

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA  
Peperiksaan Semester Kedua

Sidang 1987/88

HMP 404 - Terjemahan dan Penyuntingan

Tarikh: 9 April 1988

Masa: 9.00 pagi - 12.00 tengahari  
(3 jam)

Jawab SEMUA soalan.

1. Salah satu faktor pembeza antara komunikasi biasa dan terjemahan adalah maklumat sepunya (shared assumptions).

Bincangkan faktor tersebut dan kaitkan jawapan anda dengan tujuan utama terjemahan. Sertakan sekali gambar rajah model terjemahan yang bersesuaian.

(30 minit)

2. Nilai terjemahan berikut dan buat ulasan serta pembetulan. Jawapan anda mesti mempunyai dua bahagian:

- i. Ulasan terjemahan;
- ii. Versi terjemahan yang telah dibaiki.

TEKS ASAL

8.1.2 *Topic and comment*

It has already been mentioned that, from the time of Plato onward, the definition of the noun and the verb has been closely associated with the distinction of subject and predicate (cf. 1.2.5, 7.6.4.). Sapir was merely repeating the traditional view when he said: 'There must be something to talk about and something must be said about this subject of discourse....The subject of discourse is a noun....No language wholly fails to distinguish noun and verb, though in particular cases the nature of the distinction may be an elusive one.' In this passage, Sapir implicitly defines the subject as the person or thing about which something is said, and the predicate as the statement made about that person or thing. But this is only one of the ways in which subject  
.../2

and predicate have been defined by grammarians. Since we shall also be considering some of these other definitions, we will adopt Hockett's now widely accepted terminology for the notions referred to by Sapir: we will call the person or thing about which something is said the *topic*, and the statement made about this person or thing the *comment*.

Hockett introduces these terms as follows: 'The most general characterization of predicative constructions is suggested by the terms "topic" and "comment"...: The speaker announces a topic and then says something about it. Thus *John/ran away; That new book by Thomas Guernsey/I haven't read yet*. [The oblique stroke in the sentences used as examples indicates the major constituent-structure break.] In English and the familiar languages of Europe, topics are usually also subjects and comments are predicates: so in *John/ran away*. But this identification fails sometimes in colloquial English, regularly in certain special situations in formal English, and more generally in some non-European languages.'

\*\*\*\*\*

### TEKS BAHASA SASARAN

#### 8.1.2 *Berita dan cerita*

Telah dinyatakan sejak masa Plato definisi bagi kata nama dan kata kerja mempunyai hubungan rapat dengan perbezaan di antara subjek dan predikat (cf 1.2.4, 7.6.4) Sapir mengulangi pandangan tradisi ini apabila dia mengatakan, 'Mesti terdapat sesuatu untuk dikatakan dan sesuatu yang dikatakan adalah tentang subjek di dalam perbincangan...Subjek perbincangan ialah kata nama....Tiada sebarang bahasa yang tidak boleh membezakan di antara kata nama dengan kata kerja walaupun di dalam beberapa kes semulajadi, perbezaan mungkin dielakkan'. Di dalam hal ini, Sapir telah mendefinisikan subjek orang atau benda atau berkenaan dengan benda yang dikatakan dan predikat sebagai kenyataan yang dibuat tentang orang atau benda. Tetapi ini hanyalah sebagai cara mendefinisikan berkenaan dengan subjek dan predikat yang telah dibuat oleh ahli-ahli tatabahasa. Sejak kita mengambil kira tentang beberapa definisi lain, kita akan menerima definisi yang dibuat oleh Hockett telah diterima secara meluas dan menjadi rujukan Sapir. Orang atau benda sebagai berita dan kenyataan yang mengatakan tentang orang atau benda sebagai cerita.

Hockett telah menjelaskan istilah itu sebagai berikut; ciri paling umum mengenai predikat dicadangkan oleh istilah berita dan cerita....Penutur mengatakan tentang berita dan kemudian mengatakan sesuatu tentangnya. Oleh itu *John/ran away; That new book by Thomas Guernsey/I haven't read yet.* [Garis miring di dalam ayat di atas digunakan sebagai contoh untuk merujuk konstituen utama - pembahagian struktur]. Di dalam bahasa Inggeris dan rumpun bahasa Eropah, berita selalunya merupakan subjek dan pradikat sebagai cerita seperti di dalam *John/ran away.* Tetapi identifikasi ayat ini gagal di dalam bahasa Inggeris basahan. Kriteria ini sesuai untuk bahasa Inggeris formal dan beberapa bahasa bukan Eropah.

(1 Jam)

3. Terjemahkan petikan di bawah ke dalam bahasa Malaysia.

### SEMANTIC COMPONENT

#### Semantic Categories and Labels

A British woman teaching English composition to a class of secondary school Kenya students once asked her class to write a composition about the English language--a "What English Means to Me" composition. The opening sentence of one student's composition was "English is a language which is full of words." And so it is! One of the three major components of native speakers' knowledge of the structure of their language relates to the meaning parts of their language and the words that represent these meaning parts or concepts--their "mental dictionary." This *semantic component* is an important part of the sound-meaning association system which constitutes the structure of a language. One thing the speakers of any language surely know is the way the people of their community view the world, the way they divide reality into significant categories and label them in their language.

No two language-culture communities view reality the same way, and each community's language reflects its world view, what it regards as the significant categories and relations of experience. Though all humans are endowed with the same types of perceptual and cognitive mechanisms, each group represents reality differently, assigning to their experience of the world different significance, groupings, relationships. Examples are legion of different groups dividing and labeling reality differently. The color continuum that English divides into the six categories labeled purple, blue, green,

.../4

yellow, orange, red, some American Indian languages divide into four labeled categories and others into only two categories. English speakers regard snow as a single category, but Eskimos have many categories for snow, depending on the kind of snow it is. English speakers see one (singular) and more than one (plural) as significant categories. But many languages differentiate between one (singular), two (dual), and more than two (plural). In English, this and that indicate near and not near spatial divisions. But some languages label spatial areas much more specifically with categories, for example, for "near me but not near you," or "far away from both of us," or "out of sight of both of us," or "near both/all of us." Much of what English categorizes as a "that" (inanimate), some languages categorize as a "who" (animate).

Every human being is born into a community which views reality its own way, and whose language reflects that world view. As a member of that community, the human learns that particular world view as he learns the language which expresses the groupings and relations it labels. Because we live with the categories our language uses, we tend to feel that these categories and labels are somehow God-given or inherently logical in the objects and experiences themselves. But this is clearly not so, for if our categories and labels were inherently logical, then all languages would encode the same categories. As we have seen, they do not. Each culture simply groups diverse objects, experiences, and events so that its members, in a sense, agree to regard some sets of unidentical things which share certain features, as "the same" or equivalent, and to regard other events, experiences, and objects not possessing certain crucial features, as "different." as belonging to different classes or categories. The words of our language convey our categories.

It has been argued by many, Benjamin Whorf chief among them, that one's way of thinking and of viewing the world is determined by the language he learns, for as he learns his language, he is necessarily learning the categories and relations it encodes. The English speaker views (and labels) some things as "red" and others as "orange," some things as animate and others as inanimate, because his language "tells" him through its labels that it is so. Certain features of object shape, or certain spatial divisions, he regards as significant and used as categorization bases for new items or experiences, because his language expresses categories based on these dimensions. Other potential category bases--those his language does not use (though other languages may)--he does not use as bases for grouping his experiences into categories.

Many, including me, would protest that this deterministic view of the iron control that language has over the way one thinks is too strong. Native speakers of one language are able to learn, to some degree, to think about reality as organized according to some scheme other than the one their own language expresses. We do so, to some extent, every time we learn an additional language. That our thinking is not completely controlled by our language seems clear from the fact that we can, at some intellectual level, consider other possible categorization schemes. And anthropologists do, after all, study cultures other than their own and come to understand, at least to some extent, the world view of the group under study, though never completely. How could this happen if anthropologists were unable to think outside of the framework imposed on them by their own language?

(1 1/2 jam)

-ooo000ooo-