

**INVESTIGATING THE TRANSLATION OF ADDRESS TERMS  
VIA ATTITUDE OF THE APPRAISAL THEORY**

Frans I Made Brata  
Fakultas Sastra,  
Universitas Udayana.  
[fbrata@gmail.com](mailto:fbrata@gmail.com)

**1. Background and problems**

In the translation of English address terms in Luke’s Bible into Balinese, the translator has to choose the proper variation form of address term due to the two different linguistic system and unknown concepts of specific religious-cultural terms.

**2. Concept and Theoretical Framework**

**2.1 Concept**

**2.1.1 Address Terms**

*Form of address are words and phrases used for addressing* (Braun, 1988:5). 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). In translating, the way how A1 addresses A2 and/or speaks about A3, may reflect the emotion of ‘feeling’ of A1 towards A2 and/or A3 employed through the choice of the available variation of forms. The profile of forms of English and Balinese pronouns can be seen below:

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

From the above diagram we can see that the 1P has no RF, and the 2P has no HF

**2.1.2. Criteria for Distribution of Class and Social Stratification**

By adapting the Balinese caste system, the participants in Luke’s Bible can be classified into three classes and four social classification as follow:

Class	Criteria for Distribution of Class and Social Stratification			
	Title	Role	Profession	Social Status
Upper Class (UC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jesus</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noble man</li> </ul>
Middle Class (MC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jesus Followers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leaders of the Jewish</li> <li>• Roman Officer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers of the Law</li> <li>• Chief Priest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pharisees</li> <li>• Stranger</li> <li>• Group of people</li> </ul>
Lower Class (LC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Devil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criminal</li> <li>• Servant</li> </ul>		

## 2.2. Theoretical Framework

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

Attitude consists of three types: (1), affect: personal emotion, (2) judgment: appraisal of other's moral behavior; or how people should or should not do, and (3) appreciation: evaluation of phenomena All three ways of feeling can be either positive [+] or negative [-] (Hope, D. and Jonathan R. 2004: 7)

Based on the pronoun I – you (Tn-Vn) Address Terms Theory in the framework of the Appraisal Theory, the three types of attitude can be paralled with Balinese case system: (a) affect in SL in the progression of vertical-down interaction can be paralled to UC – LC employed OF: icang – cai in TL, (b) judgment in the progression of horizontal interaction can be paralled to MC – MC employed ML, and (c) appreciation in the progression of vertical-up interaction can be paralled to LC – UC employed HF / RF.

## 3. Factors Influence the Choice Done by The Translator(s) in The Translation of English Address Terms in Luke's Bible into Balinese

### 3.1 Text Factor

#### 3.1.1. Linguistic Factor

##### 3.1.1.1. Affect in The Translation *I - you*

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

The translation from *I – you* into **icang** – **cai** (*the nobleman to his servant*) employed OF was due to the progression of vertical-down interaction of A1 UC and A2 LC.

### 3.1.1.2. Judgment in The Translation *I – you*

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** ...

Shift done by the translator from **titiang** – **IRatu** (HL) into **tiang** – **Ragane** (MF) (*the chief priest to Jesus*) was due to negative attitude [- reckless] of A1 that construed A2 in MF.

### 3.1.1.3. Appreciation in The Translation *I – you*

SL: *I know who you are*

TL: **Titiang** uning sira sujatinne **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.

### 3.1.2. Cultural Factor

The different types of Possessive in Relational Process as a part of the Ideational Function in Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) can be used to trace why the possessive 'of' in religious-cultural concepts were translated using amplification translation techniques. *The Son of Man* is relational possessive: *attributive*.

	Literal Translation	with Amplification
SL	<i>The Son of Man</i>	
TL	Sang Putraning Manusa	Utusan Ida Sang Hyang Widi Wasa
	The Son of Man	Messenger God Mighty

### 3.2. OutsideText Factor

#### 3.2.1. Translator Preference

##### 3.2.1.1. Translators' Attitude

The two products of the translation's comparable corpora below can reflect the attitude of the message sender and that can be viewed either positively [ + ] or negatively [ - ] (White, 2001:1). Choice made by the two different translators can reflect the different subdivisions of attitude of the message sender and that can be viewed either positively [ + ] or negatively [ - ] as can be seen in the two examples below.

They were mostly the Teachers of the Law and always had different of understanding with Jesus when teaching in synagogue about what people should and should not do when practising their religion in their daily life. At the very hour some Pharisees came, and said to Him as in the example below.

SL: ***You** must get out of here*

TL:(a) Rarisangja **Ragane** makaon saking iriki.

Please **2P MF** go from here

[appreciation, valuation, - shallow]

TL: (b) Nawegang gelis-gelis **I Ratu** kesah saking iriki

Excuse quick-quick **2P RF** go from here

[appreciation, valuation, + profound]

From those two above versions, we can see that the appreciation of the translator's personal attitude through the message sender (a) was negatif [-]: employed MF due to the bad deed, while (b) was positif [+]: employed RF due to the good deed. The different point of view of

those two translators, as one of the readers, was due to the emotions or feeling of the translator evaluating the text.

### 3.2.2. Context of Situation

Jesus, as a central issue in Luke's Bible, in a context of situation was subject to get the different roles that brought Him into a different class due to the different dimension of attitude: affection, judgment, and appreciation of the message sender towards Jesus.

#### 3.2.2.1. Affect

"... 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:

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.

#### 3.2.2.2. Judgment

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:

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

TL: Punapi wantah **Jerone** kewanenke Anak pendonan sane wenten ring kota ...

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

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

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

### 3.2.2.3. Appreciation

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 stated:

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

TL: Inggih Ratu Hyang Yesus, elingangja titiang yening **I Ratu** sampun madeg Ratu

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

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

## 4. Conclusion

Types of attitude in the Appraisal Theory can be employed to determine the classes and stratifications of the social status of the participants. For pronouns address terms, affect can be paralleled to vertical-down interaction from UC towards LC employing OF: icang – cai; judgment to horizontal interaction from MC towards MC, or in the same classes employing MF: tiang-ragane; and appreciation to vertical-up interaction from LC towards UC employing HF/RF: titiang – Iratu. For objects or nouns which are not available in the TL, amplification techniques and reader-focused shifts of coherence done by the translator was due to the readability of the specific religious-cultural address terms.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Braun, F. 1988. *Terms of Address: Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures*. [http:// www.books.google.co.id/books](http://www.books.google.co.id/books). Accessed on June 05, 2009.

Hope, D. and Jonathan R. 2004. *Appraisal Theory the Language of Emotion, Ethics, and Aesthetics*. Online Address:

[www.cogs.susx.ac.uk/users/jlr24/presentations/appraisal\\_theory.ppt](http://www.cogs.susx.ac.uk/users/jlr24/presentations/appraisal_theory.ppt). Accessed on June 05, 2009.

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](http://www.wartahpi.org/conference-program.pdf). Accessed on June 05, 2009