WORD LEVEL EQUIVALENCE IN THE INDONESIAN TRANSLATION OF THE DIALOGUES IN *"THE LIGHTNING THIEF"*
(A Descriptive Qualitative Study in the Novel "THE LIGHTNING THIEF")

Dewi Maulud Diati✉

English Department. Faculty of Languages and Arts. State University of Semarang.

Abstract

This descriptive qualitative study mainly describes the word level equivalence found in the translated dialogues in The Lightning Thief. The final project mainly aims at identifying the word level equivalence strategy in translating the dialogues of The Lightning Thief from English into Indonesian and identifying its word level equivalence meaning. The study focuses on the classification of word level equivalence offered by Mona Baker in her book In Other Words. The data obtained were analyzed by comparing both English and Indonesian versions. Words or phrases which contained any word level non-equivalence were analyzed further to find out the context in which it occured. Then the data analyzed were evaluated its word level equivalent meaning. The evaluation involved some raters who are expert in their field. The finding show that: the strategies used by the translator to overcome the problems in translating the dialogue are translation by paraphrase using related word (24.11%), translation by a more specific word (18.43%), translation by paraphrase using unrelated word (14.89%), translation by a more general word (14.19%), translation by omission (13.48%), translation by more expressive or less neutral word (8.51%) and translation by using loan word or loan word plus explanation (6.39%). Word level equivalence meaning in the strategies: translation by using loan word (92.59%) was the strategy whose data were got higher result of score 3 (meaning is sufficiently renderred) by three raters, translation by a more general word (36.67%) was the strategy whose data were got higher result of score 2 (meaning is insufficiently), and translation by omission was the strategy whose data were got higher result of score 1 (59.65%). Suggestion drawn from this study is that to transfer meaning of the source text into the target text accurately, the translator should decide to make choices in each word or phrases, and choose the most suitable strategies that can overcome problems and difficulties of translation, especially problems of non-equivalence at word level.

© 2016 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉ Correspondent Address:
 B3 Building FBS Unnes
 Sekaran, Gunungpati, Semarang, 50229
 E-mail: mauludiadewi@ymail.com

INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of interesting activity for some people, indeed some of them assume that reading is a need and hobby. Many kinds of reading we can find in our daily life through several media, such as news paper, magazine, television, internet, and the book itself. People read something to get information. For some people who has a hobby of reading, they will read something because they are interested in reading.

From various kind of reading, novel is one of the media of reading which has fascination for some people. Novel is a long prose narrative that is normally in prose, which describes frictional characters and events, usually in the form of a sequential story. Many of story in novel have been filmed and watched by people. Besides the plot of the story or the content of the story, one of the interesting thing is the dialogue in the novel. Some of best popular novel are originally available in English, and to adapt it, the novel were translated into different languages, such as Bahasa Indonesia.

Translating the novel especially the dialogue of the novel from source language (English) into the target language (Indonesian) is not an easy task. The translator must consider not only the word selection but also the message delivery. In this point, a question come up: does the target language (Indonesian) novel, especially dialogues of the novel, deliver the same message as the source language (English) dialogue of the novel? Therefore, it is interesting to find out whether the target language dialogues of the novel have delivered the same message as the source language dialogues of the novel or not. Ultimately, the message transfers from source language to target language can be accomplished by several strategies and making sure of the word level equivalence between the two languages. From this reason, I conducted the research of translation equivalence in the dialogues of the novel entitled "The Lightning Thief" particularly in terms of word level equivalence. In this research, I use word level equivalence classification by Baker (1992).

DISCUSSION

Translation has various definitions which can be a broad or narrow one. The broad definition of translation is a change from one form to another, for exampletransforming a feeling into a poem or lyrics.

It is also revealed by Larson (1984:3) that translation consist of transferring meaning of Source Language into the Receptor Language. It means that the act of translation involves the change of form from the first language to the form of the second language; but the meaning is still constant. The form from which the translation is made will be called Source Language (SL) and the form into it is to be changed will be called the Receptor Language or Target Language (TL).

Translation contains a large number of values such as, culture, language, and so on. Further, translation has a large of experts who reveal, research, and define all it one. Catford (1965:1) explains that, 'Translation is the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual in another language (TL)". Next, Nida (1969:12) defines that, translation consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style". According to Newmark (1988:7), on the other hand, "Translation is a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another

language". It is also revealed by Bell (1991:1) that, 'Translation is an art or craft and therefore not amenable to objective, scientific description, ex[lanation. As quoted by Hewson and Martin (1991:38) Steiner states that, "The role of the ranslation is determining in this process cultural cross-determination, since in translating the dialectic of unison and plurality is dramatically at work.

From those definitions I can conclude that: (a) translation involves two languages, the source language (SL) and the target or recptor language (TL); (b) to translate means to reproduce or to replace the message of the SL text into that of the TL text; (c) every translator must find the equivalent of the TL; (d) translation is an art process of replacing the SL into another language (TL), involving cultural values.

Types of Translation

Catford (1965:21-26) divides translation based on three criteria: the extent of translation (full translation vs. Partial translation), the levels of language involved in translation (total translation vs. Restricted translation), and the grammatical rankat which the translation equivalence is established (rank-bounded translation vs. Unbounded translation). In a full translation, every part of the source language text is replaced by the target language text material, whereas in a partial translation, some part of parts of the source-language text are, left untranslated. In a total translation, the grammar, lexis, phonology or graphology of the SL are replaced by their equivalence in the TL. In contrast, a restricted translation only replaces limited textual materials of the SL with its equivalence in the TL, e.g. grammar and lexis. Rank-bounded translation is normal total translation in which the selection of the target language equivalence is bounded or limited to a low

rank or only a few ranks in the hierarchy of grammatical units, e.g. words or morphemes. In contrast, unbounded translation is normal total translation in which equivalence shift-freely up and down the rank scale

The experts of translation mention the types of translation differently based on some points of view. Generally, it is divided into literal translation and non-literal translation.

Larson as quoted by Simatupang (1999:6) divides the kinds of translation into two categories. One is meaning – based translation and yhe other is form – based translation. Form – based translation attempts to folloe the form of the source language and is known as literal translation. On the other hand, meaning - based translation is translation that emphasizes on meaning.

Nida and Taber as cited by Simatupang (1999) support this type of translation by dividing translation into literal translation and dynamic translation. Basically, dynamic translation has the same characters with the meaning – based translation, taht is emphasis on the meaning rather than on the form.

Litearal translation is translation that emphasizes on the form. For example, 'You must study alone here' 'Anda harus belajar sendirian disini'. In the example, we can see that English and Indonesian are related, which means that the general grammatical form may similar, so the literal translation can be understood. However, in some cases, we can find that literal translation will produce an unnatural, because the Indonesian language uses different expression.

Equivalence in Translation

It discusses about the definition of equivalence by some professionals and experts.

Definitions of Equivalence

Catford (1965:21) notes that "the central problem of translation practice is that finding TL translation equivalence. A central task of translation theory is taht of defining the nature and condition of translation equivalence". Equivalence is the most appropriate meaning of source language in the target langauge. Bell (1991:70) defines the term equivalence as the replacement of stretch of a source langauge (particularly idioms, cliches, provrb, greetings, etc,) and the like by its functional equivalent.

Baker (1992) acknowledges that equivalence can usually be obtained to some extent, but it is influenced by variety of linguistics and cultural factors and is therefore always relative. She outlines five types of translation equivalence; they are equivalence at word level, equivalence above word level, grammatical equivalence, textual equivalence and pragmatic equivalence.

Problems of Non-Equivalence at Word Level

Based on types of lexical meaning above, there are some of the more common types of non-equivalence which often pose difficulties for the translator. Non-equivalence at word level means that the target language has no direct equivalent for a word which occurs in the sourrce

a) Culture-specific concept

In culture specific concepts, the problems emerges as a result of source-language that expresses a concept of word which is totally unknown in the target language culture. The concept may be abstract or concrete, for example: an English concept is the word *privacy,* which is understood by people from other culture.

b) The source-language concepts is not lexicalized in the target language

In this type of non-equivalence, the source-language expresses a word which easily understood by people from other culture but it is not lexicalized. For example, the word savoury has no equivalent in many languages, although its meaning is easy to understand.

c) The source-language word is semantically complex

In this type of non-equivalence, the source-language word is semantically complex, as quoted by Bolinger and Sears, Baker (1992:22) stated that words do not have to be morphologically complex to be semantically complex. A single word which consists of a single morpheme can sometimes express a more complex set of meanings than a whole sentence. For example, a word arruacao, a Brazilian word which means 'clearing the ground under coffee trees and piling it in the middle of the row in order to aid in the recovery of beans dropped during harvesting'.

d) The source and the target languages make different distinctions in meaning.

In this type of non-equivalence, the target language may make more or fewer different distinctions in meaning than the source language. For example, the word *going out in the rain* makes two meaning in mIndonesia *(kehujanan dan hujan-hujanan),* which are different in terms of going out in the rain without knowledge (kehujanan) and going out in the rain with the knowledge (hujan-hujanan) while English does not make this distinction.

e) The target langauge lacks a superordinate

In this type of non-equivalent, the target langauge may have specific words (hyponym) but no the general word. For example, Russian has no equivalent for *facilities,* but it has several words which can be thought as types of facilities.

f) The target language lacks a specific term (hyphonym)

Usually, langauges tend to have general words (superordinate), but lack the specific ones (hyphonyms). Engalish has a variety of hyphonyms which have equivalent in other languages. For example, English has many hyphonyms under the word *house,* such as *cottage, hut villa, lodge, bungalow,etc.*

g) Differences in physical or interpersonal perspective

In this type of non-equivalence, physical or interpersonal perspective that has to do with where things or people are in relation to another or to a place may be more important in one language than in another. For example, Japanese has six equivalence for *give*, depending on who gives to whom: *yaru, ageru, morau, kureru, itadaku, and kudasaru* (Mc Creary , 1986).

h) Differences in expressive meaning

Baker (1992:24) said that differences in expressive meaning are usually more difficult to handle when the target-language equivalent is more emotionally loaded than the source-langauge item. For example, the English word batter (as in child/wife battering) was rendered by the more neutral Japanese word tataku, means 'to beat', plus an equivalent modifier such as 'savagely' or 'ruthlessly'.

i) Differences in form

In this type of non-equivalence, there is often no equivalent in the target-language for a particular form in the source text. English has many couplets consist of such noun and suffixes or prefixes such as imployer/employee, trainer/trainee, steward/stewardess. Arabic, has no ready mechanism for producing such forms and so they are often replaced by an appropriate paraphrase, depending on the meaning they convey.

j) Differences in frequency and purpose of using specific forms

In this type of non-equivalence, English, for example, uses the continuous –*ing* form for binding clauses much more frequently than other languages. As a result, rendering every –*ing* from English to target langauge would make unnatural style.

k) The use of loan words in ghe source text

Once a word is loaned into a particular langauge, we cannot control its development or its additional meaning. For example, average Japanese translator is not likely to confuse an English *feminist* with a Japanese *feminist* (*feminist* in Japanese means a man who excessively soft with woman).

Strategies in Non-Equivalence Problems of Translation

Baker (1992:26) suggests some strategies to overcome the problems arising in the process of translation related to various types of non-equivalence. As this study is focused on word level equivalence, the strategies discussed are limited on that level of equivalence:

a) Translation by a more general word (superordinate)

This strategy means that the translator may go up one level in a given semantic field to find a more general word that covers the core proportional meaning of the missing hyphonym in the receptor language.

b) Translation by a more neutral / less expressive word

In this strategy, the translators may use the more / less expressive word if the source langauge has diffrences in expressive meaning which is more difficult to handle because the target language equivalent is more emotionally or less emotionally than the source-language item.

c) Translation by cultural subtitution

This strategy involves replacing a culture-specific item or expression with the target langauge item which does not have the same prportiona meaning but is likely to have a similar impact on the target reader. The advantages is the readers can identify a concept which familiar to the readers.

d) Translation using a loan word or loan word plus explanation

This strategy is particularly common in dealing with non-equivalent on culture specific concepts. One item may be not exist in the particular langauge because it depends on the environment culture. Once explained, the loan word continually can be used on its own, the reader can undertsand without further lengthy explanation, because it is explained formerly.

e) Translation by paraphrase using a related word

This strategy tends to be used when the concept expressed by the source item is lexicalized in the target lanaguge but in different form, and when the frequency which a certain form is used, the source text is significantly higher than would be natural in the target langauge (Baker 1992: 37).

f) Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words

In this strategy, the translators still can use the paraphrase strategy although the source text word is not lexicalized at all in the target langauge and it is semantically complex. The step is by modifying a superordinate or simply unpacking the meaning of the source item. The disadvantage of using this strategy is that it is awkward to use because it involves filling a one-item slot with an explanation consisting of several items.

g) Translation by omission

In this strategy, the translators sometimes can simply omit translating the word from the source text because it is not vital enough to the development of the text. it does no harm compared to distract the reader with a lengthy insignificant explanation.

h) Translation by illustration

This strategy offers an easy choice and it can be a useful option if the word which has no equivalent in the receptor langauge refers to a physical item which can be illustrated.

i) Translation by a more specific word (hyphonym)

In addition, a strategy that is not mentioned by Baker that is translation by a more specific word (hyphonym). In this strategy, the translator may go down one level in a given semantic field to find a more specific word that covers the core proportional meaning of the word in the source language. In other words, this strategy may be used to overcome a relative lack of superordinate in the target language.

From the description above, the writer can conclude that there are many problems that may arise when one translates one word from one language to another language. The scholars found that the lack of non-equivalence words across languages may ignite the problems in translating one word across languages. Therefore; the one who does translating must know the strategies to solve the problems. Baker (1992) offers strategies to deal some problems of word level equivalence. In this study, the writer observes that the translator's problem of non-equivalence at word level is a challenging problem to be solved. The writer decided to do the same research about word level equivalence in the Indonesian translation dialogue in The Lightning Thief novel by using Baker's strategies.

From the explanation above, the problems of translating emerge because of some factors, such as: the culture specific concepts, the source language is not lexicalized in the target language, the source language word is semantically complex, the source and target languages make different distinction in meaning, the target language lacks a super ordinate, the target language lacks specific term (hyponym), teh differences in physical or interpersonal perspective, differences in expressive meaning, differences in frequency and purpose of using specific

forms, and the use of loan words in thhe source text. Most of them also become a real obstacle in translating the dialogue, especially at word level.

As well as the problem of non-equivalence, the translators also have to give attention to the strategies to gain them. In dealing with this, Baker (1992) proposed some strategies, such as: translation by a more general word, translation by a more/less expressive word, translation by cultural subtitution, translation using a loan word or loan word plus explanation, translation by paraphrase using related word, translation by paraphrase using unrelated word translation by omission, and translation by illustration.

As have been stated above, several strategies have been suggested by Baker (1992) to gain the word level equivalence problems; translators sould be able to produce an acceptable translation. From this point, the writer intends to find out the strategies used by the translators of the dialogue to overcome non-lequivalence at word level and the equivalence meaning of the dialogue.

FINDINGS

There are two result of the studies according to the objective of the studies; results of the strategies used by the translator deal with the problems of non-equivalence at word level in the Indonesian translation of the dialogues in Rick Riordan's *The Lightning Thief* viewed from Baker's word level equivalence classification and result of the rating of word level equivalence meaning in the translated dialogues.

STRATEGIES FOR WORD LEVEL EQUIVALENCE

Table 4.1.1 Strategies for Word Level Equivalence

No.	Translation Strategies	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Translation by paraphrase using a related word	34 26	24.11 %
2.	Translation by a more specific word (*subordinate*)	21 20	18.43 %
3.	Translation by paraphrase using unrelated word	19 12	14.89 %
4.	Translation by a more general word (*super ordinate*)	9 -	14.19 %
5.	Translation by omission	-	13.48 %
6.	Translation by a more neutral/less expressive word		8.51 %
7.	Translation by using a loan word or loan word plus explanation		6.39 %
8.	Translation by illustration		-
9.	Translation by cultural subtitution		-
	Total	141	100 %

As shown in the result above, there are seven Baker's (1992) translation strategies being applied in the Indonesian translation of dialogues in the Rick Riordan's *The Lightning Thief*. The most frequently used strategy was translation by paraphrase using related word and the least used strategies was translation using a loan

word or loan word plus explanation. The strategy of translation by illustration and cultural substitution were not found in this study.

Word Level Equivalence in the Translated Dialogues

The further result is the rating of word level equivalence meaning of translated dialogues as shown in table below:

Table 4.1.2 Recapitulation of Word Level Equivalence Rating of Translated Dialogues

No	Strategy	Total Data	Score 3				Score 2				Score1			
			1st rater	2nd rater	3rd rater	Percentage	1st rater	2nd rater	3rd rater	Percentage	1st rater	2nd rater	3rd rater	Percentage
1	Translation by paraphrase using related word	34	14	30	29	71.57 %	10	4	5	18.63 %	10	-	-	9.80 %
2	Translation by a more speficic word	26	14	17	15	58.98 %	5	7	8	25.64 %	7	2	3	15.38 %
3	Translation by paraphrase using unrelated word	21	13	16	15	69.84 %	6	3	4	20.64 %	2	2	2	9.52 %
4	Translation by a more general word	20	10	12	9	51.68 %	8	6	8	36.67 %	2	2	3	11.67%
5	Translation by omission	19	14	3	2	33.33 %	4	-	-	7.02 %	1	16	17	59.65 %
6	Translation by less neutral or more expressive word	12	1	7	8	44.45 %	4	4	3	30.56 %	7	1	1	24.99 %
7	Translation using loan word or loan word plus explanation	9	7	9	9	92.59 %	2	-	-	7.41 %	-	-	-	-
Total		141												

Note:

Score (3): meaning is sufficiently rendered (equivalent)
Score (2): meaning is insufficiently rendered (some loss of meaning)
Score (1): meaning is distorted (non-equivalent)

The table above shows the percentages of the results of the averages of rating of each scores by each raters. Translation by paraphrase using related word is the highest strategy whose data reached 34 of 141 data, with percentage of average of the reslut of score 3 is 71.57 %, percentage of average of score 2 is 18.63 %, and score 1 is 9.80 %. The second highest strategy is translation by a more specific word which has 26 of 141 data with 58.98 % of the average of result of score 3, then, 25.64 % of score 2, and 15.38 % of score 1. There are 21 data were found in the translation by paraphrase using unrelated word which percentage of the average of score 3 reached 69.84%, 20.64 % of score 2, and 9.52 % of score 1. Translation by a more general word has 20 of 141 data whose average of score 3 reached51.68 %, score 2 reached 36.67 %, and 11.67 % of score 1. Translation by omisson is in the forth position which has 19 of total data with 33.33 % of the average of score 3, 7.02 % of score 2, and 59.65 % of score 1. Translation by less neutral or more expressive word is under the translation by omission strategy with 12 of total data and 44.45 % of average of score 3, 30.56 % of score 2, and score 1 reached 24.99%. The last lowest strategy is translation by using Loan word or Loan word plus explanation which total data reached 9 of 141 data with 92.59 % of the average of score 3, 7.41% of score 2, and 0 % of score 1.

Translation by Paraphrase Using Related Word

This strategy tends to be used when the concept expressed by the source item is lexicalized in the target language but in different form, and when the frequency with certain form is used in the source text is significantly higher than would be natural in the target language.

Datum 1

ST: "Not a scratch on this car, *brain boy*,"

TT: "Jangan   sampai   tergores sedikitpun, anak *jenius*,"

BT: "Not a scratch on this car, *genius boy*,"

From the datum above, the word *brain* was translated to *jenius*. *Brain* means the organ inside the head that controls thought, memory, feelings and activity (Cambridge Dictionary). If the translator used the phrase *anak otak*, it will be correct but the translation work would be very ordinary and flat. Therefore, translation by paraphrase using related word was used in this case.

Translation by a More Specific Word

In this strategy, the translator may go down one level in a given semantic field to find a more specific word that covers the core propositional meaning of the word in the source language.

Datum 2

ST: "Your dad, actually. Don't you remember? Medusa was Poseidon's girlfriend. They decided to meet in my mother's temple. That's why Athena turned her into a monster. Medusa and her two sisters who had helped her get into the temple, they became the three gorgons. That's why Medusa wanted to slice me up, but she wanted to preserve you as a nice statue. She's still *sweet* on your dad. You probably reminded her of him."

TT: "Sebenernya, berkat ayahmu. Kau lupa ya?Medusa itu pacar Poseidon. Mereka memutuskan untuk bertemu di kuil ibuku. Itu sebabnya Athena mengubahnya menjadi monster. Medusa dan kedua saudarinya yang membantunya masuk ke kuil, mereka menjadi ketiga gorgon. Itu sebabnya Medusa ingin mencincangku, tetapi dia ingin mengabadikanmu sebagai patung yang bagus. Dia masih *naksir* ayahmu. Kau mungkin mengingatkan dia pada ayahmu."

BT: "Your dad, actually. Don't you remember? Medusa was Poseidon's girlfriend. They decided to meet in my mother's temple. That's why Athena turned her into a monster. Medusa and her two sisters who had helped her get into the temple, they became the three gorgons. That's why Medusa wanted to slice me up, but she wanted to preserve you as a nice

statue. She's still *like* your dad. You probably reminded her of him."

From the datum above, the word *sweet* was translated to *naksir* (Back Translation: *like*). If an emotion or event is sweet, it is very pleasant and satisfying (Cambridge Dictionary) that is the word *sweet* is described as. In this sample, the translator used the word *naksir* instead of *manis* since it sounds more natural. Therefore, the translator try to specify the word *manis* to *naksir*.

Translation by Paraphrase Using Unrelated Word

The paraphrase may based on modifying a super ordinate or simply on unpacking the meaning of the source item, particularly if the particular item or expression is not vital enough to the development of the text to justify distracting the reader with lenghty explanation, translators can and often do simply omit translating in question.

Datum 3

ST: "He will drive you into the city, and, er, well, keep an eye on *things*."

TT: "Dia akan mengantarmu ke kota dan, eh, yah, pasang mata dengan *keadaan sekitar*."

BT: "He will drive you into the city, and, er, well, keep an eye on the *condition around*

From the datum above, the word *things* was translated to *keadaan sekitar* (Back Translation: *the condition around*). *Thing* is used to refer in an approximate way to an object or to avoid naming it (Cambridge Dictionary). The translator used the phrase *keadaan sekitar* since it is more suitable than the proper language.

Translation by a More General Word

In translation by a more general word, the translator may go up one level in a given semantic to find a more general word that covers the core propositional meaning of the missing hyponym in the receptor language.

Datum 4

ST: "And *gave* Kronos a rock to eat instead."

TT: Dan *menggantinya* dengan batu untuk dimakan kronos."

BT: "And *change* Kronos a rock to eat instead."

From datum above, the word *gave* was translated to *menggantinya*. The word *gave* is past form of the word *give*. Cambridge Dictionary defines this word as offering something to someone, or to provide them with it. The translator used the word *menggantinya* which is a more general according to the context of the dialogue.

Translation by Omission

If the meaning conveyed by particular item or expression is not vital enough to the development of the text to justify distracting the reader with lengthy explanation, translators can and often do simply omit translating the word or expression in question.

Datum 5

ST: "Like we're going to use this *in real life*."

TT: "Memangnya pelajaran ini bakal kita pakai."

BT: "Memangnya pelajaran ini bakal kita pakai *dalam kehidupan nyata*."

In the datum above, there are some words omitted in the target-language. *In real life* (Back Translation: *dalam kehidupan nyata*) was omitted by the translator.

Translation by Less Neutral/More Expressive Word

Translation by a more neutral/less expressive word means that the translator may use the more neutral/less expressive word if the source language has differences in expressive meaning, which is more difficult to handle because the target language equivalence is more emotionally or less emotionally than the source language item.

Datum 6

ST: "I should have seen her for what she was. Now let's just *worry* about keeping Percy alive until next fall-"

TT: "Semestinya saya menyadari apa sebenarnya bu Dods itu. Sekarang, kita *berkosentrasi* saja soal menjaga Percy tetap hidup hingga musim gugur depan."

BT: "I should have seen her for what she was. Now let's just *concentrate* about keeping Percy alive until next fall-"

From the datum above, the word *worry* was translated to *berkosentrasi. Worry* means to think about problems or unpleasant things that might happen in a way that makes you feel unhappy and afraid (Cambridge Dictionary). It is possible to explain that the translator used the word *berkosentrasi* in the target language because it is most suitable. The proper translation of the word *worry* will be weird; therefore, the translator used a more neutral and communicable word.

Translation Using a Loan Word or Loan Word plus Explanation

In translation using Loan word plus explanation, one item may not be exist in the particular language because it depends on the environment culture. Once explained, the loan word continually can be used on its own; the reader can understand without further explanation.

Datum 7

ST: "Your dad, actually. Don't you remember? Medusa was Poseidon's girlfriend. They decided to meet in my mother's temple. That's why Athena turned her into a monster. Medusa and her two sisters who had helped her get into the temple, they became the three *gorgons*. That's why Medusa wanted to slice me up, but she wanted to preserve you as a nice statue. She's still sweet on your dad. You probably reminded her of him."

TT: "Sebenernya, berkat ayahmu. Kau lupa ya?Medusa itu pacar Poseidon. Mereka memutuskan untuk bertemu di kuil ibuku. Itu sebabnya Athena mengubahnya menjadi monster. Medusa dan kedua saudarinya yang membantunya masuk ke kuil, mereka menjadi ketiga *gorgon*. Itu sebabnya Medusa ingin mencincangku, tetapi dia ingin mengabadikanmu sebagai patung yang bagus. Dia masih naksir ayahmu. Kau mungkin mengingatkan dia pada ayahmu."

BT: Your dad, actually. Don't you remember? Medusa was Poseidon's girlfriend. They decided to meet in my mother's temple. That's why Athena turned her into a monster. Medusa and her two sisters who had helped her get into the temple, they became the three *gorgons*. That's why Medusa wanted to slice me up, but she wanted to preserve you as a nice statue. She's still sweet on your dad. You probably reminded her of him."

From the datum above, the word *gorgon* was translated to the same word. According to Cambridge Dictionary, *gorgon* means a woman whose appearance and behavior causes fear. The translator used the same word as its target text since that word does not exist in the target-language. Therefore the translator used this strategy.

CONCLUSION

Out of the nine strategies proposed by Baker , seven strategies were uesd. The most dominant was translation by paraphrase using related word which has 34 data (24.11%). This strategy got 71.57% of score 3, 18.63% of score 2, and 9.80% of score 1. The second dominant was translation by a more specific word which has 26 data (18.43%). This strategy got 58.98% of score 3, 25.64% of score 2, and 15.38% of score 1. Translation by paraphrase using unrelated word which has 21 data (14.89%) was in third position with 69.84% of score 3, 20.64% of score 2, and 9.52% of score 1. The fourth position was translation by a more general word which has 20 data (14.19%) with the average of the result of score 3 was 51.68%, 36.67% of score 2, and 11.67% of score 1. Translation by omission which has 19 data (13.48%) was in fifth position with 33.33% of score 3, 7.02% of score 2, and 59.65% of score 1. The next followed by translation by less

neutral or more expressive word which has 12 data (8.51%). This strategy got 44.45% of score 3, 30.56% of score 2, and 24.99% of score 1. The least strategy was translation using loan word or loan word plus explanation which has 9 data (6.39%). This strategy got 92.59% of score 3, 7.41% of score 2, and 0% of score 1. Regarding the result of each strategy above, word level equivalence meaning of the data in the strategies: translation by using loan word (92.59%) was the strategy whose data were got higher result of score 3 (meaning is sufficiently renderred) by three raters, translation by a more general word (36.67%) was the strategy whose data were got higher result of score 2 (meaning is insufficiently), and translation by omission was the strategy whose data were got higher result of score 1 (59.65%).

SUGGESTIONS

Translating work is not an easy task. The product of translation must be able to render the meaning sufficiently to the reader. Therefore, good and natural translation must be made. The analysis of the study shows that there were problems related to meaning equivalence. There were some data in some strategies which meaning equivalence is insufficiently renderred even distorted or non-equivalence. It is important for the translator to know the strategies to overcome the problems of non-equivalence especially at word level equivalence; therefore, the messages and the meanings of the source language can be transferred proportionally and appropriately into the target langauge.

Regarding the points above, it is suggested that to transfer meaning of the source text into the target text accurately, the translator should decide to make choices in each word or phrases, and choose the most suitable strategies that can overcome problems and difficulties of translation, especially problems of non-equivalence at word level.

It is also offered a suggestion for the students, translating work needs an accuracy and carefulness, by reading source text and target text intensively, it will enrich vocabulary and

understanding about translation, so it will helps students to find suitable translation strategy to solve the problems of word level equivalence.

REFERENCES

Baker, Mona. 1992. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, Susan. 1991. Translation Studies. London and New York:Routledge.

Bell, R.T. 1991. Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice. New York: Longman.

Catford, J.C. 1965. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. London: Oxford, university Press.

Hewson, L. Dan J.Martin. 1991. Redefining Translation : The Variational Approach. London:Routledge

Larson, L.M 1984. Meaning-Based Translation. A Guide to Cross Language Equivalence. Lanham: Uniersity Press of America.

Machali, R. 1998. Redefining Textual Equivalence in Translation with Special Reference to Indonesian-English. Jakarta: The Translation Center.

_____. 2000. Pedoman bagi Penerjemah. Jakarta: PT Grasindo.

Newmark, P 1998. A Text Book of Translation. New York: Prentice Hall International English Language Teaching.

Nida, Eugene. A. dan Charles .R. Taber. 1982. The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Simatupang, M.D.S. 1999. Pengantar Teori Terjemahan. Jakarta: Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi Departemen Pendidikan Nasional