Analysis of Translation Techniques and Translation Quality of Metaphor MOOD Proposal in the Novel Charlie and the Great Glass Elevator and Matilda by Roald Dahl

Virda Rikza Surya Pradani[1]; M.R. Nababan[2]; Riyadi Santosa[2]

[1] Postgraduate Student, Linguistic Program, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

[2] Professor, Linguistic Program, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

This study discusses the translation technique and translation quality of the metaphor of MOOD proposal in the novel Charlie and The Great Elevator and Matilda by Roald Dahl. The aims describe the metaphor of MOOD proposal, translation technique that is used to translate the metaphor of MOOD proposal and the translation quality such as accuracy, acceptable, and readability in the novel Charlie and The Great Elevator and Matilda by Roald Dahl. This study uses qualitative descriptives with focuses on single case study. This study uses primer data, there are linguistic data and translation data. The collecting data through document analysis and FGD (Focus Group Discussion). The result in this study in the novel Charlie and The Great Elevator and Matilda is that there are 2 clauses such as interrogative and declarative clauses and there are 8 speech functions. The speech function is requesting, asking, suggesting, ordering, forbidding, begging, advising, and recommending. Further there are 11 translation techniques such as established equivalence 68,93%, variation 16,09%, modulation 3,86%, pure borrowing 3,62%, explicitation 2,5%, compensation 1,37%, implicitation 1,37%, reduction 0,91%, paraphrase 0,91%, generalization 0,22%, and transposition 0,22%. Then the translation quality is accurate, acceptable, and readable.

Keywords: *Metaphor of MOOD Proposal; Translation Technique; Translation Quality*

Introduction

In the SFL (Systemic Functional Linguistics) there are 3 metafunctions, such as ideational, interpersonal and textual. The ideational metafunction is a relation with experiential reality and logic. Interpersonal metafunction is a relation with social reality, interactional, and transactional. Meanwhile textual metafunction is a combination between ideational and interpersonal metafunction. The 3 metafunctions above can be applied in written text and oral text. In both written text and oral text it can be seen from the grammar that it is related with the system of language. The system of language is related with lexicogrammar. The lexicogrammar consists of lexis and grammar (Santosa, 2003:77). The lexis is at the word level, it uses the context of language. Grammar is a structure of language at the group of word or clause level.

Analysis of Translation Techniques and Translation Quality of Metaphor MOOD Proposal in the Novel Charlie and the Great Glass Elevator and Matilda by Roald Dahl

225

In the clause level, grammar will be seen on the system and structure of the clause. The structure of clauses makes it realize the meaning of interpersonal, it has a grammar that it calls system of MOOD and structure of mood (Santosa, 2003). The system of MOOD refers to the system of clauses that it classifies become indicative - declarative, indicative - interrogative, and imperative. Congruently indicative - declarative is realized to give the information. But incongruently indicative - declarative is realized to demand goods and services. The incongruent above is called the metaphor of MOOD proposal.

According to Devrim (2015) metaphor of MOOD proposal constructs a discourse semantic speech function through incongruent mood option in grammar. Meanwhile Halliday (2014) metaphor of MOOD proposal in the semantic system, speech function can be realized softly, for example in dialog "*Oh. Stefan, can you turn off the tape?*". The clause has a speech function "command", that uses interrogative clauses. Congruently interrogative clauses use to demand the information, but it uses to demand the goods and services. Speech function of "command" is realized with an imperative clause, but incongruently it is realized as an interrogative clause. Therefore the metaphor of MOOD proposal is realized incongruently in the speech function of clause.

Sometimes the metaphor of MOOD proposal is used in dialog in everyday life. The aim is to make an utterance become more polite. The metaphor of MOOD proposal also happens in a few literary works such as novel, film, short story, magazine, ect. This study will use novels to analyze the metaphor of MOOD proposal. The novel is a translation novel in which the source text is English and the target text is Indonesian. This study will describe the phenomenon of translation of the metaphor of MOOD proposal in the Novel. It is interesting because the metaphor of the MOOD proposal has a speech function in which it can be translated into target text. The question is the speech function in source text: if it translates into target text, the speech function can be changed or not. It becomes a problem in this study.

Based on the explanation above, there are some previous studies related to this topic. Patrianto (2016), Subiyanto (2016), Xianzhu Si dan Wang (2021), and Dinagara (2016) describe the translation of grammatical metaphor that includes ideational, interpersonal, and textual. The focus of their studies on the method and technique translation in the grammatical metaphor. Thus the researcher finds the gap of study to the next study. This study of the translation technique used to translate the metaphor of MOOD proposal in the novel and translation quality is limited. Hence in this study aim to analyze translation techniques used to translate the metaphor of MOOD proposal in the novel Charlie and The Great Elevator and Matilda and their translation quality.

The speech function of the metaphor of MOOD proposal theory from Searle and Vanderveken (1985) and also the theory of metaphor of MOOD proposal from Halliday (2014). The theory from Searle and Vanderveken is to classify the speech function of the metaphor of MOOD proposal in the novel. Meanwhile the theory from Halliday is to classify the metaphor of MOOD proposal in the novel. Searle and Vanderveken have 18 categories of speech function, there are request, ask, urge, require, demand, order, forbid, prohibit, permit, suggest, advise, recommend, beg, command, enjoin, insist, warn, and tell. Halliday states that there are 3 clauses such as indicative-interrogative, indicative declaratif, and imperatif. But this study just uses indicative clauses cause the topic of the study is metaphor of MOOD. The translation techniques theory from Molina and Albir (2002). There are 18 techniques, such as adaptation, amplification, borrowing, calque, compensation, description, discursive creation, established equivalent, linguistic compression, literal translation, reduction, substitution, particularization, variation, and transposition. The translation quality uses theory from Nababan et all (2012:44), it consists of 3 aspects of translation quality, which are accuracy, acceptable, and readability.

Research Methodology

This study uses Systemic Linguistic Functional (SFL) approach and Translation approach. The type of this study is qualitative descriptive, because the data will be explained with the words and sentences. Based on Moleong (2018) qualitative research is the study that is to understand the

phenomenon about the subject of the study, such as behavior, perception, action, etc., holistically and in a way of description in the form of words and language. This study is also called one case study, because this study will explain and describe in detail about the translation in the metaphor of MOOD proposal in the novel. This study is also an ethnographic study that in the collecting data uses rater.

This study uses primary data, it is a linguistic data and translation data. The linguistic data is the metaphor of MOOD proposal, meanwhile the translation data is a translation technique used to translate the metaphor of MOOD proposal in the novel and their translation quality. The data source in this study from document and informant or rater. The document is taken from the novel Charlie and The Great Elevator and Matilda. The informant is a three rater including researcher. Then the three raters will do FGD (Focus Group Discussion) to discuss the translation technique and translation quality from source text to target text in the novel. The collecting data is carried out through document analysis and FGD.

Result and Discussion

1) **Metaphor of MOOD Proposal in the Novel Charlie and The Great Elevator and Matilda**

Halliday (2014) suggests that there are 3 clauses such as indicative-interrogative, indicative-declarative, and imperative. This study finds 2 indicative clauses (interrogative and declarative) in the novel. Furthermore, Searle and Vanderveken (1985) have 18 categories of speech function, but this study just finds 8 speech functions. The speech function is requesting, asking, suggesting, ordering, forbidding, begging, advising, and recommending. The dominant in this study is indicative-declarative clause and using speech function ordering, it can be seen in the table below:

Table 1 Metaphor of MOOD Proposal

	MOOD	Speech Function		Frequency	Percentage
Charlie and The Great Glass Elevator	Imperative-Interrogative	Demanding goods & services	Requesting	5	5.88%
			Asking	2	2.35%
			Suggesting	1	1.17%
			Ordering	1	1.17%
	∑ **Indicative-Interrogative Clauses**			**9**	**10.58%**
	Imperative-Declarative	Demanding goods & services	Ordering	16	18.82%
			Requesting	4	4.70%
			Forbidding	4	4.70%
			Asking	1	1.17%
			Begging	1	1.17%
			Suggesting	1	1.17%
			Advising	1	1.17%
			Recommending	1	1.17%
	∑ **Indicative-Declarative Clauses**			**29**	**34.11%**
Matilda	Imperative-	Demanding goods	Requesting	15	17.64%

		Asking	2	2.35%
Interrogative	& services	Begging	1	1.17%
∑ **Indicative-Interrogative Clauses**			**18**	**21,17%**
Imperative-Declarative	Demanding goods & services	Requesting	8	9.41%
		Ordering	5	5.88%
		Asking	4	4.70%
		Advising	4	4.70%
		Suggesting	3	3.52%
		Commanding	2	2.35%
		Forbidding	1	1.17%
		Demanding	1	1.17%
		Begging	1	1.17%
∑ **Indicative-Declarative Clauses**			**29**	**34.11%**
The Amount of Metaphor of MOOD Proposal			**85**	**100%**

Based on the table above from 85 data in the 2 novels, the form of MOOD indicative-interrogative clause is the least data. In the novel Charlie and The Great Elevator there is found 9 data, and the percentage is 10.58%. Further in the novel Matilda there is 18 data, and the percentage is 21.17%. The form of MOOD indicative-declarative clause is most data, it is found 29 data and the percentage is 34.11% in the novel Charlie and The Great Elevator and Matilda. Then the speech function ordering is the most data in this study. The amount is 16 data and the percentage is 18.82 %. In this novel, speech function ordering is often used because when the speaker wants to order the hearer, the speaker has no power or authority (Searle and Vanderveken, 1985). For example in the data below:

Data code: 52/28/62/CGE

Context situation: Charlie told Mr Wonka to reply to the words of the President who had just invited them to the White House.

Charlie: But **we've got to say something to him.**

In the example above, we know that Charlie told Mr Wonka to do something. Based on the context situation Charlie has no power because he is still a child then Mr Wonka is a mature man. So the clause above has speech function ordering, and the form of MOOD is indicative-declarative.

2) Translation Technique that using in the Metaphor of MOOD Proposal in the Novel Charlie and The Great Elevator and Matilda

Molina and Albir (2002) states that, there are 18 translation techniques, this study found 11 translation techniques. There are established equivalence, variation, modulation, pure borrowing, explicitation, compensation, implicitation, reduction, paraphrase, generalization, and transposition. The table of translation technique can be seen below:

Table 2 Translation Technique

No	Translation Technique	Frequency	Percentage
1	Established equivalence	304	68,93%
2	Variation	71	16,09%
3	Modulation	17	3,86%
4	Pure borrowing	16	3,62%
5	Explicitation	11	2,5%
6	Compensation	6	1,37%
7	Implicitation	6	1,37%
8	Reduction	4	0,91%
9	Paraphrase	4	0,91%
10	Generalization	1	0,22%
11	Transposition	1	0,22%
Amount		**441**	100%

The table above, the established equivalence is the most translation technique, that the amount is 304 and the percentage is 68.93%. The generalization and transposition is the least translation technique in this study. The amount is 1 and the percentage is 0.22%. Using established equivalence techniques is often used because it is to defend the meaning in the source text. Then generalization and transposition is rarely used in this study because in the source text there are not many terms that should be translated in general and also in this source text don't use difficult grammatical terms. Here is an example of technique from established equivalence, generalization, and transposition.

Example of Established Equivalence:

Data Code: 68/78/177/CGE

Context Situation: When Charlie is uncomfortable being in Minusland, and Mr. Wonka tells to stay focused and do a search for Grandma Georgina.

ST: But we've got a job to do, Charlie, and **we must go through with it.**

TT: Tapi, ada tugas yang harus kita lakukan, Charlie, dan **kita harus melaluinya.**

Data Code: 120/187/262/M

Context Situation: The nurse suggested taking Miss Trunchbull to the school's health room.

ST: We must carry her up to the sick-room.

TT: Kita harus membawanya ke ruang kesehatan sekolah.

Example of Generalization:

Data Code:113/155/215/M

Context Situation: Miss Honey asked Matilda to get some water.

ST: You can get me some water while I light **the Primus.**

TT: Kau bisa mengambil sedikit air sementara aku menyalakan **kompor.**

Example of Transposition:

Data Code:110/142/197/M

Context Situation:Miss honey asked Matilda to put it in detail.

ST: I still don't quite understand **what you mean.**

TT: Aku masih tidak mengerti **maksudmu?**

3) Translation Quality in the Metaphor of MOOD Proposal

Translation quality can be measured with 3 parameters, such as accuracy, acceptable, and readability. Accuracy is the translation accurate and the meaning is same with the source text. Acceptable is the translation accepted according to the rule in the target text. Then readability is the translation easy to read at one time (Nababan et al, 2012). This study analyzes accuracy, acceptable, and readability in the translation of metaphor or MOOD in proposal. The explanation of translation quality will be described below.

a) Accuracy

The result of the study in the translation of metaphor of MOOD proposal in the novel Charlie and The Great Elevator and Matilda. there are 77 data accurate the percentage is 90.59% and less accurate 8 data the percentage is 9.41%. The table of accuracy can be seen below:

Table 3 Translation Quality of Accurate

No	Translation Quality	Frequency	Percentage
1	Accurate	77	90,59%
2	Less Accurate	8	9,41%
3	No Accurate	0	0
	Amount	**85**	**100%**

The an example of data

Data code: 80/12/12/M

Context situation: Mrs Phels advises Matilda to ask her mother for permission when she visits the library.

ST: I think you'd better ask her.

TT: Kupikir, sebaiknya kau meminta izin kepadanya.

The example above is the data that is accurate because there is no change in the message from source text to target text. The example above uses established equivalence and variation. Their techniques don't subtract or add the meaning in the target text, so the translation is accurate. Meanwhile, the example below is less accurate because the message in source text is subtracted when translating in the target text. It is because of the technique reduction.

The an example of data

Data code: 59/49/109/CGE

Context situation: Mr Wonka told the Oompa-Loompa to help get the bed out of the elevator.

ST: Thank you for your welcome! **Will some of you please help to get this bed out of here!**

TT: Terima kasih atas sambutan kalian! **Bisakah kalian membantu mengeluarkan tempat tidur dari sini?**

b) Acceptable

In this study 83 data is found that it is acceptable and the percentage is 97.64%. The least acceptable is 2 data and the percentage is 2.36%. The table of acceptable can be seen below:

Table 4 Translation Quality of Acceptable

No	Translation Quality	Frequency	Percentage
1	Acceptable	83	97,64%
2	Less Acceptable	2	2,36%
3	No Acceptable	0	0
Amount		**85**	**100%**

The an example of data:

Data code: 55/44/CGE

Context situation: Charlie suggests helping the Transport Capsules as they are chased by knids.

ST: **Then we must help them!**

TT: **Kalau begitu, kita harus membantu mereka!**

The example above is acceptable because there is no rule that contradicts the target text. This example uses established equivalence, that it is commonly adapting to the equivalents in the target language with existing rules. The example below is less acceptable because the rule is not suitable with the target text.

The an example of data:

Data code: 78/8/6/M

Context situation: When Matilda asked her father to buy a book.

ST: **Daddy, do you think you could buy me a book?**

TT: **Daddy, apakah Daddy bisa membelikanku sebuah buku?**

c) Readability

Readability in this study 83 data is found, and the percentage is 97.64%. The least readability is 2 and the percentage is 2.36%. The table of readability can be seen below:

Table 5 Translation Quality of Readable

No	Translation Quality	Frequency	Percentage
1	Readable	83	97,64%
2	Less Readable	2	2,36%
3	No Readable	0	0
Amount		85	100%

Analysis of Translation Techniques and Translation Quality of Metaphor MOOD Proposal in the Novel Charlie and the Great Glass Elevator and Matilda by Roald Dahl

231

The an example of data:

Data code: 74/84/189/CGE

Context situation: Mr Wonka told Grandpa Georgina to think how old she was.

ST: You've got to think!

TT: Anda harus berpikir!

The example above is readability because the data can be read in one time and also the data using technique established equivalence and variation. Then the next example is less readability because the data is difficult to read and needs a little time to understand.

The an example of data:

Data code: 65/65/149/CGE

Context situation: Mrs Bucket tells Grandma Georgina to leave her pills.

ST: **Could't you spare just one for each of us, Mother?**

TT: **Maukah kau menyisakan satu untuk kami, Mother?**

Conclusion

From the findings, it can be concluded that the metaphor of MOOD proposal in both novels uses declarative clauses to command the speaker to do something. The characters in the novel often use declarative clauses rather than interrogative clauses because the speaker expresses their behavior with statements. Further the speech function ordering is often used in both novels, because if they command the hearer, they don't have the power or authority to order the hearer.

From the perspective of translation studies, the established equivalence is the most technique that is used in translation of the metaphor of MOOD proposal. Then generalization and transposition is rarely used in this study because there are not many difficult terms that can confuse the reader and the grammar in both novels is easy to understand. Further the translation technique in the metaphor of MOOD proposal is accurate, acceptable and readable, because the percentage in each aspect is high.

References

Devrim, D. Y. (2015). Grammatical metaphor: What do we mean? What exactly are we researching?. *Functional Linguistics a Springer open Journal 2015 2:3*.

Dinagara, Restu Surya. (2016). Grammatical Metaphor as Framework Analysis of Students' Translation of Discussion Text (A Case Study of English Department's Students in Public University Indonesia University of Education). *Journal of English and Education 2016, 4(1), 92-108.*

Halliday, M.AK., Matthiessen & M.I.M Christian. (2014). *Introduction to Functional   Grammar*. New York. Routledge.

Moleong, Lexy J. (2018) *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung. Remaja Rosdakarya.

Molina, L., & Hurtado Albir, A. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta: Journal des Traducteurs/Meta: Translators' Journal, 47 (4), 498-512.*

Nababan, M.R. (2016). *Teori Menerjemah Bahasa Inggris*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Patrianto, Hero. (2016). Penerjemahan Bentuk Metafora Gramatikal sebagai Indikator Kesulitan Penerjemahan Teks Sains dan Humaniora. *Kandai Vol. 12, No. 2, November 2016; 167—186*.

Santosa, R. (2003). *Semiotika Sosial Pandangan Terhadap Bahasa*. Surabaya: JP Press.

Searle, John dan Daniel Vanderveken. (1985). *Foundations of Illocutionary Logic*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Si Xianzhu dan Wang. (2021). Grammatical Metaphor in English Chinese Translation. *International Journal of Translation, Interpretation, and Applied Linguistics Volume 3 Issue 1 January-June 2021*.

Subiyanto, Paul. (2016). The Impact of Transposition on Grammatical Metaphor A Study of Translation from the Perspective of SFL Theory. *International Journal of Linguistics, Language and Culture Vol. 2, No. 9, September 2016, pp. 97~101*.