalam Perspektif Ekologi Sastra**

Darmawati M.R.
Hal.163 – Hal.170

**Encouraging English Foreign Language
University Students to Speak**

Nonny Basalama
Hal.171 – 180

**Kajian Campur Kode Bahasa
dalam Komunikasi Sosial Masyarakat Gorontalo di Facebook**

Yunita Hatibie
Hal.181 – Hal.190

**Kontribusi Cerita Rakyat Gorontalo
sebagai Jenis Ragam Sastra Anak**

Zilfa Achmad Bagtayan, dkk.
Hal.191 – Hal.204

ON THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO TRANSLATION: LINGUISTIC-BASED TRANSLATION SHIFT AND FUNCTIONAL THEORY

Novriyanto Napu
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo

Abstrak

Sejak tahun 1970an, kajian penerjemahan (Translation Studies) telah menjadi sebuah disiplin ilmu yang berdiri sendiri. Penerjemahan umumnya didefinisikan melalui berbagai cara dengan berbagai pandangan pendekatan dan teori berbeda. Beberapa definisi penerjemahan diantaranya lahir dari pendekatan teori penerjemahan dengan sudut pandang linguistik (linguistic approach) dan juga dari sudut pandang fungsional (functionalism). Tulisan ini akan mendiskusikan dua pendekatan penerjemahan dari sudut pandang linguistik dan fungsional yang memiliki pengaruh besar dan sering diperdebatkan dalam kajian penerjemahan. Tulisan ini akan membandingkan prinsip dasar dari *equivalence* dengan mempresentasikan teori *translation shift* atau pergeseran makna dan *Skopos* yang merupakan pendekatan dari teori fungsional. Kelebihan dan kekurangan dari masing teori tersebut juga akan didiskusikan.

Introduction

Theoretical approaches have always become a big issue in translation studies. Different people come with different idea and notions. However, there are some reviews and critics given to the theory by other experts and linguists. The theory such as the originality, functionalist and non-functionalist has been a big issue surrounding the translation since the late 1990s. This paper will look at two different notions in translation. The first one is the translations shift proposed by Catford, which is based on the idea of equivalence theory of translation and the second is the functional theory called Skopos proposed by Vermeers.

A shift can be defined as a transfer from the source language into the target language. In this respect, a translator needs to look at some criteria such as stylistics or even cultural aspects in order to gain a good translation result. According to Al-Zoubi & Al-Hassnawi (2001) revealed that shift should be redefined positively as the consequence of the translator's effort to establish translation equivalence (TE) between two different language systems. There have been some different kinds of theories proposed by translation experts or linguists such as Vinay and Darbelnet, Catford, Van Leuven-Zwart about the translation shifts since the phenomenon of the shift itself is unavoidable and essential in translation studies. Some different varieties of linguistic approaches have been proposed to the translation process in detail since the 1950s (Munday, 2001). For example, Vinay and Darbelnet as cited in Cyrus (2006), working in comparative stylistics and they developed a translation procedure system. Van Leuven-Zwart also has his concept of translation shift which introduced a comparative model of shifts and devised as a practical method for studying semantic, stylistics, syntactic and pragmatic styles in sentences, phrases, clause and literary text as well as their translation (Cyrus, 2006). Considering theories of translation shifts, this paper will look at the theory of translation shift which is proposed by Catford.

Translation Shifts

The term shift was firstly introduced by Catford in his book *The Linguistics Theory of Translation* (1965). His main contribution in the field of the theory of translation is the new introduction of his concepts about types and shifts of translation. He identified and

distinguished an essential distinction between formal correspondence that occurs between the source text and target text, and translational equivalence that holds within two portions of texts which are the translation of each other. It is revealed that Catford brought out an extensive types or kinds of translation in terms of three criteria which are 1) The extent of translation (full translation versus partial translation); 2) the grammatical rank at which the translation equivalence is established (rank bound translation versus unbounded translation); 3) the levels of language involved in translation (total translation versus restricted translation) Daninilege (2008). Catford himself followed the linguistic model of Firthian and Halidayan both of whom he knew analyzing language as communication. He is the first British linguist who used the term 'shift.' According to Catford in Venutti (2000) states "shifts are departures from formal correspondence in the process of translation, operating functionally in context and on a range of different levels such as phonology, graphology, and grammar (Munday.). Furthermore, Catford in Venutti (2000, p.141) states that "translation shift is the process of going from SL (source language) to the TL (target language)."

Furthermore, Catford considers two kinds of translation shift which are known as Level shift and category shift which are described as follows:

Level shift

Catford identified that a source language item at one linguistic level has a target language equivalent at a different level. It can be expressed by the grammar in a language and lexis in another. The example of this kind of shift can be seen from Russian as cited in Munday (2001) *igrat* (to play) and *sigrat* (to finish playing). This is translated by a lexical verb. Moreover, Catford in Venutti (2000) states that the translation between the level of phonology and graphology or vice versa is not possible. However, the level shift could be something that can be expressed by the grammar in one language and lexis in another. The example of level shift can be seen in the following between English and Indonesian language.

SL: *He is working on his assignments.*

TL : *Dia sedang mengerjakan tugasnya.*

The sentence is in progressive. In English, it is stated in grammatical level by showing the progressive tense, but in the Indonesian language, the translation is stated in lexical level, not in grammatical level.

Category shift.

According to Catford in Venutti (2000), this kind of shift refers to unbound and rank-bound translation or the departures from formal correspondence in translation. He mainly talks about this in his theory of translation shift. This shift consists of structure shift, class shift, unit shift, and intrasystem shift.

a. Structural Shift

This shift involves a change in grammatical structure between the source and target language. They occur in phonological and graphological translation and also in total translation (Catford in venutti, 2001). He gave an example of English-Gaelic in term of their clause-structure shift;

SL text: *John loves Marry*

TL text: *Tha gradh aig Ian air Mairi.*

An example of English-French can be seen as the following

SL: *I like Jazz*

TL: *J'aime le jazz.*

The French example is translated according to its equivalent in English in term of the grammar. It is structured as indirect pronoun + verb + subject noun (Munday, 2001). Another example can be seen from English- Indonesian as in *I love you* becomes *Aku cinta kamu* or *White House* becomes *Gedung Putih*. Example of English-Indonesian in the form of sentence is as follows:

SL : *They did not eat*

TL : *Mereka tidak makan*

Here, the source language and the target language are not formal correspondence. In the source language text, the auxiliary verb *did* occur to make the sentence negative. On the other hand, in the target language text, there is no need to use the auxiliary verb in making the sentence negative. Class Shift

This shift occurs when the translation equivalent of a source language item is a member of a different class from the original item. Catford gives an example of English-French such as *medical student* = *un etudiant en medicine*. In the example, the English pre-modifying adjective *medical* is translated by the adverbial qualifying phrase. In Indonesian, the example can be seen in the following:

SL: *the teachers were hostile to the students*

Adj

TL : *Para guru memusuhi para murid tersebut.*

Verb

It can be seen that the adjective *hostile* has an equivalent meaning as a verb in *memusuhi* in Indonesian. The word *memusuhi* is equivalent with the word *hostile*. Another example is a *medical student* (adjective + noun) becomes *mahasiswa kedokteran* (noun + noun) in Indonesian. The adjective *medical* in the source language which acts as a modifier is translated into a noun *kedokteran* in the target language. Here, the shift from adjective to noun occurs in the translation process.

b. Unit Shift or Rank Shift

Catford in Venutti (2001) says that unit shift is the departure from formal correspondence in which the translation equivalent of a unit at one rank in the source language is a unit at a different rank in the target language. The rank here refers to the hierarchical linguistic units of the sentence, clause, group, word, and morpheme. For example, the phrase *these days* can be translated into *sekarang* in the Indonesian language. The phrase *these days* becomes a word when it is translated into a target language or vice versa. Other examples can be seen from morpheme unit such as (SL): *Immortal* becomes (TL): *tidak abadi*. The morpheme *-im* is a morpheme which refers to negative meaning. This morpheme is translated into *tidak* in the target language. It is one of the examples of a morpheme to word translation in a unit shift. Moreover, (SL) *face pack* becomes *masker* in TL which causes a translation from the unit shift from a phrase into word.

(SL):the gross commercialism and ostentatious lifestyle of many of the newly rich in modern Southeast Asia, becomes

(TL: *Orang kaya baru di Asia tenggara dewasa ini memeperlihatkan komersialisme yang kasar dan dalam gaya hidup yang suka memaerken kekayaannya.*

Here, it can be seen that a phrase form in the source language is translated into a form of a clause in the target language. This is the example of the shift from a phrase into clause (Daninilege, 2008).

c. Intra-System Shift

This kind of shift occurs when the source language and target language have an approximately corresponding system the translation involves selection of a non-corresponding term in the target language system (Catford as cited in Munday, 2001, p.61., Venutti, 2000, p.146). Catford gave an example of English to French because these two languages can be said possess formally the corresponding system of *number* and article system. Although they have similar systems that operate in those two languages, they do not always correspond (Catford in Venutti (2000). For example, the word *advice* (singular) in English can become *des conseils* (plural) in French. In Indonesian language case, this shift can be identified in the word *cans* (plural) in English becomes *kaleng-kaleng* in Indonesian. Here, the plural word of English can be translated into reduplication in the Indonesian language.

As has been discussed above, it is evident that Catford sees and analyses a translation is a process of transferring and substituting a text from one language or source language to the text in the other language or target language. He also considers that language is working in a different level of steps such as graphology, phonology, syntax, lexis, and grammar. Additionally, he sees that language also is working on the level of ranks such as sentences, phrase, clause, group, morpheme, and word. According to Catford, one of the leading points of translation is that to define the theory of translation based on the equivalence which he considers as the basic of translating from a source language into the target language.

Furthermore, after he published his book of *The Linguistic Theory of Translation* in 1965, there have been many critics came to him. His book was highly and widely criticized. There are some linguists such as Hornby, Taylor, Hatim and Munday, Fawcett, Newmark, and Venutti who criticized his book. They think that his book is too highly theoretical, abstract, idealized, and decontextualized and never related to the whole text (Munday, 2001). For example, Venutti in Manfredi (2008) attacked his theory for being mainly focused on the level of words and sentences and unauthentic examples. Newmark also criticised his theory about the grammatically plural word in one language becomes a singular word in another language or vice versa to be more helpful tips for learners who are translating instead of giving a valuable theory to translation.

Moreover, Fawcett in Manfredi (2008) remarked that Catford himself was not unaware of his definition might create problems such as his ideas of the sameness of situation. Catford also was criticized about his theory that seems to define equivalence as a phenomenon which is fundamentally quantifiable, and so he was attacked by calling his theory as “*statistical touch*” (Hatim in Manfredi, 2008).

Despite many critics for him for decontextualizing the translation process, other linguists considered that he give a contribution to the translation theory. For example, Fawcett considers that Catford makes references to context and uses the social contextual function concept to suggest a solution to dialect translation (Fawcett in Manfredi, 2008). The findings of Catford in translation shifts brings out a critical theory in translation studies since his theory comprises essential approaches in equivalence such as linguistic and cultural approaches in translation especially in shifts which he put in his categorization.

Skopos theory

Skopos theory is an approach that was proposed by Hans Vermeer. The word Skopos was derived from Greek word which is used as the technical term for the translation purpose (Venuti, 2000., Munday, 2001). This theory has been a prevalent one since in late 1990 as there have been many people look at and discuss this theory (Berghout lecture, 28/10/2009). Skopos theory is oriented on the concept of functional and socio-cultural of translation. It is considered that translation is the specific form of human action rather than a process of translation.

One of the main tasks of translator theorists is to identify criteria to help translators choose an adequate translation strategy. The primary factor in determining the translation strategy was the text type. It was believed that translation strategy is determined by the type of audience which is the people or reader targeted and directed. From this point, the notion of this approach appears that said the same text could be translated differently for different readers and target. After that, the emphasis of translation was changed into the function or the purpose of translation. In Skopos theory, it is said that the functional approach asks the translators to produce a new text that fulfills the cultural expectation of the target reader.

Furthermore, the primary factor or aim of the theory is that the target readers or the address of who is going to read the translation which is, in this case, the audience. The theory focuses on producing a functionally adequate result of translation which is regarded as 'an offer of information' by Vermeer, and he called it the *translatum* (Munday, 2001). Moreover, Vermeer also introduced the domestication in the translation process which the result of the translation must be closed to the reader culture. He also gave the approach of foreignization which is to keep the source text value as well as to introduce it to the reader in the target text.

In Skopos theory, Vermeer introduced five rules in the approach which are defined as the following:

1. The target text is determined by its Skopos.
2. A target text is an offer of information in a target culture and target language concerning an offer of information in the source culture and source language.
3. A target text does not initiate offers of information in an apparently reversible way.
4. A target text must be coherent.
5. A target text must be coherent with the source text, (Munday, 2000).

Furthermore, Skopos theory has modernized the translation approach by introducing another alternative than traditional translation (Baker, 1998). In this functional approach, the translation focuses on the function of the translation that can be different from the source text while the traditional approach the translator is required to translate the essence of source text into the target text without doing any shift which is mainly the same with the source text. Also, the translator has to be faithful to the author of the source text and deliver what is written in the source text into the target text. Meanwhile, in Skopos theory, the translator is free to produce new text that can be different from the source text either in form or substance (Sarcevic, 2000).

A significant advantage which the Skopos theory brings out is that the possibility of the same text which can be translated into different ways according to the target readers. Therefore, texts can be translated free without using footnotes like in the literal translation. If it comes to translate a text such as a novel, there is no need to put a footnote which may interrupt the reading process (Munday, 2000).

However, despite the advantage of the Skopos theory, there are many critics and arguments against the theory. Some said that the theory ignores the essence of the

translation when it comes to translating legal or law text. The meaning will be different from the source text if it is translated using the Skopos approach which is using free translation according to the translators choice. It is also said that Vermeer's example oversimplifies the decision making the process of legal translators to the point that it is misleading (Sarcevic, 2000).

The critics of the Skopos theory are also mainly focusing on the relationship between the source and the target text. Translation expert like Newmark also criticized about the oversimplification which is inherent in functionalism, the emphasis on the message at the expense of the richness of meaning (Baker, 1998). Moreover, the central criticism of Skopos theory is that the extremeness of the theory which aims to the dethronement of the source text which is an inadmissible idea in the perspective of the legal translation where the source text is considered sacred. Also, Munday (2001) argues that this theory cannot be applied in literary translation.

Concluding comments

After looking at those two theories discussed above, it can be concluded that these theories brought out a significant influence on the translation studies. They have given a significant contribution to the development of translation theory despite some criticism that comes towards the theories. Catford himself comes out with his theory of translation that looks at the relationship between the textual equivalence and formal correspondence. Catford revealed that the textual correspondence is where the source text is equivalent to the target text and vice versa. While the formal correspondence is where the target text is as close as possible to the source text (Munday, 2000). Also, Catford makes references to context and uses the social contextual function concept to suggest a solution to dialect translation. However, his theory was considered too highly theoretical, abstract, idealized, and decontextualized and never related to the whole text.

On the other hand, Skopos theory aims at the purpose of translation and the function that the target text will fulfill the target culture which may not be the same as the purpose of the source text. The translator has the freedom to translate the same text into different way based on the purpose and the readers or the audience of the translation. The translator has his strategy to be used for translating a source text into the target text by looking at the cultural background of the readers in the target text (Venuti, 2000). It can be said that Skopos theory gives a significant advantage because it allows the freedom of translating a source text in different ways based on the target text cultural background and purpose. Skopos theory has helped to bring the target text into focuses (Baker, 1998). However, some theorists argued that this cannot be applied to the literary text.

References

- Al Zaobi, Mohammad Q.R., Al Hassnawi, Ali Rasheed. (2001). *Constructing a Model for Analysing Shift in Translation*. Irbid National University, Jordan. Retrieved from: <http://accurapid.com/journal/18theory.htm>.
- Amstrong, Nigel. (2005). *Translation, Linguistics, Culture*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd
- Baker, Mona. (1998). Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies. Great Britain: TJ International Ltd.
- Berghout, Anita. Lectures at Newcastle University 28/10/2009.
- Cyrus, Lea. (2006). *Building Resource for Studying Translation Shifts*. Arbeitsbereich Linguistik, University of M"unster, Germany. Retrieved from: <http://www.mt-archive.info/LREC-2006-Cyrus.pdf>.

- Daninilege (2008). *Methodology of Research*. Retrieved from:
<http://backgroundstudy.wordpress.com/2008/11/18/methodology-of-research/>.
- Kuhiwczak, Piotr., Littau, Karin. (2007). *A Companion to Translation Studies*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Manfredi, Marina. (2008). *Translating Text and Context: Translation Studies and Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Retrieved from:
http://amsacta.cib.unibo.it/2393/1/Manfredi_2008_Monografia.pdf.
- Munday, Jeremy. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge
- Sarcevic, Susan. (2000). Legal Translation and Translation Theory: a Receiver-oriented Approach. (University of Rijeka, Croatia). Retrieved from: <http://www.tradulex.org/>.
- Venutti, Lawrence. (2000). *Translation Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Prof. Dr. Gufran Ali Ibrahim, M.S.
Prof. Dr. Burhan Nurgiantoro
Prof. Dr. Setya Yuwana Sudikan, MA.
Prof. Dr. Sayama Malabar, M.Pd.

Badan Pembangunan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kemdikbud
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo

Muziatun	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Zakiyah Mustafa Husba	Kantor Bahasa Sulawesi Tenggara
Supriyadi	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Novriyanto Napu	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Muhammad Akhir	FKIP Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar
Asna Ntelu	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Ririn M. Djailani, Magdalena Baga	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Herman Didipu	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Fatmah AR. Umar	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Adrianto, Hadirman	Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Manado
Rahmawaty M., Nurlaila H., Indri W.B.	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Herson Kadir	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Mery Bulango	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Darmawati M.R.	Kantor Bahasa Provinsi Gorontalo
Nony Basalama	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Yunita Hatiebie	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
Zilfa A. Bagtayan, dkk.	Universitas Negeri Gorontalo



ISBN 978-602-50665-0-4



9 786025 066504