

An Insight To Translation Strategies Of “Tidak Ada New York Hari Ini” Poems

Ni Komang Ariani

Universitas Pamulang
komangariani2013@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper examines several translation strategies in attempting to meet naturalness *Tidak Ada New York Hari Ini* poems. Recently, there have been wide interests to investigate how translators work on literary translation and anticipate the cultural distance between the source text and the target text. According to Nida (2004), there is no absolute correspondence between two languages. In addition she proposes that the translators also need to pay attention to the figurative expressions and metaphors in literary translation. The data collection and analysis were done by reading the poems closely in which the target text and the source text were compared in terms of equivalence. The writer also interviewed the translator of the poetry, John H. McGlynn.

Keywords: Translation methods, Newmark, Semantics translation, Poems

INTRODUCTION

Introduction (without subsection, 2-3 pages) includes background, objectives, methods, and literature reviews/theoretical construct (if needed) of the research. The introduction section ends with an emphasis on items to be discussed. Introduction consists of background of the study explaining the actual phenomenon that has been investigated, supported by references and previous studies that have been done individually or in a group or team. The author must also explain the existence of this research compared to those previous studies. Introduction consists of problem(s) (one problem that is becoming the focus of the study is even better), purpose of the study, research significance, and theory used to solve the problem(s). All sources that are cited or paraphrased should be all written in the references list. Introduction does not allow subchapterdsada

DISCUSSION

This research stems from the researcher's interest on the poetry of *Tidak Ada New York Hari ini* which is used in the movie *Ada Apa dengan Cinta 2*. Poetry *Tidak Ada New York*

Hari is the work of poet M. Aan Mansyur. It is enticing to understand the strategies used by the translator (John H. McGlynn) to translate the poem into English.

Poetry *Tidak Ada New York Hari ini* was translated by John H. McGlynn into *There is No New York Today*. John H. McGlynn is one of Indonesia's leading translators. According to Landers (2001), the translation of literary works is one of the most difficult forms of translation, since it must transfer meaning from one language to another.

Regarding the translation strategy, Rieu and Phillips (in Nida, 2004) explain two types of equivalents, formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. Formal Equivalence focuses on the accuracy and precision of the source text, whereas Dynamic Equivalent emphasizes more on the translator's readers.

In the translation of literary works, two terms are used to discuss the text, that is source language (SL) and target language (TL). This research seeks to evaluate the correspondence between TL and SL and to know the strategies used by translators to achieve this goal.

Based on the background of the problem, this research is aimed to investigate what the translator's strategies are to transfer meaning from original text to the target text, and what the translation methods are chosen by the translator to achieve the equivalence between the original text and the target text.

Jones (2011) proposed the complexity of translation, that is "The nature of poetic text makes it challenging to translate, which has stimulated much debate about how these challenges should be tackled." (p. 117). Jones defined poetry as "poetry may be characterized in terms of textual features and communicative function. The communicative function of poetry is rarely informative or persuasive, but rather to entertain or to give heightened emotional or intellectual experience." (p. 117).

Meanwhile, Nida (2004) adds, "In poetry there is obviously a greater focus of attention upon formal elements than normally find in prose... Only rarely can one reproduce both content and form in translation, and hence in general the form is usually sacrificed for the sake of the content." (p. 154).

According to Newmark (1988, p. 45), "the central problem of translating has always been whether to translate literally or freely." According to him, there has been a debate since first century. At the beginning, many writers favoured the "free" translation upon the literal translation. However, in the turn of nineteenth century, the literal

translation became increasingly favoured. The purpose of translation, the nature of the readership, the type of text were some that were discussed in the debate. According to Newmark (1988, pp 45-47), the methods in translation consists of **1) Word-for word translation, 2) Literal Translation Faithful translation, 3) Semantic translation, 4) Adaptation, 5) Free translation 6) 7) Idiomatic translation, 8) Communicative Translation.**

Newmark (1988) argued, "Semantics translation is used for 'expressive' texts, communicative for 'informative' and 'vocative'. (p. 47), in addition, according to him, in semantics translation, "the translator is essentially trying to render the effect the SL text has on *himself* (to feel with, to emphathise with the author), not on any putative readership. (p. 48-49).

The data were obtained through a book of poetry published by PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama published in 2016. This poetry book consists of 31 titles of poems by M. Aan Mansyur which was translated into English by John H. McGlynn.

This study uses a qualitative method, namely by conducting in-depth reading to the text, comparing the target text with the original text to determine the strategies used by translator. In addition to that, the writer also interviewed the translator, John H. McGlynn via email to understand the reason why the translator choose that strategy.

DISCUSSION

In an attempt to understand the translation methods used by the translator, the writer interviewed the translator. John H. McGlynn wrote that he aimed of eliciting in the reader of the translation the same or similar stirring of emotions that the Indonesian reader feels when reading the

work in the original language.

Siti A., Amir M. - Cooperative Translators in The Egyptian Speech Community

Based on the close reading to the text, the following are the finding of the research, the following are the translation methods employed by the translator:

In data number 1, ST: *Tidak ada New York hari ini* and TT: *There is no New York Today*. In this data, it can be seen that, the translator used *semantics translation method*. *Semantics translation method* attempts to take more account of the aesthetics value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text. In this case, the transformation happened during the translation process was derived from the grammatical differences between SL to TL.

In data number 2, ST: *Tidak ada New York kemarin* and TT: *There was no New York yesterday*. Data number 2 was derived from repetitive properties of poetry. Data number 1 was discussing about there was no New York today, meanwhile data number 2 narrated about there was no New York yesterday. In the present data, the translator also translated the source text faithfully. The translator employed used *semantics translation method*.

In data number 3, ST: *Aku sendiri dan tidak berada di sini* and TT: *I am alone and am not here*. In this data, the translator also followed closely the intended meaning of the source text. Differ from literal translation method which ignored the context, in this data the translator used *semantics translation method*. As stated by the translator, John McGlynn, he thought that the reader would compare between the original text with the translation in that kind of bilingual publication. The transfer between the SL to TL only included adjustment based on the grammatical differences.

In data number 4, ST: *Seperti orang adalah orang lain* and TT: *Everyone is someone else*. In this data, the translator was consistently being faithful to the SL. As stated by McGlynn that, the translation should reflect the strategies that are employed by the author of the original text. "Does the author write in an obscure manner? If so, the translation should be obscure as well. Does the author use in-your-face language? If so, the translator must use in-your-face language as well." In this case, he chose to use *semantics translation method*. The difference was originated from grammar difference between Indonesian language and English.

In data number 5, ST: *Bahasa ibu adalah kamar tidurku* and TT: *My mother tongue is my bedroom*. *Communicative translation method* was employed in this data. 'Bahasa ibu' was translated into 'My mother tongue'. Comparing the original text to source text would bring us to the understanding that the translator did not translate the word singly. The word 'ibu' was transferred into 'mother', however the word 'my', 'tongue' was the translator's effort to attain natural translation. In data number 6, ST: *Kupeluk tubuh sendiri* and TT: *I embrace myself*. In this data, the translator deleted the word "tubuh" and decided only use the word "embrace" to translate "Kupeluk tubuh sendiri".

In data number 7, ST: *Dan cinta—kau tak ingin aku mematikan mata lampu* and TT: *And love—you don't want me to extinguish light's eyes*. According to www.merriam-webster.com dictionary, the word "extinguish" means: *to bring to an end ;make an end of, to cause to cease burning ;quench*. The word was used to translate the word "mematikan". In this data, the translator consistently used the *semantics translation method*.

Semantics translation method attempts to take more account of the aesthetics value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text.

In data number 8, the ST: *Jendela terbuka dan masa lampau memasukiku sebagai angin* and the TT: *Through the open window the past enters me like wind*. In this data, the translator chose to employ communicative translation method. The meaning of the word 'Through' did not exist in SL, however the word 'dan' in source text was dissappeared in target text. Thus, the use of 'through' in TL was a replacement for 'dan' in SL which has slightly different meaning. If it was translated singly, then the word 'dan' would become 'and'.

Next, in data number 9, In data number 8, the ST: *Meriang. Meriang. Aku meriang* and the TT: *I shiver. Shiver. Shiver*. According to Oxford dictionary, the meaning of quiver is *gemetar*. In this case, the translator chose to use the word "shiver" as translation of "meriang" which is the meaning are around "menggigil" and "gemetar". In this case, translator has employed *semantic translation method*. This method is quite flexible and allows for the translator's intuitive empathy with the original. The translator also deleted the word "Aku" from the source text.

Next, in data number 10, In data number 8, the ST: *Kau yang panas dikening. Kau yang dingin di kenang* and the TT: *You are the fever in my mind, you are the frost in my memory*. In this data, the translator chose to merge the two sentences in source text to one sentence in target text. The word "panas" was translated to "fever", in fact the word "panas" in Indonesian language can have several other meanings. Meanwhile, the meaning of the word "frost" relates to something

frozen. In fact, the word "dingin" does not always relate to the word "frozen". Hence, in this data, the translator again employed *the semantic translation method*.

Next, in data number 11, In data number 8, the ST: *Kemarin tidak nyata* and the TT: *Yesterday is not real*. In this data, the translator seemed to follow the form of SL closely. He aimed to produce natural translation. Therefore, in the current data, the translator used *semantics translation method*. Semantics translation method attempts to take more account of the aesthetics value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text. The shift that was happening between SL to TL only in the use of auxiliary "is" as part of grammatical differences.

Next, in data number 12, the ST: *Aku sendiri dan tidak menulis puisi ini* and the TT: *I am alone and not writing this poem*. Grammatical differences are the thing that can be observed from this data. The translator chose to be faitfull, but also free at the same time. In this data, the translator aimed to maintain semantic-syntactic-oriented. Thus, this data showed that the translator has employed the *semantic translation methods*. 'Aku sendiri' was translated into 'I am alone'. The word 'dan' in the middle of the sentence preserved by using 'and' in the target text. Then, 'tidak menulis puisi ini' was translated into 'not writing this poem'.

Next, in data number 13, the ST: *Semua kata tubuh mati semata* and the TT: *Words are but lifeless souls*. The present data showed that the translator has made some shiftings in translation from source text to target text. The translator did not follow the form of the SL language. The word "soul" did not present in the source text, meanwhile the translator omitted the meaning of the words "semua", "tubuh" and "semata". Therefore, it can

be concluded that in this data, the translator has made use of *idiomatic translation method*. As he has reproduced the ‘message’ of the original and distorted nuances of meaning.

For data number 14, the ST: *Puisi adalah museum yang lengang* and the TT: *Poetry is a deserted museum*. The word “*lengang*” in this data was translated into “deserted” which was used in form of past participle of the word “desert”. By choosing the word “deserted” as translation of “*lengang*”, the translator has given some added meaning to the target text. It probably brought the reader to imagine the museum as a desert. Thus, the translator has employed the *communicative translation method*.

Next, for data number 15, the ST: *Masa remaja dan negeri jauh* and the TT: *Days of youth and far-away land*. From this data, it can be observed that the translator employed *semantics translation method*. *Semantics translation method* attempts to take more account of the aesthetics value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text. He has followed closely both the form and the intended meaning of SL.

Meanwhile for data number 16, the ST: *Jatuh dan patah* and the TT: *Fallen and broken*. In this data, the translator consistently used *semantics translation method*. *Semantics translation method* attempts to take more account of the aesthetics value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text. The used of conjunction to combine two words in SL language was also preserved in TL language. “*Jatuh*” was translated into “Fallen”. “*Patah*” was translated into “Broken”. “*dan*” in SL language was translated into “and” in TL language.

The source text of data number 17 is *Foto-foto hitam putih* and the target text is *Black and*

white photographs. Consistently, the translator made use of *used semantics translation method* in the present data. *Semantics translation method* attempts to take more account of the aesthetics value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text. The form probably looked different between SL and TL, in fact it was part of grammatical differences between English and Indonesian language.

Next, the target text of data number 18 is *Aroma kemeja ayah dan senyum perempuan yang tidak membiarkanku merindukan senyum lain*, meanwhile the target text is *The smell of my father’s shirt. The smile of a woman who will not permit me to pine for a different smile*. In the present data, the translator split one sentence in SL language into two sentences in TL. “*Aroma kemeja ayah*” translated into “The smell of my father’s shirt” as the first sentence. Meanwhile the phrase “*dan senyum perempuan yang tidak membiarkanku merindukan senyum lain*” was translated into “*The smile of a woman who will not permit me to pine for a different smile.*” The split done by the translator indicated that he did not follow the SL structure closely. Thus, into two sentences, in the present data, the translator has employed *the communicative translation method*.

Next, in data number 19, the ST: *Tidak ada pengunjung* and the TT: *There are no visitors*. Obviously, used *semantics translation method* in the current data. *Semantics translation method* attempts to take more account of the aesthetics value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text. The form and intended meaning was followed closely. The changing was derived from the difference in grammatical structures between English and Indonesian language.

For data number 20, the ST: *Tidak ada*

pengunjung and the TT: *There are no visitors.* This data was a repeated phrase in the poems. The translator also repeated the translation. As discussed in the above data, the present data was also employing *semantics translation method*. *Semantics translation method* attempts to take more account of the aesthetics value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text.

Further, in data number 21, the ST: *Di balik jendela, langit sedang mendung* and the TT: *Outside the window, the sky is overcast*. Observing the current data, the translator mostly rendered to the source text and attempted to produce acceptable meaning in the target language. Interestingly, the translator translated the word “*dibalik*” into “outside” which is slightly having different meaning. The translator attempted to make the translation more understandable in the target language by using “outside”. In this case, he has employed the *communicative translation method*.

The data number 22, the ST: *Tidak ada puisi hari ini* and the TT: *There is no poetry today*. In data number 22 and 23, the writer repeated the word “*tidak ada*” that was then translated into “there is no” in the target text. It was part of repetitiveness characteristics of poetry. In the present data, the translator attempts to take more account of the aesthetics value (that is, the beautiful and natural sound) of the SL text. The modifications made by the translator were only based on the grammatical differences between Indonesian language with English. Thus, in this data, the translator employed *semantics translation method*.

Next, in data number 23 the ST: *Tidak ada puisi kemarin* and the TT: *There was no poetry yesterday*. As discussed in data number 22, this

data was a repetition of data number 22, with variation in the last phrase. Data number 22 was ended with “*hari ini*”, then was translated into “today”. In the present data, it was ended with “*kemarin*”, then it was translated into “yesterday”. Observing the present data, the translator consistently transform the form and meaning of source language into the target language. That made the translator decide to render faithfully to the source text. Thus, in the present data, the translator also utilized *the semantics translation method*.

Finally, in data number 24, the ST: *Aku menghapus seluruh kata sebelum sempat menuliskannya* and the TT: *I erase all the words even before I have the chance to write them*. In this data, the translator also employed *the communicative translation method*. Interestingly, the translator added the word “even” in target text, which was not exist in the source text. According to Oxford Dictionary, the word “even” means “*pun*”, and “*lagi*”. It gives added meaning to the word “before”. The meaning of the target text was slightly different from the source text.

The translator, John H. McGlynn was originally from Wisconsin, U.S.A, but he has lived in Jakarta almost continually since 1976. He was also a graduate of the University of Michigan Ann Arbor (1981), with a Masters degree in Indonesian language and literature. Through the Lontar Foundation, which he co-founded in 1987, McGlynn has edited, overseen the translation of, and published close to two hundred books on Indonesian literature and culture. Those information tells that the translator means he has adequate knowledge about Indonesian culture.

Therefore, it is less likely for him to misunderstand the meaning of Indonesian language vocabularies. McGlynn stated he also found

challenges in transferring meaning between a source language and a target language. He argued that a good translator never works on a “word-by-word” basis, on the other hand, they generally worked with phrases and their relationship to the larger entire text. “As for metaphors, some are translatable, some are not; some sound fine in the original but others sound like clichés in the target language. The translator must make a choice. This is where the creativity of the translator most comes into play.” (cited from McGlynn’s email)

McGlynn argued that his priority was on the target language, however on the case of *There is No New York Today*, which is a bilingual publication (where the original text sits side by side with the translation), he said that he was forced to more closely adhere to the syntax and form of the original text. This reason provided explanation that McGlynn seem to faithful to the source text. “...in bilingual publications like that one where the buyers and readers of the book were likely to compare the original text with the translation on a line-by-line basis. The reader would be forgiving if the translation differs greatly in form or in shape from the original.” (cited from McGlynn’s email).

CONCLUSION

According to the translator, John H. McGlynn, a good translator never works on a “word-by-word” basis, on the other hand, they generally worked with phrases and their relationship to the larger entire text. This statement has brought to understanding the reason why McGlynn would not decide to use *word for word* and *literal translation method*. However, McGlynn did not seem to one of

followers of *free translation method* because he was really prioritizing the author’s intention. As stated on his interview that “...in bilingual publications like that one where the buyers and readers of the book were likely to compare the original text with the translation on a line-by-line basis. The reader would be forgiving if the translation differs greatly in form or in shape from the original.” (cited from McGlynn’s email).

Thus, this research found that the method used by the translator were mostly *semantics translation method*. It could be seen from data number 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16. Besides, the translator also tended to use *communicative translation method*. It can be seen from data number 5, 6, 8, 14, 18, 21, and 24. Meanwhile, in data number 13, the translator chooses to utilize the idiomatic translation method. Idiomatic translation method attempts to reproduce the ‘message’ of the original but tends to distort nuances of meaning. In data number 13, the translator has reproduced the message from SL to TL. If the sentence in SL language was translated singly, the translation would be as follows: 1) *semua* becomes *all*, 2) *kata* becomese *word*, 3) *tubuh* becomes *body*, 4) *mati* becomes *dead*, 5) *semata* becomes *only*. The meaning is quite different from the translated version ‘*words are but lifeless souls*’.

Newmark (1988) himself commented the close connection of semantics and communicative translation method. He states that “only semantics and communicative translation fulfil the two main aims of translation, which are first, accuracy, and second, economy. (p. 47). Newmark (1981) also consider these two methods have very close connection. As his statement that (1981), “A translation can be more or less,

However, this two methods has some differences, namely, *communicative* is ‘reader-centred’, meanwhile the semantic translation is ‘author-centred’. *Semantic translation method* is faithful, but more literal, on the other hand, *the communicative translation* is freerer. In semantic translation method, the translator has no right to improve or correct, meanwhile in *communicative translation method*, the translator has the right to correct and improve the logic and style of the original.

The dominant use of semantics translation method in the current research possibly comes from McGlynn’s aspiration to elicit the same or similar stirring of emotions that the Indonesian reader feels when reading the work in the original language. He wanted to create an English language rendition that sparks those same feelings. (cited from McGynn’s email).

REFERENCES

- Landers, C. E. (2001). *Literary translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd
- Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford; New York: Pergamon Press
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of Translation*. UK: Prentice Hall International
- Nida, E. (2004). Principles of Correspondence. In L. Venuti (Eds), *The translation studies reader* (2th ed., pp. 153-167). New York: Routledge
- Mansyur, M. A. (2014). *There is no New York today*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Grossman, E. (2010). *Why translation matters*. Pennsylvania: Louis Stern Memorial Fund
- Munday, J. (2012). *Introducing translation studies*: