CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I would like to draw some conclusions which are based on the findings that I have got in the previous chapter. In translating a text, translators may face difficulties. One of the difficulties is caused by the different systems of the languages, in this case English and Indonesian. The different systems lead translators to think hard of how to translate the text accurately from the original text into the translation text and how to make the translation sound natural and accurate in conveying messages from the writer to the readers.

The novel the translation of which I analyze is based on a true story. Therefore, in my opinion, the level of difficulty of translating it increases. The translator must have an ability to translate every scene of the novel in detail and naturally. Otherwise, the readers will miss some information or they will not know what really happens in the story.

After I read the translation novel, in general, I think the translator is quite good in translating it. Nevertheless, I find some words which are not translated equivalently from the original text (English) into the translation text (Indonesian). We can see in the previous chapter that there are fourteen data of words which are

not translated equivalently enough. The non-equivalence of meaning is based on the componential analysis and hierarchical structuring analysis which I use as the tools.

Based on the analysis and compared with the hierarchical structuring analysis, I think componential analysis is more accurate to use as a tool when we want to find words which are equivalent in meaning. Componential analysis gives specific components of meaning of each word; on the other hand, hierarchical structuring analysis just shows the level of word meanings. It is possible that words of the same level have different components of meaning. Consequently, we must still find the components of meaning of the words to show how one word is different from other words. Furthermore, it will make it easier for us to get the more proper equivalent word for the translation text.

Out of the fourteen data, we can see that there are eight data which are analyzed using componential analysis and six data using hierarchical structuring analysis. From all the analysis, we can find that a word in the translation text sometimes has a loss in meaning or sometimes a gain in meaning or even both a loss and gain in meaning.

In the componential analysis, we can find that there are seven data that have both a loss and gain in meaning and one data which has a loss in meaning. Both a loss and gain in meaning here means that the words from the original text (English) have lost one or more components of meaning. Besides, they get additional components of meaning which are different from the components of the words in the original text. Another data from the componential analysis shows a loss in meaning. It is a loss because the word in the translation text does not have

Maranatha Christian University

one component of meaning in the original text. From these two cases, I think these non-equivalence of meaning is not caused by the translator's lack of vocabulary but because he focuses more on the context of the story. Furthermore, contextually speaking, the parts of the story are still acceptable in meaning. In my opinion, the translator knows the meaning of the words that he translates. Even if he is not familiar with the words, he can find the meaning of the words in a dictionary.

Another six data of the non-equivalent words are based on the hierarchical structuring analysis. The different levels of word meanings also give influence for translators to find the equivalent meaning. One word may have a different level from another word. It can be as the superordinate or as the lower specific term which is called hyponym. If we translate a word from the original text into the translation text in different semantic levels, it will also make the meaning become not equivalent.

In the hierarchical structuring analysis, we can see that five data have a loss in meaning and one data has a gain in meaning. We can see that they have a loss in meaning because of the different levels from the hyponym in the original text (English) into the superordinate in the translation text (Indonesian). This happens due to the fact that the English language has more extensive and specific vocabulary than Indonesian. As a result, it will make the translator face difficulties to find the equivalent meaning.

On the other hand, when the word has a gain in meaning, it is because of the different levels from the superordinate in the original text into the hyponym in the translation text, in this case meal is translated into makan siang. In my

opinion, this occurs because, again, the translator focuses more on the context of the story. In this case, he intends to make the setting of the story clear.

As a closing remark, I think translators should minimize the non-equivalent words in the translation. First, I think they must master the two languages, the source language and the target language. By having more vocabulary, the words that they choose will be more accurate as the equivalents. Furthermore, I think diction is a very significant thing in translating a text. As a result, translators must be careful in choosing the diction so that they can convey natural and accurate messages delivered by the writer to the reader. In addition, if translators know and understand the theory of translation, it can make them and their translation more perfect. Consequently, the reader will get all of parts of scene and information from the story in the original text.

Maranatha Christian University