The Impact of Translation Techniques Toward Translation Quality of Logical Metaphor as Conjunctive Relation in the Indonesian Version *"Pride and Prejudice"*

Li Wenlin[1]* & M. R. Nababan [2] * & Riyadi Santosa [3]
[1]*Postgraduate Student, Linguistic Program, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia*
[23]*Professor, Linguistic Program, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia*
Corresponding Author: Li Wenlin, E-mail: liwenlino@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	The aims of this study are to identify translation techniques of logical metaphor as conjunctive relation in the Indonesian version of novel *"pride and prejudice"*, and its effect on translation quality of logical metaphor in accuracy, acceptability, and readability aspects. This descriptive qualitative research is an embedded-cased study and oriented to translation products. The data were collected by document analysis, focus group discussion and analyzed by Spradley's data analysis method. The results show that the translation techniques established equivalence, explicitation, transposition and modulation contributed to the translation quality. Meanwhile, creative discursive, paraphrase, generalization, particularization and deletion decreased the translation quality. This implies that translators should consider logical metaphor in translating commands.

1. INTRODUCTION

According to Bell (1991: 36), a translator should meet five distinct conditions, namely having access to source language knowledge, target language knowledge, text type knowledge, subject area knowledge, and contrastive knowledge. However, Sriyono (2012) added that translators should also pay close attention to symbols in the source text and endeavor to maintain in the target text. To realize the unity of source text and target text, one of the symbols that should be noticed is the conjunctive relation. How the conjunctive relation that signifies the logical relationship between clauses, sentences or paragraphs is formed, would affect whether the cohesion of a text could be interpreted and examined properly.

Conjunctive relation is the concept of systemic functional linguistics, expressing logical meaning in the logic of discourse. Santosa (2011) indicated that the logic of discourse generally is considered to be realized through conjunctions, but according to Martin and Rose (2003), the logic of discourse can also be realized by continuatives and logical metaphor. The three forms of realizing logic of discourse are referred to as conjunctive relations. Logical metaphor is another kind of conjunctions, which is rendered by verbs, nouns and other grammatical classes.

The former researches related to the translation of conjunctive relation are mainly focused on conjunctions, and the recreation of logical structure in translation. Krisztina (2016) founded that the number of conjunctions and relational propositions in translation no statistically significant shifts occur, but in their quality and the hierarchical organization of relational propositions considerable shifts appear, even affecting the global meaning of the target text. The results may be attributed to a special set of discourse-level translation strategies, forming part of translator's discourse competence. Sriyono (2017) compared conditional conjunctions in English and Indonesian legal texts, the results showed that inappropriate technique in translating conditional conjunctions may cause multi interpretation. Besides, explicitness and implicitness of conditional conjunctions between source text and target text are also identified by translation techniques applied. Pan (2013) also compared conjunctive relation in two legal subgenres to find how translators configure the logical flow of translations. It was showed that conjunctive patterns in the two subgenres had two different trends, tending to become implicit in one of the subgenre translations and to become explicit in another subgenre translation. This may be caused by cross-linguistics differences and extra-linguistic factors.

However, conjunctions are not the only way to realize the logic of discourse, and the translation quality would also reflect the competence of translators more directly. Accordingly, this research aims to study the translation techniques of logical metaphor and its effect on translation quality.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Logical Metaphor
Conjunctions can be reconstrued as other kinds of elements, including processes, things, qualities, and circumstances. This kind of conjunctions is called logical metaphor. It is used to reconstrue logical relations between figures as if they were relations between elements within figures (Martin and Rose, 2007). The classification of logical metaphor is based on the classification of Martin and Rose (2007) and Santosa (2011).

2.1.1 Logic as process

Logic as process means that conjunctive relation is realized with the verbal group that acts as predicate in grammatical functions or as process in transitivity. There are four types of meaning in this kind of logical metaphor, namely addition, comparison, time and consequence.

2.1.2 Logic as Circumstance

It is called logic as circumstance because it acts as adjunct in the grammatical functions and as circumstance in transitivity. There are three types of logical meaning in this kind of logical metaphor.

2.1.3 Logic as things

Logic as things is presented on the subject or complement in the grammatical functions or on the participant in transitivity. So, this kind of logical metaphor is found inside noun group. It has two logical meaning, namely comparison and consequence.

2.2 Translation Techniques

According to Molina and Albir (2002), most studies of translation techniques do not seem to fit in with the dynamic nature of translation equivalence. In their opinion, a technique can only be judged meaningfully when it is evaluated within a particular context. Therefore, translation techniques are not good or bad in themselves, they are used functionally and dynamically. In the light of the above, a proposal to classify translation techniques are made by them, including:

Adaptation. To replace a ST cultural element with one from the target culture. This corresponds to SCFA's adaptation and Margot's cultural equivalent.

Amplification. To introduce details that are not formulated in the ST, including information and explicative paraphrasing. This includes SCFA's explicitation, Delisle's addition, Margot's legitimate paraphrase, Newmark's explicative paraphrase and Delisle's periphrasis and paraphrase. Footnotes are also a type of amplification.

Reduction. To suppress a ST information item in the TT. This includes SCFA's and Delisle's implicitation, concision, and Vázquez Ayora's ommision. It is the opposite of amplification.

Borrowing. To take a word or expression straight from another language. It can be pure (without any change), or it can be naturalized (to fit the spelling rules in the TL). Pure borrowing corresponds to SCFA's borrowing. Naturalized borrowing corresponds to Newmark's naturalization technique.

Calque. Literal translation of a foreign word or phrase; it can be lexical or structural. This corresponds to SCFA's acceptation.

Compensation. To introduce a ST element of information or stylistic effect in another place in the TT because it cannot be reflected in the same place as in the ST. This corresponds SCFA's conception.

Description. To replace a term or expression with a description of its from or/and function.

Discursive creation. To establish a temporary equivalence that is totally unpredictable out of context. This coincides with Delisle's proposal.

Established equivalent. To use a term or expression recognized (by dictionaries or language in use) as an equivalent in the TL. This corresponds to SCFA's equivalence and literal translation.

Generalization. To use a more general or neutral term. This coincides with SCFA's acceptation.

Particularization. To use a more precise or concrete term. This also coincides with SCFA's acceptation. It is in opposition to generalization.

Linguistic amplification. To add linguistic elements. This is often used in consecutive interpreting and dubbing.

Linguistic compression. To synthesize linguistic elements in the TT. This is often used in simultaneous interpreting and in sub-titling. It is the opposite of linguistic amplification.

Literal translation. To translate a word or an expression word for word. In contrast to the SCFA definition, it does not mean translating one word for another. Molina and Alibir's literal translation

correspond to Nida's formal equivalent; when form coincides with function and meaning. It is the same as SCFA's literal translation.

Modulation. To change the point of view, focus or cognitive category in relation to ST; it can be lexical or structural. This coincides with SCFA's acceptation.

Substitution. To change linguistic elements for paralinguistic elements or vice versa. It is used above all in interpreting.

Transposition. To change a grammatical category.

Variation. To change linguistic or paralinguistic elements that affect aspects of linguistic variation: changes of textual tone, style, social dialect, geographical dialect, etc.

3. Translation Quality Assessment (TQR)

This assessment is intended to measure the quality of the translation text from English to Indonesian. This study is going to apply the TQR instruments from Nababan et al. (2012). The TQR model they proposed aims to evaluate the translation quality from English to Indonesian. Translation quality evaluated includes accuracy, acceptability, and readability. The level of translation accuracy is set by how accurate or equivalent the message from the source language transferred into the target language. The level of translation acceptability is set by deciding whether the message from the source language text has been conveyed in accordance with the rules, norms, and culture of the target language. The level of translation readability refers to the degree of ease of the translated text to be understood by the target readers.

There are three instruments for translation quality assessment in the TQR model: (1) Translation Accuracy Assessment Instrument, (2) Translation Acceptability Assessment Instrument, (3) Translation Readability Assessment Instrument. Each of the instruments includes three parts: (1) Translation category, (2) Scores with the scale from 1 to 3, which is arranged in an inverted pyramid form, (3) Description of parameters.

Table 2.1 Translation Accuracy Assessment Instrument

Translation Category	Score	Qualitative Parameters
Accurate	3	The meanings of words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences or source language texts accurately transferred into the target language; absolutely no meaning distortions occur.
Less Accurate	2	Most of the meanings of words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences or source language texts had been transferred accurately into the target language. However, there are still distortions of meaning, translation of double meanings or the meanings are deleted, which disturb the integrity of message.
Inaccurate	1	The meanings of words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences or source language texts are not accurately transferred into the target language, or totally deleted.

(adopted from Nababan et al., 2002: 50)

Table 2.2 Translation Acceptability Assessment Instrument

Translation Category	Score	Qualitative Parameters
Acceptable	3	The translations are natural; the technical terms are commonly used and familiar to the reader; phrases, clauses, and sentences are in accordance with the rules of the Indonesian language.
Less Acceptable	2	In general, the translation already feels natural; however, there are few problems in the use of technical terms or grammatical errors.
Unacceptable	1	The translations are not natural; the technical terms are not commonly used and not familiar to the readers; phrases, clauses, and sentences are not in accordance with the rules of Indonesian language.

(adopted from Nababan et al., 2002: 50)

Table 2.3 Translation Readability Assessment Instrument

Translation Category	Score	Qualitative Parameters
Readable	3	The readers can understand the words, technical terms, phrases, clauses, sentences, or translation texts easily.
Less readable	2	In general, the readers can understand the translations; however, there are certain parts that require to be read more than once to understand.
Unreadable	1	The readers cannot understand the translation.

(adopted from Nababan et al., 2002: 50)

The three instruments above show the scale from 1 to 3. The higher the score given by the raters, the more accurate, acceptable, and readable the translation resulted. In contrast, the lower the score is given to the translation, the less accurate, acceptable, and readable the translation resulted.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study led to the translation product. Research about translation products can be done by comparing the source text with the target text. Translation units of this study are a logical metaphor as conjunctive relation in the novel *"pride and prejudice"* and its translation in Indonesian. The data were analyzed to achieve the research objective: to find the translation techniques used in the logical metaphor in the novel *"pride and prejudice"* and its influence toward translation quality inaccuracy, acceptability, and readability.

Besides, this descriptive qualitative study is an embedded case study, the study focuses on the logical metaphor in the novel *"pride and prejudice"* and this focus is based on the objectives and interests of the research before the researcher enters the ground (Supoto, 2006).

The sources of data used in this research are *"pride and prejudice"* and its Indonesian translations. The data are all logical metaphors founded in the novel. Affective data were collected by document analysis. Then in the focus group discussion, questionnaires were distributed to three informants (raters) to collect the respondents about translation techniques and translation quality of logical metaphors.

Data were analyzed by Spradley's data analysis method (Spradely, 1980). In domain analysis, the researcher collects all the effective data in the novel. In Taxonomy analysis, researcher classified all the translation techniques employed by translator and translation quality which had been collected in the focus group discussion. In componential analysis, the components in domain analysis and taxonomy analysis were connected together, researcher could analyze the impacts of translation techniques toward translation quality. In the final stage, researcher could describe the characteristic of pattern among domain and taxonomy.

4. RESULTS AND DISCCUSION

Table 4.1 The relation of Logical Metaphor, Translation Techniques, and Translation Quality

in the Novel *Pride and Prejudice*

Logical Metaphor	Translation Techniques	Translation Quality								
		Accuracy			Acceptability			Readability		
		3	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	1
L as C	Established Equivalent	62	-	-	62	-	-	62	-	-
	Modulation	3	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	-
	Transposition	5	-	-	5	-	-	5	-	-
	Explicitation	19	-	-	19	-	-	17	-	-
	Discursive Creation	-	1	2	1	2	-	2	1	-
	Parafhrase	-	3	-	-	3	-	3	-	-
	Particulartization	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
	Deletion	-	-	6	-	-	6	-	-	6
L as P	Established Equivalent	26	-	-	26	-	-	26	-	-
	Modulation	7	-	-	7	-	-	7	-	-
	Transposition	7	-	-	7	-	-	7	-	-

	Explicitation	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
	Discursive Creation	-	1	3	3	1	-	4	-	-
	Parafhrase	-	5	-	-	5	-	5	-	-
	Generalization	-	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
	Deletion	-	-	5	-	-	5	-	-	5
L as T	Established Equivalent	12	-	-	12	-	-	12	-	-
	Modulation	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
	Transposition	7	-	-	7	-	-	7	-	-
	Explicitation	2	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-
	Discursive Creation	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-
	Deletion	-	-	4	-	-	4	-	-	4

From the table above, we could know that 9 translation techniques are used on the logical metaphor in the novel *Pride and Prejudice*, namely established equivalent, modulation, transposition, explicitation, discursive creation, paraphrase, generalization, particularization, and deletion.

Translation techniques that contribute to translation accuracy are established equivalence, modulation, transposition, and explicitation. Established equivalent can be implemented if the translators maintain the logical metaphor in the target language. This technique is mostly used in translating logical metaphor, that suggests that even though English and Indonesian have different language system, but still share a great similarity in logical metaphor. Modulation changes the cognitive category relation to the ST but not changing the category of logical metaphor, i.e. logic as circumstance "at this time of year" becomes logic as circumstance "pada masa seperti ini". The logical form and meaning are still maintained in the TT. Transposition changes grammatical category, i.e. logic as process "was added" becomes logic as circumstance "sebagai tambahan". Category logic as process was translated into logic as circumstance, but the translation is still logical metaphor and the logical meaning addition is also maintained. The explicitation technique also produces accurate translation, with changing the form of conjunctive relation. Conjunctive relation that realized in logical metaphor in the ST was translated into continuatives and conjunctions. i.e. logic as thing "consequence" becomes conjunctions "karena". Conjunctive relation was realized in conjunctions in the TT and logical meaning is still consequence. In addition, the translation techniques mentioned above also contributed to acceptability and readability.

Discursive creation, paraphrase, generalization, and particularization may result in less accurate translation. The application of those translation techniques discarded the logical form and meaning of logical metaphor in the translation. i.e. Generalization: logic as process "continued" becomes "kata". Logic as process "continued" not only has meaning 'continue to do something', but also has the logical meaning time, sequencing the event in the context. "Kata" only has the meaning 'to say' but not having the logical meaning that is implicit in the ST. Thus, the message in the ST could not be able to represent integrally in the TT.

Most of the inaccurate translation was resulted in the application of deletion, only few translations were translated by discursive creation. Deletion (omission) belongs to the translation technique reduction (Molina and Albir, 2002). "Omission is the unjustifiable suppression of elements in the ST." (ibid). In other words, this translation technique was used to delete the wordy phrases in the ST. But this opinion is contrary to what is found in this research. What the translator deleted is not the wordy phrases but the logical metaphor in the ST. In this way, the integrity of message in the TT declined. Besides, it is worth noting that some translations maintained the form and meaning of logical metaphor were still evaluated inaccurate, i.e. Discursive creation: logic as process "continued" becomes logic as process "mengakhiri". The logical form and meaning in the translation are the same as in the ST. But if "continued" was translated into "melanjutkan" would be more appropriate. The meaning of the source language was improperly transferred.

In the acceptability aspect, except the established equivalence, modulation, transposition and explicitation contributed to the translation acceptability, discursive creation, generalization, particularization also produce acceptable translations, since the words used by the translator are in accordance in the rules of Indonesian language. Less acceptable translations were resulted in the use of paraphrase and discursive creation, because there are still some problems in using words in the translation.

All the unacceptable translations were found in applying deletion. Since the logical metaphor in the ST was deleted in the TT, the translation naturally is inacceptable.

Finally, as to translation readability, only one translation was evaluated less readable, which was attributed to the use of discursive creation. All the unreadable translation was imputed to using deletion. The rest of the translation techniques all produce readable tranlations.

According to Nababan et al. (2002: 49), the evaluation of translation accuracy, acceptability, and readability was done separately. Therefore, the translation may be evaluated less accurate, but has a high score in acceptability and readability.

5. CONCLUSIONS
In this research, the researcher found 9 translation techniques used by the translator in translating logical metaphor in the novel *"pride and prejudice"*. They are established equivalent, modulation, transposition, explicitation, discursive creation, paraphrase, generalization, particularization, and deletion. Established equivalent is the translation technique which mostly used by the translator.
The translation techniques give an influence for the translation quality. Established equivalent, modulation, transposition, explicitation produce accurate translation, while the application of discursive creation, paraphrase, generalization, particularization produce less accurate translations. Discursive creation also produces inaccurate translations, so does the deletion technique.

The acceptable translations were resulted in the used of established equivalent, modulation, transposition, explicitation, discursive creation, generalization, and particularization. Some of the less acceptable translations were produced by applying discursive creation, the others were from the paraphrase's application. All the unacceptable translations were due to applying the translation technique deletion.

Only one translation of logical metaphor was evaluated less readable in the novel *"pride and prejudice"*, because of using discursive creation. Meanwhile, the translation technique deletion produces all the unreadable translations. The rest of the translation techniques have a good influence on the translation readability.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

ABOUT THE AUTHOR (S)
Li Wenlin is a postgraduate student in Linguistics Program at Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia.

Mengatur R. Nababan and **Riyadi Santosa** are professors of Linguistics Program at Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia.

REFERENCES
[1] Bell, Roger T. (1997). Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice. London and New York: Longman. Inc.

[2] Hanting Pan. (2013). Translating conjunctive cohesion in legal documents. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 22(1), 1-20.

[3] Jane Austen. (2007). *""Pride and Prejudice""* (3rd ed.). Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited.

[4] Jane Austen. (2019). *""Pride and Prejudice""*. (Susilawati, Sri Wahyuningsih, Trans.). Yogyakarta: Shira Media. (Original work published 1813).

[5] Kaijingulu Somwe Mubenga. (2014). A systemic functional analysis of conjunction in *Au Revoir les Enfants*. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*, 43, 297-325.

[6] Lucía Molina et Amparo Hurtado Albir. (2002). Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach. *Meta: Translator's Journal*, 47(4), 498-512.

[7]Mangatur Nababan, Ardiana Nuraeni & Sumardiono. (2012). PENGEMBANGAN MODEL PENILAIAN KUALITAS TERJEMAHAN. *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, 4(1), 39-57.

[8] Martin, J.R., & Rose, D. (2003). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. London: Continuum.

[9] Martin, J.R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. Second Edition. London: Continuum.

[10] Riyadi Santosa. (2011). *Logika Wacana: Analisis hubungan konjungtif dengan pendekatan Linguistik Sistemik Fungsional*. Surakarta: UNS Press.

[11] Spradely, J. P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

[12] Sriyono. (2012). HUBUNGAN KONJUNGTIF DALAM PENERJEMAHAN. *Prosodi*, 6(2), 63-71.

[13] Sriyono, Suhandano & Poedjosoedarmo, S. (2017). Translating English Conditional Conjunction in Legal Texts into Indonesian. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*, 5(4), 22-31.

[14] Sutopo, H. B. (2006). *Penelitian Kualitatif: Dasar Teori dan Terapannya dalam Penelitian*. Surakarta: Unviersitas Sebalas Maret.