

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

Having analyzed the data found in Lewis Carroll's Through the Looking-Glass, I categorize the form of language play into three areas of linguistic which are morphology, phonology, and semantics. From the analysis, I find six forms of language play; they are affixation, blending, compounding, alliteration, free verbal repetition and antonym.

I discover that some language play in the data involve several morphological processes. There are affixation, compounding, and blending. Data 1 contains affixation. Language play which belongs to compounding is found in data 2 and 6b; meanwhile, language play that contains blending is found in the

From the Indonesian version, data 1 that contains affixation is translated into different forms but same sense. The translator does not choose to keep the translation of data 2. form of affixation in the data. The translator translates language play in data 2 that contains compounding into a different form but same sense. However, data 6b that also contain compounding are translated into different form and sense.

For the readers, in data 1, the effect of language play in the source text is humorous; while, the effect of language play in the target text is also humorous. From the use of compounding in data 2, the effects of compounding in the target text are humorous. For the use of compounding in data 6b, the effect on the readers of the source text is confusing and pleasant to read; while the effect on the readers of target text is interesting. Meanwhile, the effects of language play in the source text in 4a and 4b are the readers will find it pleasant to read, interesting, and ludicrous. In the target text the effect will be confusing and ludicrous so that the readers need to know other additional information to understand the new meanings. For the use of compounding in data 6b, the effect on the readers of the source text is confusing and pleasant to read; while the effect on the readers of target text is interesting.

For the finding above, I conclude that it is very difficult to translate language play into the same form and sense in translation. Data 1 that contains affixation and data 2 that contains compounding are successfully translated into the same sense in the target text. Unfortunately, the rest of data that involve compounding are translated into different form and sense. In my opinion, the difficulty to translate into the same form and sense are due to different morphological process in the target language, especially in affixation and compounding.

However, sometimes, the translator has to change the forms of language play because the forms of linguistic devices in the English version are different from the forms of linguistic devices in the Indonesian version. There is a prefix to

show negative meaning un- in English but there is no prefix in Indonesian that show negative meaning. The word tidak and bukan are not prefix and cannot be attached to a noun.

In phonology, I notice that the author uses free verbal repetition in data 3, alliteration in data 5a, 5b, and 6a.

In data 3, which contains free verbal repetition, the translator keeps both of form and sense. In data 5a, 5b, and 6a that contain alliteration, the translator does not keep the form in both of them. The translator also can not keep the sense in data 5b and 6b. However, the translator keeps the sense in data 5a.

From data 3, in the source text, the effects of language play on the readers is that the readers will find it pleasant to hear; while in the target text the readers will find it entertaining. From data 5a, the effect of language play on the readers in the source text is pleasant to hear; while in the target text the effect no longer exists. From data 5b, the effect of language play on the readers in the source text is pleasant to hear, while the effect of language play on the readers in the target text is confusing. From data 6a, the effect of language play and its translation is pleasant to hear on the readers' ear.

From the finding above, I conclude that language play that contain phonology process sometimes can be translated into the same form and sense, but sometimes can not. This happens due to the similarity and difference of phonological process of English and Indonesian. Besides, the translator also has to consider the sense of the translated version if he wants to keep the phonological process. The effect of language play that use phonological processes are pleasant

to the readers; however, the readers in the Indonesian version do not always get the same effect with in English version.

In semantics, I recognize that the author uses negation in data 1. I cannot find any language play that contains synonym, homophone, and homonym. In data 1, the translator keeps the sense; meanwhile only one of the forms is kept. The author and the translator use the same form. The form is antonyms.

The effect of language play which deals with semantics in data 1 is that the readers will find it humorous but ludicrous. The author plays with the negation of birthday present. What makes it humorous but ludicrous is that the readers will know that there is not antonym of birthday present, except if it is used in negative sentence. From the translation, the readers can not find the same effect, but I think the translation is entertaining for the readers because the translator tries to maintain the sense although the phrase hadiah bukan-hadiah ulang tahun is ungrammatical.

From the analysis of data 1, I conclude that language play in the novel that contains a device in semantic is easier to be translated into the same sense because the meaning usually remains the same.

In order to translate language play that contain devices in morphology, phonology, and semantic, the translator needs to translate language play carefully because they have to deliver the aims of the author in making the language play.

For me, language play in the novel are interesting because the language play are made very creatively by the author. Furthermore, when English novels which contain language play are translated into Indonesian, I think it is not easy

for the translators to translate them into the same form and sense. Sometimes, the translator should keep only the form or the sense to deliver the message of the language play. When the translator fails to keep either the form or the sense, the readers of the Indonesian version will also fail in identifying the words or phrases that actually contain language play in the English version.

Personally, I am interested in the ways of the author creating language play in the novel. From the analysis of data 5, I know that the author uses logical and mathematical elements and he expresses it through language to show that he is talking about mathematics operation of addition. The author also invites the readers to imagine the term or the name of a thing such as found in data 2 and data 6b. He asks the readers to imagine rocking-horse-fly, a thing which only exists in a wonderland. It makes the readers imagine what it is like by relating it with the knowledge or information which they know about rocking-horse and horse-fly.

For further research, I suggest that any researchers, who want to take a similar topic, should find other children novels because the data that contains language play in this novel are quite limited. However, there are other topic that can be used to analyze in this novel, for example rhymes, homophone, and homonym.

1.276 words