

TEXTUAL EQUIVALENCE OF PHRASAL VERB TRANSLATION IN THE NOVEL ‘*THE OTHER SIDE OF MIDNIGHT*’ INTO ‘*LEWAT TENGAH MALAM*’

Anita Permatasari

Magister Program (Linguistic Program) In Translation Studies
Postgraduate Program, Udayana University
Phone number (0361) 424409/085936127347
anitaloaf@yahoo.co.id

ABSTRACT

In transferring one language into another, translation is much needed by someone to solve diversity problems in languages either from lexical or grammatical problems. Lexical related to the terms used in the text, and grammatical problems cover the problems related to the word in relation to the other word. The lexical problems in case of variable of phrasal verb will be analyzed by knowing types of phrasal verb with the theory of equivalence in translation in which each language also has its own language system which is different one another besides cultural divergence. In finding the textual equivalence, having the same and different concepts in both SL and TL are applied. The combination between verb and particle in phrasal verb can form many various meaning in which the meaning itself can predicted or can't be predicted from the individual meaning of phrasal verb. Those combinations give something unique and special in form of verb, adjective, or adverb in a sentence.

Keywords : *phrasal verb, translation, equivalence.*

ABSTRAK

Dalam menerjemahkan suatu bahasa kedalam bahasa yang lain, terjemahan sangat dibutuhkan oleh seseorang untuk memecahkan berbagai permasalahan dalam bahasa, baik dari segi leksikal maupun gramatikal. Leksikal berkaitan dengan istilah- istilah yang digunakan dalam text, dan gramatikal memecahkan permasalahan yang berkaitan dengan kata dalam hubungannya dengan kata yang lainnya. Masalah – masalah leksikal khususnya dalam variabel ‘phrasal verb’ akan dianalisis dengan mengetahui jenis- jenis dan makna dari ‘phrasal verb’ dengan teori persamaan dalam terjemahan dimana setiap bahasa memiliki sistem bahasanya tersendiri yang membedakannya selain perbedaan budaya. Dalam menemukan persamaan tekstual, konsep yang sama dan berbeda dari strategi persamaan diaplikasikan. Kombinasi antara kata kerja dan partikel dalam ‘phrasal verb’ dapat membentuk berbagai macam makna yang maksudnya dapat atau tidak dapat diprediksi dari makna tersendiri dari ‘phrasal verb’. Kombinasi – kombinasi tersebut memberikan sesuatu yang unik dan khusus dalam bentuk kata kerja, kata sifat, atau kata keterangan dalam sebuah kalimat.

Kata kunci : *frasa verbal, terjemahan, persamaan.*

INTRODUCTION

In transferring one language into another, translation is much needed by someone to solve diversity problems in languages either from lexical or grammatical problems (Munday: 2000). Lexical related to the terms used in the text, and grammatical problems cover the problems related to the word in relation to the other word. The lexical problems in case of variable of phrasal verb will be analyzed by knowing types and meaning of phrasal verb with the theory equivalence in translation in which each language also has its own language system which is different one another besides cultural divergence. And the phrasal verb is one of the familiar phenomena which is the translator faces during the process of change of meaning. Nida and Taber (1982:12) propose also a rather complete definition about translation. According to them “Translating consisting of reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalence of source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style.”

The definition proposed by Nida and Taber(1982:12) means that the elements that should be taken into account by a translator in performing his/her task are reproducing the message, equivalence, natural equivalence, closest equivalence, priority on meaning and also style. By choosing the topic equivalence in phrasal verb translation, we can determine the most appropriate strategy which is applied in translation process. Equivalence procedures can also be used as strategies to overcome the problem in translation. And the equivalence of translation is one of the main goal of the product of translation as Nida and Taber proposed.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The method used in analyzing the data is qualitative method in which the finding of phrasal verb variables was classified and analyzed collectively based on their types (using particle *out, up, over, in, into, back, down, and away*). The method which is used in this study is library research in which reading the pages of the novel ‘The Other Side of Midnight’ into

'Lewat Tengah Malam' was done at the first stage in order to get comprehension of the content. Then, finding and marking the phrasal verb variables in the sentences were done. The data source is based on the translation of the novel of 'The Other Side of Midnight' into 'Lewat Tengah Malam'. The reason of choosing this kind of literature, first is phrasal verbs are used most commonly in fiction and conversation but they are rare in academic writing (Stig & Douglas: 1999). Second, it is caused by abundant and various finding of phrasal verb variables to be analyzed based on theories of shift and equivalence.

DISCUSSION

Phrasal verb is a set of verb which demonstrates some unique properties with any particle which collocate it (Olteanu: 2012). It is a compound verb (more than one word) that results from combining a verb with an adverb or a preposition. The resulting compound verb is idiomatic. Due to their meanings are idiomatic, there is no logical pattern or formula for learning them, Brown (2002). The meaning of verb will be different if it is collocated with any particle such as particle, *out*, *up*, *over*, *in*, *into*, *back*, *down*, and *away*. The combination will be one united form and meaning. The form and meaning of a phrasal verb is not always the same in a sentence in order to express the idea of translator. Sometimes, the same form of a phrasal verb will have different meaning if it is put in different context of situation. The dynamics of language also influence the change of phrasal verb meaning. So, the meaning of phrasal verb can't be predicted, and that's why it is called idiomatic. Verb and particle which collocate it can't be translated individually or separately in order to get the meaning. For example, in the phrasal verb '*run out*', the word *run* and *out* don't have meaning relation to make it appropriate in word usage. '*run out*' means '*habis*', so we can't translate it separately *run* means move using your legs and *out* means away from the inside of a place or thing. The result of translation is meaningless and not appropriate in the context. In some cases, there are also some phrasal verbs which have correct equivalence meaning based on the meaning of

verb and its particle which collocate it. For example, for the phrasal verb ‘*come back*’ in which ‘*come*’ means *datang* and ‘*back*’ means *kembali* have meaning relation if it’s combined. The phrase of ‘*datangkembali*’ sound natural, acceptable and supposed as equivalence.

The notion of equivalence that we have to realize is that equivalence in translation should not be approached as a search for sameness, since sameness cannot even exist between two target languages version of the same text. Besides, the primary goal of a translator is to discover the naturalness commonly used in the target language. According to Margono (2002) “If we keep closely to the definition of translation, even to produce an exact equivalence is impossible, let alone a better equivalent”. The translation may seem “better” if the original text is bad from the linguistic point of view and the translation is structured better or even more beautifully.

The problem of equivalence is of central importance to translation. In finding the closest equivalence translation, it is often necessary to translate one word of the SL by several words in the TL in order to guarantee the maintenance of the same meaning and sometimes the opposite will be true. According to Larson (1984), translation involves the transfer of form and meaning of the SL to the TL. And there is no exact equivalence between the words of one language and the words of another. There will be words which have some of the meaning components combining in them and matching the words which having these components with some additional ones. It is as Nida and Taber (1982) stated that “Translating consist of in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalence of the source message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style”. The definition means that the translator must have main priority at reproducing the message. To do so, making adjustment grammatically and lexically are needed.

Nida argued that there are two different types of equivalence, namely formal equivalence- which in the other edition by Nida and Taber is referred to *formal correspondence* -and *dynamic equivalence*. Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content, and dynamic equivalence based upon the principle of equivalent effect. In doing formal equivalence, a translator attempts to produce as literally and as meaningfully as possible the form and content of original in such a translation one is concerned with such correspondences poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence and concept to concept. It attempts to reproduce several formal elements, including (1) grammatical unit, (2) consistency in word usage and (3) meanings in terms of the source context. The reproduction of grammatical units may consist : (a) translating noun by nouns, verbs by verbs, etc, (b) keeping all phrases and sentences intact (i.e. not splitting up and readjusting the units), (c) preserving all formal indicators e.g. marks of punctuation, paragraph breaks, and poetic indentation. Such a translation might be a rendering of some Medieval French into English which is intended for students of certain aspects of early French literature and not requiring a knowledge of the original language. Then, it would require numerous footnotes in order to make the text fully comprehensible. (Nida in Venuti, 2000 : 129).

In contrast, dynamic equivalence is oriented to be complete naturalness of expression in which the translator is not so concerned with matching the receptor language (message) with the source language (message), but with dynamic relationship. The relationship between the receptor and the message should be substantially the same as that existing the original, receptor, and the message. One way of defining dynamic equivalence in translation is to describe it as the closest natural equivalent to the source language message. This type of definition contains three terms : (1) equivalent, which points toward the source language message, (2) natural, which point toward the receptor language, and (3) closest, which bind

the two orientations together on the basis of highest degree of approximation. (Nida in Venuti : 2000 : 136).

Dealing with the equivalence problem, Baker (1991: 17) states that the choice of a suitable equivalent in a given context depends on a variety of factors. The factors may be strictly linguistic or extra- linguistic. She explores the notion of equivalence at different levels, in relation to translation process, including all different aspects of translation and hence putting together the linguistic and the communicative approach. Based on this, she classified equivalence into 1) *Equivalence at a word and above word level* that is the first element to be taken into consideration by the translator because when he /she starts analyzing the SL, she /he looks at the word as a single unit in order to find a direct “equivalent” term in the TL, 2) *Grammatical equivalence*, when referring to diversity of grammatical categories across language that may cause remarkable changes in the way the information or message that carried across that may induce the translator either to add or omit information in the TL because of lack of the particular grammatical devices in the TL itself, 3) *Textual equivalence*, when referring to the equivalence between a SL text and and a TL text in terms of information and cohesion, and 4) *Pragmatic equivalence*, when referring to implicatures and strategies of avoidance during the translation process.

Bell (1991: 17) views translation as the replacement of a representation of a text in one language by a representation of an equivalent text in a second language. Texts in different languages can be equivalent in different degrees (fully or partial equivalent) in respect of different levels of presentation (equivalent in respect of context, of semantic, of grammar, of lexis, etc) and at different ranks (word- for- word, phrase- for- phrase, sentence- for – sentence). In order to produce a qualified work of translation, a translator should know grammar, sociolinguistics, discourse, and strategic knowledge. An ideal translator should not

only be bilingual but also a bicultural. Cultural knowledge competence, both in SL and TL help the translator to grasp meaning of the whole text that he is translating.

An interesting discussion in the notion of equivalence can be found in Catford's (1965) who seems to offer a more detailed list of condition upon which the concept of equivalence can be applied. Catford states that translation equivalence occurs when either a SL or a TL text or term is relatable to (at least some of) the same features of substance. It means that equivalence in translation will be possible when SL and TL text or item have a number of the same situational features. So, translator should be aware of the situation in which the words are used in particular communication act. For example the word *father* and *daddy* have the same referential meaning, but the use of them depends on the situation Michael Swan (1980: 26), likewise the words ayah and papa. Therefore, equivalence need some strategies in order to represent the meaning of SL into TL.

The aim of translation is to find the meaning of the source language text and then reconstructing this same meaning using the natural forms of the receptor language. The translator is constantly looking for lexical equivalents between the source language and the target language. However, it is very difficult to find the lexical equivalent of the source text in the target language due to the different culture of the speakers. This makes a literal, one-for-one equivalent of lexical items impossible. Accordingly, the translator needs some strategies to find the most natural and accurate way to express the meaning. There are three strategies of how the translator may find an appropriate lexical equivalent based on Larson's theory (1998: 169). They are following :

Similar Concept Between Source Language and Target Language

The first main thing that a translator must accept is that although the concept of the source language and target language are known, the translator should not expect concepts to be presented the same way in the target language as they are in the source language text being

translated. Concept is used in the text to refer not to the form (word) but only to the meaning content. Since the lexical structures of the two languages are different, the way the concepts are expressed will be different. There are three ways to find the lexical equivalent in this category by using the following methods: Descriptive Phrase, Using Related Words as Equivalents, and Using Generic- Specific Words. Below are the examples of phrasal verb ‘drive out’ and ‘give up’ :

SL	TL	MEANING
<i>Drove Catherine out</i>	<i>Catherine tidak betah tinggal</i>	“Force someone to leave a place” Cambridge International Dictionary of English. Cambridge: (1995).

Table 1. Drive out

The meaning of phrasal verb ‘drive out’ in (Sheldon : 2001) translated into ‘tidakbetahtinggal’ is related to the meaning of ‘force someone to leave a place’. It is textual equivalence as proposed by Baker (1991: 17) which refers to the equivalence between a SL text and a TL text in terms of information and cohesion. The factors may be strictly linguistic or extra- linguistic. The translation have the same concepts in both SL and TL by **using related words as equivalents**. Although the concept of the source language and target language are known, the translator should not expect concepts to be presented the same way in the target language as they are in the source language text being translated. Larson (1998: 169).

The word ‘*tidakbetahtinggal*’ can be one of lexical equivalents of clause ‘force someone to leave a place’ because two language may often do not have matching of synonyms related to a given concept. It is oriented to be complete naturalness of expression in which the translator is not so concerned with matching the receptor language (message)

with the source language (message), but with dynamic relationship. Based on the theory proposed by (Nida in Venuti : 2000 : 136), dynamic equivalence is oriented to be complete naturalness of expression in which the translator is not so concerned with matching the receptor language (message) with the source language (message), but with dynamic relationship. The relationship between the receptor and the message should be substantially the same as that existing the original, receptor, and the message. The translator describes it as the closest natural equivalent to the source language message.

SL	TL	MEANING
Give up	Bersediamelupakan	Stop doing something that has been a habit. Stop being friendly, end relationships. Stop doing something. Surrender, stop trying. Sacrifice or dedicate time, etc, to something. Allow someone to sit in your chair, take your place,etc. Cambridge International Dictionary of English. Cambridge: (1995)

Table 2. Give up

The phrasal verb ‘**give up**’in (Sheldon : 2001) means stop doing something that has been a habit, stop being friendly or end relationships, stop doing something, surrender or stop trying, sacrifice or dedicate time, etc to something, allow someone to sit in your chair or take your place, etc, allow or give away a run while pitching (baseball). Based on the context of situation, it is related to the meaning sacrifice or dedicate time, etc to something. In the SL it is translated into ‘*bersediamelupakan*’ which have the same concept both in SL and TL. Although the concept of the source language and target language are known, the translator should not expect concepts to be presented the same way in the target language as they are in the source language text being translated. In finding the textual equivalence, it is **using generic- specific words** in which the source language text use generic term, but the target language may only use a specific term in that semantic area.Larson (1998: 169). In the SL,

‘sacrifice or dedicate time, etc to something is generic terms and in the TL, ‘*bersediamelupakan*’ is specific terms which may only used in that semantic area.

It is *Textual equivalence* as Baker (1991: 17) states that it refer to the equivalence between a SL text and and a TL text in terms of information and cohesion. The relationship between the receptor and the message should be substantially the same as that existing the original, receptor, and the message. One way of defining dynamic equivalence in translation is to describe it as the closest natural equivalent to the source language message. This type of definition contains three terms : (1) equivalent, which points toward the source language message, (2) natural, which point toward the receptor language, and (3) closest, which bind the two orientations together on the basis of highest degree of approximation. (Nida in Venuti : 2000 : 136).

Different Concept Between Source Language and Target Language

Because of the different in culture, there will be some concepts in the source language which are unknown in the receptor culture. Accordingly, the translator must find out a way to express a new concept to the speakers of the target language. There are three basic alternative ways in which a translator can find an equivalent expression in the target language. They are by using the following method: Generic Word with a Descriptive Phrase, To Find Equivalence by Modifying a Loan Word, and To Find Equivalence by Cultural Substitute.

Below are the examples of phrasal verb ‘**fill out**’ and ‘**throwaway**’ :

SL	TL	MEANING
Had filled out	Kekarberisi	Complete a form. Cambridge International Dictionary of English. Cambridge: (1995).

Table 1. Fill out

The phrasal verb ‘**fill out**’ in (Sheldon : 2001) in the SL means complete a form and it is translated into ‘*kekarberisi*’. The translation is different from SL to TL in which those items have different concepts in finding the textual equivalents. The textual equivalents refer to the equivalence between a SL text and and a TL text in terms of information and cohesion. The method used is finding equivalence by cultural substitute when a real word referent from the receptor language is substituted for the unknown referent of the source language or used

when the thing or event of the source language is not exactly the same but occurs in the target language. The meaning of *'kekarberisi'* in TL is not exactly the same with the meaning of phrasal verb 'fill out'. **Modifying key term by cultural substitute** is used to determine lexical equivalence in order to establish dynamic equivalence.

Dynamic equivalence is oriented to be complete naturalness of expression in which the translator is not so concerned with matching the receptor language (message) with the source language (message), but with dynamic relationship.(Nida in Venuti : 2000 : 136). It binds the two orientations together on the basis of highest degree of approximation. In the TL culture, 'his body' as the subject is used to indicate the occurrence of doer based on the context of situation. If the real meaning is translated lexically, it will be meaningless and unacceptable in the TL as meaning of 'complete a form' is used for human being activity and not for physical appearance. According to Bell (1991), an ideal translator should not only be bilingual but also a bicultural. Cultural knowledge competence, both in SL and TL help the translator to grasp meaning of the whole text that he is translating.

SL	TL	MEANING
Throw yourself away	Menjerumuskandirimusendir i	Discard something when no longer needed. Cambridge International Dictionary of English. Cambridge: (1995).

Table 2. Throw away

The phrasal verb '**throw away**' (Sheldon : 2001) in the SL, means discard something when no longer needed. In the TL, it is translated into '*menjerumuskan*' which have different concepts by modifying the key term. Because there is some concepts in the SL which are unknown in the receptor culture, the translator must find out a way to express a new concept to the speakers of the target language. **Cultural substitute** is used to find equivalence in order to establish dynamic equivalence. Bell (1991) states that an ideal translator should not only be bilingual but also a bicultural. Cultural knowledge competence, both in SL and TL

help the translator to grasp meaning of the whole text that he is translating. The key term of ‘yourself’ is related to the word ‘*menjerumuskan*’ and is used to substitute the term in the SL which is not exactly the same to ‘discard something when no longer needed’.

Catford (1965) states that translation equivalence occurs when either a SL or a TL text or term is relatable to (at least some of) the same features of substance. It means that equivalence in translation will be possible when SL and TL text or item have a number of the same situational features. As the word *throwandmenjerumuskan* have the same referential meaning, but the use of them depends on the situation. Therefore, equivalence need some strategies in order to represent the meaning of SL into TL. Based on the theory proposed by (Nida in Venuti : 2000 : 136), dynamic equivalence is oriented to be complete naturalness of expression in which the translator is not so concerned with matching the receptor language (message) with the source language (message), but with dynamic relationship. The relationship between the receptor and the message should be substantially the same as that existing the original, receptor, and the message. The translator describes it as the closest natural equivalent to the source language message.

CONCLUSION

The combination between verb and particle in phrasal verb can form many various meaning in which the meaning itself can predicted or can’t be predicted from the individual meaning of phrasal verb. Those combinations give something unique and special in form of verb, adjective, or adverb in a sentence. The different concepts of equivalence strategies are applied to know what strategies applied in translating the phrasal verbs. The translator attempts to find lexical equivalence of phrasal verb although the meaning is different from the real meaning. The factors which influence the translator preference are context of situation and dynamics of language. In analyzing the data about equivalence of translation, having the same and different concepts in both SL and TL are applied.

REFERENCES

- Baker, Mona. 1991. *In Other Words. A Course Book on Translation*. London :Routledge.
- Bell, Roger T.1991:Translation and translating : theory and practice, London: Longman.
- Brown, D.B. & Hudson, T. 2002.Criterion-Referenced Language Testing. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press
- Cambridge International Dictionary of English*. Cambridge: CUP, 1995. (CIDE).
- Catford, J.C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*.London : Oxford University Press.
- Larson, Mildred. 1984. *Meaning- Based Translation*. Maryland. University Press of America Inc.
- Larson, Richard. 1998. "On the Double Object Construction". *Linguistic Inquiry* 19.3,335-391
- Margono. 2002. *Essentials of Theory and Practice of Translation*. Denpasar.UniversitasUdayana
- Munday, J. 2000. *Introducing Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nida, Eugene A and Charles R. Taber.1982. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*.Leiden: E.J.Brill.
- Olteanu, Andrea- Rosalia. 2012. *A Holistic Approach to Phrasal Verb*.EdituraSfântuIerarhNicolae
- Sheldon, Sidney.2001. *The Other Side of Midnight*. New York : United States of America
- Stig&Douglas.1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*.NewYork : Longman Inc.
- Swan, Michael. 1980. *Practical English Usage*. London : Oxford University Press.
- Venuti, Lawrence (Ed.). 2000.The Translation Studies Reader. New York: Routledge.