Journal of Language and Literature
Vol. 23 No. 2, October 2023, pp. 370 – 383
DOI: 10.24071/joll.v23i2.6205
Available at https://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/JOLL/index
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

A Comparative Analysis of the Impact of Translation Techniques on the Translation of Similes and Metaphors in *The Old Man and The Sea*

Aulia Rachma Pratiwi, Nurenzia Yannuar, Arif Subiyanto
aulyarachmap@gmail.com
Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang, INDONESIA

Abstract

Figurative language is a way to captivate readers, expressed through writing in a more creative style. This research aims to find out and compare the translation techniques used by Sapardi Djoko Damono and Dian Vita Ellyati to translate similes and metaphors in The Old Man and The Sea Novel and their effect on the quality of the translation. This research used a descriptive qualitative method that employed a sampling technique. The research data are similes and metaphors from The Old Man and the Sea and its two Indonesian translations. This research collects data from document analysis, questionnaires, and focus group discussions. This research shows that translation techniques used in similes and metaphors have different impacts on the translation quality in both versions. The final result of the calculation shows that version A has a final translation quality score of 2.42, while version B has a final quality score of 2.54. The findings highlight the importance of carefully considering and selecting appropriate techniques to convey figurative language in translated works effectively. Future research in this field could focus on exploring additional translation strategies for other forms of figurative language, investigating the preferences, and examining the influence of cultural context on the translation process.

Article information

Received:
7 April 2023

Revised:
15 July 2023

Accepted:
19 July 2023

Keywords: *similes; metaphors; translation techniques; translation quality*

Introduction

This paper looks at the translation of *The Old Man and the Sea* by Ernest Hemingway, published in 1952. This novel is famous worldwide, leading Hemingway to win the Novel Prize of Literature in 1954. For many years, The Old Man and the Sea has been considered an outstanding work of classical literature that significantly impacted the world of literature in the 20th century and is still worthy of reference today (Mohammed, 2017). Due to its popularity, this novel has been translated into many languages. In Indonesia itself, there are several versions of Indonesian translations. Sapardi Djoko Damono was the first to translate the novel in 1973. Several other versions followed, including Yuni

Kristeningsih Pramudhaningrat's version in 2009, Dian Vita Ellyati's version in 2013, and Deera Army Pramana's translated version in 2015. Different translators will come up with different products. Traditionally, translation has been viewed as a derivative rather than a creative activity (Ordudari, 2008; Toury, 2021). As Razmjou (2004) stated, the translator cannot have and should avoid a distinctive style. The translator's role is to translate the original style as closely as possible (Baker, 2000; Huang, 2015; Jahromi & Suzani, 2016; Newmark, 1988). However, whether intentionally or not, translators will leave a personal imprint on every text they produce (Zhonggang, 2006). According to Baker (2018), translations have various styles because each translator has a technique for translating literary works. This fact has caught the interest of researchers researching the impact of translation techniques on translation quality.

Holmes (2011) and Prasetyo (2021) agree that language is a product of a particular culture, so the translator has an essential role as a mouthpiece, forwarder of intent, messenger, and liaison between one culture and another. The translator is responsible for connecting writers in the source language and readers in the target language. (Baker, 2018; Razmjou, 2004). A good translation is needed to maintain the reader's interest and understanding of the novel. For that reason, many novel publishers compete to publish good translated novels. As a result, many distinct versions of translated novels are available from various publishers. However, Indonesians voiced their displeasure with the quality of the translations of scientific and non-scientific publications released in the country. According to Dr Salim Said in Nababan and Nuraeni (2012), many translated works, particularly from English to Indonesian, depart from the original text's content. According to House (2014), the translation is more likely a messenger. Thus, a translator must be able to deliver, transform, and express the writer's thoughts and ideas or message from SL into TL accurately, acceptably, and readably (Nababan & Nuraeni, 2012). Hartono (2017) and Nababan (2003) stated that the translator should be able to write, read, know, and understand enough other languages as fluent as the natives and be familiar with cultural terminology in both languages. Considering the importance and beneficial effects of translation work in transmitting information and technology, the quality of the translation needs to be maintained (Ardi, 2014).

Several studies raise the topic of translation techniques and quality. Fitriana (2014) researched the analysis of techniques and quality of expressive speech acts in the Stealing Home novel by Sherryl Woods. From her research, it was found that 11 translation techniques were used to translate expressive speech acts. The application of 11 translation techniques positively impacts the quality of the translation so that this expressive speech act maintains the uniqueness of the story's theme, including its characterizations in the Indonesian translation. Dhyaningrum et al. (2016) tried to find out the complexity of sentences containing satirical expressions, types of satirical expressions, rhetorical devices in satirical expressions, techniques of translation, and the impact of translation techniques on the quality of the translation of sentences containing satirical expressions in the novel. Her study showed that the most frequent translation techniques positively contribute to translation quality. The average translation quality score is 2,82, which can be considered high. Another research on translation quality is also conducted by Nasution (2020). This study deals with translation techniques, ideologies, and quality of the translated text of sea repast incantation from Malay into English. According to Nasution (2020), the utilization of foreignization ideology and the use of source language-oriented translation techniques showed that the intercultural and thematic knowledge of the translators needs to be improved. Since the frequency of the literal technique was less than 25%, the quality of the translated text was regarded as 'fair.'

Despite the valuable insights provided by previous studies conducted by Fitriana (2014), Dhyaningrum et al. (2016), and Nasution (2020) on the positive impact of translation techniques on quality and the limitations arising from inadequate intercultural and thematic knowledge, comparative

investigations in this domain remain scarce. Consequently, there is a pressing need for further research that examines and compares translation techniques and their impact on translation quality. The researcher analyses the Indonesian-translated novel *The Old Man and The Sea* in the present study to address this research gap, specifically focusing on two translated versions. The first translation, by Sapardi Djoko Damono, was published by Pustaka Jaya in 1983, marking the earliest and most renowned translation of this novel in Indonesia. The second translation, by Deera Army Armana, was published by Narasi in 2015. The comparative analysis is motivated by the differences in translation techniques between these two versions. Furthermore, considering the temporal disparity between the publications, variations in word choices and adaptations to the prevailing cultural and contextual circumstances are expected to emerge.

Therefore, referring to the explanation above, this study aims to address the existing research gap by examining the translation techniques employed by translators in translating similes and metaphors in the *The Old Man and The Sea* novel and its translated versions. Furthermore, the study tries to assess the impact of these translation techniques on the quality of translation in the two translated versions. The selection of figurative language as the focal point of investigation stems from Toolan's (2004) assertion that figurative language imbues literary sentences with a distinctiveness not present in literal expressions. Given the prevalence of figurative language, the researcher has specifically chosen to analyze similes and metaphors, both of which are employed for comparison purposes. This research endeavour is prompted by the inherent challenges of comprehending figurative language's true meaning and implications within Indonesian culture. Consequently, the researcher investigates how translators navigate the cultural divide by identifying the translation techniques utilized in rendering similes and metaphors.

Methodology

The researcher used a qualitative descriptive research method to analyze the translation technique in *The Old Man and The Sea* novel. The characteristics of qualitative descriptive research are that the data collected is mainly in words, sentences, and pictures that have more meaning than numbers or frequencies (Creswell, 2017; Litosseliti, 2018). This study used the qualitative method because in analyzing the data in the form of similes and metaphors in the novel The Old Man and The Sea and its translation, the result was not presented as a number but as a narrative description of the problems examined. It also emphasized the validity of the research and commended the researcher's abilities for gathering and analyzing data.

The research data were from Ernest Hemingway's The Old Man and The Sea, published by Vintage 2000. Their Indonesian translation was translated by Sapardi Djoko Damono and published by Pustaka Jaya in 1983. Another newer version, translated by Deera Army Armana, was published by Narasi in 2015.

The data for this research were collected through content analysis, questionnaires, and focus group discussions. The content analysis examined sentences containing similes and metaphors from The Old Man and The Sea novel to identify the translation techniques employed. Questionnaires were distributed to three raters and 30 correspondents. The raters evaluated the quality of the translation, specifically in the accuracy and acceptability aspects. At the same time, correspondences gave a score on the readability aspect. The raters and correspondences used a scale adapted from Nababan and Nuraeni (2012) for their assessments. Weighting was applied to calculate the overall translation quality score, following the manual calculation method outlined by Nababan and Nuraeni (2012). The raters were carefully selected based on their fluency in Indonesian and English, translation theory, and practice expertise.

Furthermore, the researcher conducted a focus group discussion with a representative rater and correspondence. The focus group

discussion was used to gather information and comments from the respondents (Podesva & Sharma, 2014). In this case, it will discuss the quality of translation when there are differences in giving scores by the raters and correspondences.

Results and Discussion

Translation Techniques Found in Similes and Metaphors Translation

The translation technique theory to analyze the simile and metaphor translation technique in this study was from Molina and Albir (2002). According to Molina and Albir (2002), the translation technique is a practical way to analyze and classify how the equivalent search process is carried out. In this study, the researcher found that the translator in version A uses 14 translation techniques consisting of 10 data using a single technique and 4 data using the couplet technique. In version B, the translator uses 11 translation techniques consisting of 8 data using a single technique and 3 data using couplet techniques. The comparison of translation techniques can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. The comparison of translation techniques

No	Translation Techniques	Version A (Translated by Sapardi Djoko Damono in 1983)		Version B (Translated by Deera Army Armana in 2015)	
		Total	Percentage	Total	Percentage
Single Technique					
1	Literal	8	22%	18	50%
2	Transposition	5	14%	1	3%
3	Modulation	3	8%	3	8%
4	Amplification	2	6%	-	-
5	Established Equivalent	1	3%	2	6%
6	Generalization	2	3%	3	8%
7	Particularization	3	8%	-	-
8	Reduction	5	14%	4	11%
9	Adaptation	1	3%	1	3%
10	Borrowing	1	3%	-	-
11	Discursive Creation			1	3%
Couplet Techniques					
12	Borrowing + reduction	1	3%		
13	Borrowing + literal			1	3%
14	Transposition + amplification	2	6%		
15	Modulation + reduction			1	3%
16	Amplification + reduction	1	3%		
17	Established equivalent + generalization	1	3%		
18	Established equivalent + particularization			1	3%

The researcher found that the translation techniques that the most dominant used by the translator in version A are as follows: literal 8 data (22%), transposition 5 data (14%), reduction 5 data (14%), modulation 3 (8%), particularization 3 data (8%), amplification 2 data (6%), generalization 2 data (6%), the combination of transposition and amplification 2 data (6%), established equivalent one datum (3%), adaptation one datum (3%), borrowing one datum (3%), the combination of borrowing and reduction one datum (3%), the combination of amplification and reduction one datum (6%), and the combination of established equivalent and generalization one datum (3%). In total, the translated version A uses 14 translation techniques. The frequency of translation techniques showed that the most dominant translation technique used is the literal technique.

In version B, the researcher found that the translation techniques that the translator used

are literal 18 data (50%), reduction 4 data (11%), modulation 3 data (8%), generalization 3 data (8%), established equivalent 2 (6%), transposition one datum (3%), adaptation one datum (3%), discursive creation one datum (3%). Then it is followed by couplet techniques which are the combination of borrowing and literal one datum (3%), the combination of modulation and reduction one datum (3%), and the combination of established equivalent and particularization one datum (3%). In the translated version B, the translator uses 11 translation techniques. According to the frequency of the various translation techniques, the most frequently applied in version B is also the literal technique. The comparison of translation techniques between the two translated novels can be seen in Table 1.

The Result of Translation Quality

The analysis of the translation quality of the two versions of *The Old Man and The Sea* novel covers three aspects of translation assessment according to Nababan and Nuraeni (2012): accuracy, acceptability, and readability. The highest score for each aspect is 3, and the lowest is 1.

Table 2. The comparison of translation quality in both translated versions

Category		Version A (Translated by Sapardi Djoko Damono in 1983)		Version B (Translated by Deera Army Armana in 2015)	
		Data	**Percentage**	**Data**	**Percentage**
Accuracy	Accurate	15	42%	21	58%
	Less Accurate	16	44%	11	31%
	Inaccurate	5	14%	4	11%
Average		2.3		2.5	
Acceptability	Acceptable	20	56%	22	61%
	Less Acceptable	13	36%	11	31%
	Unacceptable	3	8%	3	8%
Average		2.47		2.52	
Readability	Readable	21	58%	24	67%
	Less Readable	13	36%	10	28%
	Unreadable	2	6%	2	6%
Average		2.5		2.6	

Regarding accuracy, the average score of translation accuracy for version A is 2,2. Version B has a higher average score of 2,5. While from the aspect of acceptability, the average score for the acceptability of version A is 2.47. Version B scored slightly better than Version A, with an average score of 2.52. Regarding the readability aspect, version B shows a better score in the readable aspect, scoring 2.6 as opposed to Version A's average score of 2.5.

The table 2 reveals notable distinctions in each aspect of translation quality between version A and version B. Version B surpasses version A in accuracy, acceptability, and readability. These findings emphasize the significance of examining the specific data that indicate the enhanced quality in version B. It provides valuable insights into the effectiveness and appropriateness of the translated texts.

The Impact of Translation Techniques on the Quality of Translation

The finding shows that translators in versions A and B use different techniques for translating similes and metaphors. The translator of version A uses 14 translation techniques, while the translator of version B uses 11. However, not all of them are

translated using different techniques. Some data was translated using similar techniques. These different translation techniques and combinations also make the translation quality different. In this section, the researcher tries to find out whether the translation techniques used by each translator impact the translation quality.

Table 3. The comparison of the impact of the translation techniques on the translation accuracy

No	Translation Techniques	Version A (Translated by Sapardi Djoko Damono in 1983)			Version B (Translated by Deera Army Armana in 2015)		
		Data	Level of Accuracy	Percentage	Data	Level of Accuracy	Percentage
1	Literal	6	Accurate	16.7	12	Accurate	33.3
		2	Less Accurate	5.6	6	Less Accurate	16.7
2	Transposition	2	Accurate	5.6	1	Accurate	2.8
		3	Less Accurate	8.3			
3	Modulation	3	Accurate	8.3	3	Accurate	8.3
4	Amplification	2	Less Accurate	5.6			
5	Established Equivalent	1	Less Accurate	2.8	2	Accurate	5.6
6	Generalization	2	Less Accurate	5.6	1	Accurate	2.8
					1	Less Accurate	2.8
					1	Inaccurate	2.8
7	Particularization	2	Accurate	5.6	-	-	
		1	Less Accurate	2.8			
8	Reduction	1	Accurate	2.8	2	Accurate	5.6
		4	Inaccurate	11.1	1	Less Accurate	2.8
					1	Inaccurate	2.8
9	Adaptation	1	Less Accurate	2.8	1	Less Accurate	2.8
10	Borrowing	1	Accurate	2.8	-	-	
11	Discursive Creation	-	-		1	Inaccurate	2.8
12	Borrowing + reduction	1	Less Accurate	2.8	-	-	
13	Borrowing + literal	-	-	-	1	Less Accurate	2.8
14	Transposition + amplification	2	Less Accurate	5.6			
15	Modulation + reduction	-	-	-	1	Inaccurate	2.8
16	Amplification + reduction	1	Inaccurate	2.8			
17	Established equivalent + generalization	1	Less Accurate	2.8			
18	Established equivalent + particularization	-	-	-	1	Less Accurate	2.8

Table 3 highlights different translation techniques' impact on translation accuracy in both versions. Version B demonstrates a higher accuracy score than version A, which can be attributed to specific techniques. The dominant use of the literal technique in both versions for accurate translations suggests its effectiveness in conveying the intended meaning. However, version B shows more consistent accuracy across various techniques, as evidenced by the higher number of accurate translations and the lower number of less accurate and inaccurate translations compared to version A.

As shown in Table 3, the literal technique significantly contributes to translation accuracy. Six data in version A were translated using this technique, and 16.7% have an accurate translation. Meanwhile, in version B, are 17 data translated using this technique, and 33.3% are accurate. Some translation techniques contribute much to this research's less accurate and inaccurate translation category. They are literal, generalization, and reduction.

Source language
30/SL/15a : 'You are my alarm clock,' the boy said.
Target language
30/TLA/20a : *Kaulah jam wekerku,"* kata anak itu.

The example above used the literal technique because it is translated word for word according to SL. The phrase alarm clock is translated according to the function and meaning of each word according to the target language's structure, which produces an accurate translation.

Source language
28/SL/26 : He knew that each of the jerking bumps of the shark had been meat torn away and that the fish now made a trail for all sharks as wide as a highway through the sea.
Target language
28/TLB/142 : Ia sadar bahwa di setiap guncangan yang diakibatkan oleh hiu itu kini menghamparkan lintasan *selebar jalan raya melalui laut b*agi semua hiu.

In datum version B above, as wide as a highway through the sea, it is translated word by word; however, ignore the context which makes the meaning distorted so that the translation doesn't make sense. Therefore, the translation quality results are less accurate.

Source language
03/SL/11 : His shirt had been patched so many times that it was like the sail and the patches were faded to many different shades by the sun.
Target language
03/TLA/15 : Kemejanya penuh tambalan sehingga tampaknya *seperti layar*, dan tambalan-tambalan itu sudah luntur menjadi bermacam-macam warna kena sinar matahari.

This translation shows that the specific term sail translates into the general term *layar*. As we know the equal meaning of sail is *layar perahu*, while in Indonesia layar can be *layar kaca* or *layar tancep* etc. Translations that are too general make the translation feel ambiguous, so the raters judge the quality of the translation to be less accurate.

Sources language
13/SL/46b : His sword was as long as a baseball bat and tapered like a rapier and he rose his full length from the water and the re-entered it…
Target language
13/TLA/59b : Pedangnya sepanjang pemukul baseball dan *meruncing*, dan ia menampakkan seluruh panjang tubuhnya di permukaan air dan kemudian menyelam kembali…

The example shows that there is a reduction in information from the SL. The translator did not translate the simile part and

omitted the words' like a rapier'. The phrase tapered like a rapier only translated into *meruncing*. This research found that there is a suppression of information done by the translator, making the translation quality less accurate.

These translation techniques are found both on versions A and B. The literal translation technique can lead to accurate or less accurate translation. Literal translation, sometimes-called word-for-word translation, does not translate words, phrases, or clauses by finding the whole equivalent meaning. It only simply translates words, phrases, or clauses word by word. It can be less accurate when there is distortion meaning. The generalization technique usually makes a translation less accurate or inaccurate because it generalizes a specific term into a general term. It makes the information in the source text not fully conveyed. Reduction techniques can also lead to translation into less accurate or inaccurate translations. This technique suppresses the source text information. This technique does not partially convey the complete information in the source text. It can lead to a translation of a less accurate and inaccurate one.

Table 4. The comparison of the impact of the translation techniques on the translation acceptability

No	Translation Techniques	Version A (Translated by Sapardi Djoko Damono in 1983)			Version B (Translated by Deera Army Armana in 2015)		
		Data	Level of Acceptability	Percentage	Data	Level of Acceptability	Percentage
1	Literal	7	Acceptable	19.4	14	Acceptable	38.9
		1	Less Acceptable	2.8	4	Less Acceptable	11.1
2	Transposition	3	Acceptable	8.3	1	Less Acceptable	2.8
		2	Less Acceptable	5.6			
3	Modulation	3	Acceptable	8.3	3	Acceptable	8.3
4	Amplification	2	Less Acceptable	5.6	-	-	
5	Established Equivalent	1	Unacceptable	2.8	1	Acceptable	2.8
					1	Less Acceptable	2.8
6	Generalization	1	Acceptable	2.8	3	Less Acceptable	8.3
		1	Less Acceptable	2.8			
7	Particularization	2	Acceptable	5.6	-	-	-
		1	Less Acceptable	2.8			
8	Reduction	1	Acceptable	2.8	3	Acceptable	8.3
		2	Less Acceptable	5.6	1	Unacceptable	2.8
		2	Unacceptable	5.6			
9	Adaptation	1	Less Acceptable	2.8	1	Less Acceptable	2.8
10	Borrowing	1	Less Acceptable	2.8	-	-	
11	Discursive Creation	-	-	-	1	Unacceptable	2.8
12	Borrowing + reduction	1	Acceptable	2.8	-	-	

No	Translation Techniques	Version A (Translated by Sapardi Djoko Damono in 1983)			Version B (Translated by Deera Army Armana in 2015)		
		Data	Level of Acceptability	Percentage	Data	Level of Acceptability	Percentage
13	Borrowing + literal	-	-	-	1	Less Acceptable	2.8
14	Transposition + Amplification	2	Acceptable	5.6	-	-	
15	Modulation + reduction	-	-	-	1	Unacceptable	2.8
16	Amplification + reduction	1	Less Acceptable	2.8			
17	Established equivalent + generalization	1	Less Acceptable	2.8			
18	Established equivalent + particularization	-	-	-	1	Acceptable	2.8

This research shows that versions A and B's translation acceptability levels have slightly different scores (Table. 2). The translation techniques found in version B are not entirely different from those in version A. It also makes the average score for translation acceptability not entirely different. On version A, it can be found that 20 data are translated acceptably. The acceptable translation is mainly translated with the literal technique (7 data). Then, it is followed by transposition (3 data) and modulation (3 data). The next is the combination of transposition and amplification with two data and particularization with two data. Then, each generalization technique, reduction, and the combination of borrowing and reduction have one datum. Version B contains more acceptable data than version A. 22 data are acceptable. The dominant translation technique is literal with 14 data. Next, the technique of modulation and reduction has the same amount of three data. Then, the established equivalent and the combination of the established equivalent and particularization have one datum.

Source language
35/SL/51 : Man is not much beside the great birds and beasts.
Target language
35/TLB/86 : *Manusia tak seberapa jika dibandingkan unggas dan makhluk buas yang hebat.*

As we can see, the SL in the example above is an active sentence, while the TL is translated passive sentence. It is marked by the word dibandingkan. The translator used a modulation technique when the word in SL does not have a meaning in the TL, for example, changing the source language's active structure to passive in the target language. Even though the structure has changed, the translation is still acceptable according to the raters.

This different amount of translation technique data also occurs in the less acceptable translation category. Version A has 13 less acceptability data than version B, which has 11 less acceptability data. According to the data found, the less acceptable translation in version A is translated with transposition (2 data), amplification (2 data), and reduction (2 data). Then, each technique of literal, generalization, particularization, borrowing, the combination of amplification and reduction, and the combination of established equivalent and generalization have one datum. The less acceptable translation in version B translated with literal (4 data), generalization (3 data), transposition (1 datum), established equivalent (1 datum), adaptation (1 datum), and the combination of borrowing and reduction (1 datum).

Source language
01/SL/06 : His hope and his confidence had never gone.

But now they were
freshening as when the
breeze rises**.**

Target language

01/TLB/16 : Harapan dan kepercayaan dirinya tidak pernah hilang. Tapi sekarang kembali *segar saat angin sepoi-sepoi berembus*.

Based on the example in the version B, translation in the simile used transposition techniques. According to Molina and Albir (2002) transposition is a translation technique that tries to change the grammatical category. In this datum, the translator translated freshening to *segar,* where there is a shift in the class of verbs to adjectives. Despite the change in grammatical categories, the translation still conveys naturally. However, there is a slight error in the translation of the word **as** where the translator translates it into *saat* which makes the translation odd. This makes the translation results less acceptable according to the raters.

At the same time, the amount of unacceptable data for both versions is the same. Two translation techniques in version A and three in version B are unacceptable. In version A, established equivalent techniques contribute one datum, and reduction techniques contribute two data. Otherwise, the reduction technique contributes one datum, the discursive creation technique contributes one datum, and the combination of modulation and reduction technique also contributes one datum in version B.

Shortly, version B certainly has more data in the acceptable category. The literal technique has many contributions against its acceptability in translation. It can be seen in both versions. Seven data (19.4%) in version A were translated with this technique, while 14 (38.9%) in version B were translated with this technique. Besides, there is an exciting thing about the reduction translation technique. The research found that version A has two unacceptable data and version B has one unacceptable data translated with the reduction technique.

Both of these translations are categorized as unacceptable since the term translation is not familiar with the target text culture and sounds unnatural. In this research, the reduction technique has a negative effect on the acceptability and accuracy of the translation. Hence, this technique should be avoided when translating similes and metaphors. *Reduction* is a translation technique that reduces information items in the source language. Using this technique is not recommended because, in translating similes and metaphors, we have to translate them to convey the meaning. The comparison of the effect of translation techniques against translation acceptability can be seen in Table 4.

Table 5. The comparison of the impact of the translation techniques on the translation readability

No	Translation Techniques	Version A (Translated by Sapardi Djoko Damono in 1983)			Version B (Translated by Deera Army Armana in 2015)		
		Data	Level of Readability	Percentage	Data	Level of Readability	Percentage
1	Literal	6	Readable	16.67	12	Readable	33.3
		1	Less Readable	2.8	6	Less Readable	16.7
		1	Unreadable	2.8			
2	Transposition	3	Readable	8.3	1	Less Readable	2.8
		2	Less Readable	5.6			
3	Modulation	2	Readable	5.6	2	Readable	5.6

No	Translation Techniques	Version A (Translated by Sapardi Djoko Damono in 1983)			Version B (Translated by Deera Army Armana in 2015)		
		Data	Level of Readability	Percentage	Data	Level of Readability	Percentage
		1	Less Readable	2.8	1	Unreadable	2.8
4	Amplification	2	Less Readable	5.6	1	Readable	2.8
5	Established Equivalent	1	Readable	2.8	2	Readable	5.6
6	Generalization	2	Readable	5.6	1	Readable	2.8
					2	Less Readable	5.6
7	Particularization	1	Readable	2.8	-	-	
		2	Less Readable	5.6			
8	Reduction	3	Readable	8.3	3	Readable	8.3
		2	Less Readable	5.6	1	Less Readable	2.8
9	Adaptation	1	Less Readable	2.8			
10	Borrowing	1	Readable	2.8	-	-	
11	Discursive Creation	-	-	-	1	Unreadable	2.8
12	Borrowing + reduction	1	Readable	2.8	-	-	
13	Borrowing + literal	-	-	-	1	Readable	2.8
14	Transposition + Amplification	1	Readable	2.8	-	-	
		1	Less Readable	2.8			
15	Modulation + reduction	-	-	-	1	Readable	2.8
16	Amplification + reduction	1	Less Readable	2.8	-	-	-
17	Established equivalent + generalization	1	Unreadable	2.8	-	-	-
18	Established equivalent + particularization	-	-	-	1	Readable	2.8

Table 5 shows that both versions employ various translation techniques to enhance readability. In both versions, literal translation is the primary technique to ensure readability. The use of reduction and other techniques, such as transposition, modulation, generalization, and the combination of various techniques, further contribute to the readability of the translated text. Version B exhibits more readable data, suggesting that the techniques employed in this version effectively enhance the readability compared to version A.

The emphasis on literal translation in both versions can be attributed to its ability to

maintain the original meaning and structure of the text, thereby facilitating readability. The presence of other techniques, such as reduction, transposition, modulation, and generalization, can be seen as strategies to adapt the text while still preserving its readability. Applying these techniques ensures that the translated text is easily comprehensible to the readers.

Something is fascinating about the assessment of the readability aspect; if in the previous assessment, the reduction technique scored between 2 and 1, the reduction got a high score on the readability aspect. It is because the correspondent only assesses whether the translation is easy to read. In the example below, as tight as the gripped claws of an eagle is only translated *kaku bagai cakar elang* and does not translate the word gripped even so many correspondents judge that the translation is readable and not long-winded.

Source language

15/SL/47 : Now alone, and out of sight of land, he was fast to the biggest fish that he had ever seen and bigger than he had ever heard of, and his left hand was still as tight as the gripped claws of an eagle.

Target language

15/TLA/60 : Kali ini ia sendiri, daratan tak tampak lagi, berurusan dengan ikan
paling besar yang pernah dilihatnya, yang lebih besar daripada yang pernah ia dengar- dengar,
dan tangan kirinya masih juga *kaku bagai cakar elang*.

The higher number of less readable data in version A suggests that combining transposition, amplification, particularization, and reduction techniques may have contributed to decreased readability. In version B, the heavy reliance on the literal technique and the generalization technique's usage has somewhat affected the readability.

Regarding the unreadable aspect, versions A and B have two unreadable data. Two unreadable data in version A are translated literally and combined with established equivalent and generalization techniques. Unlike version A, version B is translated with modulation and discursive creation. Discursive creation in translation involves the creative adaptation and redrawing of the source text to convey the intended meaning in the target language. This technique is beneficial when dealing with idiomatic expressions, cultural references or complex linguistic structures that may not have a direct equivalent in the target language (Hartono, 2017). However, translators need to be careful when using discursive creation techniques to maintain the source text's essence and integrity (Baker, 2018; Ordudari, 2008). Balancing creative adaptation with fidelity to the original author's intent is crucial to maintaining the overall quality and coherence of the translated work.

Conclusion

This research found some differences and similarities between the translation of similes and metaphors in versions A and B. The differences and similarities of translation from version A and B can be analyzed starting from the translation techniques used by each translator. The research found two variants of translation techniques used in similes and metaphors. They are single techniques and a couple of variant techniques. There is a similarity in that both translated versions use all these variant techniques in translating the similes and metaphors. However, there are differences here. The differences lie in the combination of translation techniques. This research also found similarities between versions A and B regarding the dominant translation technique. The research data shows that both simile and metaphor translations found in versions A and B are mostly translated using the literal technique.

Both translation versions show the same accuracy, acceptability, and readability levels. Version B, however, is better than Version A in terms of accuracy, acceptability, and readability. Both versions are classified as good translations since they have a good quality score. Version B, however, achieves a

higher score than version A at translating similes and metaphors.

To conclude, this study shows the importance of translation techniques in shaping the quality of translated similes and metaphors. The study provides insights into the effectiveness and appropriateness of various translation techniques and their impact on the accuracy, acceptability and readability of translations that translators, researchers and practitioners could utilize to help them in their decision-making process and improve translation outcomes. As suggestions for further research, researchers could focus on exploring additional translation strategies for other forms of figurative language, investigating preferences or ideology, and examining the influence of cultural context on the translation process. In addition, researchers could conduct a more in-depth similar study by looking at several variables, such as how confident translators are in using specific translation techniques and the role of editors in checking translations.

References

Ardi, H. (2016). The impact of translation techniques toward the quality of translation: A case study on a social text. *Humanus: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu-ilmu Humaniora*, *15*(2), 142-153. https://doi.org/10.24036/jh.v15i2.6564

Baker, M. (2000). Towards a methodology for investigating the style of a literary translator. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies*, *12*(2), 241-266. https://doi.org/10.1075/target.12.2.04bak

Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. London: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Dhyaningrum, A., Nababan, N., & Djatmika, D. (2016). Analisis teknik penerjemahan dan kualitas terjemahan kalimat yang mengandung ungkapan satire dalam Novel the 100-year-Old man who climbed out of the Window and Dissapeared. *PRASASTI: Journal of Linguistics*, *1*(2), 210-229. https://doi.org/10.20961/prasasti.v1i2.1074

Fitriana, I. (2014). *Analisis teknik dan kualitas terjemahan tindak tutur ekspresif dalam Novel Stealing Home (Hati Yang Terenggut) karya Sherryl Woods* (Doctoral dissertation, UNS (Sebelas Maret University).

Hartono, R. (2017). *Pengantar ilmu menerjemah (teori dan praktek penerjemahan)*. Semarang: Cipta Prima Nusantara.

Holmes, J. S. (Ed.). (2011). *The nature of translation: Essays on the theory and practice of literary translation* (Vol. 1). Walter de Gruyter.

House, J. (2014). Translation quality assessment: Past and present. In *Translation: A multidisciplinary approach* (pp. 241-264). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Huang, L. (2015). Style in Translation. In: Style in Translation: A Corpus-Based Perspective. New Frontiers in Translation Studies. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-45566-1_2

Jahromi, P. P., & Suzani, S. M. (2016). A study of relationship between translation studies students' critical thinking ability and the quality of literary prose text translation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *6*(9), 1855. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0609.19

Litosseliti, L. (Ed.). (2018). *Research methods in linguistics*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Mohammed, R. K. (2017). A literary study on hemingway's works. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature*, *5*(4), 22-27.

Molina, L. and Albir A.H. 2002. Translation Technique Revisited: A Dynamic and Functional Approach. Meta, XLVII, 4. Spain, Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Nababan, M. Rudolf. (2003). *Teori Menerjemah Bahasa Inggris.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Nababan, M., & Nuraeni, A. (2012). Pengembangan Model Penilaian Kualitas

Terjemahan. *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra*, *24*(1), 39-57. Retrived from https://publikasiilmiah.ums.ac.id/xmlui/handle/11617/2220

Nasution, D. K. (2020). Impact of Translation Techniques and Ideology Quality Text Translation in Mantra Jamuan Laut. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, *3*(2), 1518-1529. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v3i2.1024

Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation* (Vol. 66, pp. 1-312). New York: Prentice hall.

Ordudari, M. (2008). Good translation: Art, craft, or science. *Translation journal*, *12*(1), 1-11. https://translationjournal.net/journal/43theory.htm

Podesva, R. J., & Sharma, D. (Eds.). (2014). *Research methods in linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.

Prasetyo, Arif Bagus. (2021). *Saksi Kata*. Yogyakarta: Diva Press.

Razmjou, L. (2004). To be a good translator. *Translation Journal*, *8*(2), 1. *Paper presented at the Second International Conference on "Critical Discourse Analysis: the Message of the Medium" in Yemen, Hodeidah University, October, 2003*

Toolan, M. (2014). *Language in Literature*. New York: Routledge.

Toury, G. (2021). The nature and role of norms in translation. In *The translation studies reader* (pp. 197-210). New York: Routledge.

Zhonggang, S. (2006). A relevance theory perspective on translating the implicit information in literary texts. *Journal of Translation*, *2*(2), 43-60. Retrieved from https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=f433c9852e9af62ee2ffe80968e5e2e9a4135886