

# International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding

http://ijmmu.com editor@ijmmu.con ISSN 2364-5369 Volume 6, Issue 6 December, 2019 Pages: 273-285

The impact of translation techniques toward accuracy and acceptability of circumstance in "The Old Man and the Sea" by Ernest Hemingway into "Lelaki Tua dan Laut" by Sapardi Djoko Darmono

Tri Purwaningsih; M.R. Nababan; Riyadi Santosa

Graduate School, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v6i6.1213

## Abstract

Translation techniques refer to how a translator transfer meaning from source text into target text. Their usage results in either good, good enough, or bad translation, or so-called translation qualities. This study aims to know the impact of translation techniques of circumstances in The Old Man and the Sea by Ernest Hemingway and Lelaki Tua dan Laut by Sapardi Djoko Darmono toward their qualities in terms of accuracy and acceptability. It deployed embedded case study of descriptive qualitative method. The data included types of circumstances, translation techniques, and translation qualities, obtained through content analysis and focus group discussion. They were then analyzed through domain, taxonomy, componential analysis to portray cultural value. The result shows that deletion results in inaccurate and inacceptable translation; modulation, explicitation, and transposition produce less accurate and acceptable translation; and discursive creation reflects inaccurate translation but acceptable translation.

Keywords: Transitivity; Cirqumstances; Translation Techniques; Translation Quality

#### 1. Introduction

Novel is a literary work that generally described a certain event in society. It is considered as the realization of authors' imagination or even derived from real phenomena. By the story delivering in novels, authors attempt to construct their ideas or experiences by describing what kind activities are taken place, how participants are described (Alaei & Ahangan, 2016), and what kind of circumstances are set (Ong'onda, 2016). How authors construct their ideas or experiences in terms of activities, participants, and circumstances deal with transitivity (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014).

Studies on transitivity have been conducted by some researchers (Adjei & Ewusi-Mensah, 2016; Anggraeni, 2017; Bustam, 2011; Harwiyati, 2016; Yokossi & Koussouhon, 2017). They reveal the domination of transitivity elements in discourses. However, they only focus on counting on processes, participants, and circumstances found. They are lack of revealing the idea why those elements are used. Nevertheless, Isti'anah (2014); Lima-lopes (2014); Zhang (2017) deal with it. They indicate that the

tendency of using certain elements conveys authors' intension. Furthermore, Sinar, Mbete, and Setia (2015) realized that these transitivity elements are equally related to the visual representation.

Besides, transitivity system has also to be done with characterization (Qasim, Talaat, Khushi, & Azher, 2018; Song, 2013; Zahoor & Janjua, 2016). These studies reveal that each transitivity elements have accounted in constructing certain characteristics. Additionally, Cunanan (2011) claimed that the distribution of transitivity elements reflect authors' elusive and subjective mind style.

Moreover, some studies on transitivity imply authors' ideologies (Alaei & Ahangan, 2016; Gusnawaty, Yastiana, & Yassi, 2017; Ong'onda, 2016). These reflect how authors' construct addressees' ideas through their discourses by distributing certain transitivity elements.

Since transitivity system consists of three elements, including process, participant, and element. The study focuses on circumstances. A study on circumstances has been taken place by Jegede (2018). He argued that the distribution of circumstances creates impact on audiences in relation to realization of the messages of the editorials. Another study on circumstances reflected circumstantial unit in comparison (Mahmood & Ali, 2011). It denoted that English Pakistani is an independent variety. Since it compared two languages, it only reveals differences and contrasts. It has nothing to do with meaning transfer. A study on meaning transfer has been carried out by Tilusubya, Nababan, and Santosa (2018). They proposed that certain translation techniques give either positive or negative impact on the quality of the meaning transferred. They also found that certain techniques result in shifts. While the previous study on both not shift and shift, this study only deals with shifts.

#### 2. Methods

The study focuses on how translation techniques influence accuracy and acceptability of circumstances found in *The Old Man and the Sea* by Ernest Hemingway (Hemingway, 1952) and its Indonesian translation *Lelaki Tua dan Laut* by Sapardi Djoko Darmono (Hemingway & Trans. Sapardi Djoko Damono, 1973). It was a descriptive qualitative research. Since the topic of the study was determined before conducting the research, it employed embedded case study. It was located in the media in terms of novel, consisting of place, actors, and activities (Spradley, 1980) related to circumstances. These novels were selected based on criterion-based sampling. The data were obtained through content analysis and focus group discussion. Content analysis resulted in the data of circumstances resulted in shift in TT and translation technique in document (novels). Meanwhile, focus group discussion involved raters to obtain translation quality with using instruments for accuracy and acceptability assessment proposed by Nababan, Nuraeni, and Sumardiono (2012). The data were then analyzed through domain, taxonomy, and componential analysis to portray cultural value (Santosa, 2017).

#### 3. Results and Discussion

Focusing on the impact of translation techniques on accuracy and acceptability of circumstances in *The old Man and the Sea* and *Lelaki Tua dan Laut* novels, the study indicates data distribution in English and Indonesian versions, translation techniques, translation qualities, and the impact of translation qualities on accuracy and acceptability.

## 3.1 Data Distribution in Source Text and Target Text

Based on content analysis conducted in ST and TT, the study indicates that different distribution of data in source text (ST) and target text (TT). They are reflected in the following table 3.1.

ST TT No. **Types of Data** Types of Circumstances Extent Duration 1. 7 2. Frequency 1 3. Location Place 73 7 4. Time 44 4 5. Manner Means 24 4 57 7 6. Quality 7. Comparison 3 2 8. Degree 4 2 1 9. Cause Reason 1 4 10. Purpose 1 Condition 11. Contingency 1 12. Accompaniment Comitative 11 **13.** Role Guise 1 Others 2 Noun Group **Epithet** 1. 2. Qualifier 10 38 **Participant** 3. 4. **Process** 6 5. Participant + Process 1 Process + Participant 23 6. 7. Participant + Process + Participant 8 Total 232 120

Table 3.1 Data Distribution in Source Text and Target Text

Table 3.1 shows that ST and TT distributes different data. ST reflects eleven sub categories of circumstance as proposed by Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), including duration, frequency, place, time, means, quality, comparison, degree, reason, purpose, and comitative, in which the most frequent type is place. Meanwhile, TT contains both circumstances and non-circumstances. Circumstances include duration, frequency, place, time, means, quality, comparison, degree, reason, purpose, condition, and guise. Non-circumstances are epithet, qualifier, participant, and process. These different distributions indicate that there are shifts from ST to TT. For example:

#### Data 015/TOMATS

ST: Each bait hung head down with the shank of the hook inside the bait fish, tied and sewed solid and all the projecting part of the hook, the curve and the point, was covered **with fresh sardines**.

TT: Setiap umpan tergantung kepalanya di bawah, dan tangkai pancing tersembunyi didalamnya, terikat erat-erat, dan segala bagian yang menonjol dari pancing itu —lengkungannya dan matanya — tersembunyi dalam ikan-ikan sardin yang segar.

Data 015 above shows both ST and TT are circumstances with different category. With fresh sardines is categorized as manner: means while dalam ikan-ikan sardin yang segar refers to circumstance: enhancing: location: place. This difference between ST and TT is due to the use of modulation. How the translator modulates with into dalam gives negative impact on accuracy in term of less accurate translation. However, its acceptability is good, referring to acceptable translation.

## 3.2 Translation Techniques of Circumstances

As indicated from the previous point, there are 232 units of circumstance in ST. These circumstances are not equally transferred into the same units and categories of circumstance in TT. This case is reflected by the use of translation techniques as shown in the following table 3.2.

| No. | Circumstances | Translation Techniques |    |   |    |   |    |    | Total |
|-----|---------------|------------------------|----|---|----|---|----|----|-------|
|     |               | D                      | DC | E | M  | T | Co | Tr | Tutai |
| 1.  | Duration      | 1                      |    |   | 3  |   |    |    | 4     |
| 2.  | Frequency     | 4                      |    |   | 3  |   |    |    | 7     |
| 3.  | Place         | 23                     |    |   | 34 |   | 14 | 2  | 73    |
| 4.  | Time          | 40                     |    |   | 2  |   | 1  | 1  | 44    |
| 5.  | Means         | 4                      |    |   | 15 |   | 4  | 1  | 24    |
| 6.  | Quality       | 35                     | 3  |   | 15 | 1 | 3  |    | 57    |
| 7.  | Comparison    | 1                      |    |   | 2  |   |    |    | 3     |
| 8.  | Degree        | 3                      |    |   |    |   | 1  |    | 4     |
| 9.  | Reason        |                        |    |   |    | 1 |    |    | 1     |
| 10. | Purpose       | 1                      |    |   | 2  |   |    |    | 4     |
| 11. | Comitative    | 2                      |    | 1 | 5  | 1 | 2  | 1  | 11    |
|     | Total         |                        | 3  | 1 | 81 | 3 | 27 | 5  | 232   |

**Table 3.2 Translation Techniques of Circumstances** 

From the table: Couplet (Co), Deletion (D), Discursive Creation (DC), Explicitation (E), Modulation (M), Transposition (T), Triplet (Tr).

Table 3.2 shows that translator used five techniques as well as couplet and triplet. These techniques are based on the theory proposed by Molina and Albir (2002). These include deletion, discursive creation, explicitation, modulation, transposition, and couplet and triplet by combining some techniques in terms of adaptation, addition, establish equivalent, explicitation, modulation, particularization, reduction, and transposition.

First, the highest frequency of translation techniques used in translating circumstances is deletion. Deletion is a sub category of reduction technique, which omits the meaning in TT. It results in the reduction number of circumstances in TT. For example:

## Data 018/TOMATS

ST : The sun was two hours higher **now** and it did not hurt his eyes so much to look into the east.

TT : Matahari telah dua jam mendaki lebih tinggi dan matanya tidak lagi merasa sangat pedih kalau menatap ke arah timur.

In data 018 above, *now* refers to circumstance: enhancing: location: time. In TT, the translator omits *now*. Consequently, *now* is not reflected anything, both circumstances and others.

Second, the next highest frequency is modulation, which shift the point of view. The shift of point of view is in line with the shift of circumstances. This technique is indicated as the cause of different units in TT. For example:

#### Data 004/TOMATS

ST : Stay with them.

TT : Jangan kau tinggalkan orang-orang itu.

In data 004 above, with them is categorized as circumstance: expending: accompaniment: comitative, and orang-orang itu is reflected as goal. For the data above, the translator shift point of view of the whole sentence from positive into negative. As a consequence, with them is shifted into another form, that is goal. Goal is a participant of material process with its element including Jangan-tinggalkan (Material Process) + kau (actor) + orang-orang itu (Goal).

Third, the next significant frequency is the application of couplet technique. They are reduction and establish equivalent as much as 9, modulation and establish equivalent as much as 5, addition and establish equivalent as much as 4, reduction and particularization as much as 2, establish equivalent and explicitation as much as 2, reduction and transposition as much as 1, modulation and reduction as much as 1, and reduction and variation as much as 1.

These combinations mostly involve establish equivalent. Establish equivalent refers to transferring the meaning with the nearest equivalence. However, the use of this technique with combination of other techniques frequently produces shifts. For example:

### Data 121/TOMATS

ST : "I will never in a boat again without salt or limes."

TT : "Lain kali aku tak akan lupa **membawa garam dan jeruk** kalau turun ke laut."

Data 121 employs explicitation and establish equivalent. Without salt or lime indicates circumstance: enhancing: manner: means. Membawa garam dan jeruk is constructed by material process and goal. While the translator transfers without explicitly into membawa, he changes preposition (denoting circumstance) into process. However, salt or limes is equivalently translated.

The next frequent translation technique combination is reduction. It frequently reduces prepositions in TT. For example:

#### Data 016/TOMATS

ST: Then the sun was brighter and the glare came **on the water** and then, as it rose clear, the flat sea sent it back at his eyes so that it sharply and he rowed without looking into it.

TT : Matahari semakin terang dan cahayanya menyusur **permukaan laut** dan kemudian, ketika hari makin tinggi, laut yang datar itu memantulkan cahaya itu ke matanya sehingga terasa pedih dan ia terus mendayung tanpa menatap pantulan itu.

Data 016 above applies the combination between reduction and particularization. *On the water* is considered as circumstance: enhancing: location: place. However, translator omits *on* (preposition) in TT resulting in different unit in terms of range (participant of material process). Beside explaining the process, *permukaan laut* extends the process. While *on* is reduced, *the water* is transferred into more specific term, *permukaan laut*.

Another frequent translation technique combined with others is modulation. As modulation technique above, modulation in combination with establish equivalent also changes TT point of view. Besides, it also frequently occurs in preposition. For example:

#### Data 065/TOMATS

ST: Holding the line with his left shoulder again, and bracing **on his left hand and arm,** he took the tuna off the gaff hook and put the gaff back in place.

TT : Sambil menahan bobot tali pada pundak kirinya, dan sambil menahan tubuhnya **dengan tangan dan lengan kirinya**, ia lepaskan tuna itu dari mata kaitnya lalu meletakkan kait itu di tempatnya semula.

Data 065 above uses the combination between modulation and establish equivalent. On his left hand and arm reflects circumstance: enhancing: location: place, and dengan tangan dan lengan kirinya refers to circumstance: enhancing: manner: means. Since his left and arm is translated into its equivalent term, changing point of view from on into dengan (referring to with) results in different category of circumstance between ST and TT.

Fourth, other significant frequency of translating circumstances is triplet technique. They are establish equivalent, explicitation, and adaptation (1 datum); reduction, establish equivalent, and explicitation (2 data); reduction, establish equivalent, and addition (1 datum), and reduction, establish equivalent, and explicitation (1 datum). As couplet technique, establish equivalent is mostly used to be combined. In spite of the use of nearest equivalence in TT, its combinations greatly influence translation equivalence negatively and lead to translation shift. For example:

#### Data 094/TOMATS

ST: Then the negro, **after the rum**, would try for a tremendous effort and once he had the old man, who was not an old man then but was Santiagao El Campeon, nearly three inches off balance.

TT : Kemudian **sehabis minum tuak** negro itu mencobakan seluruh tenaganya dan sekali lelaki tua itu, yang belum tua pada waktu itu dan yang masih dijuluki Santiago El Campion, terdesak tiga inci.

Data 094 above is translated by using established equivalent, explicitation, and adaptation. *After the run* is indicated as circumstance: enhancing: location: time while *sehabis minum tuak* is material process and goal. *After* is transferred equivalently into *sehabis. Minum* is explicitly expressed to explain that *the rum* is for drinking. *Tuak* has no equal meaning as *the rum*. Since *the rum* is not existed in TT culture, it is adapted into the more familiar term *tuak*, but still both *the rum* and *tuak* share general meaning of *alcoholic drink*.

Fifth, the study indicates that the translator uses a little number of discursive creations. The application of discursive creation represents shifts in TT, from circumstances into non circumstances. For example:

#### Data 127/TOMATS

ST : He looked back at the coils of line and they are feeding **smoothly.** 

TT: Ia menengok ke arah gulungan tali dan nampak gulungan-gulungan itu semakin menipis.

Data 127 above shows *smoothly* as circumstance: enhancing: manner: quality and *semakin menipis* as attributive relational process + attribute. The use of discursive creation only establishes a temporary equivalence resulting in translation shift in meaning, form, and category of circumstances.

Sixth, the study also reveals the use of transposition. Since, the nature of transposition is to change grammatical order or category, translated versions shows different grammatical forms that lead to producing other elements. For example:

## Data 014 /TOMATS

ST: Each bait hung head down with the shank of the hook inside the bait fish, tied and sewed solid and all the projecting part of the hook, the curve and the point, was covered with fresh sardines.

TT: Setiap umpan tergantung kepalanya di bawah, **dan tangkai pancing tersembunyi didalamnya**, terikat erat-erat, dan segala bagian yang menonjol dari pancing itu —lengkungannya dan matanya — tersembunyi dalam ikan-ikan sardin yang segar.

Data 014 above shows that with the shank of the hook inside the bait fish is circumstance: expending: accompaniment: comitative, and dan tangkai pancing tersembunyi didalamnya refers to carrier + attributive relational process, and attribute. As transposition functions, ST change in grammatical level from phrase into clause.

Seventh, the smallest number of translation technique is explicitation. This technique reveals the meaning that implicitly stated by the author. For example:

#### Data 005/TOMATS

ST : But remember how you went eighty-seven days **without fish** and then caught big ones every day for three weeks

TT : Tapi ingat betapa kau pernah selama delapan puluh tujuh hari ke laut **tanpa mendapat seekorpun ikan**, dan kemudian kita menangkap beberapa ekor ikan besar setiap hari selama tiga minggu.

Data 005 shows that *without fish* is categorized as circumstance: expending: accompaniment: comitative, and *tanpa mendapat seekorpun ikan* is indicated as material process and goal. Changes in element from circumstance into material process and goal is due to that translator reveals the meaning of *mendapat* in that circumstance.

## 3.3 Accuracy and Acceptability of Circumstances

Translation quality deals with how good or bad translation is, with reference to accuracy, acceptability, and readability (Nababan et al., 2012). Accuracy shares the highest number for translation quality, followed by acceptability and readability. Nevertheless, this study only focuses on accuracy and acceptability. The result is represented in table 3.3.

| No          | Circumstance     | Accuracy |   |               | Acceptability  |    |    |  |  |  |
|-------------|------------------|----------|---|---------------|--|----|----|--|--|--|
|             | S                | A        | LA  | IA            | A  | LA | IA |  |  |  |
| 1.          | Duration         |          | 3   | 1             | 3  |    | 1  |  |  |  |
| 2.          | Frequency        |          | 4   | 3             | 4  |    | 3  |  |  |  |
| 3.          | Place            |          | 50  | 23            | 50   |    | 23 |  |  |  |
| 4.          | Time             |          | 4   | 40            | 40   |    | 4  |  |  |  |
| 5.          | Means            |          | 20  | 4             | 20   |    | 4  |  |  |  |
| 6.          | Quality          |          | 22  | 35            | 23   | 1  | 33 |  |  |  |
| 7.          | Comparison       |          | 2   | 1             | 2  |    | 1  |  |  |  |
| 8.          | Degree           |          | 1   | 3             | 1  |    | 3  |  |  |  |
| 9.          | Reason           |          | 1   |               | 1  |    |    |  |  |  |
| 10.         | Purpose          |          | 3   | 1             | 3  |    | 1  |  |  |  |
| 11.         | Comitative       |          | 9   | 2             | 9  |    | 2  |  |  |  |
|             | Total            |          | 119   | 113           | 156  | 1  | 75 |  |  |  |
|             |                  |          | $9 \times 2) + (1$                            | $13 \times 1$ | $= \frac{(156 \times 3) + (1 \times 2) + (75 \times 1)}{}$ |    |    |  |  |  |
| Average     |                  | _        | 232   |               | 232  |    |    |  |  |  |
|             |                  | = 1.51   |   |               | = 2.35   |    |    |  |  |  |
| Av          | Average Score of |          | $-\frac{(1.51 \times 3) + (2.35 \times 2)}{}$ |               |  |    |    |  |  |  |
| Translation |                  | 6        |   |               |  |    |    |  |  |  |
|             | Quality          | = 1.85   |   |               |  |    |    |  |  |  |

**Table 3.3 Accuracy and Acceptability of Circumstances** 

From the table A = accuracy/ acceptability, LA = less accurate/ less acceptable, and IA = less inaccurate/ inacceptable.

Table 3.3 shows that translation quality is not good enough, reflected by the average score of 1.85. This score is obtained from average score of accuracy as much as 1.51 and acceptability as much as 2.35. By assessing accuracy, it reflects 119 less accurate translations and 113 inaccurate translation. By assessing acceptability, it shows 156 acceptable translations, 1 less acceptable translation, and 75 inacceptable translations. For example:

## Data 009/TOMATS

ST: "I go **now** for the sardines," the boy said.

TT : Aku pergi mencari sardin.

#### Data 010/TOMATS

ST : "I go now **for the sardines**," the boy said.

TT : Aku pergi mencari sardin.

#### Data 095/TOMATS

ST : The sun will bake it out **well now**, he thought.

TT : Matahari akan memanggangnya sampai i**a jadi baik kembali,** pikirnya.

From the example above, less accurate translation in reflected in data 010. *Mencari sardin* reflects the distortion of meaning. It is distorted from being a purpose into an action. Inaccurate translation is indicated by Data 001 and 095. In data 001, the meaning of *now* is deleted. In data 095, *well now* is not reflected in *ia jadi baik kembali*. Meanwhile, acceptable translation is shown in data 010. *Mencari sardin* is considered as a natural translation. Less acceptable translation is reflected in data 095. *Ia jadi baik kembali* contains grammatical error although translation seems natural. Inacceptable translation is represented in data 009. Deleting *now* in TT is considered unnatural.

## 3.4 The Impact of Translation Technique on Accuracy and Acceptability of Circumstances

Transferring meaning from ST to TT definitely gives many difficulties to translators. It is even complicated when ST and TT language systems are totally different. Translators deal with this problem by using translator techniques. Those techniques affect positively or negatively depending on in which case they are used. As subjected previously that the study investigates the impact of translation techniques toward its quality, the result shows as the following table 3.4.

Table 3.4 Translation Techniques toward Accuracy and Acceptability of Circumstances

| No.   | Circumstances | ТТ | Accuracy |     |     | Acceptability |    |    |
|-------|---------------|----|----------|-----|-----|---------------|----|----|
|       |               |    | A        | LA  | IA  | A             | LA | IA |
| 1.    | Duration      | D  |          | 3   |     | 3             |    |    |
|       |               | M  |          |     | 1   |               |    | 1  |
| 2.    | Frequency     | D  |          |     | 3   |               |    | 3  |
|       |               | M  |          | 4   |     | 4             |    |    |
| 3.    | Place         | D  |          |     | 23  |               |    | 23 |
|       |               | M  |          | 34  |     | 34            |    |    |
|       |               | Co |          | 14  |     | 14            |    |    |
|       |               | Tr |          | 2   |     | 2             |    |    |
| 4.    | Time          | D  |          |     | 40  |               |    | 40 |
|       |               | M  |          | 2   |     | 2             |    |    |
|       |               | Co |          | 1   |     | 1             |    |    |
|       |               | Tr |          | 1   |     | 1             |    |    |
| 5.    | Means         | D  |          |     | 4   |               |    | 4  |
|       |               | M  |          | 15  |     | 15            |    |    |
|       |               | Co |          | 4   |     | 4             |    |    |
|       |               | Tr |          | 1   |     | 1             |    |    |
| 6.    | Quality       | D  |          | 2   | 33  | 2             |    | 33 |
|       |               | DC |          | 1   | 2   | 2             | 1  |    |
|       |               | M  |          | 15  |     | 15            |    |    |
|       |               | T  |          | 1   |     | 1             |    |    |
|       |               | Co |          | 3   |     | 3             |    |    |
| 7.    | Comparison    | D  |          |     | 1   |               |    | 1  |
|       |               | M  |          | 2   |     | 2             |    |    |
| 8.    | Degree        | D  |          |     | 3   |               |    | 3  |
|       |               | Co |          | 1   |     | 1             |    |    |
| 9.    | Reason        | T  |          | 1   |     | 1             |    |    |
| 10.   | Purpose       | D  |          |     | 1   |               |    | 1  |
|       |               | M  |          | 2   |     | 2             |    |    |
|       |               | Tr |          | 1   |     | 1             |    |    |
| 11.   | Comitative    | D  |          |     | 2   |               |    | 2  |
|       |               | Е  |          | 1   |     | 1             |    |    |
|       |               | M  |          | 5   |     | 5             |    |    |
|       |               | T  |          | 1   |     | 1             |    |    |
|       |               | Co |          | 2   |     | 2             |    |    |
| Total |               |    |          | 119 | 113 | 156           | 1  | 75 |

Table 3.4 shows that the selection of certain techniques influences its quality either positively or negatively. It is deeply described in the following paragraph.

First, the application of deletion technique results in inaccurate and inacceptable translation. By using deletion technique, translator omits the author's intention in TT. Besides, this occurs 123 amongst 232 data, indicating that deletion renders the great number in the average score of translation quality. This is in line with Tilusubya et al. (2018) who stated that deletion gives negative effect in both accuracy and acceptability.

Second, modulation, explicitation, transposition, and reduction produce less accurate and acceptable translation. These translation techniques are accounted in producing different translated units. Modulation is a technique with changing point of view. Its negative impact on accuracy and positive impact on acceptability has been suggested in Tilusubya et al. (2018). Explicitation indicates when the translator shows an implicit meaning. Its impact on less accurate translation contradicts Tilusubya et al. (2018) while its impact on acceptable translation definitely reinforces Tilusubya et al. (2018). Transposition is considered as change grammatical form or units. Its result in terms of less accurate and acceptable translation is similar to Tilusubya et al. (2018). Reduction refers to suppressing ST information in TT. It is different from Tilusubya et al. (2018) in terms of producing distortion and less familiar term in TT.

Last, discursive creation results in inaccurate translation but acceptable translation. Discursive creation allows translator to translate creatively and out of the context. The translated version of discursive creation strengthens the finding of Tilusubya et al. (2018). Since he concludes two result for acceptability including acceptable and less acceptable, this finding clarifies that discursive creation mostly produces acceptable term in TT.

#### **Conclusion**

From the analysis above, the study is indicated that the application of translation techniques is quite related to categories and sub categories of circumstances. It is highly found that sub categories of circumstances in terms of quality, place, and time are deleted in TT. Besides, the application of translation techniques is also related to the form of translation unit. Translation units constructed by preposition + noun frequently employed modulation and reduction (in combination with other techniques). This is in line with translation quality indicating as not good enough. While acceptability is considered good enough, this quality highly influences by accuracy since it shares a great score for translation quality.

The study limits the translation quality in terms of accuracy and acceptability. Hence, there is a gap for further researcher in conducting translation readability. Besides, a great number of translators in translating this novel can also become an opportunity to conduct comparative study. Moreover, since translated version are published in different period of time, it is possible to investigate its stylistics.

#### References

- Adjei, E. A., & Ewusi-Mensah, L. (2016). Transitivity of Kufour's 2008 farewell speech to the Ghanaian parliament. *British Journal of English Linguistics*, *4*(1), 36–49.
- Alaei, M., & Ahangan, S. (2016). A study of ideational metafunction in Joseph Conrad's "Heart of Darkness": A critical discourse analysis. English Language Teaching, 9(4), 203–213.
- Anggraeni, C. W. (2017). Ideational meaning in students' self-introduction: What are realized? *Methathesis*, 1(1), 46–61.
- Bustam, M. R. (2011). Analyzing clause by Halliday's transitivity system. *Jurnal Ilmu Sastra*, 6(1), 22–34.

- Cunanan, B. T. (2011). Using transitivity as a framework in a stylistic analysis of Virginia Woolf's Old Mrs. Grey. *Asian EFL Journal*, *Professional Teaching Articles*, *54*(August), 69–79.
- Gusnawaty, G., Yastiana, Y., & Yassi, A. H. (2017). Ideational meaning of Butonese foklore: A systemic functional linguistics study. *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *IX*(1), 328–338.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). Haliday's introduction to functional grammar. In *Materials Science* (Fourth, Vol. 38). https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021717531970
- Harwiyati, R. (2016). Transitivity system on Joko Widodo's speech at the APEC CEO summit on November 10th, 2014, in Beijing, China. *Premise Journal*, *5*(1), 160–171.
- Hemingway, E. (1952). The old man and the sea. USA: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Hemingway, E., & Trans. Sapardi Djoko Damono. (1973). Lelaki tua dan laut. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.
- Isti'anah, A. (2014). Transitivity analysis in four selected opinions about Jakarta governor election. *Phenomena*, 14(2).
- Jegede, O. O. (2018). Circumstances and their roles in the development of editorials. *World Journal of English Language*, 8(2), 21–30. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v8n2p21
- Lima-lopes, R. E. De. (2014). Transitivity in Brazilian Greenpeace's electronic bulletins. *RBLA*, *Belo Horizonte*, *14*(2), 413–439.
- Mahmood, M. A., & Ali, N. (2011). Circumstance adverbials in Pakistani English: A corpus-based comparative analysis. *International Journal of Academic Research*, *3*(5), 47–51.
- Molina, L., & Albir, A. H. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta: Translators' Journal, XLVII*(4), 498–512.
- Nababan, M., Nuraeni, A., & Sumardiono. (2012). Pengembangan model penilaian kualitas terjemahan. *Kajian Linguistik Dan Sastra*, 24(1), 39–57.
- Ong'onda, N. A. (2016). Transitivity analysis of newspaper headlines on terrorism attack in Kenya: A case study of Westgate Mall, Nairobi. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 6(7), 59–70.
- Qasim, H. M., Talaat, M., Khushi, Q., & Azher, M. (2018). Linguistic choices in Hamid's Moth Smoke: A transitivity analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 8(3), 303–317. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n3p303
- Santosa, R. (2017). Metode penelitian kualitatif kebahasaan. Surakarta: UNS Press.
- Sinar, T. . S., Mbete, A. M., & Setia, E. (2015). Ideational meaning of wedding ceremonyin Deli Malay's traditional culture: A multimodal analysis. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 20(2), 22–29. https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-20212229
- Song, Z. (2013). Transitivity analysis of A rose for Emily. *Thoery and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(12), 2291–2295. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.12.2291-2295
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). Participant Observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Tilusubya, B., Nababan, M., & Santosa, R. (2018). Translation analysis of circumstances in the Gospel of Matthew chapter 12 through 14 from English into Indonesian. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(4), 415–421. https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i4.4608
- Yokossi, D. T., & Koussouhon, L. A. (2017). Transitivity analysis of Chinua Achebe's Arrow of God and Ngugi Wa Thiong'o's Petals of Blood: A comparative systemic functional linguistic approach. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(3), 171–195.
- Zahoor, M., & Janjua, F. (2016). Character construction in tributive songs: Transitivity analysis "I am Malala." *Trames*, 20(2), 201–213. https://doi.org/10.3176/tr.2016.2.05
- Zhang, Y. (2017). Transitivity analysis of Hillary Clinton's and Donald Trump's first television debate. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 6(7), 65–72.

## Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).