

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I would like to give some conclusions which are based on the result of the research in Chapter Three. I would like to present the concluding points starting from the componential analysis, hierarchical structure analysis, and contextual analysis. I would also give my personal opinions and comments concerning the result and some suggestions for translators.

First, in analysing the words and phrases in the translated novel which show non-equivalence of meaning by using componential analysis, I find twelve data, consisting of two phrases and ten words, which are proved not equivalent to the source text. It is proved when I contrast each component of the words and phrases in the target text with those in the source text, by observing the definition of each word and phrase from the Indonesian and the English dictionaries.

Having found the fact of the inequivalent words and phrases through the analysis, I think this non-equivalence of meaning is caused by the different standard of quality between the Indonesian dictionaries and the English dictionaries.

In my opinion the English dictionaries have more detailed and clearer definitions than the Indonesian dictionaries. This may lead to the fact that the Indonesian dictionaries are not so reliable, as they may give a chance to have more inaccurate translation.

Moreover, through this analysis I also find that out of twelve data, eight words and two phrases are translated totally out of context, while the other two data are still related to the context of the story but their meanings are not equivalent to the source text. It is proved through the comparison of the components of the words and phrases in the componential analysis. As a result, when I read the sentences in the target text, it leads me to a different understanding compared with the source text. This fact is of course what a translator should avoid, for transference of the same message is the basic essence of translation.

Next, in the hierarchical structure analysis of the data, I find that there are eleven words, the meanings of which are proved not to be equivalent to the source text. The non-equivalence of meaning in this analysis consists of seven words which are translated from the specific term into the generic term and four words which are translated from generic term into the specific term.

However, I have found the closer equivalents for those non-equivalent words through this analysis, which is supported not only by the diagram of the levels of the words but also by the word definitions in both languages. Moreover, this analysis also leads me to the fact that actually in our language we have the term, both for the specific term and for the generic term, and we do not need to change the term from the generic one to the specific one or vice versa. Therefore,

having found the fact that the meanings of the translated words are not equivalent, I think the non-equivalence found in the translated work is caused by human error.

Then, in the contextual meaning analysis of the data, I find four sentences which are not translated equivalently into the source text. All the non-equivalent meanings in the translation are caused by the difference of structures in both languages. The major problem in this analysis is that the English language structure, has a tense system, which is very crucial in determining the time when an event happens, while the Indonesian language structure does not have such a system so that we have to add an adverb of time to make it clear when an event happens. Through this analysis, I see that this problem can be a factor which confuses the reader in following the story.

Having done the analysis, I think that componential analysis, hierarchical structure analysis and contextual meaning analysis are very useful in helping us to translate the source text into the target text. In my opinion there are some advantages which I can gain from this lexical meaning analysis. First, we can find the equivalent words or phrases through the componential analysis and hierarchical structure analysis. Second, through the contextual analysis we can find the appropriate sentences to use in the translation so that it will make the translation better. Moreover, I also think that these three ways of analysing can help the translator to reduce the non-equivalence of meaning as well as to prevent them from using inaccurate words/phrases/sentences in their translation work.

Finally in this conclusion part, I would also like to share some points which might be of some benefit for translator. In translating a source text, translators should be more careful in choosing the words which they are going to

use in the target text to replace those in the source text, for I think it will influence the readers' understanding when they read a translation work or make them lose the ideas of the content of the book. Besides, in my opinion the more accurate the translated words, phrases, and sentences are, the closer the translation is to the source text.

Second, if the translators are unsure of the word that they are going to use in the target text, componential analysis is profusely helpful in finding the equivalent words or phrases, while hierarchical structure analysis is useful in figuring out the generic term or the specific term that we may use in the target text. On top of that the use of contextual analysis helps us to find the right sentences to be used in the target text. A translator must also pay more attention to certain structures that are typical in the source language, but which the target language does not have, for I think a translator is always expected to create a work of translation which is coherent, comprehensible and easily understood so that it will help the readers to understand the information that the source text has.

(983 words)