


## Utilizing Translation Equivalence in J.K Rowling's *Harry Potter in the Phoenix New Order*

Moh.Supardi<sup>1</sup>  , Hasnul Insani Djohar<sup>2</sup>  and Frans Sayogie<sup>3</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Lecturer of English Literature Department, UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta; Doctoral Candidate at UNIKA Atma Jaya Indonesia

<sup>2,3</sup>Department of English Literature, Universitas Islam Negeri (UIN) Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta

 **Corresponding Author:** Moh.Supardi, **E-mail:** moh.supardi@uinjkt.ac.id

### ARTICLE INFORMATION

**Received:** April 08, 2021

**Accepted:** May 18, 2021

**Volume:** 4

**Issue:** 5

**DOI:** 10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.5.12

### KEYWORDS

Literary translation, non-equivalence, and strategy

### ABSTRACT

Many scholars have offered many theories to solve the problems of literary translation. However, the quality of literary translation remains a big burden and challenge for many translators due to literary translation often encounters the problems of fluency, accuracy, register, flexibility, a feeling for style, an appreciation of nuance, and transparency (Landers, 2001, p.13). The subjectivity in the interpretation of the source language message, the motion of stylistic faithfulness, and flexibility as regards the form of the source text and the greatest possible degree of the impracticality of an adequate translation have led to the problem of equivalence. Indeed, such problems of translation equivalence that are invoked by the translation process may bring serious problems to literary translation. The paper aims to seek the problems of non-equivalence in literary translation and to apply the concept of translation equivalences proposed by Mona Baker within and above the word levels grammatical level, textual level, and pragmatic level. By using Baker's concept of the equivalence functions, this paper provides strategies to deal with non-equivalence problems found in J.K Rowling's novel *Harry Potter in the Phoenix New Order*. This paper has found that the translation of the *Phoenix New Order* novel bears non-equivalencies in the level of the word, above word, grammatical, textual, and pragmatic. Thus, translators need to apply several strategies, especially the concept of translation equivalence, in their translating process to ensure effective and efficient translation.

### 1. Introduction

Literary translation has been practiced for many centuries. However, many people react differently toward the quality of literary translation. Some of them find literary translation interesting while others find literary translation is annoying. Reading a literary translation sometimes implies a loss of innocence. This becomes evidence that literary translation brings a significant burden for the translators to overcome the problems to apply a firm grasp on principles and techniques. Accordingly, translating adult and children's literature will encounter the problems of fluency, accuracy, register, flexibility, a feeling for style, an appreciation of nuance, and transparency (Landers, 2001, p.13). Terms in literary translation with certain themes, let say magic, which some Christian fundamentalists view as witchcraft in the *Harry Potter* books have been criticized for several reasons due to the non-equivalencies.

Literary translation, somehow, has become one of the most interesting topics in the subject of translation research in recent years. The changing development of literary translation required not only translation techniques but also changes in the reader's cultural expectations and aesthetic concepts (Robinson, 1997). One of the most important problems comes from the translator itself, such as reliability, involvement in the profession, ethics, good intelligence, and memory also capable of creating the link between the text and the intended readers (Hermans, 2007: 79). Thus, Professional translators are expected to carefully examine

the problematic word, phrase, syntactic or grammatical structure, textual and pragmatic aspects as well as a cultural assumption, with full analytical awareness of the problem and its possible solutions. Hence, it is important to understand how to be a good translator and acknowledge every aspect to deal with the translation process.

The success of a translation generally lies on the degree to which it does not sound like a translation since the purpose of translation itself is to alter Language A into Language B that leaves as little evidence as possible of the process. At this point, a reader might be unrealized that he/she is reading a translation. Although the majority of readers likely hold it as the most important aspect of a 'good' translation, the view among translators, however, especially academics, is less unanimous. Scholars seem to have more receptive to the theory of translation product rather than process. Therefore, it is important to understand translation theory in order to get success as a professional translator.

Many scholars, such as Bassnett (2014), have offered many theories to deal with the problems of the translating process. In literary translation, the order of the words, such as the style, can make the difference between a lively, highly readable translation and a stilted, rigid, and artificial rendering that strips the original of its artistic and aesthetic essence, even in its very soul (Bassnett, 2014, p.47). Literary translators must also concern with tone, style, flexibility, inventiveness, knowledge of the SL culture, the ability to grasp the meaning from ambiguity, capable of listening sonority, and humility. The literary translation process, however, cannot be overwhelming with the translation as a product, due to the different functions and propose.

Based on this problem, this paper aims to analyze the literary translation of J.K. Rowling's novel *Harry Potter in the Phoenix New Order* and its Indonesian translation as the product. Mona Baker's concept of equivalence in the word level, above word, grammatical, textual, and pragmatic equivalences is likely focused on the translation as a product. This concept is important to be applied in analyzing the literary translation of JK Rowling Harry Potter in the Phoenix New Order to find the non-equivalences and close equivalence of translation as a production.

Thus, analyzing the result of translation concerns with the problems of how equivalencies are viewed based on the problems found by the translators. In this way, Mona Baker's concept of equivalence in translation can help translators to deal with the problems of translation in the word level, above word, grammatical, textual, and pragmatic level of equivalencies. The levels of equivalences proposed by Mona Baker are expected to give comprehensive discourse in translation.

This paper aims to provide pieces of evidence of the non-equivalence translation of JK Rowling Harry Potter in the Phoenix New Order translated by Gramedia Pustaka Utama. Thus, this paper applies the concept of translation equivalences proposed by Mona Baker in the word level, above word level, grammatical level, textual level, and pragmatic level. The concept of equivalence refers to Mona Baker's book, *In Other Words (Year)*. By using the function of the equivalence concept proposed by Mona Baker, this paper provides shreds of evidence of translation equivalence. In addition to this, this paper provides strategies to deal with non-equivalence problems found in J.K Rowling's novel Harry Potter in the Phoenix New Order.

## 2. Literature Review

According to Ingo (1984) (as cited by Nykyri, 2000) that translation studies have relied very much on linguistic philology when a text has been considered a static object and the translation process itself has not been explained. At various times translation (as a process and action) has been understood in many different ways. Demands and purposes have been passionately polemical as long as there have been translations. The ancient Cicero and the renaissance Dante both considered translation as impossible. If translating is understood as transferring information or a message, i.e. meaning, from a source language into a target language, translating is nowadays seen as generally possible (p.76-77).

According to Oittinen (1995), (as quoted in Nykyri, 2000) opinions around equivalence are strongly disunited. It is considerably more common to question the concept of equivalence than to explicitly define it. For example, what do correspondence and faithfulness mean? How do we then define a good translator and a good translation? Indeed, translating is considered to understand as a doomed action, where a translator is aiming at the unattainable sameness. Traditionally, a good translator is considered to be invisible and humble, in the sense that a good translation is loyal to the source text, and a translator can be seen as an active manipulator, who aims not at sameness but stretches his/her words to the future target language readers. Oittinen's idea about translation as manipulation is related to the idea of language and power and how language does not reflect reality passively and neutrally.

Nida and Reyburn (1981) found that a translator usually understands the message by following his /her cultural-linguistic context. Usually, a translator is aware of that and tries to solve the problem by using foreign terms. Regardless of this, a concept in the source language is not always semantically equivalent to the same concept in the target language. Generally, descriptive phrases are better (more equivalent) than foreign terms in translating a message into another culture. (Nida & Reyburn, 1981,

pp.21- 25). This can also be seen in thesaurus construction standards and guidelines where loan words are not recommended (e.g. ISO 5964-1985, ISO 2788-1986, SFS 5471-1988).

The art of translation meant, for Horatius and Cicero, careful interpretation of the source text and composition of source text according to the principle not word for word, but thought for thought. This means that a translator is responsible always for the target audience (Bassnett, 1995, p.62). Translation can be seen from many different perspectives and is already defined and illustrated differently within translation science. For example, translation may be defined as follows:

The translation is the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent material in another language (TL).” Catford (1965, p.20) (as cited by Schäffner 1998) “Translation is a kind of activity which inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions.” Toury (1978, p.200) “The translation would not simply be a question of linguistics. One should start translating not only words but also concepts and even contexts”. Not only translations, but also the theories surrounding it, are – or should be – context-bound: “Any definition of anything is theory-bound, so there is no such thing as an objective definition of “translation” that we can take for granted before we start studying it, as there will never be any definition of translation that will be all-inclusive. We start with a preliminary working definition and refine it as we go along. Different scholars with different research aims tend to start (and end up) with different definitions. We should be aware of “why we choose or accept a particular definition and/or conception of translation” (Carmen, 2004, p.2).

### **2.1 Theoretical Concept of Translation Equivalence according to Mona Baker**

It is important to discuss the notion of equivalence by Baker (1992) because she offers a more detailed list of conditions upon which the concept of equivalence can be defined. She explores the notion of equivalence at different levels concerning the translation process, including all different aspects of translation and hence putting together the linguistic and the communicative approach. She distinguishes between:

*Word equivalence:* Baker defines the term word since it should be remembered that a single word can sometimes be assigned different meanings in different languages and might be regarded as being a more complex unit or morpheme. This means that the translator should pay attention to several factors when considering a single word, such as number, gender, and tense.

*Above word:* Besides having individual meaning, words, translation problems almost always occur in the company of other words to construct meaning, i.e., phrases. The differences between the lexical patterning of the source language and target language, the translator usually finds difficulties in deals with collocation and idiom and fix expression.

*Grammatical Equivalence:* Different grammatical structures in the SL and TL may cause remarkable changes in the way the information or message is carried across. These changes may induce the translator either to add or to omit information in the TT because of the lack of particular grammatical devices in the TL itself. Amongst these grammatical devices which might cause problems in translation Baker focuses on a number, tense and aspects, voice, person, and gender.

*Textual Equivalence:* Texture is a very important feature in translation since it provides useful guidelines for the comprehension and analysis of the ST which can help the translator in his or her attempt to produce a cohesive and coherent text for the TC audience in a specific context. It is up to the translator to decide whether or not to maintain the cohesive ties as well as the coherence of the SL text. His or her decision will be guided by three main factors, that is, the target audience, the purpose of the translation, and the text type.

*Pragmatic Equivalence:* The translator needs to work out implied meanings in translation to get the ST message across. The role of the translator is to recreate the author's intention in another culture in such a way that enables the TC reader to understand it clearly (Baker, 1992).

### **3. Methodology**

*Source of data* are J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter And The Order Of The Phoenix* Published by Arthur Levine Books, an imprint of Scholastic Inc 2003, and its Indonesian version published by Gramedia Pustaka Utama 2017. *Data* are the words, phrases, sentences, and the texts as the corpus of the data analysis taken from the novel of J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter And The Order Of The Phoenix* and its Indonesian version. *Data are collected* through reading, marking, classifying, comparing between SL and TL in terms of non-equivalence in the word level, above word, grammatical, textual, and pragmatic equivalence. *Data are analyzed* qualitatively based on Mona Baker's concept of Translation Equivalence in terms of word, above word, grammatical, textual, and pragmatic level as well as the strategies of non-equivalence translation.

#### 4. Results and Discussions

The findings of non-equivalence translation of J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter And The Order Of The Phoenix* are presented in the following tables:

Table 1: Non-Equivalence Translation in J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter and The Order of The Phoenix*

Levels of Equivalent Translation strategy	Word	Above Word	Grammatical	Textual	Pragmatic
<b>Data 1</b>	SL: Anyway, that's not the only - he <u>blew</u> up his aunt, for God's sake! TL: Lagipula, itu bukan satu-satunya - dia <u>menggelembungkan</u> bibinya, demi Tuhan!	SL: Harry's heart <u>turned over</u> TL: Jantung Harry <u>berbalik</u>	SL: <u>What am I supposed to be looking at?</u> TL: <u>Apa yang seharusnya sedang kulihat?</u>	SL: He <u>would have to</u> face his aunt and uncle <u>later</u> and pay the price for his rudeness, but he did not care very much just <u>at the moment</u> ; he <u>had much more pressing matters on his mind</u>  TL: Dia <u>harus</u> menghadapi bibi dan pamannya <u>nanti</u> dan membayar kekasarannya tadi, tetapi dia tidak begitu peduli <u>saat ini</u> ; <u>dia punya masalah yang lebih menuntut pikiran</u>	SL: Why <u>wasn't he</u> , Harry, <u>busy</u> ? TL: Mengapa <u>dia</u> , Harry, <u>tidak sibuk</u> ?
<b>Strategy</b>	Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words	Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words	Translation by paraphrase using related words	Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words	Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words
<b>Data 2</b>	SL: They didn't fight <u>Quirrell</u> with me. TL: Mereka tidak bertarung dengan <u>Quirrel</u> bersamaku.	SL: He <u>looked up into</u> the handsome wizard's face, but close to Harry thought he looked rather weak and foolish. TL: Dia <u>memandang ke atas</u> ke wajah penyihir	SL: He <u>felt it would sound highly ungrateful</u> , not to mention childish, to say, 'I wish he'd talked to me, though.' TL: <u>Dia merasa akan terdengar sangat tidak berterima kasih</u> , belum lagi	SL: For a split second Harry thought he had done magic without meaning to, although he'd been resisting as hard as he could - then his reason caught up with his senses - he didn't have the power to turn off the stars TL: Selama	SL: 'I expect <u>someone will be in touch with you soon enough</u> ' TL: <u>Kuharap seseorang akan segera berhubungan denganmu.</u>

		pria tampan itu, tetapi dari dekat Harry berpikir dia tampak agak lemah dan bodoh.	kekanak-kanakan, untuk berkata, 'Walaupun kuharap dia berbicara kepadaku.3156	sepersekian detik Harry berpikir bahwa dia telah melakukan sihir tanpa disengajanya, <u>walaupun</u> dia telah menahan sekuat mungkin - lalu nalarnya menyangkut di akal sehatnya - dia tidak mempunyai kekuatan untuk memadamkan bintang-bintang	
<b>Strategy</b>	Translation using a loan word	Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words	Translation by paraphrase using related words	Translation by paraphrase using related words	Translation by paraphrase using unrelated words

From the table above, the non-equivalence translation occurs in all levels, word, above word, grammatical, textual, and pragmatic. While the strategies used by the translator in table 1 mostly employ translation by using unrelated words.

- *Non-Equivalence in word level*

SL: Anyway, that's not the only - he blew up his aunt, for God's sake!

TL: Lagipula, itu bukan satu-satunya - dia menggelembungkan bibinya, demi Tuhan!

In the above example, the translator translates the word 'blew' into 'menggelembung.' According to Mona Baker's concept, such translation can be categorized into translation by paraphrase using unrelated words. The translation is considered not equivalence in the word level due to the unnatural translation. The meaning of the sentence is distracted by the word 'menggelembung.' This translation should be revised to give a natural understanding of the target language readers' culture. Therefore, it is suggested that the translation would be better if it is translated into 'beginitulah, yang jelas atau ternyata, dia tidak hanya membentak bibinya.' It is very often that there is no equivalent in the target language for a particular expression in the source text. There may be a target-language word that has the same propositional meaning as the source-language word, but it may have a different expressive meaning. The difference may be considerable or it may be subtle but important enough to pose a translation problem in a given context. It is usually easier to add expressive meaning than to subtract it. In other words, if the target-language equivalent is more neutral compared to the source-language item, the translator can sometimes add some additional information to the evaluative element using a modifier or adverb if necessary or by building it in somewhere else in the text. Differences in expressive meaning are usually more difficult to handle when the target-language equivalent is more emotionally loaded than the source-language item.

SL: Harry listened to a jingle about Fruit 'n' Bran breakfast cereal while he watched Mrs. Figg, a batty cat-loving old lady from nearby Wisteria Walk, amble past

TL: Harry mendengarkan jingel mengenai sereal sarapan pagi Fruit 'n' Bran sementara dia memperhatikan Mrs Figg, seorang wanita tua pecinta kucing yang agak sinting dari Wisteria Walk yang letaknya tidak jauh, lewat pelan-pelan

The translation of underlined words 'jingle and cereal' in the source language is considered not equivalence if they are translated into 'jingel and sereal' because they are not familiar with Indonesian readers. The translator translates the words jingle and sereal by using the loan word translation strategy. The translation is considered not equivalence at the word level due to the unnatural effect for the readers, particularly for Indonesian readers. The meaning of the sentence is not natural for target readers due to the words 'jingel and sereal' are not recognized in TL. This translation should be revised to give a more natural understanding of the target language readers' culture. Therefore, it is suggested that the translation would be better if they are omitted rather than be preserved or substituted with a word that is acceptable for target readers. Therefore the suggested translation would be

better if it is translated into 'Harry mendengarkan dengan seksama mengenai sarapan pagi Fruit 'n' Bran sementara dia memperhatikan Mrs. Figg, seorang wanita tua pecinta kucing yang agak sinting dari Wisteria Walk di sekitar sini.' The target language may make more or fewer distinctions in meaning than the source language. What one language regards as an important distinction in meaning another language may not perceive as relevant. The use of loan words in the source text poses a special problem in translation. Translation of a loan word may pose another problem for the unwary translators. They are often associated with historically or culturally related languages. Once a word or expression is borrowed into a language, we cannot predict or control its development or the additional meanings it might or might not take on. Some false friends are easy to spot because the difference in their meanings is so great that only a very inexperienced translator is likely to be unaware of it.

- *Non-equivalence in above word level*

SL: Harry's heart turned over

TL: Jantung Harry berbalik

The translation of the phrase or idiomatic expression above is considered nonequivalence in the above word level because the phrase 'turn over' from the source language translated into 'terbalik.' The strategy used by the translator is a translation of idiom by paraphrase using unrelated words. For Indonesian readers, the word 'terbalik' will not be matched with the problem of heart or jantung. The meaning of the sentence is distracted by the word 'terbalik.' This translation should be revised to give a natural understanding of the target language readers' culture. Therefore, it is suggested that the translation would be better if it is translated into 'Jantung Harry berdebar-debar or berdegup kencang.' The translator may be better to consider the target readers' culture. It is very often that there is no equivalent in the target language for a particular expression in the source text that may express a concept which is known in the target culture but simply not lexicalized, in a sense, that it is not 'collocation' in target-language. The word 'turn over' may become a problem for certain languages. The collocation in the source language may be difficult to find in the target language due to the lack of equal expression. However, the word 'turn over' can be rendered using the close equivalence that is acceptable by target readers' culture.

SL: He looked up into the handsome wizard's face, but close to Harry thought he looked rather weak and foolish.

TL: Dia memandang ke atas ke wajah penyihir pria tampan itu, tetapi dari dekat Harry berpikir dia tampak agak lemah dan bodoh

From the example above, the translation of 'lookup into' is paraphrased by the translator by using unrelated words. The translation of the phrase above is considered nonequivalence in the above word level because the phrase 'look up into' from the source language translated into 'memandang ke atas' sounds unnatural for target readers. The strategy used by the translator is a translation by paraphrase using unrelated words. For Indonesian readers, the word 'memandang ke atas' is usually used to express different cases or objects. The phrase "memandang ke atas" is considered no collocationized with the parallel situation, for example, when the speaker and the opposite speaker are facing each other. The meaning of the sentence is distracted by the word "memandang ke atas." This translation should be revised to give a natural understanding of the target language readers' culture. Therefore, it is suggested that the translation would be better if it is translated into 'Dia memandang ke atas ke wajah penyihir pria tampan itu, tetapi dari dekat Harry berpikir dia tampak agak lemah dan bodoh.' The translator may be better to consider the target readers. It is very often that there is no equivalent in the target language for a particular expression in the source text. The source-language word may express a concept which is known in the target culture but simply not lexicalized, that is not 'collocation' in target-language word to expresses it. The word 'look up into' may become a problem for certain languages. The phrase in the source language may be difficult to find in the target language due to the lack of equal expression. However, the word 'look up into' can be rendered using the close equivalence that is acceptable by target readers.

- *Non-equivalence in grammatical level*

SL: What am I supposed to be looking at?

TL: Apa yang seharusnya sedang kulihat?'

In the above example, the translator translates the sentence 'What am I supposed to be looking at' into 'Apa yang seharusnya sedang kulihat.' According to Mona Baker's concept, such translation can be categorized into grammatical levels by using the strategy of translation by paraphrase using unrelated words in different tenses and aspects. The translation is considered not equivalence in the grammatical level due to the unnatural structure for target language readers' culture. The meaning of the sentence is distracted by the word 'apa yang seharusnya sedang kulihat.' This translation should be revised to give a natural understanding of the target language readers' culture. Therefore, it is suggested that the translation would be better if it is translated into 'Apa yang harus kulihat.' The translator may better omit or exchange words that are not familiar with the target language structure. It is very often that there is no equivalent in the target language for a particular expression in the source text.

So, rendering structure is sometimes necessary for the translator to translate the grammatical structure that matches the target language structure norms.

There may be a target-language word that has the same propositional meaning as the source-language word, but it may have a different expressive meaning. The difference may be considerable or it may be subtle but important enough to pose a translation problem in a given context. In other words, if the structure of target-language is less equivalent to target language readers, they are supposed to alter based on target readers' norms. Differences in expressive meaning are usually more difficult to handle when the target-language equivalent is not available in the source-language structure. Not all languages have the same grammatical structure. That is why the translators often face difficulties and make some adjustments by changing the information or structure. The strategies used by the translator depending on the grammatical rules in the target language. The common problem arises when a translator working from a language has number distinctions into a language with no aspects category. The above example of strategies used by the translator is categorized into translation by using unrelated words or unrelated structures.

SL: He felt it would sound highly ungrateful, not to mention childish, to say, 'I wish he'd talked to me, though

TL: Dia merasa akan terdengar sangat tidak berterima kasih, belum lagi kekanak-kanakan, untuk berkata, 'Walaupun kuharap dia berbicara kepadaku

In the above example, the translator translates the sentence 'felt it would sound highly ungrateful' into 'merasa akan terdengar sangat tidak berterima kasih.' According to Mona Baker's concept, such translation can be categorized into grammatical level by using the strategy of translation by paraphrase using unrelated words in different aspects. The translation is considered not equivalence in the grammatical level due to the unnatural. The meaning of the sentence is distracted by the word structure 'merasa akan terdengar sangat tidak berterima kasih.' This translation should be revised to give a natural understanding of the target language readers' culture. Therefore, it is suggested that the translation would be better if it is translated into 'dia adalah orang yang tidak tahu berterima kasih.' The translator may better alter or exchange words that are not familiar with the target language structure. It is very often that there is no equivalent in the target language for a particular expression in the source text. So, rendering structure is sometimes necessary for the translator to translate the grammatical structure that matches the target language structure norms. Accordingly, there may be a target-language word that has the same propositional meaning as the source-language word, but it may have a different expressive meaning. The difference may be considerable or it may be subtle but important enough to pose a translation problem in a given context. In other words, if the structure of target-language is less equivalent to target language readers, they are supposed to alter based on target readers' norms. Differences in expressive meaning are usually more difficult to handle when the target-language equivalent is not available in the source-language structure. Not all languages have the same grammatical structure. That is why the translators often face difficulties and make some adjustments by changing the information. The strategies used by the translator depending on the grammatical rules in the target language. The common problem arises when a translator working from a language has number distinctions into a language with no aspects category. The above example of strategies used by the translator is categorized into translation by using unrelated words or unrelated structures.

- *Non-equivalence in textual level*

SL: He would have to face his aunt and uncle later and pay the price for his rudeness, but he did not care very much just at the moment; he had much more pressing matters on his mind

TL: Dia harus menghadapi bibi dan pamannya nanti dan membayar kekasarannya tadi, tetapi dia tidak begitu peduli saat ini; dia punya masalah yang lebih menuntut pikiran

In the above example, the translator translates the sentence 'would have to face his aunt and uncle later and pay the price for his rudeness, but he did not care very much just at the moment; he had much more pressing matters on his mind' into 'harus menghadapi bibi dan pamannya nanti dan membayar kekasarannya tadi, tetapi dia tidak begitu peduli saat ini; dia punya masalah yang lebih menuntut pikiran.' Such translation is considered non-equivalence at the textual level due to the difference in grammatical aspects. According to Mona Baker's concept, such translation can be categorized into a textual level by using the strategy of translation by paraphrase using unrelated words in different aspects. The translation is considered not equivalence in the textual level due to the unnatural sounds for target readers. The meaning of the sentence is distracted by the word structure in the source language. This translation should be revised to give a natural understanding of the target language readers' culture. There may be a target-language word that has the same propositional meaning as the source-language word, but it may have a different expressive meaning. The difference may be considerable, or it may be subtle but important enough to pose a translation problem in a given context. In other words, if the structure of target-language is less equivalent to target language readers, they are supposed to alter based on target readers' norms. Differences in expressive meaning are usually more difficult to handle when the target-language equivalent is not available in the source-language structure. Not all languages have the

same grammatical structure. That is why the translators often face difficulties and make some adjustments by changing the information. The strategies used by the translator depending on the grammatical rules in the target language. The common problem arises when a translator working from a language has number distinctions into a language with no aspects category. The above example of strategies used by the translator is categorized into translation by using unrelated words or unrelated structures. Therefore, it is suggested that the translation would be better if it is translated into "Dia harus menghadapi bibi dan pamannya dan menerima sikap kekasarannya tadi, namun dia tidak begitu peduli pada saat ini; dia punya masalah yang mengganggu pikiran." The translator may better alter or exchange words which is not familiar with the target language structure. It is very often that there is no equivalent in the target language for a particular expression in the source text. So, rendering structure is sometimes necessary for the translator to translate the grammatical structure that matches the target language structure norms.

SL: For a split second Harry thought he had done magic without meaning to, although he'd been resisting as hard as he could - then his reason caught up with his senses - he didn't have the power to turn off the stars

TL: Selama sepersekian detik Harry berpikir bahwa dia telah melakukan sihir tanpa disengajanya, walaupun dia telah menahan sekuat mungkin - lalu nalarnya menyangkut di akal sehatnya - dia tidak mempunyai kekuatan untuk memadamkan bintang-bintang

In the above example, the translator translates the sentence 'For a split second Harry thought he had done magic without meaning to, although he'd been resisting as hard as he could - then his reason caught up with his senses - he didn't have the power to turn off the stars' into 'Selama sepersekian detik Harry berpikir bahwa dia telah melakukan sihir tanpa disengajanya, walaupun dia telah menahan sekuat mungkin - lalu nalarnya menyangkut di akal sehatnya - dia tidak mempunyai kekuatan untuk memadamkan bintang-bintang.' Such translation is considered non-equivalence at the textual level due to the difference in grammatical aspects, particularly the use of cohesion. According to Mona Baker, cohesion is objective and based on the principle of automatic recognition, in contrast to coherence which is more dependent on the reader's attitude. Cohesion connects words and expressions with their counterparts in the text. Baker says that cohesion is the surface expression of coherence relations and calls it a device for making conceptual relations explicit. According to Mona Baker's concept, such translation can be categorized into a textual level by using the strategy of translation by paraphrase using unrelated words in different aspects. The translation is considered not equivalence in the textual level due to the unnatural sounds for target readers. The meaning of the sentence is distracted by the word structure in the source language. This translation should be revised to give a natural understanding of the target language readers' culture. There may be a target-language word that has the same propositional meaning as the source-language word, but it may have a different expressive meaning. The difference may be considerable, or it may be subtle but important enough to pose a translation problem in a given context. In other words, if the structure of target-language is less equivalent to target language readers, they are supposed to alter based on target readers' norms. Differences in expressive meaning are usually more difficult to handle when the target-language equivalent is not available in the source-language structure. That is why the translators often face difficulties and make some adjustments by changing the information. The strategies used by the translator depending on the grammatical rules in the target language. The common problem arises when a translator working from a language has number distinctions into a language with no aspects category. The above example of strategies used by the translator is categorized into translation by using unrelated words or unrelated structures. In compliance with Mona Baker, cohesion is objective and based on the principle of automatic recognition, in contrast to coherence which is more dependent on the reader's attitude. Cohesion connects words and expressions with their counterparts in the text. Baker says that cohesion is the surface expression of coherence relations and calls it a device for making conceptual relations explicit. Therefore, it is suggested that the translation would be better if it is translated into "Selama sepersekian detik Harry berpikir bahwa dia telah menggunakan sihirnya tanpa disengaja, padahal dia telah menahan sekuat mungkin - dan dia pun mulai berpikir keras - karena dia tidak mempunyai kekuatan untuk menutup bintang-bintang." The translator may better alter or exchange words which is not familiar with the target language structure. It is very often that there is no equivalent in the target language for a particular expression in the source text. So, rendering structure is sometimes necessary for the translator to translate the grammatical structure that matches the target language structure norms and cohesion.

- *Non-equivalence in pragmatic level*

SL: Why wasn't he, Harry, busy?

TL: Mengapa dia, Harry, tidak sibuk?

In the above example, the translator translates the sentence 'Why wasn't he, Harry, busy' into 'Mengapa dia, Harry, tidak sibuk.' Such translation is considered non-equivalence at the pragmatic level due to the difference in implication meaning. According to Mona Baker, Pragmatics is the study of language in use. It is the study of meaning, not as generated by the linguistic system but



as conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communicative situation.' This means that pragmatic equivalence deals more with the reader's attitude than with theoretical issues and that it emphasizes the value of the text including its cultural and emotional connotations. Such translation can be categorized into a pragmatic level in the smallest unit by using the translation strategy by paraphrasing using unrelated words in different aspects of implication. The translation is considered not equivalence at the pragmatic level due to the different implications for target readers. The meaning of the sentence is distracted by the inappropriate place in the target language. This translation should be revised to give a natural understanding of the target language readers' culture. Therefore, it is suggested that the translation would be better if it is translated into 'Mengapa harus dia, Harry, sebetulnya dia sibuk apa.' The translator may better alter or exchange words that are not familiar with the target language structure. It is very often that there is no equivalent in the target language for a particular expression in the source text. The level of expressivity or the expressive meaning of the translated word is intensified or weakened by the used target word. However, the translator tried to preserve the same or at least a similar level of expressivity, which was obvious from the context. There may be a target-language word that has the same propositional meaning as the source-language word, but it may have a different expressive meaning. The difference may be considerable or it may be subtle but important enough to pose a translation problem in a given context. In other words, if the structure of target-language is less equivalent to target language readers, they are supposed to alter based on target readers' norms. Differences in expressive meaning are usually more difficult to handle when the target-language equivalent is not available in the source-language structure. Not all languages have the same grammatical structure. That is why the translators often face difficulties and make some adjustments by changing the information. The strategies used by the translator depending on the grammatical rules in the target language. The common problem arises when a translator working from a language has number distinctions into a language with no aspects category. The above example of strategies used by the translator is categorized into translation by using unrelated words or unrelated structures. In compliance with Mona Baker, cohesion is objective and based on the principle of automatic recognition, in contrast to coherence which is more dependent on the reader's attitude. Cohesion connects words and expressions with their counterparts in the text. Baker says that cohesion is the surface expression of coherence relations and calls it a device for making conceptual relations explicit. So, rendering structure is sometimes necessary for the translator to translate the grammatical structure that matches the target language structure norms and cohesion.

SL: I expect someone will be in touch with you soon enough

TL: Kuharap seseorang akan segera berhubungan denganmu

In the above example, the translator translates the sentence 'I expect someone will be in touch with you soon enough' into 'Kuharap seseorang akan segera berhubungan denganmu.' Such translation is considered non-equivalence at the pragmatic level due to the difference of implication aspects. According to Mona Baker, Pragmatics is the study of language in use. It is the study of meaning, not as generated by the linguistic system but as conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communicative situation." This means that pragmatic equivalence deals more with the reader's attitude than with theoretical issues and that it emphasizes the value of the text, including its cultural and emotional connotations. Such translation can be categorized into a pragmatic level in the smallest unit that the text connotes negative in target language readers' culture. This translation employ strategy of translation by paraphrase using unrelated words in a negative connotation. The translation is considered not equivalence at the pragmatic level due to the different implications for target readers. The meaning of the sentence is distracted by the inappropriate place in the target language. This translation should be revised to give a natural understanding of the target language readers' culture. Therefore, it is suggested that the translation would be better if it is translated into 'Kuharap seseorang akan segera menghubungimu.' The translator may better alter or exchange words that are not familiar with the target language structure. Such translation may be considered profanity for the target readers. It is very often that there is no equivalent in the target language for a particular expression in the source text. So, rendering structure is sometimes necessary for the translator to translate the grammatical structure that matches the target language structure norms and cohesion. Sometimes, the level of expressivity or the expressive meaning of the translated word is intensified or weakened by the used target word. However, the translator tried to preserve the same or at least a similar level of expressivity, which was obvious from the context. There may be a target-language word that has the same propositional meaning as the source-language word, but it may have a different expressive meaning. The difference may be considerable or it may be subtle but important enough to pose a translation problem in a given context. In other words, if the structure of target-language is less equivalent to target language readers, they are supposed to alter based on target readers' norms. Differences in expressive meaning are usually more difficult to handle when the target-language equivalent is not available in the source-language structure. Not all languages have the same linguistic structure. That is why the translators often face difficulties and make some adjustments by changing the information. The strategies used by the translator depending on the language rules in the target language. The common problem arises when a translator working from a language has number distinctions into a language with no aspects category. The above example of strategies used by the translator is categorized into translation by using unrelated words or unrelated structures.

## 5. Conclusion

Based on the data analysis, it can be concluded that the non-equivalence translation found in JK Rowling's *Harry Potter The New Order Phoenix* due to the unacceptable concept or cultures which are no match to the target language readers. The absence of culture-specific concepts, the source-language concept is not lexicalized in the target language, the source-language word is semantically complex, the source and target languages make different distinctions in meaning, the target language lacks a superordinate, the target language lacks a specific term, differences in physical or interpersonal perspective, differences in form, and the use of loan words in the source text. The translator seems to apply different strategies, especially in terms of linguistic aspects. In the word level, the strategies used by the translator are loan words, translation by using related words and unrelated words. In the above word level, the translator's strategies are using idiom with similar meaning but the dissimilar form, changing the meaning, and using idiom similar meaning but dissimilar form. At the grammatical level, the translator's strategies are changing the tense aspect and changing the voice. At the textual level, the translator's strategies are translation by paraphrase using related and unrelated words in terms of references, substitution, ellipsis/omission, and conjunction. At the pragmatic level, the translator's strategies are using coherence and implicature aspects. By investigating the translation of JK Rowling's *Harry Potter The New Order Phoenix*, this paper has revealed how it is important to understand the translation theory, in this case, Mona Baker's Concept of Translation Equivalence, in order to make sure that the translation's process and product have good qualities, which provide meaningful understanding for readers.

Utilizing translation equivalence in this research may not cover any problems of translation. It is definitely confined to the view of Mona Baker translation theory that can be influenced by a number of linguistic and cultural factors and is therefore always relative when it is viewed from other perspectives. This research is, therefore, expected to bring about alternative in translation studies that can allow translators to mediate translation task and future researchers from different unexplored perspectives.

**Acknowledgement:** Special thanks to Prof. Bahren for the Source of data "J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter and The Order Of The Phoenix" Published by Arthur Levine Books, an imprint of Scholastic Inc 2003, and its Indonesian version published by Gramedia Pustaka Utama 2017. Any shortcomings remain the authors' responsibility.

**Conflicts of Interest:** We have no conflict of interests that may be perceived to influence the results and discussion reported in this paper (personal & institutional).

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

## References

- [1] Aksoy, N. B. (2017). Assessing the Role of Style in Literary Translation. *The Annals of Ovidius University of Constanța: Philology Series. OVID–Metaphor, Spatiality, Discourse*, 27(2) p.159-167
- [2] Anelo, C.G. (2004). Philosophy, Anthropology, and Linguistics in Translation. *Translation Journal*, 8(1), p.1-2
- [3] Baker, M. (2011). *In Other Words: A Coursebook of Translation*. London: Routledge Group
- [4] Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [5] Catford, (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay on Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press, London
- [6] Christina, S. (1998). The concepts of Norms in Translation Studies. *Current Issues in Language and Society*, 5(1&2), p.1-9.
- [7] Landers, C. (2001). *Literary Translation. A Practical Guide*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [8] Larson, M.L. (1984). *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- [9] Munday, J. (2009). *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. Routledge: Taylor and Francis groups.
- [10] Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- [11] Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- [12] Nykyri, S. (2010). *Equivalence and Translation Strategies in Multilingual Thesaurus Construction*. Abo: Abo Akademi University Press.
- [13] Nida, E. A. (1982). *Translating Meaning*. San Dimas, CA: English Language Institute.
- [14] Nida, E. A. and W. D. R. (1981). *Meaning Across Culture*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis
- [15] Oittinen, R. (1993). *I am Me, I am Other: On The Dialogics of Translating for Children*. Tampere: University of Tampere.
- [16] Robinson, D. (2003). *Becoming a Translator: An Introduction to The Theory and Practice of translation*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Routledge.
- [17] Sánchez, M. T. (2009). *Problems of Literary Translation*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- [18] Toury, G. (1995). The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation. In Venuti, L. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.