WHICH ASPECT OF MEANING IS LOST?
APPLYING SFL-SYSTEMIC FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS IN TRANSLATION ASSESSMENT

Rochayah Machali, M.A., Ph.D.[*]

Abstract

Translation assessment is important for two reasons: For creating the dialectics between theory and practice and for purposes of setting criteria and standards in translation assessments, in particular when we compare an SL text and its different TL versions (Machali, 2009:153). There are various theoretical frameworks that can be used in this context, among which are the Skopos or the Functionalism theories. However, it is not easy to apply these into practice, particularly when we are faced with loss of meaning that cannot be judged as 'mistranslation'. Some of the general phrases that some evaluators often use are 'too literal', 'not natural', etc. These criteria, in fact, only emphasize one aspect of meaning, the experiential (i.e., who does what to whom, why, when and how). As such, assessors have ignored the fact that a text is a realization of three aspects of meaning: the experiential (which is a part of ideational meaning), interpersonal, and textual (Halliday, 1994; Mathiessen, 1992; Catford, 1965). In this framework of SFL, these three aspects of meaning must be considered together as 'criteria' for translation assessment. There are challenges and problems in this application of SFL, particularly when we are faced with such notions as 'naturalness' in translation or 'translation as ideology'.

Key words*:*
Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), Exeperiential, interpersonal, textual, mistranslation, translation as ideology, criteria, assessment.

Abstrak

Penilaian terjemahan penting karena dua alasan: untuk menciptakan dialektika antara teori dan praktik dan untuk tujuan menetapkan kriteria dan standar dalam penilaian terjemahan, khususnya ketika kita membandingkan teks Bsu dan versi Bsa yang berbeda (Machali, 2009:153). Ada berbagai kerangka teori yang dapat digunakan dalam konteks ini, di antaranya adalah teori Skopos atau Fungsionalisme. Namun, tidak mudah menerapkannya ke dalam praktik, terutama ketika kita dihadapkan pada hilangnya makna yang tidak dapat dinilai sebagai 'salah terjemahan'. Beberapa ungkapan umum yang sering

---

[*] Dosen pada Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Airlangga, rmachli@gmail.com, Jalan Dharmawangsa Dalam, Gubeng, Surabaya, Jawa Timur

digunakan oleh beberapa evaluator adalah 'terlalu literal', 'tidak wajar', dan lain-lain. Kriteria ini sebenarnya hanya menekankan satu aspek makna, yakni aspek makna eksperiental atau pengalaman (yakni siapa melakukan apa kepada siapa, mengapa, kapan dan bagaimana). Dengan demikian, penilai telah mengabaikan fakta bahwa sebuah teks adalah realisasi dari tiga aspek makna: pengalaman (yang merupakan bagian dari makna ideasional), interpersonal, dan tekstual (Halliday, 1994; Mathiessen, 1992; Catford, 1965). Dalam kerangka SFL ini, ketiga aspek makna ini harus dipertimbangkan bersama sebagai 'kriteria' penilaian terjemahan. Ada tantangan dan masalah dalam penerapan SFL ini, terutama ketika kita dihadapkan pada gagasan seperti 'kealamian' dalam terjemahan atau 'terjemahan sebagai ideologi.

Kata kunci:
Linguistik Fungsional Sistemik (SFL), Eperiensial, interpersonal, tekstual, terjemahan sebagai ideologi, kriteria, dan penilaian.

1. Introductory remarks: SFL in Translation and Translation Assessment

Translation assessment has not been studied well despite the fact that many universities in the world offer translation both as theory and as practice. A number of researchers and theorists have recognized the risk of 'subjectivity' in translation assessment, due to the lack of systematic criteria that can be used to universally assess translation (Bowker 2000:183 in Kim 2009:123; also, Bassnett-Mcguire 1997). Many translation teachers are faced with challenges on this, particularly when we have to provide students with constructive and detailed feedback on their translation.

In many cases the focus has been on 'translation as product' as this is usually the main concern of assessment. We generally are faced with the question of whether or not the translation is 'good' and by this it usually means 'correct', running the risk of emphasizing one aspect of meaning, i.e., the experiential. As such we may have ignored other aspects of meaning, the interpersonal and the textual, in the assessment. Therefore, when we find variations in how these other aspects of meaning are reproduced in the TL version, we run the risk of lumping them into 'incorrect' translation, and in so doing we give them the same 'value', and this should not be.

Furthermore, in commenting on the 'incorrectness', the assessor's focus is often on the lower level of lexicogrammar rather than on meaning and how meaning is represented or reproduced in the TLT. It is true that what we see are words and sentences, but it's important to view these as the realization of meaning. The centrality of meaning seems to be the core links between SFL and Translation studies.

In SFL theory, it is meaning that is transferred and interpreted on the basis of evidence of linguistic resources at the clause level. In this sense, Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) is the same as other grammars, i.e., looking at the linguistic features at the clause level, but it is different in that SFG does not interpret them as a set of rules but, rather, describes them as resources for interpreting different aspects of meaning. This interpretation is viewed in terms of context, which can be context of culture and/context of situation.

Diagrammatically, the above concept can be represented as correlation:

Context (register)… ⬆ *(Construed from)*	Field	Tenor	Mode
	Ideational	Interpersonal	Textual
Semantics……… ⬇ *(realized as)* ……. Grammar	TRANSITIVITY	MOOD	THEME

Figure 1: The correlation between grammar, semantics and context.

Notes:

(a) Following the convention of SFG, the names of linguistics systems are written in capital letters (e.g., THEME) while the names of structural functions are written with an initial capital (e.g., Theme).

(b) upward arrow means construed from (e.g., Interpersonal meaning is construed from Tenor) and downward arrow means realized as (e.g., Interpersonal meaning is realized as MOOD in the grammar).

Ideational meaning is realized through the TRANSITIVITY system in association with the field of the text; interpersonal meaning is realized through the MOOD system in association with the tenor of the text; and textual meaning is realized through the THEME system in association with the mode of the text.

The correlation between contextual variables (register) and grammatical choices have been described by Martin (2001) as important because it enables systemicists to predict on the basis of context not just what choices a speaker is likely to make, but (also) which areas of the grammar are at stake (p. 54). Further, Martin argues that it (the correlation) 'allows us to look at particular grammatical choices and to understand the contribution they are making to the contextual meaning of a sentence' (Martin, op cit).

As concrete examples of the above correlation, I have provided two texts to compare from my own research (see Machali 2009:65-66). In the examples below, we can see how 'field' is the same but 'tenor' is 'mode' are different: the 'field' is about how to make flour from cassava.

Text 1

Mula-mula kulit ubi kayu <u>dihilangkan</u>. Kemudian <u>dijemur</u> sampai kering. Namanya gaplek. Gaplek <u>ditumbuk</u> menjadi tepung.

Text 2

Pertama-tama ubi kayu *kita* kupas kulitnya. Kemudian ubi itu *kita* jemur sampai kering, yang biasanya disebut gaplek. Selanjutnya gaplek tersebut *kita* tumbuk menjadi tepung.

The 'tenor' in text 1 is realized through the [di-] verbs (underlined). In Indonesian language, this is a realization of impersonalization through passive sentences, which is used to 'distance' the writer from the addressee. On the other hand, the 'tenor' in text 2 is personal, through the use of 'kita' (we'), thus involving the addressee. So, to put it in SFL perspective, we can see how language is a meaning potential, and writers can choose different realizations in the transitivity system of the Indonesian language, thus representing different interpersonal meaning.

The textual meaning in both texts is also realized in somewhat different way, although both make use of conjunctive relations as cohesive devices, e.g., 'mula-mula' (text 1) and 'pertama-tama' (text 2) to mean 'firstly', the conjunction 'kemudian' in both mean 'then'. In addition to these, textual meaning is also realized through the cohesive tie of [di-] verbal prefix in text 1 and through the pronoun 'kita' in text 2 which run throughout the texts.

The correlation between contextual variables (register) and grammatical choices described by Martin (2001) and exemplified using Indonesian texts above is also important for translation in general and translation assessment in particular. In order to produce a translation that functions within the constraint of a specific register or contextual construct (field, tenor and mode), translators have understood and interpreted the source text at all these levels using a cultural understanding and linguistic knowledge of both languages. As such, translators, translator teachers as well as student translators should consider the target reader's register and assess whether the linguistic resources (i.e., lexicogrammar) have been used appropriately and adequately to (re)create different kinds of meaning (i.e., semantics) within the register.

This approach to translation and translation assessment is different from one that focuses on grammatical errors, i.e., more on the

lower-level representation of meaning, without considering the higher level of register. As an example, take a TLT below as a translation for Text 1 (Indonesian) above:

TLT 1 (of SLT1)

Firstly, the cassava skin was removed. Then it was dried under the sun. The dried cassava is called *gaplek*. Afterwards, the *gaplek* was pounded to make flour.

In assessing the above translation, we cannot comment on it without considering the context of the translation: what is the purpose of the translation? The way the translator manipulates the (lower) lexicogrammar is in direct correlation with the higher contextual configuration of the Target Text's register. Again, we have to consider the target reader's register and assess whether the linguistic resources (i.e., lexicogrammar) have been used appropriately and adequately to (re)create different kinds of meaning (i.e., semantics) within the register. The purpose of translation is discussed below in the context of Skopos theory.

This kind of assessment approach is different from one that focuses on, say, grammatical errors. Even a translation without grammatical errors may still be considered as inappropriate if it does not recreate the register specified in the TLT context. In a similar context of assessment, in my earlier research on translation assessment I refer to the fact of whether or not the distorted meaning, if any, only occur locally and affect sentence level or whether they affect the higher level of register and change the purpose of the text in some way. The question is how we as assessor give feedback on these distortions of meaning and probably deduce marks where possible: what value is given to which loss of meaning, so as to avoid the risk of being subjective. In this case, we need parameters that can universally be applied to any pairs of languages involved in translation.

2. Skopos Theory and Functionalism in Translation Assessment

Before discussing further, the SFL-based parameters in translation assessment, it is worth discussing a concept known as Skopos theory. Skopos is the Greek word for 'aim' or 'purpose' and this term was introduced into the translation theory by Vermeer in the 1970s (Munday2001:79). Skopos theory focuses on the purpose of the translation and it argues that the translator should adopt translation methods and strategies to produce a TT (target text) that fulfils its functional roles (Vermeer and Reiss, 1984). The functional roles of the TT are determined by the so-called 'translation brief' that contains the purpose of the translation and other information that are relevant to the target readers (Nord, 1997). The translation brief becomes the source for determining the context of the translation and the translator could then use it for determining the method and strategy for his/her translation.

Once the contexts of both ST and TT are at hand, the translator is then ready to translate the ST along the line of the purpose of the translation. S/he may want to choose to use a particular method or translation strategy to suit his/her need. Among the translation strategies that a translator may want to use is whether s/he wants it to be an 'overt' or 'covert' translation (House 1997 in Munday, 2001:91). House suggests that an overt translation means a translation in which the TT is made explicit of being a translation while a covert one is a TT that 'enjoys the status of an original source text in the target culture' (House in Munday, p. 94).

However, it is not the intention of this paper to suggest that House's strategy is the only one that a translator can choose to use. It is presented here as an option simply because House (in her 1997 model) has incorporated the SFL register analysis of field, tenor and mode in her proposed strategy of 'overt' and 'covert' translation. The relevance of these notions is the fact that a translator is required to

produce texts that suit a certain context (register). So, a translation assessor should consider the contextual information and judge the overtness and covertness that is necessary for the translation. Alongside this is the consideration of how appropriately the translator has used the linguistic resources in the translation.

If we look again at the TLT 1 above, it can be judged as inappropriate if the translation brief says: '*The following text is part of a collection of recipes in a book about how to make flour from different raw materials. Please translate it for an equivalent publication in English*'. The past tense used in the lexicogrammar of the TLT is not in the transitivity system of English for this particular register. It is more appropriate for such register to be realized using chains of command verbs, e.g., 'skin the cassava and then put them under the sun to dry, etc. Of course, it can be argued that these commands can be realized in different transitivity system in order to capture different interpersonal meaning and, as such, becomes the representation of different tenor. For example, we can use passive voice for the commands and, in this way, the producer of the text distances himself or herself from the readers (compared to the use of direct commands with 'imperatives').

On the other hand, TLT 1 above can be considered appropriate if the TT's context says: '*The text below is part of a larger report on an ethnographic description about how people in the Bromo mountain of Java make flour from cassava. Please translate it for an equivalent report in English*'. The contextual configuration is appropriately realized here: past experience is reported in past tense and the passive voice indicates the reporter's neutrality and his being removed from the thing reported. In addition, there is an overtness in the third sentence through the repetition of the noun group 'dried cassava' and causes the textual and cohesive patterning to shift from the original: from grammatical chain with '-nya' (it) to lexical chain with '(dried) cassava'. Despite this shift, the translator has legitimately manipulated linguistic resources to recreate meaning in the SLT, within the constraint of the TT's context.

The shift is in fact not required systemically. The shift is more of the translator's choice and an 'addition' in this case, not a shift dictated by the system.[*] The 'obligatory' shift that is systemic is termed 'translation shift' by Catford (1965). By translation shift Catford departs from formal correspondence in the process of going from SLT to the TLT. When formal correspondence (e.g., word-for-word level equivalence) between ST and TT is not possible, the translator can decide how and how far the translation can move away from word-to-word equivalence. When this happens, the aspects of meaning affected by the shift can be the ideational (thus causing mistranslation) or the interpersonal as well as the textual.

Therefore, a translation assessor should, again, consider all these. The questions that remains are: (1) when a shift involves loss of (aspects of) meaning in the text, how should an assessor count it, in the sense of 'deduction of marks'; (2) What 'equivalence value' can we assign to these three different aspects of meaning, so as to allow 'serious' deduction of marks? To this we now turn.

3. My Criteria for Translation Assessment: Fine Tuning using SFL

In an earlier approach to translation assessment (2000; 2009)[†], I have used three important aspects of accuracy in reproducing meaning: (a) linguistic aspects; (b) semantic aspects; (c) pragmatic aspects (see Chapter 8). I have also further specified different criteria for (b) and (c) into whether or not there is distortion of meaning in the TL version and whether such distortion is local (i.e., affecting the lower level of the

---

[*] With 'addition', particularly one that may be more serious than this example, should be carried out with care, particularly when taking the NAATI accreditation test. According to NAATI's grading criteria, omission and addition are 'errors' and can cause deductions of marks (see the 2005 grading criteria); NAATI= National Accreditation of Australian Translators and Interpreters. Also see www.trans-int.org/index.php/transint/article/view/42/66 *(NAATI, 2005, 5.2-17) accessed 30 November 2011.*

[†] Historically, the assessment devised here was more for practical purposes for selecting translators for the 1992 Non-Aligned Movement Summit in Jakarta. The assessment is not strongly grounded on a conceptual framework that applies universally (such as SFL).

lexicogrammar) or total (affecting the overall purpose of the text). The Table below is an English version taken from part of the Table presented in Chapter 8 (Machali, 2009:153).

Aspect	Criteria

A. Accuracy of semantic reproduction*)
 	
1. [left out]
 	
2. *Semantic aspect*
 (a) Referential meaning
 (b) Interpersonal meaning
   (i) style
   (ii) other aspects
    of interpersonal meaning
 (Misalnya, konotatif-denotatif)
 	
3. *Pragmatic aspect*
 	
a. *equivalence of text type (including*
   purpose)
 	
b. *coherence and cohesion at the lower level*
   and textual levels.
	shifted?
	
	(local/total?)
	
	Shifted?
	
	(local/total?)
	
	incoherent?
	
	(local/total?

B. naturalness (TT focus) *)	Natural? Literal?
C. terminology *)	Correct? clear
D. spelling *)	Correct? Standard?

Tabel 1 Assessment Criteria

Notes:

*) are not discussed below; beyond the scope of the paper.

a) "local" means affecting some sentences in proportion to the percentage of the whole text.

b) "total" means 75% or more in proportion to the whole text

[other notes are excluded-→ please see the original in Chapter 8 of "Pedoman bagi Penerjemah" in Machali 2000; 2009]

On observing those printed in italics we can see some correlations with the aspects discussed earlier in relation to SFL concepts and system. Some terms require explanation: the term 'referential' [2(a)] in this Table correlates with 'experiential' in SFL since it is the representation of experience. The pragmatic aspect is in principle a feature of the context (see Figure 1 in this paper). Differing from the SFL, the textual aspect (coherence and cohesion) is placed as part of the pragmatic aspect, because I originally thought of it as something to do with the higher level of text (than the lower level of lexicogrammar). However, in the discussion that follows the textual aspect is discussed in the same footing as other semantic aspects (the referential and the interpersonal). To start with, we shall consider an SL Text below and its two TL versions or translations (from Machali 2009:61 with slight modifications to suit present discussion)

SLText 2

[1] Some focal points of crisis in the present-day world are of long-standing nature. [2] These conflicts which more often than not have deep-lying regional causes are aggravated and have acquired new dimensions by interference, intervention, and involvement of outside powers. [3] The resultant conflicts undermine international relations, cause great human sufferings and prevent the international community from addressing the major problem of today. (From: The Declaration of the Non-Aligned Movement, 1989).

TL Text 2.1

[1] Beberapa titik krisis di dunia masa kini sudah lama adanya. [2] Konflik-konflik ini seringkali bersifat regional dan sering dikemukakan dan memerlukan bentuk baru karena adanya

gangguan, intervensi dan keterlibatan kekuatan dari luar. [3] Konflik yang menggerogoti hubungan internasional tersebut mengakibatkan penderitaan besar bagi kemanusiaan[...].

TLText 2.2

[1] Beberapa persoalan krisis berat yang sering ditemukan di dunia saat ini sudah bersifat kronis. [2] Konflik-konflik tersebut lebih sering berakar dari persoalan regional yang berkembang dan memperoleh dimensi baru karena campur tangan dan keterlibatan kekuatan luar. [3] Akibatnya, konflik tersebut menggerogoti hubungan internasional, menyebabkan [...]

TLText 2.3 (only the first sentence is quoted here)

Beberapa hal penting yang merupakan krisis dunia dewasa ini adalah mengenai pelestarian alam.

The SL Text is part of a declaration that was given as a test to approximately 75 participants for selection to work in the Media Centre in the main complex where the Non-Aligned Movement Summit was held in 1992 in Jakarta. The time for the test was limited to one hour for a text of approximately 500 words in length and there was hardly time to check the dictionary. There was no 'translation brief' that explicitly stated the purpose of the translation. However, since it is a text of political declaration that contains an urging to the members of the Non-Aligned Movement to move together in facing the crises of the present day world, the linguistic resources will obviously those concerned with strong interpersonal meaning that is realized using 'powerful' words and noun groups such as 'focal point of crisis' (rather than just 'crisis'), 'deep-lying regional causes' (rather than just 'regional causes'), 'aggravated' (rather than 'made worse'), etc. The textual meaning is realized, among others, through the lexical cohesion of the word 'conflicts' in [2] and [3] and through anaphoric references with 'these' in [2].

Before applying any aspect of assessment there is one overriding principle that needs to be applied: "there should not be any shift in ideational meaning that affects the purpose of the text" (Machali 2009:151 for the Indonesian version of this principle). As Halliday puts it:

> '…. the ideational [meaning] carrying by far the highest value overall. It is not hard to see the reason for this. As a general rule, "translation equivalence" is defined in ideational terms; if a text does not match its source text ideationally, it does not qualify as a translation, so *the question whether it is a good translation does not arise'* (Halliday in Steiner and Yallop 2001:16: italicization mine).

For this reason, TLT2.3 above is ruled out as a translation as it does not ideationally match the source text right from the start: the SL text is not about 'pelestarian alam' (conservation of nature). The equivalence value of this 'text topic' is highest because it sets what comes after and, as such, determines whether or not variations at the lexicogrammar can be accepted as translation. So, in terms of deduction of marks, it is most serious of all, ranging from 4-6 (out of 10) depending on how 'total' the effect is on the whole interpersonal and textual representation of the text (c.f. Kim's interpersonal error below).

Representations at the Interpersonal level: Variations or Errors?

An example provided by Kim in the translation of Korean-English pair is the use of 'would' for 'might' in the text below (Kim 2009:140).

SLT 3

> […] Relations with India soured after Australia strongly criticised its nuclear weapons test in 1998. Uranium mining has always divided Australians, but more seem to be leaning towards an expansion of the industry in response to global warming. *However, should India test another bomb, public outrage <u>would</u> kill uranium exports in a flash. (Italicization and underlining added)*

TLT 3 (back-translated from Korean)

[only the sentence in italics above]

However, if India tests another bomb, due to Australian public outrage, the uranium export <u>might</u> be stopped immediately.

It is easy at first glance to judge the shift of 'would→might' as a simple and minor lexical 'error' (or variation) for the reason that it does not convey the experiential meaning. However, it is considered a serious error by Kim because it has a textual macro significance, since its place at the last sentence of text somehow affects the higher-level stratum. Therefore, Kim suggests a deduction of [2] marks here (out of 10) due to the fact that the lexical error has impacted on a serious interpersonal error.

In Halliday's terms (loc cit) '...high value may be accorded to equivalence in the interpersonal or textual realms – but usually only when the ideational equivalence can be taken for granted'. In Kim's example above, the ideational meaning cannot be taken for granted. In a way, I think, to put it simply, it is 'two errors in one (word)'. Now let's compare to variations of different nature in TLT 2.1 and 2.2 above. Except for the underlined clause in TLT 2.1 (which we will discuss separately below), the two TLTs are comparable to the SLT in that they represent interpersonal and textual meanings in different ways (the Textual meaning representation is discussed further separately).

Firstly, when we compare sentence [1] of the two TLTs, we can immediately see that the interpersonal meaning (of the SLT) is held constant in TLT 2.2 through the words 'krisis berat' and 'kronis'. It can argue that on the basis of rephrasing that 'focal points of crisis' are not the same as 'krisis berat' at the level of lexicogrammar, but the same 'equivalence value' (borrowing Halliday's) can be assigned to at the interpersonal level, thus in Halliday's terms 'ideational equivalence' can be taken for granted. It is important to note at this stage that there is a difference between 'equivalence' and 'equivalence value'. On the other

hand, TLT2.1 is easier to judge in that there is no shift of ideational meaning but the interpersonal meaning is not 'equivalent' to its SLT, i.e., there is a loss of interpersonal meaning in some way: 'sudah lama adanya' and 'of long-standing nature' carry different interpersonal meaning in the sense of lacking the powerful tone of the SLT. As such, both TLTs are variations and no errors are found.

When we come to sentence [2], TLT2.1 contains translation that is ideationally inaccurate: 'memerlukan bentuk baru' (lit. requiring new dimension') does not mean 'acquiring new dimension' in the SLT. However, this error in ideational representation of meaning does not have an impact on the macro level of the text. So, unlike Kim's error presented above, this error is minor and in terms of deduction or marks it can be 1 (one) mark out of 10 marks.

Representations at the Textual level: Variations or Errors?

As discussed earlier, the textual meaning is realized in the SLT mainly through lexical chains with the word 'conflict', anaphoric reference with 'these', among others. Apart from the use of 'and' in parallel structures, no particular conjunction is used in the SLT. It is where TLT2.2 differs from its SLT in that the conjunction 'akibatnya' has been used in sentence [3]. Strictly speaking, there is a shift of cohesion here, but it is justifiable in that the translator interprets 'the resultant (conflict)' to mean 'resulted from'. So, in negotiating meaning and manipulating the lexicogrammar of the text in the TLT the translator has chosen to use the conjunction 'akibatnya' (lit. 'as a consequence' or 'as a result'). In this way there is a shift from 'lexical chain' through the noun group 'resultant conflict' in the SLT to conjunctive relation with 'akibatnya'. The translator seems to have used the overtness strategy here, i.e., making the conjunctive relation more obvious than that in the original.

However, there are cases of overtness when deduction of marks is necessary in textual shifts, i.e., where they involve inaccuracy of experiential meaning. The examples below are taken from Kim (op cit, p.

142), with sentence numbering differs from Kim's for the purpose of this paper's discussion only.

SLT 4

[1] Until now all this (export) has gone to countries that have signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). [2] This ensures, in theory, that they will use it to produce electricity rather than bombs. [3] The sales will be subject to 'strict conditions'.

TLT 4 – back translated from Korean (sentence [1] excluded).

[2] By signing the agreement in theory, (they) guarantee that the imported resource will be used to produce electricity rather than bombs. [3] Uranium sales will be? subject to 'strict conditions'. (Underlining added).

Kim argues that the two sentences in TLT4 above demonstrate textually inaccurate translation. 'This' in sentence [2] refers to the sentence preceding it, i.e., sentence [1] above, not just the signing of the agreement. Kim further argues that in this instance there is a loss in textual meaning (which is an error in this case) this loss also led to an error in experiential meaning. So, Kim suggests that 2 points are deducted from the overall mark. Again, this is another case of 'two errors in one' that I have proposed earlier. In addition to this, there is another error in cohesion mentioned by Kim, i.e., one that concerns sentence [3]. In the SLT 'the sales' in the text refers to 'the sales of uranium to India' but in the TLT it suggests that it 'uranium sales' is in general. For this textual inaccuracy, Kim suggests a deduction of 1 (one) point in the overall mark.

4. Concluding Remarks

Translation is an of area of research that has not been given much attention (and in linguistic studies for that matter). Of the few, Halliday has proposed a theory of 'good translation' and an interplay

between rank, strata and metafunction in the SFL framework of theory. I have used the SFL theory in this paper to fine tune my earlier criteria for translation assessment. Using Kim's evidence from Korean language translation and Halliday's main concept on translation, I would like to revise my Table above (and in Chapter 8 of my book "Pedoman bagi Penerjemah): the criteria 'local (shift)' needs to be changed to 'local shift with macro impact'. Also, there is a need for a criterion that says 'an error with a double value' that I have termed 'two in one' above. The SLT and TLTs comparisons have also shown how loss of meaning or shift of meaning has occurred and how this should be understood in the realm of translation studies and assessment: whether they are justifiable variations or error and how serious they are as errors. These have impacts on marking and deduction of marks in marking translation. As well as this, the discussion has impacted on how 'good translation' should be viewed.

5. References

Butt D., et al, 2000 *Using Functional Grammar: An Explorer's Guide, 2nd Edition,* Sydney: Macquarie University.

Catford, J.C., 1965 *A Linguistic Theory of Translation,* Oxford University Press, London.

Echols, John M. and Hassan Shadily, 1975 *Kamus Inggris Indonesia,* Cornell University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan, 1985, *Language Context and Text: Aspects of Language In Social Semiotic Perspective,* Deakin University, Victoria. Halliday, M.A.K. 1978 Language *as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning,* London: Arnold. 2001 "Towards a theory of good translation", in Steiner, E. and Colin Yallop (eds) (2001), 13-18.

Hatim, B and I Mason
1990 *Discourse and Translator,* London/New York: Longman.

1997   *The Translator as Communicator,* London/New York: Routledge.

House, J. 1977, "A Model for Translation Quality Assessment" in Munday (2001), *Introducing Translation Studies,* London & New York: Routledge.

Kim, Mira, 2009, "Meaning-oriented Assessment of Translations: SFL and its applications to formative Assessment" in Angelelli and Jacobson (eds) *Testing and Assessment in Translation and Interpreting Studies: A Call for Dialogue between research and practice". Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Co.,2009.* 1998 "*Redefining Textual Equivalence in Translation: with evidencefrom Indonesian-English translation*", Jakarta: Pusat Penerjemahan UI.

Martin, James, 2001, "Language, Register and Genre*", in Analysing English in a Global Context, Anne Burns and Caroline Coffin (eds), 149-166, London: Routledge.*

Munday, Jeremy, 2001, *Introducing Translation Studies,* London & New York: Routledge.

Matthiessen, Christian M, C., 2001. "The Enviroenment of Translation", in E Steiner and C. Yallop (eds) 411-124, Berlin: Mouton de Gryter. Steiner, E and Colin Yallop, 2001(eds) *Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text Production: Beyond Content.*Berlin: Mouton de Gryter.

Venuti, L. 2000, *The Translation Studies Reader,* London & New York: Routledge.

Vermeer, H.J. (1898/200) "Skopos and Commission in Translational Action", in L Venuti (ed) 2000 pp 221-32