

Differences in Perception and Diction on Two Translations *Lelaki Tua dan Laut* from Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and The Sea*

Lina Meilinawati Rahayu

Universitas Padjadjaran

Email: lina.meilinawati@unpad.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Translation of literary work is never simply the business of translating the work in the source language into the target language. Translation is always culture-sensitive, as it also means translating the source culture into the target culture. This study examines two translations of the novel *The Old Man and The Sea* (1952) by Ernest Hemingway in the Indonesian language. Both are titled *Lelaki Tua dan Laut*. The earlier was published in 1973 and was translated by Sapardi Djoko Damono, while the latter was translated by Dian Vita Ellyati and was published in 2010. These two translated versions are compared with each other in order to identify differences in perception and diction. Differences in diction further influence the reader's perception. Close examination of the two versions discovers contrasting perception and diction. The study finds that Djoko Damono's translation builds meaning by using Indonesian equivalents to represent the concepts presented in the novel, while Ellyati's builds meaning through description and explanation of said concepts. Djoko Damono's translation attempts to maintain poetic expressions through the use of rhyming words; Ellyati's translation goes for clarity of meaning. Djoko Damono's translation uses extensive vocabulary with specific meanings, while Ellyati's chooses to employ words with more generic meanings. These differences indicate that translation work is never final; it is an ongoing, ever changing process.

Keywords: *diction, difference in translation, literature in translation, perception, translation*

INTRODUCTION

Translators are like farmers who work on neighbor's farm field while the outcomes belong to the landlord. This imagery proverb is offered by Dryden's Bassnet (1993:146). In the other words, whoever becomes the translator, the writer remains the fame. But actually, without the translators' hard works, a writing will not be well-known in other languages and cultures. In the other words, translators play and position an important role as mouthpiece, intention successor, messenger and connector between one culture and another. A writing could cross time and space for the

translators' hard works. Language is a product of a specific culture. Language, therefore reflect the values and norms of the culture. These reflect in its vocabulary and metaphors (Sumardjono, 2007).

Translations on Indonesian literature have been done since years. Chambert-Loir (2009) said that in 1996, for the first time in Nusantara, the reading on Wirataparwa occurred. This was the very first book of several Mahabarata translation projects. It shows that translations activity have existed since long ago, at least more than hundred years ago. This fact is supported by Moriyama (2009) who explained that translation on European

literature to Sundanese language had been done in 19th century. Printing activity has existed in Sundanese land since 1850. Translations then appeared in second-half of 19th century. Most of the writings were translated based on books from Europe. Kartawinata (1846-1906) is the personage in translation that time. In 1874, Kartawinata positioned as official translator to Dutch East Indies era.

When Indonesian literature was developing, translations became massive. It can be seen in drama development in Indonesia. Translations on drama were quite interesting. In 1950s, translations on drama were quite frequent. The desire to translate Western drama was getting stronger, for theatre groups appeared in that era did not obtain the wanted scripts. The massive number of plays was the reason why stage actors translated the scripts, for the original scripts did not satisfy them. Sumardjo (1988) said that the need on original play scripts is acquired if there is an effort to “improve” modern theatrical plays in Indonesia. The choice on play scripts translation is considered as the way out, because theatrical performance is not equal to the number of scripts. Even If the play scripts are provided, the quality is far from satisfaction. This explanation shows that translation on literature has an important position.

Translations on fictional works have long been a debate, whether to which the translated works belong, to the original or to the target language. Firmly, Salam (tt) said that translated literary works belong to the target language. Argumentatively, a translated literary work is an independent literary text in its source language. If a novel is translated to Bahasa Indonesia, it becomes part of Indonesian literature. I am in one side to this that a translated literary work is part of the literature of target language, for the language is switched. Some adjustments have been applied to it.

Furthermore, Chamber-Loir explained about the current environment of translated literary works in Indonesia. He said that most of Indonesian translators adhere “formal agreement,” which is the action of replacing original text mechanically. Meanwhile, in early development of translation in Indonesia, “dynamic agreement” was used to

reorganize the source text in order to produce same effect with different target

Nowadays, there are only few publishers who specialize themselves on translated literary works. However, among those few publishers, we might still have hope to Penerbit Obor Jakarta that consistently translates several literary works which have been reprinted several times. Among those translated literary works, there are works that are translated by different translators. Albert Camus’s *L’Étranger*, for instance, was translated by Apsanti Djokosusanto to *Orang Asing*. The same book was then translated under the title *Sang Pemberontak* by Ermelinda. Ones that take most attention are works of Kahlil Gibran. It is recorded that several translators like Iwan Nurdaya, Sugiarta Sriwibawa, Sri Kusdyantinah and Sapardi Djoko Damono have translated his works. Thus, translating works that have been beforehand translated is a prevalence, for a translated literary work is not a final result. In this paper I am going to focus on observing two translated literary works from *The Old Man and The Sea*, one that is translated by Sapardi Djoko Darmono (later is abbreviated as SDD) and the other by Dian Vita Ellyato (later is abbreviated as DVE).

The reason on comparing these to translations is because both of them are different in terms of expressions. One that is distinct is in perception, diction, and sentencing. Both research objects are examined to obtain the sight-seen differences especially in terms of perception and diction. This research will be developed based on both following questions: (1) What are the differences in perception and diction in both translations? (2) How do those differences influence the translations?

Data Source

This research uses two translated literary works as its objects:

1. *Lelaki Tua dan Laut*. trans. Sapardi Djoko Damono, 1973.
2. *Lelaki Tua dan Laut*. trans. Dian Vita Ellyati, 2010.

THEORETICAL BASIS

Translation is a process of transformation. As said by Walter Benjamin in Bassnett (1993:151) that

claimed translation developed as a transformative process. His essay is later found by translation critics in 1980s and has become one significant text of postmodern translation. Lindsay (2006) quoted Venuti, "Translation, in other word, inevitably performs a work of domestication."

Newmark (1988) said that there are eight methods in translation. Among all those eight methods, Newmark halves them to either it is closer to the source language (word-for-word translation, literal translation, faithful translation, semantic translation) or closer to the target language (adaptation, free translation, idiomatic translation, communicative translation). An easy-to-read translated work is certainly closer to the source language. If a translator borrows a language as the vehicle, it means s/he borrows other required aspects (expression, diction, language style, and etc.) in the borrowed language. The same way goes to argument stated by Nida (1964) who defined translation as reproductive process of equivalent word to the target language, in term of meaning and structure. The reproduction is natural translation that has the exact same message to the target language.

Related to perception and diction which are the research object, I shall use the definition of *persepsi* from KBBI (2008:1061), "(1) *tanggapan (penerimaan) langsung dari sesuatu; serapan; (2) proses seseorang mengetahui beberapa hal melalui pancaindranya. Ini dijadikan sebagai landasan karena ada perbedaan persepsi (tanggapan) dari kedua penerjemah atas sesuatu (jenis ikan, nama makanan, panggilan, dan lain-lain)*". The differences of perception occurred because of diction.

Diction is the act of choosing the correct word which meaningfully matches the expression to obtain certain effect (KBBI, 2008:328). Thus, differences of diction can cause a different developed effect in readers' mind. Speaking of diction, it cannot be denied that it is closely related to: denotative and connotative words, (1) words that have the same meaning; (2) common and specified word; (3) words that change meaning; (4) words that have similar spelling; (5) self-created words; (6) idioms; (7) short and long words (Hamid, 1996). In using the words, several factors

that are out of literary league. Those factors are closely related to the diction, for words serve as idea expression. Based on that, to simply express an idea, the accuracy of the chosen word is needed, the compatibility of words and talking situation, and reader condition.

Based on those explanations, it shows that differences in diction influence the meaning nuance. So that, research on diction differences on translated words from two distinct translators becomes significant.

There are numbers of research on translation conducted in recent year, one of which is "Nothing left to learn: Translation and the Groundhog Day of bureaucracy" by Michal Izak (2016), showing that a translator is a creative artist. This research critically explores translators' experience in translation process. A translator should create dialogical climate between source language and target language. Leticia Álvarez-Recio's work (2016) entitled "Spanish chivalric romances in English translation Anthony Munday's *Palmendos* (1589)" points out that Anthony Munday is an important figure in book trade in England. He proposes valuable information on the importance of the congruity between a translation work and its target language. Translator's decisions on ideology and aesthetic is also a crucial consideration which affects a translation work. An article entitled "News translation: global or cosmopolitan connections?" by Esperanza Bielsa (2015) discusses three important matters, which are: social theory, translation study, and media study on news translation. An interesting article on Quran translation entitled "Grammar-Related Semantic Losses in the Translation of the Holy Quran, with Special Reference to Surah Al A'araf (The Heights)" by Noureldin Mohamed Abdelaal and Sabariah Md Rashid (2016) illustrates how translating Quran is a challenging task. However, this condition is inevitable and even imperative since a large number of Muslims do not understand Arabic. Various translations of Quran are available today. According to this article, the loss in those translation works relies heavily on the grammar aspects due to the differences between the source text and the target text. The incongruity of grammatical aspect leads to semantic (meaning)

differences which relates to connotative meanings as well. Appropriate translation study is imperative to minimize these disadvantages.

Other than that, research on translation is “Translating social sciences into Arabic today as the case of Pierre Bourdieu” (2015). Through the example of the Arabic translations of Pierre Bourdieu, this article analyses the conditions of the introduction and reception of a sociological thought of French origin in the contemporary Arab intellectual field and, more generally, those of the international circulation of ideas in a postcolonial context. Scoville’s work (2015) entitled “Reconsidering *Nahdawi* Translation: bringing Pushkin to Palestine” point out that Translation occupies a central position in any narrative of the Arabic literary renaissance, or *nahdah*, of the nineteenth century. The vast majority of these translations, however, have been discounted as less than literary because of the freedoms that they took in altering the source texts as they translated. An article entitled “Translation and the world of the text: on the translation of the word *hijab* in the Qur’an” by Elmarsafy (2015) The article falls into two parts, the first presenting a theoretical exposition of the stakes involved in these translations, while the second traces the operation of the word *hijab* in several English translations of the Qur’an. We argue that, in the Qur’an, the word *hijab* demarcates the place that enables communication between the divine and the human.

Then, there are three more articles about translation is “Language and the national allegory: translating Peter Temple’s *The Broken Shore* and *Truth* into French” (2016) by West-Sooby about Language plays a key role in the crime novels of Peter Temple, where it serves both as a means of constructing a distinctive Australian identity and as a vehicle for expressing Temple’s critique of Australian society and its ills. A close comparative reading of his two landmark novels, *The Broken Shore* and *Truth*, and their French translations highlights the significance of their linguistic features and the challenges they pose to translators. Barker’s work (2016) entitled *The prefigurative politics of translation in place-based movements of protest*. Last, research critically

entitled “French in Springfield: a variationist analysis of the translation of first-person singular future actions in the Quebec and French dubbings of *The Simpsons*” about A variationist analysis of the different solutions along such variables as sex, age, social class, and level of education reveals some emerging but unstable patterns. Overall, the study contends that the variability observed can be perceived both as a style-shifting phenomenon and as an ideological posture taken by translators. The theoretical and practical implications of the findings are discussed.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Translation expert, I. Richards, said that translation is perhaps a complex occurrence as the result of universe evolution. However, that occurrence makes a big influence to humanity. Readers who don’t comprehend the source language will be benefited by the works of translation. Translators serve as a bridge to enter the other world. In this case, translator opens the way to understand and comprehend literature diversity in the world. As explained, the translated works are not final—never ending process. Finally, there is still a possibility for the next translators to translate the exact same works. The two translated *Lelaki Tua dan Laut* by Ernest Hemingway are distinct in a long period of time. SDD’s translated work was published in 1973, meanwhile DVE’s was in 2007—34 years distinct. Thus, SDD’s work has been known or read by readers for so long. It cannot be denied that DVE might have read SDD’s work before translating.

SDD’s and DVE’s works agree on script quantity, it means that both do not add and reduce any paragraph. Almost no paragraph is missing. Thus, the focus on this research is how both translators juxtapose all aspects from the source to the target language. After a deep reading on both works, significant differences are obtained in terms of perception and diction from both translators. Differences of perception are differences on point of views towards the way in translating to the target language. This is later going to be the focus of research.

Differences between Both of Translation Works

A. Different Perception between Both of Translation Works

Discussion of this journal would be started from the first paragraph, which is the opening for both of translation works. Analyzing this paragraph becomes significant, because it serves as a starting point to examine following translation results. It can be used to find out what language styles is going to be employed in further translation works. Presented below is quotation from the first paragraph by the two translators.

the Gulf of Mexico and heads northeast along the coastline from North America to Foundland, and turns east across the Atlantic Ocean to the coast of British Isles. This fairly lengthy description is intended to explain as clearly as possible to readers where the event takes place.

Hemingway –in *The Old Man and The Sea*– does not particularly give a clear explanation about where the event takes place, he uses “Gulf Stream” instead. DVE possibly intends to provide some insight for readers regarding the setting of this story; thus, she leaves several footnotes. It can be beneficial, on one hand, because the readers

SDD's translation	DVE's translation
<u>Ia seorang lelaki tua yang sendiri saja dalam</u> he an man old who himself only in	<u>Lelaki tua yang pergi ke laut</u> man old who set off to sea
<u>sebuah perahu, penangkap ikan di arus</u> a boat catcher fish in current	<u>seorang diri dalam perahunya</u> a self in his boat
<u>Teluk Meksiko dan kini sudah genap</u> Gulf Mexico and now already exactly	<u>di arus teluk itu telah berlayar</u> in current gulf that has sailed
<u>delapan puluh empat hari lamanya tidak</u> eighty four days long not	<u>selama delapan puluh empat hari</u> for eighty four days
<u>berhasil menangkap ikan seekor pun.</u> successful catch fish a at all	<u>tanpa membawa hasil tangkapan</u> without bringing result catch
(h. 5)	<u>seekor pun.</u> (h. 5) any
‘He is an old man by himself in a boat, a fisherman in the current of Gulf of Mexico, and now it is already eighty-four days long he does not get to catch any fish.’ (p. 5)	‘The old man who sets off to the sea by himself in his boat in a gulf current has sailed for eighty four days without bringing any catch.’ (p. 5)

The quotations above are the first paragraph of both translation works. Since the beginning, they already show different way and style in translating the text. Both of them explain the same thing about a man who has sailed for eighty four days, but still cannot catch any fish. However, the two translators have different perceptions in describing the place. SDD straightforwardly translates the place as Gulf of Mexico, while VE only mentions it as a Gulf. Then, VE adds a footnote to make clear about what she means with the Gulf. In the footnote, the Gulf is defined as *the warm current that appears in*

might receive new knowledge. On the other hand, the footnotes interfere with reading process, since people have to flip through pages to read them. In DVE’s translation, footnote is also used to explain common knowledge, like “1 pound=0.4536 kg”, yet she does not add a footnote for unfamiliar terms, like “Hatuey beer”.

In another part, DVE adds a footnote for the term “Que ya” (p. 18), defined as *omong kosong* ‘nonsense’, while SDD leaves it untranslated. If “que ya” has an equivalent meaning with *omong kosong* ‘nonsense’, then a footnote is not

particularly important, because the meaning stays intact. Translating it as “nonsense” would be sufficient.

It happens as well for names and types of fish. For instance, *sekumpulan bonito* ‘a school of bonito’ is explained in a footnote as Kenyar, or tuna; and Sarda, as a type of tuna with blue strips on its back from mackerel family. This additional definition merely provides information (insight) to the readers. In the DVE’s translation, *rumpul laut Sargasso* ‘Sargassum seaweeds’ is explained as *Ganggang coklat Sargassum* ‘Sargassum brown algae’. In this case, the translation and the footnotes do not necessarily produce a clearer meaning or form for the nouns.

Footnotes have a function to show or to confirm evidences for all statements and information regarding something that actually needs further explanation. In a literary translation, footnotes can be useful if there is no equivalent terms available, or the terms are distinctive, related to the culture of source language. However, if the cases are like aforementioned examples in DVE’s translation, footnotes would be considered an interference for readers’ convenience. Differences in way of translating will be followed by differences of perception and diction as analysis materials.

Different perception occurs in translating

nouns and expressions, as shown below in a quotation about a type of food.

In the quotation above, SDD uses *karung gandum* ‘wheat sack’, while DVE uses *karung tepung* ‘flour sack’. This different perception is not going to misguide the readers, because wheat and flour share a similarity, which are basic ingredients of bread, and they are basically flour. However, SDD chooses to be more specific by pointing out the flour’s type (wheat), while DVE chooses to play safe by using a more general word (flour). Still from the same quotation, both of them describe filth in different way. SDD’s translation is *[...]nampak seperti panji-panji tanda takluk abadi* ‘it looks like a banner of eternal vanquish’, while DVE’s is *[...]nampak seperti bendera kalah perang* ‘it looks like a flag of defeat’. Both of them have the same meaning, but create different tones. Using the phrase of *takluk abadi* ‘eternal vanquish’ means the chance of victory is long gone –the vanquish is eternal (permanent)--. Meanwhile, DVE chooses a more general phrase, that is *kalah perang* ‘defeat’.

It has been explained that SDD’s translation tends to choose specific words to “assert” the meaning. The examples of this case are also found in following translation, as presented in quotations below.

SDD’s translation	DVE’s translation
<i>Layar itu bertambal karung gandum dan</i> sail that patched sack wheat and	<i>Layar itu ditambal dengan karung tepung,</i> sail that patched with sack flour
<i>kalau tergulung di tiang nampak seperti</i> if rolled in spar seems like	<i>dan dalam keadaan tergulung nampak</i> and into circumstances rolled looks
<i>panji-panji tanda takluk abadi. (5)</i> banners sign vanquish eternal	<i>seperti bendera kalah perang. (3)</i> like flag lost war
‘The sail is patched by a wheat sack, and if it is rolled up in a spar, it looks like a banner of eternal vanquish.’ (5)	‘The sail is patched by a flour sack, and being rolled up, it looks like a flag of defeat.’ (3)

SDD's translation	DVE's translation
<p><u>Sudah kujelajahi lubang-lubuk itu selama</u> already I explore resevoirs that for</p> <p><u>seminggu dan hasilnya nihil, pikirnya.</u> a week and the result naught he thinks</p> <p>(h. 26)</p> <p>'I've been exploring the reservoirs for a week and the result is naught, he thinks.' (p.26)</p>	<p><u>Aku bekerja pada kedalaman yang terlalu</u> I work in depth which too</p> <p><u>jauh selama seminggu tanpa menghasilkan</u> far for a week without resulting</p> <p><u>apapun, timbangnya.</u> (h. 27) anything he considers</p> <p>'I've been working way far too deep for a week without resulting anything, he considers.' (p. 27)</p>

SDD chooses the word *nihil* 'naught', which means nothing at all, while DVE uses *tanpa menghasilkan apapun* 'without resulting anything'. Both of them have the same meaning. SDD attempts to find the equivalent word, while DVE

elaborates the definition. It can be said as though DVE's translation is explanation of SDD's.

The quotation below would confirm the argument before.

SDD's translation	DVE's translation
<p><u>Tampak olehnya rumput kuning tersangkut</u> Appear by him seaweed yellow caught</p> <p><u>pada talinya dan lelaki tua itu senang</u> on his rope and man old that pleased</p> <p><u>sebab rumput itu ikut memberati</u> because seaweed that also weighting</p> <p><u>talinya. Rumput Teluk yang kuning itu</u> his rope seaweed gulf which yellow that</p> <p><u>memancarkan cahaya warna-warni pada</u> radiate lights colorful at</p> <p><u>malam hari.</u> (h.51) night</p> <p>'It appears to him the yellow seaweeds are caught by his rope and the old man is pleased, because the seaweeds are weighting his rope. The yellow seaweeds of the Gulf radiate colorful lights at night.' (p. 51)</p>	<p><u>Nampak rumput laut berwarna kuning pada</u> Seen seaweed color yellow on</p> <p><u>tali pancing, tetapi lelaki tua itu tahu</u> rope fish but man old that know</p> <p><u>bahwa tumbuhan itu hanya akan menambah</u> that plants that only will add</p> <p><u>beban tarikan and justru membuatnya</u> load pull and exactly make him</p> <p><u>senang. Ia adalah rumput laut teluk</u> pleased he is seaweed gulf</p> <p><u>yang menghasilkan banyak fosforesensi</u> which produce much phosphorence</p> <p><u>pada malam hari.</u> (h.52) at night</p> <p>'It can be seen yellow seaweeds are on the rope, but the old man knows that the plants will only add a pull force and it makes him pleased instead. They are seaweeds of the gulf that create much phosphorescence at night.' (h.52)</p>

SDD uses the expression of *rumpit itu memberati talinya* ‘the seaweeds are weighting his rope’, while DVE picks a different choice, *tumbuhan itu hanya akan menambah beban tarikan* ‘the plants will only add a pull force’. As argued previously, SDD tends to choose specific word (seaweeds), while DVE uses a more general

one (plants). In the last sentence, SDD uses *cahaya warna-warni* ‘colorful lights’ and DVE chooses *fosforesensi* ‘phosphorence’, which expresses an ability for something to radiate. This uncommon term, however, is not equipped with a footnote.

Different perception in expressing something will be affirmed by three quotations below:

	SDD's translation	DVE's translation
A	<p><u><i>Sebelum pancingnya mengenai lelaki</i></u> Before his hook catch man</p> <p><u><i>tua itu menekan topi pandannya</i></u> old that press hat his straw</p> <p><u><i>sampai ke dahi dan</i></u> until to forehead and</p> <p><u><i>mengakibatkan sedikit lecet.</i></u> (h. 42) resulting to a little scratch</p> <p>‘Before his hook catches a fish, the old man presses his straw hat to his forehead that results to a little scratch.’</p>	<p><u><i>Ia telah mendorong dengan keras topi</i></u> he has push by hard hat</p> <p><u><i>jeraminya ke bagian bawah kepalanya</i></u> his straw to part lower his head</p> <p><u><i>sebelum mengail ikan itu, sekarang topi itu</i></u> before fishing fish that now hat that</p> <p><u><i>telah melukai dahinya.</i></u> (h. 43) has hurt his forehead</p> <p>‘He has pushed his straw hat strongly to his lower head before he hooks a fish, now the hat has hurt his forehead.’</p>
B	<p><u><i>Tetapi anak itu tidak bersamamu,</i></u> but kid that not with you</p> <p><u><i>pikirknya. Kau hanya sendiri dan kau</i></u> he thinks you only alone and you</p> <p><u><i>harus mengurus tali yang terakhir itu</i></u> should take care rope which last that</p> <p><u><i>sekarang, tak peduli terang atau gelap,</i></u> now not care light or dark</p> <p><u><i>dan segera memotongnya dan kemudian</i></u> and soon cut it and then</p> <p><u><i>menyambungkan dua gulungan tali</i></u> tie up two coils rope</p> <p><u><i>cadangannya.</i></u> (h. 49) backup</p> <p>‘But the kid is not with you, he thinks. You are just alone and you should take care of the last rope right now regardless it is light or dark, and cut it soon and then tie up the two coils of backup rope.’ (p.49)</p>	<p><u><i>Tapi kau tidak bersama si bocah, sungutnya,</i></u> but you not with the kid he mutters</p> <p><u><i>Hanya ada kau seorang dan sebaiknya kau</i></u> only there you alone and should you</p> <p><u><i>segera bekerja kembali pada tali yang</i></u> soon work back on rope which</p> <p><u><i>terakhir sekarang juga, dalam gelap atau</i></u> last right now in dark or</p> <p><u><i>tidak dalam gelap, kemudian memotongnya</i></u> not in dark then cut it</p> <p><u><i>dan menyambung dua gulung tali cadangan.</i></u> and tie up two coils rope backup</p> <p>(h. 50)</p> <p>‘But you’re not with the kid, he mutters. There is only you and you should get back to work soon on the last rope, whether it’s dark or not, then cut it and tie up the two coils of backup rope.’ (p.50)</p>

	SDD's translation	DVE's translation
c	<p><u>Angin bertambah kencang saja dan kini</u> wind more hard only and now</p> <p><u>bertiup kencang sekali. Pelabuhan</u> blows hard very Harbor</p> <p><u>teramat sepi dan ia tujukan perahunya</u> very deserted and he lead his boat</p> <p><u>ke tempat sempit berkerikil di bawah</u> to place narrow gravels under</p> <p><u>karang. (h.120)</u> coral</p> <p>'The wind blows hard and harder. The harbor is very deserted and he leads his boat to a narrow place with gravels under the coral.' (p. 120)</p>	<p><u>Angin bertiup dengan teratur dan kencang</u> wind blows by regular and hard</p> <p><u>dan ia berlayar ke atas menuju bidang kecil</u> and he sails up to area small</p> <p><u>dari sirap di bawah bebatuan (h. 125)</u> of shingles under rocks</p> <p>'The wind blows in a regular and hard manner and he sails up to small area of shingles under the rocks.' (p. 125)</p>

Three of quotations above confirms what has been previously argued that the translators have different perceptions. Sentence (a) explains a situation when the old man presses his hat 'till it hurts his forehead. SDD uses the sentence *sampai ke dahi dan mengakibatkan sedikit lecet* 'to his forehead that causes a bit *scratch*', while DVE chooses to express it by using the sentence *sekarang topi itu telah melukai dahinya* 'now the hat *hurts* his forehead'. *Lecet* 'scratch' is a more specific word than *luka* 'hurt'. The same expression is also shown in quotation (b). SDD writes *tak peduli terang atau gelap* 'regardless it is light or dark', while DVE writes *dalam gelap atau tidak dalam gelap* 'whether it's dark or not'. SDD uses opposite meaning by choosing antonyms (light and dark). DVE does not use antonym, but negation of the word instead (dark or not). In quotation (c) similar thing happens. SDD describes the wind that blows harder by using the sentence *angin bertambah kencang saja dan kini bertiup kencang sekali* "the wind blows hard and harder". This circumstance explains from *kencang* 'blowing hard' state to *kencang sekali* 'harder' state. While DVE expresses it by using the sentence *Angin bertiup dengan teratur dan kencang* 'the wind blows in a regular and hard manner'. It shows a different perception between the two translators in describing the blowing wind. The phrase of *kencang* 'hard' and *kencang sekali* 'harder'

describes similar situations (hard and harder), while *teratur* 'regular' and *kencang* 'hard' shows different situations and different perception of meaning in readers' mind. It could be from blowing hard to regular, or vice versa.

The discussion before proves that translation from two different persons produces different perceptions: translator's perception on translated words, and reader's perception on translated works. Perception is also associated with words, group of words, and the wording (or sentencing) occupied by the translator. SDD's translation generally uses specific words combined with suitable idiomatic expression leading to a deeper sense of perception. DVE's translation uses more common words with additional descriptions to explain things clearer and more detailed.

B. The Differences of Diction from The SDD and DVE's Translations.

Diction or choice of words has an important role in creating nuances of meaning to express an idea. Writing requires the accuracy of words to express an idea; the suitability between words and context helps the reader to understand the idea being delivered. The accuracy of diction is able to build certain nuances in the readers' mind especially in the translated works in which the cultural contexts may be completely strange to them. Every translator certainly attempts to

find the most accurate words to make the readers understand the translated works the way they do to be able to explore the treasure of literature from other nations and cultures. The results from the analysis of diction on both translations are as follows.

1. *The Translation of Pronouns*

Personal pronouns have different nuances for each nation. Acceptable pronouns in one culture might not be acceptable and equivalent to another. For example, calling a son/daughter in law with the words “son/daughter in law” is prevalent in Indian culture. However, this is not acceptable in Indonesian culture. Indonesian does not address a son/daughter in law as *menantu* ‘son/daughter in law’ in daily conversation because they regard the in laws to be the same as their own child. The word “you” in English refers to neutral addressing words. This, however, is not the case with Indonesian culture. Further explanation on personal pronouns in both of the translations will be discussed below.

translates it into *bocah* ‘kid’. Here, SDD chooses specific words by mentioning the sex (*laki-laki*, an Indonesian word for male). DVE, on the other hand, chooses to translate it to the word *bocah* ‘kid’ which could be a boy or a girl. The differences of pronouns translation also results to different effect on reader’s mind.

Next in the excerpt (b) the differences of pronouns translation can be found in addressing an older person (male). English pronoun ‘you’ has neutral meaning. That is, the expression can be said to anyone regardless the status or the age. SDD translates it to various expressions equal to ‘you’. He translates ‘you’ to *kau* as shown in the excerpt (b) above. Sometimes he also uses the term *sobat tua* ‘old friend’ as in

“*Semoga kau beruntung, sobat tua.*” (h.24)
 hope you lucky old friends
 ‘I hope you are lucky, old friend.’ (p. 24)

Unlike him, DVE chooses word or expression commonly used in the Indonesian culture. As can be seen in the excerpt (b) above, DVE translate the

	SDD’s translation	DVE’s translation
a	<p><i>Selama empat puluh hari yang pertama,</i> for forty day that first</p> <p><i>ia ditemani oleh seorang anak</i> he accompanied by a child</p> <p><i>laki-laki.</i> (h.5) male</p> <p>‘For the forty first days, he was accompanied by a boy’ (p.5)</p>	<p><i>Selama empat puluh hari pertama seorang</i> for forty day first a</p> <p><i>bocah menemaninya.</i> (h. 3) kid accompanied him</p> <p>‘For the first forty days, a kid accompanied him.’ (p.3)</p>
b	<p>“<i>Apa yang akan kaumakan?</i>” tanya what that will you eat? ask</p> <p><i>anak itu.</i> (h. 12) kid that</p> <p>‘What will you eat?’ asked the boy.’ (p. 12)</p>	<p>“<i>Apa yang Bapak punya untuk dimakan?</i>” what that father have to be eaten?</p> <p><i>si Bocah bertanya.</i> (h. 11) the kid ask</p> <p>‘“What do you Sir have that can be eaten?” the kid asked.’ (p.11)</p>

In the excerpt (a) there is difference of diction in translating the word “boy”. SDD chooses the words *anak laki-laki* ‘boy’, while DVE

word *kau* ‘you’ into *Pak* ‘sir’ (abbreviated form of *Bapak* ‘mister’), so does the term *sobat tua* ‘old friend’ that still uses the word *Pak* ‘sir’, as in

“*Semoga beruntung, Pak.*” (h. 23)
 hope lucky sir
 ‘Good luck, sir.’ (p. 23)

The word ‘*Pak*’ shows hierarchy in term of age and distance. However, in Indonesian culture this expression is commonly used to address someone

whose age gap is significant, or to address a respected person.

2. The Translation of Kinds of Food

Other differences from both of the translations can also be found in term of food as shown in the excerpts below.

	SDD’s translation	DVE’s translation
a	<p><i>Kedelai dan nasi, pisang goreng dan daging</i> soybean and rice banana fry and meat</p> <p><i>rebus.</i> (h. 16) boiled</p> <p>‘Soybean and rice, fried banana, and boiled meat/stew.’ (p. 16)</p>	<p><i>Kacang polong dan nasi, pisang goreng, dan</i> peas and rice banana fry and</p> <p><i>sayuran rebus.</i> (h. 14) vegetable boiled</p> <p>‘Peas and rice, friend banana, and boiled vegetables.’ (p. 14)</p>
b	<p>“<i>Sepanci nasi kuning dan ikan. Kau ingin</i> a pan rice yellow and fish you want</p> <p><i>makan?</i>” (h. 12) eat</p> <p>‘A pan of yellow rice and fish. You want to eat?’ (p.12)</p>	<p>“<i>Sepanci nasi jagung dengan ikan. Apa kau</i> a pan rice corn with fish what you</p> <p><i>mau?</i>” (h. 11) want</p> <p>‘A pan of corn rice with fish. Do you want?’ (p.11)</p>

Different diction in translating kinds of food can be seen from the excerpts above. First, SDD uses the word ‘*kedelai*’ (soybean) while DVE chooses *kacang polong* ‘peas’. Both still belong to varieties of beans, but the nuances created by each diction are different. *Kedelai* ‘soybean’ is a type of beans that is commonly known in Indonesian culture, while *kacang polong* ‘peas’ is not popular consumption of the society. Second, SDD translates *daging rebus* ‘stew/boiled meat’ while DVE uses *sayuran rebus* ‘boiled vegetables’. Both of the foods are quite different even though they share the same process of cooking. And third, SDD mentions *nasi kuning* ‘yellow rice’, while DVE chooses *nasi jagung* ‘corn rice’. Again, *nasi*

kuning is more common to Indonesian culture, while *nasi jagung* even though it is also widely known, is not as common as *nasi kuning*. Of the three differences in translating the food, the most striking one is the difference between *daging* ‘meat’ and *sayuran* ‘vegetables’. This difference is difficult to explain because it is clear that both are two different kinds of food.

3. The Translation of Terms and Sentencing

As being discussed before, DVE has tendency to describe than to find suitable and equivalent words, making her translation to be slightly longer. Here we will be discussing how both translators deliver ideas in the sentences.

	Terjemahan SDD	Terjemahan DVE
a	<p><u>Seluruh tubuhnya nampak tua, kecuali</u> whole his body appear old except</p> <p><u>sepasang matanya yang warnanya bagai</u> a pair of his eyes that its colors like</p> <p><u>laut serta cerah dan tak kenal menyerah</u> sea and bright and no know give up (h. 6)</p> <p>‘His whole body looked old, except for a pair of his eyes which colors were like sea: bright, and never give up.’ (p.6)</p>	<p><u>Segala sesuatu pada dirinya menggambarkan</u> all something on himself describe</p> <p><u>keuzuran selain sepasang matanya. Kedua mata</u> senile except a pair of his eyes both yes</p> <p><u>itu berwarna serupa laut dan menyiratkan</u> that color similar sea and imply</p> <p><u>keriangan serta semangat yang tak bisa</u> joy and spirit that no can</p> <p><u>dipadamkan.</u> (h. 4) turned off</p> <p>‘Everything on him showed his weakness except for a pair of his eyes. Those eyes whose color resembled the sea and implied unstoppable joy and spirit.’ (p.4)</p>
b	<p><u>Lelaki tua itu menatapnya dengan mata</u> man old that stare at him with eyes</p> <p><u>yang masak oleh terik matahari, yang</u> that ripe by blaze sun that</p> <p><u>yakin dan penuh rasa sayang.</u> (h.9) sure and full love</p> <p>‘The old man stared at him with his sunburned, confident loving eyes.’ (p.9)</p>	<p><u>Lelaki itu memandangnya dengan bola mata</u> man that looking at him with ball eye</p> <p><u>yang terbakar matahari, menyiratkan hati</u> that burnt sun imply heart</p> <p><u>yang penuh rasa sayang dan percaya diri.</u> (h.7) that full love and confident</p> <p>‘That man looked at him with his sunburned eyes, implying a heart full of love and confident.’ (p.7)</p>
c	<p><u>Lelaki tua itu bertubuh kurus dan pucat,</u> man old that body thin and pale</p> <p><u>dan tengkuknya penuh kerut merut. Di</u> and his nape full wrinkles on</p> <p><u>pipinya tampak banyak bintik-bintik</u> his cheeks appear many freckles</p> <p><u>coklat, noda kulit yang diakibatkan oleh</u> brown stain skin that caused by</p> <p><u>pantulan matahari di laut tropis.</u> (h. 5) reflection sun in sea tropical</p> <p>‘The old man’s body was thin and pale, and his nape was full of wrinkles. On his cheeks appeared small freckles, marks on the skin caused by the sun reflection in the tropical sea.’ (p.5)</p>	<p><u>Lelaki tua itu kurus kering dengan keriput</u> man old that thin dry with wrinkles</p> <p><u>yang dalam di bagian belakang lehernya. Noda</u> that inside in part back his neck stain</p> <p><u>coklat besar dari kanker kulit yang ditimbulkan</u> brown big from cancer skin that caused</p> <p><u>oleh refleksi sinar matahari laut tropis</u> by reflection light sun sea tropical</p> <p><u>tergambar di kedua pipinya.</u> (h. 3) depicted on both his cheeks</p> <p>‘The old man was skinny with wrinkles on the back of his neck. Big brown stain from skin cancer caused by the sun reflection of the tropical sea were shown on both his cheeks.’ (p.3)</p>

d	<p><i>Matahari bangkit perlahan dari laut dan</i> sun rise slowly from sea and</p> <p><i>lelaki tua itu melihat perahu-perahu lain</i> man old that see boats other</p> <p><i>berpencar di seberang arus, jauh di sana</i> disperse on across current far there</p> <p><i>dekat pantai.</i> (h. 28) near beach</p> <p>‘The sun rose slowly from the sea and the old man saw other boats dispersed across the current, far near the beach.’ (p.28)</p>	<p><i>Matahari muncul tipis dari dalam laut dan</i> sun appear thin from inside sea and</p> <p><i>lelaki tua itu bisa melihat kapal-kapal lain,</i> man old that can see boats other</p> <p><i>rendah pada permukaan air; jauh di dekat</i> low on surface water far on near</p> <p><i>pantai melintasi arus.</i> (h. 28) beach across tides</p> <p>‘The sun rose thinly from the sea and the old man saw other boats, low on the water, far near the beach, across the current.’ (p.28)</p>
e	<p><i>Agua mala, “kata lelaki tua itu.</i> Agua mala say man old that</p> <p><i>“Lonte kau.”</i> (h. 32) whore you</p> <p>“‘Agua mala.” The old man said. “You whore.”” (p.32)</p>	<p><i>Agua mala, kutuk lelaki tua. “Pelacur kau.”</i> Agua mala curse man old prostitute you</p> <p>(h.32)</p> <p>“‘Agua mala.” Cursed the old man. “You prostitute.”” (p.32)</p>

The five excerpts above shows the sentencing of the two translators. In the excerpt (a) SDD maintains poetic expression with the sentence [...] *cerah yang tak kenal menyerah* ‘[...] colors were like sea: bright, and never give up’ while DVE explains it with detailed description. Poetic expression refers to building up the sentence with rhymed words as if it is a lyrical poetry. In the excerpt (b) SDD chooses the word *menatap* ‘stare’, while DVE chooses *memandang* ‘look at’. Both of the words are another form of ‘seeing’. Its distinction lies in the object being seen. *Menatap* ‘staring’ has more fixed object and a longer time, while *memandang* ‘looking’ has an extent width of object. The differences of diction will affect the nuances being built in general. The excerpt (c) explains about physical appearance of an old man. The effect caused by each translation is quite different. SDD describes the freckles on the old man’s cheeks is due to the tropical sun, while DVE describes the huge freckles caused by skin cancer. The effect caused by SDD’s sentence is normal. It means, it is quite normal for people living in a tropical area and are often exposed to the sun to have freckles on their skin. Meanwhile, DVE translates it with greater influence of meaning to

the reader that the old man has huge skin cancer on his face.

Excerpts (d) and (e) also show different diction in conveying something. In the excerpt (d) describing the state of the sunrise, SDD chooses the words *bangkit perlahan* ‘rose slowly’, while DVE chooses *muncul tipis* ‘rose thinly’. The diction chosen by both SDD and DVE have different figure of speech. SDD uses personification, while DVE uses analogy. In the excerpt (e) the translation also differs in the expression of swearing. SDD chooses the word *lonte* ‘whore’ while DVE chooses *pelacur* ‘prostitute’. Both of the words refer to women who sell themselves. The word *lonte* in Indonesian culture was popular and commonly used during the 70s. The word then is rarely used until it is replaced by the word *pelacur*. This may indicate the identity of the translators because SDD lived in the era when the word *lonte* was common, while DVE chooses popular word used in her time.

This analysis will be closed with Nida’s argument that a satisfying translation on aesthetical literary works requires aesthetical ability of the translator. It requires the sensibilities, the way color management and three-dimensional spatial structure requires aesthetical competence.

CONCLUSION

Both of the translations “are not torturing” to be read. They both, thus, have proper readability level. The analysis of the two translations of *Lelaki Tua dan Laut* results to a number conclusion as follows.

1. SDD’s translation shows that meaning is built by finding the suitable and equivalent words to represent the same concept. DVE’s translation shows that meaning is built through description and explanation.
2. SDD’s translation attempts to maintain poetic expression through rhymed diction. DVE’s translation aims more to clarity of meaning.
3. SDD uses more specific meaning words. DVE uses more common meaning word.

Therefore, both of the translations have their own strengths. However, if the readers are after the literary effect, SDD’s translation is considered to be more successful.

The analysis of the two translation works indicates that each of the work carries its own vision. As Newman (1988) points out, a work of translation is either near to the source language (word-for-word translation, literal translation, faithful translation, semantic translation) or to the target language (adaptation, free translation, idiomatic translation, communicative translation). SDD is near to the target language by maintaining its literary effect. DVE employs the same method as well by positioning itself as near as possible to the target-language culture.

REFERENCES

- Álvarez-Recio, Leticia (2016). Spanish chivalric romances in English translation Anthony Munday’s *Palmendos* (1589), *Cahiers Élisabéthains: A Journal of English Renaissance Studies*, vol. 91(1), pp. 5-20.
- Baker, Mona (2016). The prefigurative politics of translation in place-based movements of protest Subtitling in the Egyptian Revolution, *The Translator*, vol. 22(1), pp.1-21.
- Bassnett, Susan (1993). *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*, Oxford UK and Cambridge USA: Blackwell.
- Bielsa, Esperanza (2015). *Media, Culture & Society*, March 2016; vol. 38, 2: pp. 196-211. *firstpublishedonDecember16,2015*.
- Chambert-Loir, Hendri (2009). Pendahuluan, in *Sadur: Sejarah Terjemahan di Indonesia dan Malaysia*, Jakarta: KPG.
- Elmarsafy, Ziad and Mustapha Bentaïbi (2015). Translation and the world of the text: on the translation of the word hijab in the Qur’an, in *The Translator* online p. 210-222. Published online: 30 Nov 2015.
- Guy Mboudjeke, Jean- (2016). French in Springfield: a Variationist Analysis of the Translation of First-Person Singular Future Actions in The Quebec and French Dubbings of The Simpson, *The Translator*, vol.22(1), pp.22-39.
- Hamid, Abdul. (1996). *Bentuk dan Pilihan Kata” Makalah pada Penataran Guru*, Bandung: Tim Pemasarakatan Bahasa Indonesia.
- Izak, Michal, (2016). Nothing left to learn: Translation and the Groundhog Day of Bureaucracy, *Management Learning Journal*, vol. 47(5), pp. 543-562.
- Jacquemond, Richard (2015). Translating social sciences into Arabic today. The case of Pierre Bourdieu, *The Translator*, vol. 21(2), pp.189-209.
- Lindsay, Jennifer (2006). Translation and/of/in Performance: New Connection, in Jennifer Lindsay, ed., *Between Tongues*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Sastriani, Siti Hariti (2007). Transformasi Gaya Bahasa dalam Karya Sastra Terjemahan, in *Jurnal Humaniora*, vo. 19(1), pp. 73-80.
- Mohamed Abdelaal, Noureldin and Sabariah Md Rashid (2016). *Grammar-Related Semantic Losses in the Translation of the Holy Quran, with Special Reference to Surah Al A’araf* (The Heights), SAGE Open, July-September 2016; vol. 6, 3: 2158244016661750 <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2158244016661750>.
- Moriyama, Mikihiro. (2009). “Lahirnya Pembaca Modern: Penerjemahan Cerita-Cerita Eropa ke dalam Bahasa Sunda pada Abad ke-19” in *Sadur: Sejarah Terjemahan di Indonesia dan Malaysia*. Jakarta: KPG.
- Newmark, Peter. (1998). *A Text Book of Translation*. London: Prentice-Hall.

- Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. (1964). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, first published in 1982 and a companion work to *Toward a Science of Translating*. Brill.
- Rosidi, Ajip. (2009). *Terjemahan Bahasa Sunda* in *Sadur: Sejarah Terjemahan di Indonesia dan Malaysia*. Jakarta: KPG.
- Salam, Aprinus. (tt). *Sastra Terjemahan: Beberapa Persoalan* in *ugm.academia.edu*. https://www.academia.edu/1490358/Sastra_Terjemahan.
- Scoville, Spencer . (2015). Reconsidering *Nahdawi* Translation: bringing Pushkin to Palestine, *The Translator*, vol. 21(2), pp. 223-236.
- Sumardjo, Jakob (1988). Perkembangan Terjemahan Sastra Drama Asing Di Indonesia, in Afrizal Malna *dkk.*, ed. *Beberapa Pemikiran Tentang Pementasan Naskah Barat Oleh Teater Indonesia* (Jakarta: Goethe-Institute Jakarta, 1988), pp. 5-16.
- Sumardiono, LP. (2007). Penerjemahan dan Budaya”, in <http://dion-zydion2i.blogspot.co.id/2009/10/karya-ilmiah-penerjemahan-dan-budaya.html>.
- West-Sooby, John (2016). Language and the national allegory: translating Peter Temple’s *The Broken Shore* and *Truth into French*, *The Translator*, vol. 22(2), pp.190-206.