

## **SHIFTS IN TRANSLATING THE PROCLAMATION OF INDONESIAN INDEPENDENCE IN RICKLEFS' *A HISTORY OF MODERN INDONESIA SINCE c.1200***

**Anandika Panca Nugraha\***

### ***Abstract***

This article attempts to investigate the shifts in translating the Proclamation of Indonesian Independence in M.C. Ricklefs' book entitled *A History of Modern Indonesia since c.1200*. This descriptive qualitative research uses Catford's translation shifts and Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy of translation shifts as the theoretical groundwork in identifying the shifts and then analyzing their impact on the translation of the Proclamation text. After comparing the original and Ricklefs' translation, this research finds 16 shifts out of 19 pairs of units of translation including modulation, level shift, class shift or transposition, unit or rank shift, structural shift, equivalence, and adaptation. These shifts lead to a slight change in the text's formality. Research in translation shifts is potentially biased since there are no clear-cut boundaries of units of translation. As this article uses units of translation at the word and phrase levels, further research can be conducted by considering more complex units.

Key words: unit of translation, translation shift, translation, procedures, legal text.

### **Abstrak**

Artikel ini meneliti fenomena pergeseran dalam penerjemahan teks Proklamasi Kemerdekaan Indonesia yang terdapat di buku sejarah karangan M.C. Ricklefs berjudul *A History of Modern Indonesia since c.1200*. Penelitian deskriptif kualitatif ini menerapkan teori pergeseran penerjemahan Catford dan taksonomi pergeseran penerjemahan Vinay and Darbelnet dalam mengidentifikasi pergeseran dan kemudian menganalisis dampaknya terhadap teks terjemahan Proklamasi tersebut. Setelah membandingkan teks Proklamasi asli dengan terjemahan Ricklefs,

---

\* Penerjemah Pertama pada Bagian Humas Sekretariat Daerah Kab. Sampang, Jl. Jamaluddin No. 1A, Sampang, Jawa Timur 69213. [anand.nugraha@gmail.com](mailto:anand.nugraha@gmail.com).

penelitian ini menemukan 16 pergeseran dari 19 pasang unit penerjemahan antara lain modulasi, pergeseran level, pergeseran kelas kata atau transposisi, pergeseran unit atau peringkat kata, pergeseran struktural, pemadanan dan adaptasi. Pergeseran itu berdampak pada perubahan tingkat keformalan gaya bahasa teks terjemahan. Problematika penelitian pergeseran ini adalah adanya potensi bias mengingat tidak adanya batasan yang jelas dalam penentuan unit penerjemahan. Karena artikel ini menggunakan unit penerjemahan di tingkat kata dan frase, disarankan adanya penelitian lebih lanjut dengan mempertimbangkan unit penerjemahan yang lebih kompleks.

Kata kunci: unit penerjemahan, pergeseran penerjemahan, prosedur penerjemahan, teks hukum.

## 1.INTRODUCTION

Whatever translation strategy we employ, we deal with a number of units (words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and so forth) when working on the Source Text (ST) (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 17). As consequence of the systemic difference between Source Language (SL) and Target Language (TL), the process of reproducing message in translation would involve linguistic changes between the units of translation from ST to Target Text (TT). Catford (1965: 73) proposes a term for such changes called *shifts*, which refer to any departure from formal correspondence in the process of translating the units of SL to those of TL.

Although we agree that they must not change the main content or message of ST, their occurrences at surface levels (word, phrase, clause, sentence or even a whole text) may, to some extent, distort it. That is the challenge for translators. Message of the text is all we have to preserve. Nevertheless, it may be problematic when we translate a legal text or formal speech which *legalese* and formal style become their distinctive characteristics. In rendering such texts into another language, we need to transfer those features as well in order to maintain the soul or identity of

the ST. Whether or not the shifts that occur during translation process sacrifice the *legalese* variety, formality or even the content is something that deserves analysis.

This article attempts to figure out the kinds of shifts and impact that occur in the process of proceeding from the original text of Proclamation of Indonesian Independence as read by Sukarno in 1945 to the English translation in a history book entitled *A History of Modern Indonesia since c.1200* written by Merle C. Ricklefs. Although several translations of the Proclamation might exist, the rendition in Ricklefs' book is chosen for several reasons. First, it is included in a book whose author is well acclaimed as one of the most distinguished specialists on Indonesian studies. As Professor of History at some of the world's prominent universities and the recipient of the Centenary Medal from the Government of Australia in 1993 for his service in the study of Indonesia, Ricklefs is a bona-fide authority on the subject (Ricklefs, 2007). Second, of the major Indonesia-specific history books, Ricklefs' work, now in its fourth edition, is the best known (Hannigan, 2015). It is hardly omitted from the bibliographies or further reading lists of books about the history of Indonesia. Further, his book is also considered as the authoritative one (Drakeley, 2005: 189).

With respect to the reason for choosing the Proclamation text as object of the research, this article does not merely regard the formality of the text, but also values its historical importance for the founding of Indonesia as a sovereign country. Drafted a night before the declaration, the proclamation text carries spartan and forthright tones yet still in the formal and *legalese* style instead of dramatic and fiery language (Ricklefs, 2001: 260). It is then natural for the Indonesian people to expect that any translation of the Proclamation text be respectful of its identity as the declaration of Indonesia's independence. Therefore, investigating the shifts in its translation is an interesting research to undertake.

## 2. UNIT OF TRANSLATION

According to Hatim and Munday (2004: 33), the investigation of shifts in a translation product is possible to be conducted when we have identified the units or items of ST that are going to be rendered into TL. What is a unit of translation? Some scholars provide slightly different standpoints, especially in terms of classifying what linguistic element should be considered as the units of translation.

Shuttleworth and Cowie state that it refers to the linguistic level at which ST is recodified in TL (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 17). Thus, we can say that it is the element in the ST being rendered into TL by a translator. It may take the forms of a word, a phrase, a clause, a sentence or even the whole text. For example, the sign “NO SMOKING” can be disassembled into two units of translation: NO and SMOKING and their equivalents in Indonesian would also be two units: *DILARANG* and *MEROKOK*.

The inclusion of word into the units of translation, according to Vinay and Darbelnet, derives from the linguistic concept of sign by a prominent linguist, Ferdinand de Saussure (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 17). His concept about *signifier* (sound-image or word) and *signified* (concept) has much inspired the notion that a single word represents a concept or meaning. Therefore, a word should be considered a unit of translation and must be taken into account when working on a translation.

However, if we responded to it inattentively, then we might conclude that the best translation strategy is literal, or even, word-for-word translation in order not to miss any single signified contained by an individual word in ST. That is why Vinay and Darbelnet reject that word is a unit of translation with an argument that, during a translation process, a translator is supposed to focus on the semantic field rather than the formal properties of an individual signifier (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 18). It is the message that needs to be reproduced and conveyed to the readers or receivers, not the form of the text. Further, Vinay and Darbelnet specify

that a unit of translation is the smallest segment of the utterance whose signs are linked in such a way that they should not be translated individually (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 18). This is what they call *lexicological unit* or *unit of thought* which means a group of words or lexical items that collectively form a single unit of thought. Seemingly, what Vinay and Darbelnet propose is the consequence of their orientation to the principle of free translation rather than that of literal translation.

Other linguists such as Halliday and Newmark also have differing outlooks on this subject. Halliday (2004: 59) emphasizes clause as the central processing unit of meaning in a communicative context while Newmark (1988: 31) maintains that sentence is the most normal unit of translation. Accordingly, it allows translators to use transposition or rearrangement in the process of translation.

Despite those views, analyzing units of translation of legal and formal texts like the Proclamation of Indonesian Independence is not that simple. Its special features such as formal *style* and “frozen” expressions should be carefully considered. Hence, the identification of units of translation also needs to consider such aspects in order to guarantee that the genuine message and nuance are accurately conveyed. In this article, such identification would be undertaken in advance in order to figure out any shifts that occur in translating the Proclamation text in Ricklefs’ book.

### **3. TRANSLATION SHIFTS**

After discussing the unit of translation, this article will delve into its central topic. Since translation consists of rendering the message from SL into TL, it is possible for any changes to occur because of the systemic difference between SL and TL. Such shifts are likely to happen even between languages from the same family such as English and French. Therefore, we might expect that the shifts would most likely happen between English and Indonesian.

As mentioned earlier, the term “shift” was firstly coined by Catford in his book *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. He states that *shift* is the departure from *formal correspondence* in the process of going from the SL to the TL (1978: 73). He further explains that the term *formal correspondence* refers to the formal semantic connection between two linguistic units from two different languages (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 27). Thus, in such connection, the contextual or pragmatic aspect is not taken into account. Catford used another term for the latter kind of correspondence: *textual equivalence* which focuses on the relations that exist between elements in a specific ST-TT pair (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 28). For instance, the word “kursi” in Indonesian semantically refers to “chair” in English. Then, such relationship is called formal correspondence. However, in certain context, “kursi” can refer to “power” or “position”. Thus, the latter relationship is what we call textual equivalence. In other words, shift occurs when an equivalent for a particular unit of translation diverges from its formal correspondence.

Catford proposed two kinds of shift (1978: 73-79):

1. *Level shift*: an ST unit at one linguistic level is expressed by a TT unit at different linguistic level. The simple example is a change from grammar in the ST into lexis in the TT, e.g. grammar (be+V-ing) in *I am studying* is translated into a lexis *sedang* in *Dira sedang belajar*;
2. *Category shifts* which are classified into:
  - (a) *Structural shifts*: the ones occurring at phonological, graphological or grammatical structure, e.g. *White House* (Modifier + Head) becomes *Gedung Putih* (Head + Modifier);
  - (b) *Class shifts*: changes from one part of speech to another. For example, the adjective *medical* in *a medical student* is translated into the noun *kedokteran* in *seorang mahasiswa kedokteran*.
  - (c) *Unit or rank shifts*: an ST item at a certain rank (sentence, clause, group, word and morpheme) is translated into different rank in the TT. For example: the phrase *your love* is translated into a word *cintamu*.

- (d) *Intra-system shifts*: shifts that occur because of departures from formal correspondence between SL and TL, such as system of number in English where the plural form “trousers” is translated as singular into Indonesian: *celana*.

Shifts in translation are the processes whereby structural and/or semantic adjustments are made to accommodate the SL so that the ST can be properly rendered into TL in the form of TT. As far as the adjustments do not distort the textual message, they are acceptable in translation.

However, relying on Catford's theory would be insufficient since it does not comprehensively cover all possible kinds of shifts. Hence, it would be perfectly supported by Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy which views the shifts based on the translation procedures. They categorized two main methods of translation (1995: 30-39):

1. Direct translation, which includes:

- *Borrowing* (e.g. the use of words *internet* and *printer* in Indonesian);
- *Calque* or borrowing the form but literally translating each of the elements (e.g. *postgraduate* is translated as *pascasarjana*);
- *Literal translation* (e.g. *I go to school* is translated as *Saya pergi ke sekolah*);

2. Oblique translation, which includes:

- *Transposition* or a change of one word class with another without changing the message. Hence, it is similar to Catford's class shift. (e.g. *Saya tahu dia akan pergi* becomes *I know his departure*);
- *Modulation* or a change of point of view or semantics. The patterns include abstract for concrete, cause-effect, part-whole, negation of opposite, active to passive (and vice versa), change of symbol (metaphors), etc. (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995: 246-255). (e.g. *England trounced Germany 6-2 in the final* becomes *Tim nasional Inggris menyingkat tim nasional Jerman 6-2 di babak final*);

- *Equivalence* or the use of different stylistic and structural methods in rendering the same situation, such as fixed expressions, idioms, clichés, proverbs, etc. (e.g. *bang* in English becomes *dor* in Indonesian);
- *Adaptation*: the use of cultural equivalent to render a message in ST which is unknown in the TL culture (e.g. *Adam's apple* becomes *buah Khuldi*).

Those translation procedures, according to Vinay and Darbelnet, may operate on three levels of language: lexicon, syntactic structure and message (Munday, 2008: 58). Accordingly, we can infer that the use of the above translation methods might lead to shifts structurally, semantically, and stylistically in the TT units. However, such shift possibilities are limited when we use borrowing and calque.

To some extent, shifts that take place because of different word choices, for example, would give impact on the nuance and characteristics of the TT which may depart from those of the ST. Hence, we should not ignore the context in which the ST originally exists. In performing translations, translators should consider carefully aspects such as the type of text, situation, and potential readers. That is why Vinay and Darbelnet further add that soon after we identify the units of translation, we should examine the ST by evaluating the descriptive, affective and intellectual content of the units; reconstruct the message context; evaluate the stylistic effects; and then start composing the TT and revise it (Munday, 2008: 59).

#### **4. LEGAL TEXT**

In a simple way, legal text is any text or document that states legal relationships or has a force of law which legally binds the parties involved within. Generally, it is written in the so-called *legalese* (legal discourse) and formal style. People would often find it difficult to grab the meaning of legal texts because of such attributes.



According to Crystal (1994: 374), legal language has several typical characteristics:

1. Its statements have to be so phrased that we can see their general acceptability, yet be specific and objective enough to apply to individual circumstances;
2. They have to be stable enough to stand the test of time so that they can be treated consistently and fairly;
3. Legal language is composed of lengthy sentences with complex and fixed structure in order to integrate several issues in a single statement;
4. It is also commonly repetitive in order to make sure the message is clearly informed;
5. It goes in for coordinated phrases and long lists of items to reduce the uncertainty of the interpretation;
6. It also depends on a set of grammatical and lexical features, such as modal verbs (shall, may, etc), pronouns and generic nouns.

Aside from those characteristics, other distinctive features of legalese are the use of archaic vocabulary (hereby, whereof, hereinafter, etc) and lack of punctuation (Woods, 2006: 88-89). Woods also mentions another feature: the use of performative verbs such as appoint, declare, revoke, etc. (2006: 101).

Legal texts can be in the forms of constitutions, contracts, deeds, orders, wills, pleadings, etc. As for formal speech such as the Proclamation of Indonesian Independence, it can be categorized as a legal text in terms of its degree of formality, words choice, apposition, performative verbs, and lengthy sentences. Despite mixed interpretation on the legal standing of a declaration of independence (whether it is a philosophically and historically source of law or a legal instrument by itself), the main concern for this research is the proclamation of Indonesian independence as it is concisely written in formal/ *legalese* style.

The challenge for a translator in rendering such a text is how to transfer the ST into the TL by reproducing the accurate message and preserving the form. Any translation process may lead to the occurrence of shifts. As far as they do not distort the fundamental message of ST, then it is tolerable. However, as previously mentioned, a text does not stand in a vacuum. It is connected to a particular situation, event, etc. in which it is created. Once we disregard the context, shifts that occur within the smaller units of the text may change its characteristics as a whole. In this case, this article attempts to find out the shifts that transpired in translating the Proclamation of Indonesian Independence in Ricklefs' book and their impact on the TT compared to the original.

## 5. METHOD OF RESEARCH

This study is a descriptive qualitative research since it attempts to figure out and describe any shift that may occur in translating the Proclamation of Indonesian Independence in Ricklefs' book entitled *A History of Modern Indonesia since c.1200* by comparing the TT with the ST (the original Proclamation text in Indonesian). The data are 38 units of translation in the forms of an individual word or groups of words generated by dividing ST and TT into pieces (each text consists of 19 units).

The data sources, of course, are the original Proclamation of Indonesian Independence (ST) and its English translation in Ricklefs' book (TT) from which the units of translation originate. Data collection is performed by firstly dividing the ST into units of translation and numbering them. The TT is treated in the same manner. The unit identification is based on Vinay and Darbelnet's view: unit is the smallest segment of utterance whose signs are linked in such a way that they should not be translated individually. However, when an individual word could structurally and semantically stand on its own, it is considered as a unit of translation.

In analyzing the data, the TT units are matched to the ST units. Those having the same number in each text can then be compared to see what shifts have occurred based on Catford's shifts and Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy. The final step is drawing conclusions about the translator's approach to this text and the impact on the TT.

Catford's translation shifts and the taxonomy of translation shifts by Vinay and Darbelnet are chosen as the theoretical groundwork because they are the best-known and most representative models in investigating shifts in translation (Munday, 2004: 56). The former was the first theory to use the term *shift* while the latter is considered the most comprehensive taxonomy of translation shifts, based on their translation procedures (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 29). In addition to providing a detailed and systematic analysis, they are feasible to do.

## 6. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Following the data analysis procedure, the writer first presents a segmentation of the ST and TT into units of translation as seen in Table 1. Each of the comparable units has been numbered.

Table 1. The segmentation of the ST and TT into units of translation

ST (Indonesian)	NO.	TT (English)
Proklamasi	1	Proclamation
Kami	2	We
bangsa Indonesia	3	the People of Indonesia
dengan ini	4	hereby
menjatakan	5	declare
kemerdekaan Indonesia	6	the independence of Indonesia
Hal-hal	7	Matters
yang mengenai	8	concerning
pemindahan kekoeasaan	9	the transfer of power
d.l.l.	10	etc.

diselenggarakan	11	will be carried out
dengan tjara saksama	12	in a conscientious manner
dan	13	and
dalam tempo jang sesingkat-singkatnja	14	as speedily as possible
Djakarta	15	Jakarta
<b>ST (Indonesian)</b>	<b>NO.</b>	<b>TT (English)</b>
hari 17 boelan 8 tahoen '05	16	17 August 1945
Atas nama	17	In the name of
bangsa Indonesia	18	the people of Indonesia
Soekarno-Hatta	19	Sukarno-Hatta

Totally, there are 38 units of translation where both ST and TT share 19 units respectively. As also revealed by Munday (2008: 65), it is problematic in identifying units of translation since there is no clear-cut boundary of segmentation. Although Vinay and Darbelnet define a unit of translation as the smallest segment that is translatable in isolation and they reject an individual signifier (word) as a unit, the implementation is not that easy. In the table above, a unit of translation may take the form of a word in so far as it can grammatically and semantically stand on its own. In the following, each of the comparable pairs is analyzed in terms of translation procedures and what shifts have occurred.

Unit 1 : *Proklamasi – Proclamation*

Analysis : The title is translated literally, noun for noun. It is a direct translation in the form of literal translation.

Unit 2 : *Kami – We*

Analysis : It uses literal translation since *Kami* (first person plural personal pronoun) is exactly translated as *We*. They are also in nominative case (subject).

Unit 3 : *Bangsa Indonesia – the People of Indonesia*

Analysis : There is a shift in the form of **modulation**. Semantically, the formal correspondent of *bangsa* is *nation* while *people* in Indonesian refers to *rakyat*. Hence, there is a modulation at the message level and point of view: part (*rakyat*) for whole (*bangsa*). As the absence of article in Indonesian system, the article *the* is added to indicate something uniquely specified (*bangsa Indonesia*). The preposition *of* is used to correspond with the Indonesian genitive construction (*bangsa Indonesia*).

Unit 4 : *dengan ini* – *hereby*

Analysis : It shows a **class shift** by means of **transposition**: from prepositional phrase to adverb. As a result, there is also a **unit of rank shift** since the phrase *dengan ini* (preposition + demonstrative pronoun) is translated into an individual word *hereby* (adverb). However, the ST-TT pair semantically corresponds with each other. Such vocabularies also signify the archaism in the Proclamation text.

Unit 5 : *menjatakan* – *declare*

Analysis : The transitive verb *menjatakan* is translated literally into *declare* (transitive verb).

Unit 6 : *kemerdekaan Indonesia* – *the independence of Indonesia*

Analysis : It is translated literally: *kemerdekaan Indonesia* – *the independence of Indonesia*. Additions of article *the* is to indicate the definiteness whereas preposition *of* is to indicate the genitive relationship between two items (independence – Indonesia). Those features do not exist in the Indonesian system, yet the form itself (*kemerdekaan Indonesia*) implies such grammatical functions.

Unit 7 : *Hal-hal* – *Matters*

Analysis : Although translated literally, it leads to a **unit/rank shift** from *Hal-hal* (a group of words) into *Matters* (a single word). Unlike

Indonesian which requires reduplication to indicate plurality, the equivalent in English uses the marker “s”.

Unit 8 : *jang mengenai – concerning*

Analysis : It shows a **unit/rank shift**: *jang mengenai* (prepositional phrase) - *concerning* (prepositional word).

Unit 9 : *pemindahan kekoeasaan – the transfer of power*

Analysis : It is similar to unit 6: using literal translation and additions of article *the* indicating definiteness and preposition *of* indicating genitive construction.

Unit 10 : *d.l.l. – etc.*

Analysis : It cleverly uses **equivalence** procedure: abbreviation for abbreviation (*etc.* is the English equivalent of *d.l.l.*). Actually, *d.l.l.* which stands for *dan lain-lain* can be separated into two units: *dan* (conjunction); *lain-lain* (reduplicative plural noun). If so, then the corresponding units in English might be *and other things*. Yet, *d.l.l.* is considered a fixed expression which therefore belongs to a single unit. The use of *etc.* which functionally is an adverb indicates a **class shift** or **transposition**: *d.l.l.* (conjunction + noun) to *etc.* (adverb).

Unit 11 : *diselenggarakan – will be carried out*

Analysis : There is a **level shift** where the lexis *diselenggarakan* is translated into grammar (simple future in passive voice) *will be carried out*. The interesting aspect is the use of phrasal verb *carry out* instead of a performative verb to render the verb *selenggara*. Such phrasal verb in a declaration text seems to reduce its formality. This issue would be discussed later.

Unit 12 : *dengan tjara saksama – in a conscientious manner*

Analysis : It uses literal translation: adverbial prepositional phrase = adverbial prepositional phrase. The addition of indefinite article constructs the meaning “any conscientious manner”, just like what the ST unit does. Different words order between ST and

TT is merely because of the systemic difference between Indonesian (head + modifier) and English (modifier + head).

Unit 13 : *dan – and*

Analysis : The conjunction *dan* is literally translated into *and*.

Unit 14 : *dalam tempo jang sesingkat-singkatnja - as speedily as possible*.

Analysis : It shows a **class shift** through **transposition** where the adverbial prepositional phrase becomes the adverb phrase. Further, it also reflects a message-level or point of view **modulation** where the ST unit semantically means “within the shortest possible time” while the TT unit means more straightforward: quickly.

Unit 15 : *Djakarta – Jakarta*

Analysis : Although it is a literal translation, this is what Catford called a graphologically **structural shift** (1978: 77) where the grapheme <dj> for *Djakarta* in old Indonesian orthography is written in the English orthography using <j>: *Jakarta*.

Unit 16 : *hari 17 boelan 8 tahoen '05 – 17 August 1945*

Analysis : It is a kind of **modulation** (change of symbols) where *hari 17* is symbolized by *17* only, *boelan 8* is translated into its reference *August* and *tahoen '05* is written *1945*. The shift from the year '05 (the contraction of 2605) to *1945* also indicates an **adaptation** since '05 was based on Japanese imperial year. Ricklefs renders it by using Gregorian year, i.e. 1945.

Unit 17 : *Atas nama – In the name of*

Analysis : It shows a shift through **equivalence** where the fixed idiom *Atas nama* is equivalent to the English idiomatic counterpart *In the name of*.

Unit 18 : *bangsa Indonesia – the people of Indonesia*

Analysis : Similar to unit 3 (shift in the form of **modulation**).

Unit 19 : *Soekarno-Hatta – Sukarno-Hatta*

Analysis : Similar to unit 15: graphologically **structural shift** from the grapheme <oe> of the proper name *Soekarno* to the grapheme <u> becoming *Sukarno*.

From the analysis, there writer identifies the occurrence of 16 shifts in the TT. In detail, there are 4 modulations (whole - part, point of view and change of symbols); 3 unit or rank shifts (noun reduplication - word and phrase - word); 2 structural shifts (graphological level); 2 equivalences (abbreviation and idiom); 1 cultural adaptation; 3 class shifts or transpositions (preposition - adverb and conjunction+noun - adverb); and 1 remaining is a level shift (lexis - grammar). However, of those 19 pairs, only 7 are free of shifts. That means more than a half contain shifts.

There are some problematic aspects from this analysis. It is possible that there is more than one kind of shift in an individual unit, such as unit 4, 10 and 14. It is mainly caused by the difficulty in determining the translation unit as the consequence of the vague boundaries of segmentation. Although Vinay and Darbelnet underline the lexicological unit or unit of thought as the smallest segment whose signs are linked in such a way, there is still a room for bias. For instance, unit 10 (*d.l.l.*) can possibly be separated into two units, but in this article, it is considered one unit. Therefore, another research may generate different levels of units of translation.

Furthermore, the shift theory, especially the one proposed by Catford, does not look at text as a whole, nor even above the level of sentence (Munday, 2008: 61). In fact, shift that occurs at any smaller level might shift the characteristic of the text itself. In this case, the English translation of the Proclamation in Ricklefs' book has shifted in terms of the degree of formality compared to the original. Although it does not entirely alter the characteristics as a formal text, some shifts might change its style. For instance, Ricklefs uses the phrasal verb *carry out* for rendering the performative verb *selenggara* in *diselenggarakan* instead of more formal words such as *execute*, *conduct*, or others. The same thing occurs when he uses the abbreviation *etc.* which is very informal and



should not be used in writing and formal speaking (Et cetera or etcetera, 2016). However, the original in fact also uses abbreviation (*d.l.l.*). Perhaps, he tried to accommodate the exact style of the ST. Overall; Ricklefs' translation emphasizes conveying the textual message and slightly leaves out the formality of the Proclamation.

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

From the finding and discussion, there are some conclusions to be drawn. First, there are 16 shifts out of 19 units in the translation of the Proclamation of Indonesian Independence in Ricklefs' *A History of Modern Indonesia since c.1200*. They cover **4 modulations** (whole-part, point of view and change of symbols); **3 unit or rank shifts** (noun reduplication - word and phrase - word); **2 structural shifts** (graphological level); **2 equivalences** (abbreviation and idiom); **1 cultural adaptation**; **3 class shifts** or **transpositions** (preposition - adverb and conjunction+noun - adverb), and **1 level shift** (lexis - grammar).

Second, the shifts in Ricklefs' English version of the Proclamation have an impact in the sense of slightly shifting the degree of formality of the original Proclamation text. The main cause lies in the word choices in rendering the ST.

Further research using the Proclamation text as the object can be conducted by considering larger units of translation in the sense that this research highly relies on smaller segments (word and phrase units) as the basis for investigating shifts. As stated earlier, shifts may also occur at the text level as a whole.

Although research in translation shift seems to be feasible and simple, we need to be aware of its subjectivity. However, for the sake of academic interest, like Toury has stated, translation shift analysis is most valuable as a form of discovery or a step towards the formulation of explanatory hypotheses about the practice of translation (Hatim and Munday, 2004: 32).

## REFERENCES

- Catford, John C. 1978. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Crystal, David. 1994. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Drakeley, Steven. 2005. *The History of Indonesia*. Westport: Greenwood Press
- Halliday, M.A.K. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar; 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*. London: Hodder Arnold
- Hannigan, Tim. 2015. *Indonesia: Notes and Sources*. Retrieved May 02, 2016 at 16.30 pm, from <https://timhannigan.com/a-brief-history-of-indonesia-notes-and-sources/>
- Hatim, Basil and Munday Jeremy. 2004. *Translation; an Advanced Resource Book*. New York: Routledge
- Et cetera or etcetera. 2016. Retrieved September 28, 2015 at 12.30 pm, from <http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english-thesaurus/et-cetera>
- Munday, Jeremy. 2008. *Introducing Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge
- Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International
- Ricklefs, Merle C. 2008. *A History of Modern Indonesia since c.1200*. Basingstoke: Palgrave
- Ricklefs, Merle C. 2007. *Polarising Javanese Society: Islamic and Other Visions c. 1830-1930*. Singapore: National University of Singapore Press
- Vinay and Darbelnet. 1995. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English; a Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin
- Woods, Nicola. 2006. *Describing Discourse; a Practical Guide to*

Discourse Analysis. London: Hodder Arnold.