

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

Having discussed the comparison between the two Indonesian translation texts of Sidney Sheldon's Windmills of the Gods in the previous chapter, I would like to make some concluding remarks.

As my research is to find out which one of the two translation texts has the more equivalent meaning to the source text, I base the equivalency of meaning on the correct meaning both in the referential and the contextual meanings. The equivalent meaning is also taken from the acceptable contextual meaning, although the referential meaning is not considered right. From my analysis in the previous chapter, we see that TT1 has nineteen data which are equivalent to the source text, while TT2 has just seventeen. The percentage of TT1's equivalent meaning is 86.36%, from the scale of 100%, while TT2 is just 77.27%. TT1 also has fewer non-equivalent meanings both in the referential and contextual meanings because it just has three data, while TT2 has five data. The percentage of TT1's non-equivalent meaning is 13.64%, from the scale of 100%, while TT2

is 22.73%. The following table shows the final result of the equivalent and the non-equivalent meanings both in TT1 and TT2.

Equivalent and Non-Equivalent Meaning in TT1 and TT2		Referential Meaning	Contextual Meaning	Total	Percentage
TT1	Equivalent	√	√	12	86.36%
		x	√	7	
	Non-Equivalent	x	x	3	13.64%
TT2	Equivalent	√	√	10	77.27%
		x	√	7	
	Non-Equivalent	x	x	5	22.73%

Based on the table above, I conclude that TT1 is more equivalent to ST than TT2, although it is not too significant. Basically, the equivalency of TT1 and TT2 are almost the same. The percentage of TT1's equivalent meaning, 86.36%, is much bigger than the percentage of TT1's non-equivalent meaning, 13.64%. It is almost the same case as TT2 because the percentage of TT2's equivalent meaning, 77.27%, is also much bigger than the percentage of TT2's non-equivalent meaning, 22.73%. Therefore, I also conclude that although TT2 is less equivalent to ST than TT1, TT2 is still acceptable as a good translation.

In analyzing the data, I get two kinds of condition in which a translation is considered acceptable. The first condition is when the meaning is correct both in the referential and the contextual meanings, and the second condition is when the

meaning is acceptable in the contextual meaning but it is not considered right in the referential meaning. From here I see that the contextual meaning has to be right in order that the translation can be equivalent to the source text. Therefore, I conclude that contextual meaning has a bigger role in terms of equivalency than the referential meaning. I do not mean to underestimate the referential meaning, but in reality, many words have more than one referential meaning. Consequently, we need a more specific measurement. If we only translate the referential meaning, we are likely to mistranslate the word because it might relate to other things, and it will also cause some misunderstanding about the whole text. What a translator should do is interpret the context correctly as how the word is used in the source text. In this case, the contextual meaning has its role.

Another potential mistake which can be made by a translator is when the meaning is correct in the referential meaning but it is incorrect in the contextual meaning. However, I do not find such data in the previous chapter. Therefore, I see that the translators in both TT1 and TT2 are aware of thinking about the contextual meaning. They have already considered the context of the text and they can interpret it correctly.

Yet, there are a few data which show mistranslation which I think is basically caused by human errors. The mistranslation of such words as *maverick*, *Commies*, *please*, and *commerce* into *petualang*, *orang-orang dungu*, *jangan lama-lama*, and *keuangan* respectively shows that sometimes the translators interpret the context incorrectly because the meaning of the translations has no relation with what is written in the source text.

Besides, I find four data in which neither the referential nor the contextual meanings are acceptable. I think there are several reasons which can be assumed from those mistranslated words. First, it might be caused by the translators' carelessness. A translator might misread some words because she does not pay much attention to what is originally written in the source text or she might mistype the translation. Therefore, they are unaware that they translate the text incorrectly. Some examples of this case can be seen in the previous chapter, namely in the second data in the mistranslated words found in TT1, which states *seminggu* as the translation of the phrase *two weeks* from ST, and the third data, which states *dua ratus* as the translation of the word *250*. There is also one data, the third data, in the mistranslated words found in TT2, which states *seperempat jam* as the translation of the phrase *half an hour* from ST. The second possible reason, which is still related to the first one, namely the inconsistency of the translators when they translate a text, can be seen in the second data in the mistranslated words found in TT2. The translators do not translate the phrase *a million-dollar*, the value of the reward, consistently. They translate it into *setengah juta dollar* on page 76, but on page 93, the translation is *sejuta dollar*.

Therefore, as a suggestion, when we translate a text, first, we must always think that our translation has to be equivalent to the source text. Second, in giving the equivalent meaning, we must see not only from the referential meaning but also from the contextual meaning because the two types of meaning support each other in building the understanding of the readers. However, the meaning is still acceptable only when the contextual meaning is considered right, because the

contextual meaning, as I have said earlier, has the bigger role in terms of equivalency. Consequently, it is more effective in building the understanding of the readers about the whole text.