

**‘OFF-RECORD’ STRATEGIES FOUND IN PRAMOEDYA ANANTA TOER’S
“BUKAN PASAR MALAM” AND THEIR TRANSLATIONS IN ITS TRANSLATED
ENGLISH VERSION “IT’S NOT AN ALL NIGHT FAIR” BY C.W. WATSON**

Angga Aminullah Mansur
STIBA INVADA Cirebon, Indonesia
qazkila246@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the ‘off-record’ strategies applied in conversations among characters found in Pramoedya Ananta Toer’s *Bukan Pasar Malam* and their translations in its translated English version by C.W. Watson, the reasons or backgrounds they are applied, and the techniques of translation occupied to translate them. Pararell to communicative strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) as citted by Yule (1996), the off-record strategy tends to be expressed implicitly as opposed to the ‘on-record’ strategy which is reativley more explicit. As found in the novel, the off-record strategies applied by characters are occasionally expressed in statements or declarative sentences which hold particular illocutionary forces. On the other hand, the techniques used in translating them seem to have constantly maintained the illocutionary forces though changes in form probably occur.

Keyword: off-record, communicative strategy, technique, translation

INTRODUCTION

In general, there are a couple of ways one can apply when one wants to ask other to do something. The very first way is by saying something and another way is by saying nothing. These two ways of communication are well known as the basis of communicative strategies or, specifically, as they are also recognized, as politeness strategies (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Yule, 1996). Both of those strategies come out as the result of people’s inclination to keep their self-image undaunted. The first strategy is the most common and obvious one. By saying something, people could just utter or express literally what they really want to say. Whilst, by saying nothing, people tend to use or apply some particular gestures without having to say any single word. In addition to the first strategy mentioned, people can state or express some intended utterances which directly relate to what they really want to say—this scheme is renowned as ‘on-record’ strategy. If people say something which unlikely seems to have any direct relationship to what they really mean to utter, this means that they pick out an ‘off-record’ strategy.

Bukan Pasar Malam is one of Pramoedya Ananta Toer’s classics. It tells about a personal story of a person coming home to Central Java to confront the dying and death of his father. Thereafter, he encounters some particular circumstances where he is forced to find value and meaning in not only his father’s life, but also his own as a person (Watson, 2001). The story emerges through a narrative told by the man himself as the first person and conversations within characters involved in it. The situational context and distance shared by those characters are varied, resulting in variant speech acts and strategies. Among those strategies, the off-record strategy is the least applied strategy. This strategy is mostly employed by the *Bapak* character—one of the main central characters constructing the story line.

Analyzing the translations of the off-record strategy found in the translated English version of the novel leads the writer to identify the equivalences of the strategies in English, how they are translated, and how the translator maintains the illocutionary forces the strategies have.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Brown & Levinson's Concept of Communicative Strategy

There are several ways people can take as strategies to express or utter what they really desire to say when they are practically involved in some interpersonal communication setting. As cited by Yule (1996), Brown and Levinson (1987) propose some communicative strategies people can apply when they want other to do something. In their concept they label as "*How to get a pen from someone else*", people can take two principle strategies in expressing their need, either by saying something or by saying nothing through some particular gestures. The first strategy mentioned comprises two sub-strategies: the on-record and the off-record strategy. By doing on-record, people tend to express what they really want explicitly through some explicit utterance called bald-on strategy as in "*Give me a pen*", or by modifying them by applying two face-saving act strategies known as positive and negative politeness strategies as in "*How about letting me use your pen?*" and "*Could you lend me a pen?*". On the other hand, by doing off-record, people will apply some indirect utterance which tends to be superficially out of context as in "*I forgot my pen*". The former strategy will be discussed further in the section below.

The 'Off-Record' Strategy

The off-record strategy is labeled as deference strategy (formal politeness). It emphasizes on the independency of the speaker and the hearer involved in an utterance (Yule, 1996). This concept is pretty much alike with indirectness in Fraser's illocutionary-act modification concept. According to Fraser (1980), indirectness is certainly the most obvious way people could apply to modify the illocutionary force of an utterance. By applying this strategy, the utterance is then made more palatable. The off-record strategy or indirectness is classified into syntactical-device. It comprises passive construction, agent deletion, the use of impersonal pronouns, nominalization, giving hints, rhetorical question, being ironic, ambiguity, etc (Holmes, 1984; Brown and Levinson, 1987). All of which, as it is shown above, are applied to create distance to arouse independency of both speaker and hearer that is marked by the absent of personal claims. For instance, instead of saying "*Give me your pen!*" or "*Could you lend me a pen?*" people can merely say some implicit utterance as "*I forgot my pen*" (Yule, 1996).

Translation

Translation is defined not only as transferring message from one language to another (Catford, 1965; Newmark, 1981; Brislin in Nababan, 1999), but also as transferring culture (Munday, 2001). It can also be viewed in, at least, as it is commonly talked about, two perspectives: as a process and as a product. As a process, it refers to the role of the translator in the process of taking the original or source text (ST) and turning it into a text in another language (TT). Whilst as a product, it views translation as the concrete translation product produced by the translator (Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997; Hatim and Munday, 2004). In conjunction with the first perspective, the practice of translation is regarded as a cycle that comprises three repeated-able actions—analyzing, transferring, and restructuring (Nida and Taber, 1982). This series of activities is principally aimed at finding solutions toward any translation problems that might appear in the long run to achieve the most appropriate translation goal in the receptor language (Mansur, 2014).

Translation Technique

Molina and Albir (2002) suggest such a comprehensive nomenclature of translation technique. They put the finishing touches on previous ideas of translation technique proposed by their predecessors, namely Vinay and Darblenet, Nida, Margot, Vasquez Ayora, Newmark, and Delisle. In this table below are the techniques they put forward:

Table 1

No	Techniques	Description	No	Techniques	Description
1.	Adaptation	Replacing cultural element in ST with one in TT	10.	Linguistic Amplification	Adding linguistic elements
2.	Amplification	Introducing details which are not formulated in ST	11.	Literal Translation	Word for word translation
3.	Borrowing	Taking a word or expression straight from another language	12.	Modulation	Changing the point of view, focus, or cognitive category related to the ST
4.	Calque	Literal translation of a foreign word or phrase	13.	Particularization	Using a more precise or concrete term
5.	Compensation	Introducing a ST element of information or a stylistic effect in another place in the TT.	14.	Reduction	Suppressing a ST information item in the TL
6.	Description	Replacing a term or expression with a description of its form or function	15.	Substitution	Changing linguistic elements for paralinguistic elements
7.	Discursive Creation	Establishing a temporary unpredictably out of context equivalence	16.	Transposition	Changing a grammatical category
8.	Generalization	Using a more general or neutral term	17.	Variation	Changing linguistic or paralinguistic elements that affects aspect of linguistic variation
9.	Linguistic Compression	Synthesizing linguistic elements in the TL	18.	Established Equivalent	Using a term or expression recognized (by dictionary or language use) as an equivalent in the TL

METHODOLOGY

This analysis uses a descriptive qualitative method where the off-record strategies found in the novel, their translations in the translated English version, the techniques applied to translate them, become the focal points of discussion. The data are also validated through the use of triangulation method comprising document analysis, taxonomy, and componential analysis as the basis of discovering the cultural value.

DISCUSSION

Based on the analysis conducted on the novel, it turns out that the off-record strategies are not abundantly applied. The writer only found eight data to be considered as the implementation of this strategy. This strategy is mostly used in utterances found in conversations among *Bapak* character and the narrator. Structurally, the utterances indicating the strategy are mostly actualized in declarative sentences. But pragmatically, they implicitly

hold some particular illocutionary forces such as commanding and refusing. From eight data found, it is discovered that four data implicitly hold commanding illocutionary forces, three data subtly occupy refusing illocutionary forces, and one tacitly retains accepting illocutionary force.

D/01-ST/p.19-TT/p.14

ST

Aku batuk-batuk.

“Engkau terlalu dekat pada jendela,” kata isteriku.

Dan kami berganti tempat

TT

I coughed.

“You’re too close to the window,” said my wife.

And we changed place.

From the data above we can see that the utterance in ST *“Engkau terlalu dekat pada jendela”* which is translated into *“You’re too close to the window”* is actualized in a declarative sentence or a statement. Semantically, the utterance doesn’t seem to have other meaning but simply information about the hearer’s position which is too close to the window. The speaker frees the hearer from any claims that can violate the independency of the hearer. Pragmatically, on the other hand, this utterance seems to have not only one single meaning. It truly has something more gets communicated than is said. According to the context, the utterance *“Engkau terlalu dekat pada jendela”* is actually intended to ask the hearer to move away from the window or to change seat with the speaker since the speaker notices the hearer cough as it is presumably too windy for him to sit next to the train’s window. Speaking of the translation, the utterance is literally translated into *“You’re too close to the window”* instigating it to constantly keep the similar illocutionary force as what is conveyed in the ST. It means that by applying literal technique the translator successfully maintains the implicit meaning conveyed by the ST into the TT. Another example can be seen in the data below.

D/05-ST/p.34-TT/p.29

ST

“Bagaimana makan Bapak?”

Ayah membuka matanya dan kepalanya dimiringkan... Terdengar:

“O—,” tapi ia tersenyum, “siapakah yang sampai hati memakan daging yang sebesar-besar itu?”

TT

“Would you like to eat something, father?”

Father opened his eyes and turned his eyes.... We heard:

“Ah,” but he was smiling. **“Who’s got the heart to eat meat the size of that?”**

The utterance *“Siapakah yang sampai hati memakan daging yang besar-besar itu?”* is categorized as a rhetorical question provided as the response to the speaker’s offer *“Bagaimana makan Bapak?”* Instead of saying some more explicit ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer as the response, the speaker responds in some indirect way by applying a rhetorical question that doesn’t even need an answer or a reply from the hearer. This strategy implicitly indicates a refusal. In term of its translation, the utterance in the ST *“Siapakah yang sampai hati memakan daging sebesar-besar itu?”* is translated by applying established-equivalence technique into *“Who’s got the heart to eat meal the size of that?”* It happens that the use of the technique doesn’t change its off-record strategy and its illocutionary force.

Here are the complete findings that convey all the off-strategies found, their equivalences, the illocutionary forces they have, and the translation techniques used.

Tabel 2

No	Data	Off-Record Type	Illocutionary Force	Technique	
1	D/01	ST/p.19	Giving Hints	Commanding	Literal
		TT/p.14	Giving Hints		
2	D/02	ST/p.22	Giving Hints	Commanding	Linguistic Compression
		TT/p.17	Giving Hints		
3	D/03	ST/p.33	Giving Hints	Accepting	Compensation
		TT/p.28	Giving Hints		
4	D/04	ST/p.33	Being Ironic	Refusing	Literal
		TT/p.28	Being Ironic		
5	D/05	ST/p.34	Rhetorical Q	Refusing	Established Equivalence
		TT/p.29	Rhetorical Q		
6	D/06	ST/p.35	Giving Hints	Commanding	Literal, Linguistic Compression
		TT/p.30	Giving Hints		
7	D/07	ST/p.58	Giving Hints	Commanding	Literal
		TT/p.51	Giving Hints		
8	D/08	ST/p.73	Being Ironic	Refusing	Literal
		TT/p.67	Being Ironic		

From the table above we can conclude that the off-record strategies found are actualized in the forms of giving hints, being ironic, and rhetorical question. Seven data are translated by singular technique comprising literal, linguistic compression, compensation, and established equivalence. And only one is translated by dual technique using the combination of literal and linguistic compression. Those techniques applied are ineffectual in initiating meaning shifts in case of illocutionary forces changes adhered to every each utterance.

CONCLUSION

The off-record strategies found in Pramoedya Ananta Toer's *Bukan Pasar Malam* tend to be actualized in the forms of off-record sub strategies namely giving hints, being ironic, and rhetorical question. Every utterance represents different illocutionary forces even sometimes their structural forms doesn't seem to represent the forces at all. All these strategies are applied to create distance to arouse independency of both speaker and hearer that is marked by the absent of personal claims (Yule, 1996). Those strategies are translated by applying translation techniques which tend to preserve the illocutionary forces although sometimes forms are altered. Those techniques are literal, linguistic compression, compensation, established equivalence, and the combination of literal and linguistic comprehension.

REFERENCES

- Brown, Penelope and S.C. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness Some Universals of Language Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Catford, J. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fraser, B. (1980). Mitigation. *Journal of Pragmatics* , 31: 341-350.
- Hatim, B. and J. Munday. (2004). *Translation an Advanced Resource Book*. New York: Routledge.
- Holmes, J. (1984). Modifying Illocutionary Force. *Journal of Pragmatics* , 8: 345-365.

Mansur, A. (2014). *Kualitas Terjemahan Bentuk Mitigasi pada Tindak Tutur Memerintah (Commanding) dalam Dua Seri Novel Harry Potter (Sebuah kajian Terjemahan dengan Pendekatan Pragmatik)*. UNS: Unpublished.

Molina, R and H. Albir. (2001). Translation Techniques: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs/Meta: Translations' Journal*, Vol. XLVL, No. 2 , 498-512.

Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing to Translation*. New York: Routledge.

Nababan. (1999). *Teori Menerjemahkan Bahasa Inggris*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Nida, E. A and C.R. Taber. (1982). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.